



Australian Government
Department of Industry,
Innovation and Science

National Radioactive Waste Management Facility

Barndioota Consultative Committee

Meeting Notes

Tuesday 10 October 2017

Agenda

Time	Item	Lead
Tea and coffee available from 09:30		
10:00-10:05	Welcome to country	Aaron Stuart / Michael Anderson
10:05-10:10	Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Apologies – Overview of the meeting agenda 	Paul Thomas, Independent Convener
10:10-10:30	Approve Draft Notes of meeting of 22 August 2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Discussion 	Paul Thomas
10:30 – 10:45	Project Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Heritage Assessment – Community Benefits Package – Kimba Consultative Committee – Economic Working Group 	DIIS – Bruce McCleary
10:45-12:15	Nuclear Medicine <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Production and use 	Dr Geoff Currie (CSU) Mark Moore (ANSTO)
12:15-13:00	Lunch Break	
13:00-15:00	Community Definition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To agree on a definition of ‘community’ 	Prof Peta Ashworth (UQ)
15:00 -15:15	Afternoon Tea	
15:15-15:45	Mr Sweeney to advise of topic	Dave Sweeney
15:45-16:30	Radiation Safety	Frank Harris (RioTinto)
16:30-17:10	Other items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Update on telecommunications feasibility study - Telstra – Confirmation of 12 December for next meeting – Other topics raised by BCC members 	Paul Thomas Telstra – Jaron Cooper

Attendees:

Paul Thomas (Convener)	John Rowe	Rachel Vella
Greg Flint (Deputy Convener)	Jon Gill	Julia Henderson
Susan Andersson	Ashley Haywood	Philip Fels
Cecilia Woolford	Steven Taylor	
Denise Carpenter	John Hennessy	
Ronald Daniel	Janice McInnis	

Apologies:

Michael Anderson	David Michael	
Dianne Ashton	Aaron Stuart	

Other Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Bruce McCleary	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – General Manager
Rebecca Mouthaan	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – Manager of Community Consultation Team
David Abbott	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Community Consultation Team
Nicholas Clifford-Hordacre	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Community Consultation Team
Adam White	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Community Consultation Team
Zaheer McKenzie	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Community Consultation Team
Damien Halliday	AusIndustry
Mark Moore	Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation
Dr Geoff Currie	Charles Sturt University
Professor Peta Ashworth	University of Queensland
Frank Harris	RioTinto
Dave Sweeney	Australian Conservation Foundation
Jaron Cooper (via Phone)	Telstra

Action Items

Item	Status
1. Reflect in the notes of the meeting on 22 August 2017, that in the discussion for the licensing and regulation presentation given by Dr Sarkar there is a change in wording. The last discussion point will be changed to read “There are currently no plans to extend the licence by ANSTO for Lucas Heights to hold intermediate level waste (ILW)”.	Complete
2. Provide BCC members the names of HWG members.	Complete
3. Provide members Mark Moore’s presentation.	Complete
4. Provide members Dr Geoff Currie’s presentation.	Complete
5. Provide members a link to the Local Government Act.	Complete
6. Provide community definition to the HWG and ask them to present their views to the BCC	Upon further review by HWG DIIS Representative, the HWG is not the appropriate group to address this. The BCC has Traditional Owner engagement and they are the appropriate representatives to deal with this issue. DIIS to provide draft definition to existing BCC members seeking their response and views will be sought at the next meeting.
7. Provide members Jaron Cooper’s presentation.	Complete
8. Provide members David Bruce’s presentation from ORIMA given at the June 27 meeting.	Complete
9. Arrange for the Department of Environment to give a presentation on environmental protection.	Rescheduled for February 2018

Meeting opened 10:30am

Welcome to Country

- Paul Thomas gave an Acknowledgement of Country.

Housekeeping

Approve draft notes of 6th meeting on 22 August 2017

Discussion

- A correction to the previous meeting's attendee list was raised, the department will correct the record.
- A member raised a problem with the wording in item 5 around extending the licence for ANSTO to hold Intermediate Level Waste at Lucas Heights. Currently 'ANSTO has not submitted a proposal to ARPANSA but it has not been ruled out'. Wording will be changed to read 'There are currently no plans for ANSTO to extend the licence to hold ILW at Lucas heights'.

Action Item 1:

- *Reflect in the notes of the meeting on 22 August 2017, that the wording around extending the licence at ANSTO to hold ILW should read 'There are currently no plans to extend the licence for ANSTO to hold ILW at Lucas Heights'.*

Project Update

The department provided an update on the project:

- Heritage Working Group (HWG) – A number of submissions have been made for the cultural heritage assessment. From the three recommended tenderers to undertake the independent heritage assessment one has been accepted but it has not been announced at this stage. Confirmed that the HWG members had provided consent for their names to be provided to the BCC.
- Community Benefit Program (CBP) – A ministerial announcement is expected in the next three weeks for round two in Barndioota and round one in Kimba. There will be a 14 week timeframe from approval including evaluation and assessment. The funds will need to be spent by June 2020.
- Kimba Consultative Committee (KCC) – The department is accepting applications for the KCC and they will be reviewed. It will take some time to work through the process but it is expected to be operating in January 2018.

- Economic Working Group (EWG) – The EWG for this community has had one meeting as seen in the latest newsletters. The main discussion was deciding on the focus of the EWG.

Discussion

- A member asked about the timeframes for the CBP applications and fund spending. The department advised that the timeframe for applications would be 14 weeks for round two and the funds would need to be spent by June 2020.
- A member raised a concern that the EWG could be swayed and just examine the benefits of the project without considering the negatives for the community. The department advised that the EWG would be looking at the positives and negatives of the facility for the community. EWG members have a range of views on the project.
- The department advised that another formal land nomination has been received. It is under review.

Action Item 2:

- *Provide BCC members the names of the HWG members.*

Heritage Working Group Members

Malcolm 'Tiger' McKenzie	Dawn Likouresis	Aaron Stuart
Angelina Stuart	Vivianne McKenzie	Janet Coulthard
Pauline McKenzie	Anthony Clark	Anthony Brady
Regina McKenzie		

Nuclear Medicine – Production and Use

Mark Moore, General Manager of ANSTO Health gave his presentation to the BCC on the production of nuclear medicine at ANSTO and how this produces radioactive waste.

The slides from the presentation will be distributed to the BCC, and made available on the project website.

Discussion

- A member asked about the level of waste in the GenTech generators which are 95% recycled. It was advised that the waste from these generators has a 66 hour half-life and is classified as low level waste. There is a small amount which continues to radiate for a longer period of time.
- A member asked how much nuclear medicine is exported. It was advised the 75% of the production is shipped across Australia and 25% is exported to various countries including China, Thailand, Hong Kong and the United States.
- A member raised the point of importing our nuclear medicine from overseas as an alternative to producing our own. Mark advised that this could lead to shortages and we could receive a lower quality product.. Mark advised that the reactor has two2 week shutdowns a year and sourcing imports for this period require us to source product from overseas such as South Africa and during these times reliable supply can be difficult.

- A member asked, how far in advance do they plan their production and delivery? It was advised the schedule is planned as a rolling 24 month forecast ahead and the next 90 days ahead are locked in and will not be adjusted.
- A member asked whether further production will cause a significant increase to waste. It was explained that the waste production is anticipated to increase but not double. The waste increase from the reactor will not increase substantially. The waste created as a part of the medical production will increase by 1.75 times.

Action Item 3:

- *Provide members Mark's presentation to the BCC.*

Dr Geoff Currie, Associate Professor in Nuclear Medicine, Charles Sturt University, gave his presentation to the BCC on the use of reactor produced nuclear medicine. This included the modern applications of nuclear imaging and how it benefits Australians through the healthcare system.

The slides from the presentation will be distributed to the BCC, and made available on the project website.

Discussion

- A member asked about the quantity of radioactive waste in hospitals? Dr Currie advised that nuclear waste from nuclear medicine procedures in hospitals is virtually zero. While many hospitals do hold radioactive waste, the use of the nuclear medicine will not contribute to radioactive waste in hospitals because it is either recycled (generators sent back to ANSTO) or this short lived product is stored for 10 half lives and then it is indistinguishable from background and disposed of as hospital waste. As an example, if you receive nuclear medicine via an injection the syringe gets put in a lead lined bin and then capped, dated and sent for incineration after 10 half lives of the longest lived radionuclide.
- A member asked about the research institutes and universities who might have radioactive material that they have stored rather than disposing of. Dr Currie advised that it cost him around \$10,000 to return an old cobalt source to the manufacturer. There may be those out there who would be reluctant to spend that money to dispose of their waste and so might have old sources in storage (particularly sources used for research or old radiation therapy sources) but if there was a designated facility they might be more inclined to come forward.
- A member raised the question of what needs to happen to the radioactive material that is brought forward before it could be disposed. Dr Currie answered that it would need to be categorised before disposal and that the sites and industries which are not disposing of industrial waste properly would need to be addressed.

Action Item 4:

- *Provide members Dr Currie's presentation to the BCC.*

Afternoon Session

Discussion on Defining Community – Professor Peta Ashworth

Professor Peta Ashworth led a discussion to further consider the definition of community for the area. Professor Ashworth developed a report based on the previous discussion around community definition during the BCC meeting on June 27.

Discussion

The members of the BCC had a wide reaching discussion about the definition of community. Various opinions as to whether the area included as the community for voting and CBP purposes should change, as well as a nomination process to include people who might have a business interest or otherwise in the area should be allowed to vote were discussed.

The discussion ended with suggestion from multiple members that the area should be defined as a 50 km radius around the site, as well as the old Hawker Local Council area. However, no decision has been made.

Members asked Prof Ashworth a number of questions, and the following key points were made:

Definition

- The current definition is the 50 km radius plus the Flinders Ranges Council area.
- A member asked why the BCC was having this discussion. The department placed this topic on the agenda at the request of some members, and at the March meeting, all members had agreed to a work program which included this topic.
- A concern was raised about changing the definition at this point in the project.
- A member mentioned that once a line has been drawn for the definition it must be adhered to. There will always be those who fall outside the eligible area.
- Several members discussed the potential suitability of the Old Hawker Council area as an appropriate definition, with a 50km radius to take in neighbours to the proposed site.
- It is necessary to have guidelines around what the community definition is. For example a member raised that if an employee is living in the area on a rented property then they shouldn't get a vote as they may not be in the area in the next couple of years. However if they are a family relative then they could be eligible to put their vote forward. If the owner of a property doesn't live there, they should still get a vote.
- It was noted that if a definition is not decided then the Minister will go ahead with the previous definition. Concerns were raised that if a new Minister was appointed then they would just change the definition anyway. The department advised that this would be unlikely, and noted that the purpose of the BCC is to provide advice to Government on issues such as this.
- It was advised that any change the BCC puts forward will not affect the current Community Benefit Programme round, as that has been confirmed, but it could affect future rounds.

Extension and Nearby Areas

- It was mentioned that Quorn has been included in the definition previously and if they were removed then that could create further tension between the towns. A member mentioned that the question was 'what do we see as a community' and it has been mentioned previously that the Hawker community does not include Quorn.
- In the previous discussion there was a strong view the Quorn should not be included.

Community Contributions

- Any list of people eligible to be 'in the community' should come from the electoral roll and there would be a list of other people who had applied for various reasons such as a strong connection to the community. A member raised the example that the IGA owner in Kimba would get a vote because he owns the store, but doesn't necessarily live in the area.
- A member mentioned that an example of contributing to the community would be working, shopping, educating in the town even if you don't live there. Concerns were raised that people from Quorn don't come up to Hawker to do business, more people do business in Quorn or Port Augusta.
- A member raised that the vote should be by people who earn a living in the area. Those who have ties to the area or own land but don't live or work here shouldn't get a vote. It was suggested that this could be achieved by who the rate payers in the area are.
- Members raised concerns about those who own holiday homes in the area may be included in the electoral roll but don't really count as locals. It was mentioned that having the nominations agreed or vetoed by trustworthy people such as the mayor or the local government CEO should be part of the process.

Local Government Processes

- It was raised that individuals from outside the designated area can be included in the process via a nomination process to be approved by the CEO of the local council.
- The CEO used the local government guidelines when making a decision in Kimba.
- Discussion was around whether it would operate like a local government election or a state election. It will operate like a local government election

Indigenous Considerations

- A member raised the issue of how indigenous people who have ties to the land but were not living in the area, or not on the electoral roll, would be included.
- A member mentioned that if somebody has a connection to country then they should have a vote. Concerns were raised on how that would affect people with a connection to land who might be overseas.

Action Item 5:

- *Provide a link to the Local Government Act.*

Please access the [South Australian Local Government \(Elections\) Act here](#). Part 5 contains information around entitlement to vote.

Dave Sweeney Presentation

Dave Sweeney, a nuclear campaigner from the Australian Conservation Foundation spoke to the BCC about his views on the process and project. Mr Sweeney suggested the government postpone this voluntary process to further assess the best way to handle Australia's radioactive waste.

Discussion

Members asked Mr Sweeney a number of questions, and the following key points were made:

- Mr Sweeney raised the point that ANSTO had a licence application to store waste including ILW and the waste should remain there. An ANSTO representative advised that the licence was granted until 2020 or until a national facility is established. This licence is only a practical measure until such time as Australia follows international best practice: which is the establishment of a national waste management facility.
- Mr Sweeney suggested that the waste remain at ANSTO until all the possible options have been looked at in case a mistake is made during the project due to time pressures on the project. A member raised that the government is trying to navigate the community consultation in the right way and that Mr Sweeney's suggestion is not a long term solution and ensures the problem will continue.

Radiation Safety - Frank Harris

Frank Harris, Chief Adviser Radiation Governance and Product Stewardship at Rio Tinto, gave a talk on radiation safety and the perception of radiation in the general public. Mr Harris has been working in radiation safety for 29 years and led a discussion on the perceived dangers of this facility and radiation in general.

Discussion:

Members asked Mr Harris a number of questions, and the following key points were made:

- A member asked what radiation levels become dangerous to human health and what level the ILW is? Mr Harris gave an explanation that sieverts are a measurement for radiation. 100 millisieverts can create health issues, 500 millisieverts will cause physical alterations and 10,000 millisieverts will cause death. The ILW would cause death if you were exposed to it however it is stored in a TN-81 shielded canister which is designed to survive harsh conditions such as a fall from 10 m or a collision with a fighter jet. Even if the waste was exposed from the TN81, the danger is virtually eliminated by moving a short distance away from it.
- A member asked about what damage this facility might cause to the tourism in the Flinders Ranges. It was advised that in Mr Harris' experience any kind of negative impact is generally short lived or non-existent in areas where facilities have been established. There may be exceptions but generally it doesn't have a significant effect on tourism in the area.

Other items

Update on the telecommunications feasibility study - Telstra

- Jaron Cooper, South Australian Local Relationship Manager at Telstra gave an update on the discussion previously held in July to improve 3G and 4G coverage.
- Telstra have developed options to improve handheld coverage between Hawker and Leigh Creek. Costings are being finalised and Jaron's intention is to attend the December 12 meeting to present the final costings and work.

Action item 6:

- *Provide members with Jaron Cooper's presentation to the BCC.*

Other comments

- It has been raised that some members of the community are using social media inappropriately. It is difficult to manage what is said on social media and it needs to be managed individually.
- A member asked for a timeline on the heritage assessment. It was advised that the process will take at least three to six months and some of the technical work including LIDAR and geological surveys will start alongside the heritage assessment.
- A member raised the issue that the presentation given by David Bruce from ORIMA was not included in the last notes. Presentation will be included in the notes from 10 October 2017 (these notes).
- It was raised that the committee will need approval from the Minister to continue operating for the next 12 months. It will be discussed in the December meeting.
- It was raised that the Department of Environment presenter planned for a previous BCC has not attended. The Department said this would be investigated and the representative will attend the next BCC.

Action item 7:

- *Provide members with David Bruce's presentation to the BCC*

Next Meeting

- The next meeting of the BCC will be on 12 December 2017. The following one is proposed for 13 February 2018.
- Invites will be sent out to Matt Barwick and Jaron Cooper to attend the next meeting.

Action item 8:

- *Arrange for Matt Barwick, Department of Environment, to attend the next BCC on 12 December.*