



## Kimba Consultative Committee and Kimba Economic Working Group Meeting

**Date:** Thursday 26 August 2021

**Time:** 9:10am–1:15pm (local time)

**Location:** Kimba Gateway Hotel, 40 High Street, 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>Housekeeping</li> </ul>
2. Project status	David Osborn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgement of Country</li> <li>New General Manager – Governance and Policy</li> <li>Legislation</li> <li>Intention to declare</li> <li>Judicial review</li> </ul>
3. TN-81 + ILW	Daniel Pond + Hefin Griffiths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New shipment arriving</li> <li>Other types of ILW</li> <li>Fact sheet</li> </ul>
4. UQ socio-economic baseline report update	Nicholas Crowther + UQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of findings</li> <li>ARWA's view</li> <li>Next steps</li> </ul>
5. ARWA update	David Osborn + Shane Holland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update on Cultural Heritage Assessment</li> <li>Community Benefit Program</li> <li>Common National Inventory of Radioactive Waste</li> <li>Community conversations</li> </ul>
6. RDA-EP visitor centre report	David Osborn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion about initial findings</li> </ul>
7. Concept design update	David	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where it's up to</li> <li>Video</li> <li>Concept drawings</li> </ul>
8. Other business	Allan Suter	-

**OFFICIAL**

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

Australian Radioactive Waste Agency

Staff attending:

- David Osborn, General Manager, Safety and Technical
- Shane Holland, Manager, Indigenous Engagement
- Megan Rusk, Media Officer, Community Engagement
- Jim Haskett, Site Supervisor
- Maree Barford, Community Liaison Officer

Staff attending via VC:

- Sam Chard, A/g Head of Division
- Nicholas Crowther, Manager, Community Engagement
- Daniel Pond, A/g Manager, Technical Team
- Clare Butterfield, Assistant Manager, Community Engagement

**Outstanding action items**

<b>Item number</b>	<b>Detail</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>KCC20210304/A06</b>	Circulate overview of the CSDP prior to detailed consultation with the community	<b>PENDING</b>

## OFFICIAL

KCC20210304/A13	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	PENDING
KCC20210422/A01	ARWA to scope out the opportunity for long term social impact assessment research proposal and put on agenda for a future meeting.	PENDING
KCC20210422/A08	ARWA to provide conflict of interest guidelines and advice about legal ramifications and penalties for not declaring conflicts of interest, should there be future funding rounds.	ONGOING

### New action items

Item number	Detail
KCC20210826/A01	Circulate a summary of the first community conversation with Council and investigate publishing the summaries on the website.
KCC20210826/A02	Where possible, provide detailed radionuclide descriptions for the ILW coming to Kimba.
KCC20210826/A03	Provide table from the framework with the ILW volumes in Australia.
KCC20210826/A04	Circulate slides from the UQ presentation.
KCC20210826/A05	Look into getting UQ to update the emotional wellbeing aspect of their report.
KCC20210826/A06	Arrange for RDA-EP to present on their findings on the visitor information centre.
KCC20210826/A07	ARWA to contact BGH regarding the conflict of interest clarification.

## 1 Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country

The Convener opened the meeting at 9:10am (local time). The Convener outlined housekeeping arrangements and proposed breaks throughout the day. Members agreed to have photographs taken throughout the day. The Convener then invited David Osborn to deliver an Acknowledgement of Country.

Mr Osborn thanked members for their continued engagement and introduced colleagues Nicholas Crowther and Clare Butterfield joining the meeting via Skype, and the ARWA team members in person: Shane Holland, Megan Rusk, Jim Haskett and Maree Barford.

Mr Osborn advised members that we will have Samantha Chard dialling in later in the day, along with presenters Daniel Pond, A/g Manager of the Technical Team, Hefin Griffiths, Chief Nuclear Officer from ANSTO, and Kathy Witt and Daniel Holm from UQ joining us via videoconference later this morning

## 2 Project status

### New General Manager – Governance and policy

Mr Osborn advised members that while Sam Chard is acting Head of Division, ARWA has welcomed Jodie McAlister who will be the General Manager for Governance and Policy for the next 12 months.

## OFFICIAL

Jodie has extensive experience as an SES Band 1 and has worked at the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment, AusAID, and had postings in Papua New Guinea, Tonga, Thailand and Geneva. Jodie is very much looking forward to visiting Kimba and meeting you all at the next meeting, COVID-19 restrictions permitting.

Mr Osborn informed members that the Economic Development Officer hired by ARWA subsequently declined the position, so we have gone back out to market and hope to have a new candidate next month. Mr Osborn said that members have most likely already heard that Maree is leaving us despite our efforts to convince her that she won't like Queensland and should stay. ARWA appreciates her significant contribution to the project over the past four years. We have advertised her position via several recruitment agencies, a notice on the Kimba community noticeboards, and Council's website.

### **Legislation**

Mr Osborn said that members would all be aware the NRWMF Legislation passed the Senate on 21 June and House of Representatives on 22 June. On the 29 June the Legislation received Royal Assent. This means that the proposed amendments to the *National Radioactive Waste Management Act 2012* have been passed and the three shortlisted sites for the facility are reflected in law. We acknowledge the broad and continued support of the Kimba community for the project and recognise there are different views, which are respected.

The Act also reinstates judicial review (which we will cover shortly), and ensures the \$20 million community fund will be available when the facility receives its operational licence.

### **Intention to declare**

The department briefed the Minister and he has issued an intention to declare Napandee as the site for the facility. There's now a minimum 60 day public consultation period (ARWA is allowing a little longer), where people with a right or interest in Napandee can make a comment about the declaration. Comments can be made via the Department's Consultation Hub or by downloading a form and posting it. More details can be found on the website and comments must be received by 22 October 2021.

The Minister will then consider all relevant comments as part of his decision-making process, and ARWA expects an outcome before the end of 2021.

ARWA's Indigenous Engagement team is working with members of the Barngarla community to provide information sessions to them about the facility's purpose, nature of the radioactive waste, and the facility's cultural heritage and environmental protections.

In terms of who can make comments on the consultation process:

The Minister's notice of intention to declare invites any person with a right or interest in the land at Napandee to comment on the proposed declaration.

While not exhaustive or necessarily relevant to the present case, the list below includes common rights or interests in land:

- land nominator;
- a fee simple (or freehold) interest in the land;

## OFFICIAL

- an easement or an interest in the nature of an easement (e.g. access rights)
- a leasehold interest in the land (e.g. a pastoral lease)
- reversionary interests in the land
- State or Territory interests in the land (e.g. Crown land)
- native title rights or interests in the land
- mineral rights in the land
- a mortgage, charge or some other encumbrance over the land
- a licence in respect of the land
- a contractual right related to the land.

This list is available on the consultation hub where comments can be submitted. Access it via our website at [www.industry.gov.au/arwa](http://www.industry.gov.au/arwa)

Not all rights or interests are written down, recorded and able to be identified by a search of public records.

This process is important as it is an opportunity for anyone who thinks that they have a right or interest in the land to let the Minister know about it, so that if they are relevant to a decision to declare the land, they can be considered.

If the land is declared, all rights and interests will be extinguished; that's why this consultation is so important. It's required by the Act.

The term 'rights and interests' is broad and will include obvious proprietary rights, but ARWA advised that if citizens think they have a right or interest in the land then they have the chance now to make it known and comment.

Whether they have a right or interest or not is a legal question, so ARWA can't advise you on that. Mr Osborn advised the committee that it is suggested they get legal advice, but if in doubt, make a comment.

### **Judicial review**

Choosing Napandee is an educated decision based on in-depth community consultation and extensive technical assessment work undertaken over a 4 year period, which started with voluntary land nomination by the owners of land.

Choosing Napandee is a legal decision with legal processes prescribed under legislation.

The first step is for the Minister to issue notices of intention to declare part of the land at Napandee, which he did recently.

The second step is for the Minister to make a subsequent decision to declare that land as the site for a National Radioactive Waste Management Facility.

If the Minister takes the second step, the Napandee site will be acquired by the Commonwealth.

The decision to choose Napandee may be subject to judicial review.

BDAC has previously stated their opposition to the facility and have flagged that they may seek judicial review if Napandee is acquired.

Judicial review would test whether the Minister had properly made the decision (i.e. the decision was made following the process correctly). It would not test whether the Minister made a good or right decision. In other words, judicial review will test how the decision was made and not the actual decision to select land at Napandee.

Any person who is affected by the decision can bring about an application for judicial review. A group of people with similar interests tend to bring a representative action as it is more cost effective.

If the grounds for judicial review have merits, then the court will hear the application.

Typically, a person will need to identify (one or more) grounds for review of the decision, which includes a failure by the Minister to follow the process in the Act for making the decision or that there is no evidence or other material to justify the decision.

For background, Section 5 of the Judicial Review Act has a broad range of grounds:

- that procedures that should have been observed in making the decision were not observed
- that the person who made the decision did not have jurisdiction to make the decision
- that the decision was not authorised by the Act under which it was made
- that the decision involved an error of law, whether or not the error appears on the record of the decision
- that the decision was induced or affected by fraud
- that there is no evidence or other material to justify the making of the decision
- that the decision was otherwise contrary to law.

Through the judicial review process, the Court will consider evidence offered by the applicant and the Minister (as the decision maker) to identify if the grounds for the review have been met. If the Court accepts the applicant's arguments, the Court can make a range of orders, including to set aside the decision. The Minister may then make a new decision.

The Minister could then make a fresh decision, absent any procedural flaws or evidentiary errors, for example.

If the court makes a decision, that decision will act as a precedent and therefore deter other people from seeking judicial review on the same grounds. A new application for judicial review can only be made if there is new information or different reasons for seeking judicial review.

The Minister and the Department are committed to the principles of consultation, sound, robust and defensible decision-making in accordance with law and have been mindful at every point through the site selection process to follow the processes required by the Act.

A member asked whether judicial review stops the acquisition of the land, and Mr Osborn advised no. Once the land is acquired, it remains commonwealth land. Another member asked if there is judicial review could they make further amendments to the legislation, and Mr Osborn advised that

judicial review questions whether the Minister followed the process outlined in the legislation process only.

Clarification was sought as to when the Community Skills and Development Package (CSDP) funding would be available, and Mr Osborn confirmed this could commence once the land acquired, in consultation with the community.

### **3 ARWA update**

#### **Update on Cultural Heritage Assessment**

The Chair invited Shane Holland to provide an update of the Cultural Heritage Assessment. Mr Holland said that AECOM has been engaged to undertake the Cultural Heritage Assessment, pending acquisition of the land, and that they will undertake public consultation with knowledge holders. The Cultural Heritage Assessment will take approximately 6 months and will be included in the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act approval process, which will inform the survey and assessment plan.

Mr Holland said that they have previously written to the Barngarla Determination Aboriginal Corporation (BDAC) inviting them to participate in the Cultural Heritage Assessment for the purposes of identifying and protecting cultural heritage on the Napandee site. ARWA has also procured the services of Australian Heritage Services, who are independent heritage consultants from Adelaide, to provide independent advice and review of our activities relating to cultural heritage and Indigenous engagement.

The Indigenous Engagement Team are also planning information sessions for Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta, and Ceduna at the request of some members of the Aboriginal community.

A question was asked about what is specifically involved in the Cultural Heritage Assessment. Mr Holland advised that there will be an updated desktop assessment of registered cultural heritage assets and, informed by the public consultation, on-ground cultural heritage surveys. There will then be a final cultural heritage assessment report released, of the site and its surrounds. ARWA will approach the Barngarla community to be involved in the on-ground surveys, without any ground disturbance. If they believe there to be something underground, there would be further exploration.

There was a question around the reason behind waiting until after the acquisition and Mr Holland advised that that the work is quite costly and it would be prudent to wait until the site is acquired to spend further public money on this activity.

#### **Community Benefit Program**

Mr Crowther spoke to members about the commitment at the last CBP meeting to resolve the geographic boundary out of session. The committee did not support changing the geographic boundary for the next round of CBP funding, so it will remain within the District Council of Kimba LGA. We anticipate that the guidelines will be issued late Sept/early Oct and the round will open shortly after that.

Mr Crowther advised that as Mr Osborn mentioned earlier, we have gone back to market to secure a new Economic Development Officer, and we hope they will be engaged as soon as possible, and will be available to assist with CBP applications. It was confirmed that the position is for a 12 month

**OFFICIAL**

period, with the option to extend. Initially, they will provide support for the CBP and CSDP funding rounds.

There was a discussion about a project outside the Kimba LGA boundary receiving funding in the first round and it was confirmed that this will not happen again, as voted by the committee. There were also some concerns raised about the CBP round opening so late in the year.

**Common National Inventory of Radioactive Waste**

Mr Osborn spoke to members about ARWA improving the management of radioactive waste across the country for Commonwealth, State and the private sector wasteholders. The Technical Team has approached States and Territories to advise of their waste holdings, so that we can collate as much information as possible. It may take a number of years to get a full understanding of what's out there, as each state has between 500 and 1000 licences.

As an example, Mr Osborn visited University of Adelaide and Royal Adelaide Hospital recently and they have waste stored in a range of locations, so it will take some time to assess the stores, as they currently have no disposal pathway.

Some concerns were raised about the volume of waste, but Mr Osborn confirmed that the inventory remains close to our original estimates. ARWA doesn't expect a dramatic increase to the volume of waste, as the majority of Australia's waste is held by ANSTO, ARPANSA, CSIRO and Defence, who have all provided information previously. It was also confirmed that bringing Commonwealth waste to the facility remained the priority for the agency.

**Community Conversations**

Mr Crowther informed members that the first community conversation was held at the District Council of Kimba on Wednesday 11 August with Councillors, Deb, and the Works Manager Michael, with a focus on Economic Development. Mel Garibaldi, the new Economic Development Officer for Council, facilitated the discussion and some valuable information was garnered.

The next community conversation is Friday 3 September, with representatives from the Kimba Men's Shed, Probus Club, Lion's Club and Senior Citizens Club to discuss health. Maree will work with new Community Liaison Officer to continue the community conversations.

It was confirmed that the information gathered from the community conversations would be circulated amongst members and possibly even published for the broader community, at the request of the committee.

<b>KCC20210826/A01</b>	Circulate a summary of the first community conversation with Council and investigate publishing the summaries on the website.
------------------------	---

There was discussion around the school not receiving any funding through the CBP and some members expressed their disappointment as to why health seems to be a priority but not the school.

Mr Crowther acknowledged the frustration and advised that it is up to the community to provide advice on priority areas for funding, and that the CBP funding is based on merit. ARWA would certainly like to see funding go to the school, and indeed ARWA recently made a significant contribution to the school for them to purchase a new laser cutter, 3D printer, trinocular microscope, Geiger counter, autoclave and science books, as part of National Science Week activities.

There was a discussion about having ARWA be more involved with the school, particularly around STEM, scholarship opportunities, and science programs. There were mixed feelings among members on this topic.

## 4 TN-81 + ILW

### New shipment arriving

Mr Hefin Griffiths, Chief Nuclear Officer from Australia's Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) and Mr Daniel Pond, A/g Technical Team Manager from ARWA joined the meeting via Skype to update the committee on developments regarding Intermediate Level Waste (ILW).

Mr Griffiths advised that ANSTO recently submitted a referral to the Department of Agriculture, Water and Environment under the EPBC process to cover the return of vitrified radioactive waste from the UK to Lucas Heights.

Mr Griffiths told members that in the mid-1990s ANSTO sent spent fuel to Dounreay in Scotland and the United Kingdom Government made a decision not to reprocess this waste. ANSTO took the opportunity to substitute 52 cemented drums from Dounreay with 4 canisters of vitrified waste from Sellafield in England to have a smaller volume of waste. The waste from the UK will also be contained in a TN-81 cask and will be stored in the same building as the existing cask at Lucas Heights, pending transfer to the NRWMF in due course. This waste is very similar to the canisters of vitrified Intermediate Level Waste stored in the existing TN-81 cask at Lucas Heights, which was transported from France in late 2015.

The current plan is for the TN-81 to be shipped from the UK in 2022 and this will be negotiated with Sellafield and the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA). The final date is yet to be decided.

In 2017 the first shipment of OPAL reactor spent fuel was sent overseas to France for reprocessing, and Australia has a responsibility to take it back once the reprocessing is finalised. Mr Griffiths said that 85% of the material is returned, the uranium and plutonium is removed, and the remainder is returned in solid form.

There will be future waste shipments from France which will contain waste resulting from the reprocessing of spent fuel used in the OPAL multipurpose reactor.

There were no questions from members for Mr Griffiths regarding ILW.

### Other types of ILW

Mr Pond introduced himself to members as the A/g Technical Team Manager and advised that he has been with ARWA for the past 18 months. Prior to his role with the agency he was an engineer at ANSTO, which included responsibilities with the intermediate level waste currently stored at ANSTO.

Mr Pond spoke to members about other examples of Intermediate Level Waste managed in Australia. Other types of ILW include:

- Disused sealed sources from industry and medicine.
- Some components resulting from the decommissioning of the MOATA, HIFAR, and OPAL reactors.

**OFFICIAL**

- Waste arising from the production of nuclear medicine including Spent Uranium Filter (SUF) cups, Synroc and contaminated single use equipment from the production hot cells. This is 98% of the ILW produced currently.
- Other long lived radioactive waste relating to historic research activities.

Mr Pond said that the facility is being designed with these waste types in mind and that all waste, including ILW, will need to meet the Waste Acceptance Criteria before ARWA will accept the waste at the NRWMF. Mr Pond also explained that any waste conditioning and packaging plans would need to be approved by the regulator, ARPANSA, before the waste is transported to the facility.

CSIRO and ANSTO are currently undertaking research in partnership with a number of international organisations in regards to ILW disposal options. Potential ILW disposal options include deep geological facilities and boreholes.

ARWA will work with ANSTO, CSIRO, and others to develop this research and implement an Australian appropriate disposal pathway in due course.

Mr Osborn raised a question from earlier in the meeting regarding the precise radionuclides in the waste.

Mr Pond said that the type and level of radionuclides in waste depends on the type of waste and where it comes from. Information has been made public identifying how many cubic metres there are of low level waste and intermediate level waste in Australia. More detailed information about the specific radionuclides and activity levels belongs to each of the wasteholders, not ARWA, and ARWA will need to seek wasteholders' permission to publish that information.

There would also be some security issues, as some of this waste is safeguarded and regulated by ASNO and inspected by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The IAEA send inspectors around the world to inspect these materials and to make sure that they have not been relocated or used inappropriately.

A question was raised about the volumes of ILW in Australia, and Mr Griffiths confirmed that they were published in the publicly available National Radioactive Waste Management Framework in 2018 and could be easily provided to the committee. Mr Griffiths also explained the process that is used to define the waste at ANSTO, as to whether its contact handleable or if it requires shielding such as the SUF cups, vitrified or synroc waste. It is possible that waste previously categorised at ANSTO as ILW (now contact handleable) could have decayed and now be classified as LLW; this will become apparent when the Waste Acceptance Criteria for the Facility is developed.

<b>KCC20210826/A02</b>	Where possible, provide detailed radionuclide descriptions for the ILW coming to Kimba.
<b>KCC20210826/A03</b>	Provide table from the Framework with the ILW volumes in Australia

There was a discussion about storing ILW above ground for decades and if this was world best practice. Mr Griffiths said that there is a lot of information about ILW remaining radioactive for 10,000 years, however the material that remains from synroc and reprocessing that's returned from France indicates that after 300 years 99% of the radioactivity will have decayed away. After 600 years, 99.9% will have decayed away.

Mr Griffiths said the approach applied at ANSTO will need to be mirrored and passive storage for the ILW, including SUF cups and synroc waste, means that there is no additional exposure to the staff, public and environment. As many members are already aware, a disposal pathway for ILW that has been under discussion since 2013 with the IAEA is the bore hole disposal. There is a research project on bore hole disposal for countries with small inventories of ILW with the IAEA, which is shared with other countries so that processes can advance. There are many advantages of combining research to identify a means of disposing Australia's waste.

Underground facilities in Finland, France, and the United Kingdom have cost about \$4 billion US to build, which includes underground research laboratories. For countries like Australia that hold low volumes of intermediate level waste, it will be more cost effective to look at the bore hole option. This option looks promising, as it isolates the material effectively and could be completed in a shorter timeframe. Mr Griffiths is hopeful that this is something that will be preferred by Australia and can be progressed.

A question was raised about the timeframe for the ILW disposal. Mr Griffiths said that, from a technical point of view, the process could take around 20 to 30 years. Identification and geological analysis, and acquisition will be the most challenging aspects. The facility would need to be in a remote area where you would drill a hole a few hundred metres down, close it, and monitor. Operators from the NRWMF could be part of the process. Mr Osborn said it is important to note that Napandee is not the ILW disposal site.

Mr Griffiths said he hopes to be able to visit Kimba again soon.

#### **New fact sheet on ILW**

A new fact sheet in ILW was distributed to members.

The Convener thanked Mr Griffiths and Mr Pond for their time.

## **5 UQ socio-economic baseline report update**

### **Overview of findings**

Mr Crowther introduced Ms Kathy Witt and Mr Daniel Holm from University of Queensland (UQ), who have been updating the economic component the 2018 Social and Economic Baseline Report.

Ms Witt presented an overview of the minimal changes they have identified since 2018, and drew the committee's attention to the key findings:

- There is a long term trend of population decline.
- Unemployment is very low and there was a small impact with covid.
- Decline in Agricultural businesses in the District Council of Kimba.
- 2020 rainfall was around average and very dry years prior.
- Good news is there are more children at the Kimba Area School.
- Median age in the community has dropped slightly.
- Crime is low and Kimba is one of the safest places to live.
- There are few rentals available and not much movement.

Ms Witt explained to the committee that UQ uses an indicator approach and choosing which characteristics to track are very important. It's the agreed indicators about what's important and what measure they should keep tracking as the facility moves forward. An example is if the rents

start increasing will school enrolment decrease. Monitoring measures like this as things change over time is important.

Ms Witt went on to elaborate on the key points in the data.

**Population:** Kimba is declining, but so is the regional population. South Australia increased by 18% but regional areas are still declining. Census data recently collected will show how long people have lived in the area and help to measure population turnover.

**Unemployment rate:** The unemployment rate in Kimba is considered very low. Ms Witt explained that their researched showed that businesses are finding it hard to find people to fill roles. Covid impacts were not felt as much as the state data, which was heavily skewed by metro areas.

**Income:** The figures received from the ATO are based on tax returns for the EOFY. There is an 18 month delay in this period, so it goes back to the 2018/2019 financial year, which was a very dry year. Individual tax returns can strongly affect this data and it can be affected if they recorded zero income. These statistics can be interpreted differently and that's why UQ also undertook 'on the ground' investigations for this report. It is expected that income would increase at around CPI rate. It is also related to seasonally fluctuation around agriculture, as it is a dominated industry in the area. Business income, including for sole traders, saw a spike in 2014/2015 and it has been fairly steady since 2017/2018. The number of businesses in the Kimba LGA seems to have remained stable over the past few years, with a few changes. There are 10 less Agriculture businesses, 6 less retail trade businesses, but an increase in admin, support services, gardening, cleaning and employment services. There are more micro businesses, pop-up shop businesses and home businesses, where people could be selling things online.

**Agriculture and rainfall:** Ms Witt spoke about the 2020 rainfall being quite average and dry years prior. Barley production increased considerably in 2019, noting that these figures were for the whole of Eyre Peninsula

**Education:** There has been an increase in the number of students at the Kimba Area School from 2018-2020 The census information is updated every 5 years, so there will be more data made available next year. Most people in Kimba only go onto complete high school, 11% graduate university and 14% gain a certificate or trade.

**Safety:** Ms Witt said that the crime rate is very low so the police officer must be doing a good job. Property, theft, damage, and assault were very low. Crime rates also include traffic offences, so these usually increase the numbers. Overall it is a very safe community and criminal offenses are very low.

**Housing:** When it comes to housing it's very difficult to get accurate data, especially when there are very low numbers of houses. The median rent is very low and there are a very low number of rentals, so it wouldn't take much for there to be increased demand.

Ms Witt explained that the prospect of ongoing socio-economic monitoring would include consultation and discussion about what things are important to the community and what changes should be monitored

There was a discussion about updating the social aspect of the report, as some members expressed their view that this was important to measure moving forward and Our Town Kimba would like this data made to be collected.

Ms Witt said that there will be some census data that would have been recently collected in the 2021 ABS Census which will provide information on volunteering and involvement in the community, and UQ would be happy to include those measures moving forward at the request of the Department. Mr Crowther confirmed that ARWA will consider including this component next time.

KCC20210826/A04	Circulate slides from the UQ presentation
KCC20210826/A05	Look into getting UQ to update the emotional wellbeing aspect of their report.

The Convenor thanked Ms Witt and Mr Holm for their time.

#### **ARWA's view**

ARWA undertook to provide an update on this work every two years to establish trends and identify where additional support and resources may be needed.

## **6 RDA-EP visitor centre report**

### **Discussion about initial findings**

Mr Crowther spoke to members about the Regional Development Australia Eyre Peninsula (RDAEP) Report and advised that ARWA has noted the initial findings and will continue to work with RDA-EP to finalise the report. Their recommendation is for the visitor centre to be located in town with the highway intersection upgrade area being one possible location. Members were asked if they think the visitor centre should be a pull-off area on the highway or should in town?

There was much discussion amongst the committee. Many members advised that they would prefer to see a visitor centre in the Kimba Township to draw travellers off the highway and into the town to maximise the economic benefit. Another suggestion was to incorporate cultural heritage and education into the visitor centre. Mr Crowther acknowledged that return to country and Indigenous economic development was a high priority.

Members also discussed whether the facility would promote things to do in Kimba. Mr Osborn said that he envisaged a visitor centre in town and the possibility of there being a viewing platform at the facility where people can look over the site to get a birdseye view. It could potentially also include information on the area including the Pinkawillinie Conservation Reserve flora and fauna. There was a discussion about the Council-owned land on the highway and the potential truck servicing centre being located in the vicinity. Members seem to be strongly for the visitor centre in the township and liked Mr Osborn's idea about the viewing platform. It was also raised that they did not want to see the visitor centre offer coffee or lunch, as it would affect local businesses.

There have been some preliminary discussions with Council and the RDAEP about how a broader tourism centre may work. Mr Crowther said that should site acquisition occur, we would look at a staged approach and start investigating those options.

KCC20210826/A06	Arrange for RDA-EP to present on their findings on the visitor information centre
-----------------	---

### **Sam Chard joined the meeting**

Ms Chard joined the meeting via video conference to say hello and answer any questions.

Members took the opportunity to talk about funding and sought clarification on whether the \$20 million community fund was tied to accepting ILW at the facility. Ms Chard confirmed that the Community Fund commitment exists independently of the waste storage and is granted to the community once the facility is issued with its operational licence. It was also confirmed that the \$8 million CSDP funding will be rolled out when the Minister makes a declaration and the Commonwealth acquires the site.

There were questions about how much the landholder will be paid for the land. Ms Chard clarified that there are a couple of things that are considered, including the PGPA Act, which says compensation must be reasonable and due diligence – including an independent assessment of the land – must be undertaken.

## 7 Concept design update

### Where it's up to

Mr Osborn updated members on the evolving concept design. The Technical Team has been working with ANSTO and Jacobs on the design, and they are getting close. However, it is still a concept design and should not be considered by anyone as set in concrete. It may change as the cultural heritage and further site assessment work progresses.

The design will also need to go through an approval by ARPANSA and the government's Public Works Committee.

### Video

Mr Osborn talked through the video that starts with identifying where Napandee is geographically and its location near Pinkawillinie Conservation Reserve. Mr Osborn pointed out the potential mallee fowl mounds identified in the LIDAR survey in Pinkawillinie, as they are very interested in these protected species.

Mr Osborn pointed out the access route along the side of the site for the landholder to access the property behind the facility, and advised that it's shaped such that existing vegetation isn't disturbed.

There were some questions from members about bitumising around the perimeter of the site, as well as in and around the grounds. Mr Osborn said that these details are still being considered and are yet to be decided.

Mr Osborn spoke to members about different aspects of the concept design which included:

- Low Level Waste
- Intermediate Level Waste
- Process for delivery of waste
- A solar farm and batteries
- Waste acceptance criteria
- An agricultural research and development zone
- Water tanks and dams
- Visitor centre
- Administrative offices
- Viewing platform
- Contractor's compound and offices
- Recreational facility for the workers at the facility.

There was some discussion about the agricultural research and development zone and the additional 50 hectares that the Commonwealth plans to acquire. Mr Osborn advised that if the facility don't end up using the extra space, ARWA may revegetate that section or extend the agricultural research and development zone.

There were questions around the police presence in the community with an influx of people for construction, and whether this is something that has been considered. Mr Osborn said that this is something that needs further discussion with South Australian Police and Council. There will be security at the site, however it is yet to be decided if it will be Australian Federal Police (AFP).

There were some questions and discussion around the various materials required for construction, where they will be sourced, and the technical aspects of the build. There was also discussion about Tola Road and how it will most likely be the primary access road, and whether the agricultural research and development zone would be open to the public and how bookings would be made. Mr Osborn said that the agency would like to bring in CSIRO, University of Adelaide, and the community to discuss that space and how best it will be utilised. We want it to be ground breaking research in that space and appreciated any ideas from the community. It may even be possible to utilise that space before the site is operational, and we will give that some more thought.

#### **Concept drawings**

Members took the opportunity during the lunch break to have a look at the concept design drawing in more detail, and overall they were quite impressed with how it is developing.

## **8 Other business**

Mr Crowther thanked Maree Barford for her four years working on the project.

It was expressed that it would be good if the CSDP funding did not overlap with the current CBP round so that the community had more time to consider projects. Mr Osborn said that the CSDP funding has a different objective to the CBP and it is to build the capability and capacity to support the construction and operation of the facility.

There was a question about the commencement of the Regional Consultative Committee and Mr Crowther advised that ARWA appreciates all the work done by the KCC and KEWG on the planning of the RCC to date, and in the coming weeks they will continue with work on the RCC guidelines.

The clarification on conflict of interest was raised and Mr Crowther said he will follow up with Business Grants Hub on this matter.

<b>KCC20210826/A07</b>	ARWA to contact BGH regarding the conflict of interest clarification.
------------------------	---

## **9 Meeting close**

The Convener thanked Maree Barford, and Convener closed the meeting at 1:15pm (local time), thanking members for their attendance.