



Australian Government
Department of Industry,
Innovation and Science

National Radioactive Waste Management Facility

Barndioota Consultative Committee

Meeting Notes

Tuesday 12th December 2017

Agenda

Time	Item	Lead
Tea and coffee available from 09:00		
09:30-09:35	Welcome to country	Aaron Stuart / Michael Anderson
09:35-09:45	Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Apologies – Overview of the meeting agenda 	Paul Thomas, Independent Convener
09:45-10:15	Approve Draft Notes of meeting of 10 October 2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Discussion 	Paul Thomas
10:15 – 10:30	Project Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Community Benefits Package – Technical/Policy Update 	DIIS – Bruce McCleary
10:30-11:00	Site Characterisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Update on heritage & site assessment tenders 	Rebecca Mouthaan
11:00-11:15	Morning Tea Break	
11:15-12:15	Community Definition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Summary of discussions and path forward – How to measure sentiment – vote vs survey? 	Peta Ashworth
12:15 -13:15	Lunch Break	
13:15-13:20	AusIndustry Representative Introduction	Abbie Arbon
13:20-14:00	EWG update to be provided by the co-chairs	Ian Carpenter Malcolm 'Tiger' McKenzie
14:00-14:30	Telstra update	Jaron Cooper
14:30-15:00	Other items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Renewal of BCC Contracts – Christmas break, confirmation of date for next meeting – Presentation from the Dept. of Environment scheduled for next meeting – CBP Review Meeting in March – Other topics raised by BCC members 	Paul Thomas

Attendees:

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

Apologies:

Michael Anderson	David Michael	Cecilia Woolford
Ashley Haywood	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
Adam White	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Community Consultation Team
Zaheer McKenzie	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Community Consultation Team
Abbie Arbon	AusIndustry
Professor Peta Ashworth	University of Queensland
Ian Carpenter	Economic Working Group
Malcolm McKenzie	Economic Working Group
Jaron Cooper	Telstra
Mark Bolton	Telstra

Action Items

Item	Status
1. Develop a confidentiality form for observers and presenters to sign	In Development
2. Provide an up to date copy of the project budget	An up to date budget is confidential. The overview budget has been provided.
3. Provide Jaron Cooper's upgrade proposal presentation	Complete
4. Provide members with Mark Bolton's contact details	Complete
5. Arrange for Matt Barwick, Department of Environment, to attend the next BCC on 13 February 2018.	Complete – Moved to the April BCC meeting

Meeting opened 09:30am

Welcome to Country

- Paul Thomas gave an Acknowledgement of Country.

Housekeeping

Discussion

- Members discussed the arrangements for observers sitting in on committee meetings. It was raised that there needs to be confidentiality on the topics discussed. The confidentiality agreement set out in the first BCC meeting states:
 - Only the independent convener can speak publicly on behalf of the Committee.
 - Members can speak on their own positions, but not on behalf of the Committee.
 - The Committee can agree not to release certain information.
 - Each person's position on an issue is to remain confidential. However, where the Committee has varying views, the difference is to be noted in the minutes.

The Committee agreed that a protocol should be developed to allow observers and to maintain confidentiality. A confidentiality form is an option for observers to sign and a confidentiality protocol will be discussed.

- Some members identified that the meeting notes were not extensive enough and that the emotions of members are not covered. The BCC guidelines state that the minutes/notes are not a verbatim record.
- Names are deliberately not identified within the minutes. This current approach was accepted by the committee as outlined in the guidelines.

Action Item 1:

- *Develop a confidentiality form for observers and presenters to sign.*

Approve draft notes of 7th meeting on 10 October 2017

Discussion

- A member requested that an up to date budget of the project be provided.
- A member raised that in the last meeting the Heritage Working Group (HWG) was listed to present their views to the BCC on community definition. It was advised that the HWG was not the appropriate group to address this.

Action Item 2:

- *Provide an up to date copy of the project budget.*

The current budget is confidential but the department can provide an overview budget for the project.

Project budget information can be found within the department's [Portfolio Budget Statements \(PBS\)](#) that are publicly issued annually. The department has a current budget allocation of \$43.4 million across the financial years of 2015-16 to 2018-19. This budget allocation covers a range of activities in relation to the project:

1. Site selection and acquisition
2. Consultation and Community Engagement
3. Indigenous Heritage Assessment
4. Site Characterisation
5. Development of a Detailed Business Case
6. Approval processes such as Public Works Committee approvals, and national and international regulatory licensing requirements (environmental and nuclear related)
7. Community Benefit Programme

Project Update

The department provided an update on the project including:

- Community Benefit Program (CBP) – The CBP nominations have opened and will close in February. The community is looking at opportunities for project applications.
- Technical and Policy Update – A number of technical and policy issues are being worked through at the moment including how much waste will be stored. We have 95% of the inventory categorised at this stage. We are continuing to work the state entities to develop the state level information and it is expected to be a few years before we have that information finalised.

Discussion

- A member asked about the CSIRO clean up at Woomera and whether previous Low Level Waste has mixed with other poisonous material. It was advised that this is a CSIRO issue and they will be consulted once they begin the conditioning of their waste.
- A member asked whether two separate licences would be required for LLW and ILW. It was advised that one of the conditions for ANSTO's licence granted by ARPANSA is temporary storage of ILW until a national facility is built. Any licence for the facility will be for storage of ILW and will not be for disposal.
- A member asked about updates on the credible plan being developed to cover ILW. It was advised that the ARPANSA application for the NRWMF will not happen for around another 2 years. Once the ARPANSA licence is granted for temporary ILW storage the Government will begin a process to identify ILW disposal options.
- A member asked how long the BCC is expected to continue if the application won't be submitted for another 2 years. It was advised that as a legislative requirement a new Regional Consultative Committee would be formed once a site is selected and as the project progresses. The BCC is expected to continue until such an announcement is made.

Site Characterisation

The department gave an update on the current site characterisation works including the heritage assessment and the site assessment.

- The heritage assessment tender has now been finalised and RPS was the successful company to conduct the assessment. The work has begun and is expected to be finalised by the end of February. The Heritage Working Group is engaging with RPS independently of the department.
- The site characterisation tender has now closed. The applications are still under review at the moment. We are working with Geoscience Australia to review the tender applications and ensure that the service provider meets the appropriate standards to complete the work. We anticipate that the initial site suitability work, which measures flora, fauna, seismic activity and water, should be available in June. As a part of this tender process we are working through a way to ensure that the information is available to the public.

Discussion

- A member asked whether we would know much about the site before June. It was advised that we will receive a large amount of data before then and which will be discussed as the process progresses. The land acquisition has two parts, first is the land suitability and land costs which will take the full six months. The other part is the community consultation and community sentiment towards the facility. All of these are timed with the delivery of the other information such as the Waste Acceptance Criteria and the safety case.
- A member asked about the costings for the roadworks and infrastructure in the future. It was advised that the first critical component is identifying the best 100 hectares first and then the department will get the pricing on roads and transport routes.
- A member mentioned that it is difficult to proceed without identifying the 100 hectare site. The department is doing all it can to speed up the process. Geoscience Australia has a huge repository of information and we are working with them to allow these companies to access their data to speed up the process. It is anticipated that by the end of February we will know where the most suitable 100 hectares are.
- A member asked if a flaw in the suitability of the site is found whether the process would continue. It was advised that all of the original 26 sites underwent a criteria assessment and a part of that put a risk profile against each site. The brief that will go to the Minister will include all of the reports, various measurements of community sentiment and the other data around the community.
- A member asked that if we progress with the site assessment and then the community votes no, will it be too late to stop given all of the work which has commenced. It was advised that if the Minister determines there is not broad community support for the facility then the work will not continue.
- A member asked about the progress of the nomination for Leonora in Western Australia. It was advised that the nominators were asked to provide more

information. Nominations stay open until a site is selected and we are awaiting their response.

- A member asked that if all this information is presented to the Minister without community support defined then it will still be up to his discretion. It was advised that the Minister will make a decision on all the information together. We will have three engineering reports and two community sentiment reports, one for each site, for the Minister to make his decision. The member mentioned there's a risk that the Minister could make a decision bound by safety and economics rather than community. It was advised that deliberations must be in accordance with the Act. The community vote is definitely one aspect of what the Minister considers along with the neighbours around the land, the local council support and other factors to consider.
- A member asked about where to acquire any broad community support documentation. It was advised that the Kimba Report should be used as indicative of what the Minister's thinking may be in terms of community support. There cannot be a specific percentage as the sole factor for community support because it is a combination of issues such as the direct neighbours, the local council, the other community groups and the vote.

Defining Community – Professor Peta Ashworth

Professor Peta Ashworth led a discussion to further consider the definition of community for the area. Professor Ashworth provided a summary of discussions held previously and options to move towards deciding on community definition

Discussion

To start the discussion BCC members reviewed the summary of the previous discussions around community definition and boundaries. In summary the discussed definitions were:

- The 50km radius plus the Flinders Ranges Council area.
- The 50km radius plus the Old Hawker Council area.
- Any residents that reside within the old Hawker Council area plus the neighbours of the land. Other considerations to be extended on a case by case basis.

The other consideration was individuals from outside the designated area may be included through a nomination process approved by the two CEO's of the Flinders Ranges Council and the Outback Communities Authority on a case by case basis.

- The local government act uses the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC) data and they facilitate the vote including those from outside the community who may be eligible. The CEO's role outlined in the local government guidelines sets out the eligibility requirements for those outside the residential area. For example if you own a business in the area you are entitled to register for a CEO's role. This allowed AEC to accept community votes that were technically from outside the community but had an interest in the community.
- A member asked if the CEO's role was discretionary. It was advised that is not a discretionary decision and is based on eligibility. You can only participate in the vote

if you meet the eligibility requirements and these submissions must be assessed as is set out in the act.

- A member asked about possibly using the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) rather than AEC for the community vote. It was advised that it must be conducted by the AEC if the process is a vote. The ABS could be used for a survey.
- A member suggested that all of the definition options should be taken to the community and community consensus should be put forward by committee members. The members would be responsible for taking the options to the community to gauge their thoughts and vote accordingly to represent the community. This proposal was agreed on by the committee.
- A member raised a concern that the proposal to include individual nominations will never work fairly to include everyone. Incorporating the individual nominations in the proposal to the council would not be achievable. If someone wants to be considered then it falls under the council rules, individual nominations would need to comply with the council rules.
- A member raised the issue of whether property owners excludes the managers and families who live there. It was advised that the residents are included in the council boundaries and are registered to vote. Property owners adjacent to the nominated land would be included if they are on the electoral roll. The way that it was written excluded persons on an adjacent property. It was clarified that anybody who is a neighbour to the site would have their view, if they shared it, included in the process. This excluded a property or leasing manager for those sites. The committee decided that the third definition was not viable and decided to remove it. Including the possibility to apply for an exception through the CEO's role, the remaining definitions were:
 - The 50km radius plus the Flinders Ranges Council area.
 - The 50km radius plus the Old Hawker Council area.
- Committee members will present the two agreed definitions to members of the community and the committee will hold a vote at the next meeting to decide on the definition.

AusIndustry Representative Introduction

Abbie Arbon from AusIndustry gave an introduction of her work history and experience to the committee. She advised the committee on the information sessions held recently concerning the Community Benefit Programme and encouraged applicants to complete their applications as early as possible.

Discussion

Members asked Mrs Arbon a number of questions, and the following key points were made:

- A member asked whether unsuccessful applications from the first round would be accepted. Mrs Arbon advised that they would need to reapply and they would be taken on their merits. It was also suggested that if any unsuccessful projects were to reapply then any feedback given in the first round should be addressed.
- A member asked whether the criteria was the same as the first round. It was advised that the criteria was the same for applications.

- A member asked whether there was any available feedback from the projects in the first round. It was advised that some projects had finished and others were still going through the process.

Economic Working Group – Ian Carpenter and Malcolm McKenzie

Ian Carpenter and Malcolm McKenzie, the Co-chairs of the Economic Working Group (EWG), gave an update on the purpose of the EWG and the meetings held so far. The purpose of the EWG is to gauge the available resources in the Barndioota area to contribute to the construction of the facility if it goes ahead. This is to ensure that local people get work and involvement in the process rather than going to an external contractor. Another aspect of the EWG is to run work experience with local schools to send children to ANSTO for mentoring for a week, to lead them up to an internship or apprenticeship.

Discussion:

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

- A member asked about the commitment of funding for local workers. It was advised that there hasn't been any commitment of funds at this stage but developing training programs for the local communities and offering further employment opportunities would be the responsibility of the EWG.
- A member mentioned that the damage to tourism in the area could not be predicted as there aren't any comparable examples for an isolated and pristine environment such as Wallerberdina to prove that it will negatively or positively impact tourism at this stage.
- The EWG will provide a report to the Minister on the impacts on tourism and the economic data in the region. Mr Carpenter stated that he believed the positives will outweigh the negatives regarding tourism.
- A member raised the questions of why Aboriginal tourism isn't already occurring near the proposed land and why would a facility improve this. It was advised that no strong businesses have formed a relationship with a strong Aboriginal community for such an experience and the facility would provide the opportunity to maximise working with the government to develop that kind of experience.

Telstra Update – Jaron Cooper and Mark Bolton

Update on the proposed network upgrades - Telstra

Jaron Cooper, South Australian Local Relationship Manager, and Mark Bolton, Area General Manager for South Australia, from Telstra gave an update on the possible upgrades to the existing infrastructure to improve handheld and highway coverage between Hawker and Leigh Creek. Costings mentioned were around 5.5 million – 7 million for a radio upgrade and 12 million – 14 million for a fibre upgrade. Telstra would be willing to contribute 50% to the upgrade costs and no markups on the products. The money can come from a variety of available funds including the community benefit programme. An example was given of a

recent upgrade on the Eyre Peninsula where the money came from the State Government, the Federal Government, and community funding.

Discussion

- A member asked about the possibility of taking a tower away to reduce the costs. It was advised that Telstra don't typically take services away.
- The Telstra representatives were asked about whether they would suggest radio or fibre. They had been asked to explore the costings for both but their recommendation would be the radio upgrade. Radio will meet the requirements needed in the area. The concern was that the funds might not be able to come together to procure the fibre upgrades.
- A member asked about the timeframes to complete the upgrades. It was advised that there would be an estimated 12–18 month lead time which would be dependent on all the stakeholders contributing funds.
- A committee member volunteered to explore funding arrangements and the upgrade options. Once confirmed Telstra can explore consultation and take on their costs. The committee agreed on this approach.

Action item 3 and 4:

- *Provide Jaron Cooper's upgrade proposal presentation*
- *Provide members with Mark Bolton's contact details.*

Other Items

Renewal of BCC Contracts

- The Department advised that all contracts for the BCC would need to be renewed for 2018. All members present at the meeting confirmed their interest in renewing their BCC contracts.

Next Meeting

- The next meeting of the BCC will be on 13 February 2018. The following one is proposed for 5 March 2018 to review the CBP applications.
- Invites will be sent out to Matt Barwick from the Department of Environment to attend the next meeting.

Other topics raised

- A member asked about whether there was a detailed list for what jobs would be required at the facility. It was advised that the department does not have that information at this stage but we should have that information by June.
- A member asked how changes in state legislation will be dealt with. It was advised that there are individual state laws but until a location is decided they will not change. Once a location is decided the department will hold further discussions with the relevant government.
- A member asked about the Low Level Waste stored at ANSTO creating a large initial influx of waste to the facility and then diminishing. It was advised that there would be a program of work to get the waste to the facility which would be slow and deliberate. The time process to move all of the waste is not expected to be quick.

- A member asked about the Environmental Protection Biodiversity and Conservation Act (EPBC) being a major assessment tool for the Minister and how would it relate to the state legislation. It was advised that the Minister will select a site to go forward and then the APRANSA licencing and EPBC requirements would start. Construction can't start until these requirements are met.
- A member asked when would there be a credible plan for the Intermediate Level Waste. It was advised that the department does not have that information at this stage.
- A member asked whether ANSTO had addressed the transportation routes or had any consultation with those along the transport routes. It was advised this would require ongoing engagement and that there are currently no issues with the 10,000 isotopes of nuclear medicine that ANSTO ship each week.
- A member asked about the possibility of each committee member being required to visit Lucas Heights to gain an appreciation of the material being discussed. The committee decided that visits to ANSTO shouldn't be mandatory.

Action item 5:

- *Arrange for Matt Barwick, Department of Environment, to attend the next BCC on 13 February 2018.*