



Australian Government  
Department of Industry,  
Innovation and Science

# National Radioactive Waste Management Facility

## Kimba Consultative Committee

### Meeting Notes

Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> July 2018

## Agenda

Time	Item	Lead
Tea and coffee available from 09:00		
09:30-10:00	Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Apologies</li> <li>- Overview of the meeting agenda</li> <li>- Business arising of meeting of 28 June 2018</li> <li>- Approval of the Draft Notes of meeting of 28 June 2018</li> <li>- Observer Protocol – meeting attendees</li> </ul>	Allan Suter, Independent Convener
10:00-10:30	Project Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AECOM update</li> <li>- July Information - Transport, Infrastructure &amp; Benefits</li> <li>- Heritage Survey Update</li> <li>- Confirm with KCC the dates for next meeting &amp; draft agenda</li> <li>- Cadence to present on economic study</li> <li>- UQ conducted ongoing socio – economic study</li> <li>- KEWG report on construction evening</li> </ul> The Information evening	DIIS – Bruce Wilson
10:30-11:00	AECOM – Site Characterisation study	AECOM – James Rusk
11:00-11:10	GA role with the NRWFMF site in the Napandee & Lyndhurst area	GA – Brian Hanisch
11:10-11:30	Morning Tea Break	
11:30-12:00	Transporting radioactive materials	ANSTO – Hef Griffiths
12:00-12:30	Woomera Waste	CSIRO - Dirk Mallants
12:30-13:00	Lunch	
13:00-14:00	Economic Impact Assessment of the NRWFMF	Cadence Economics - Steve Brown & George Michalas
14:00-14:30	Engagement regarding agriculture	DIIS – Bruce Wilson
14:30-15:00	Other Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- questions on topics of the day from the KCC</li> </ul>	Allan Suter, Independent Convener

## Attendees:

Allan Suter (Independent Convener)	Dean Johnson (Deputy Convener)	Peta Willmott
Jeff Baldock	Kellie Hunt	Peter Woolford
Heather Baldock	Jeff Koch	Amy Wright
Pat Beinke	Kerri Rayson	Toni Scott
Randall Cliff	Sally Inglis	Symon Allen
Meagan Lienert		

## Apologies:

Nil		
-----	--	--

## Other Attendees:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Bruce Wilson	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – Principal Advisor
Rebecca Mouthaan	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Manager of Community Consultation Team
Ian Carter	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – Manager in the Community Consultation Team
Adam White	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Community Consultation Team
Nicholas Clifford-Hordacre	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – Community Consultation Team
Stephanie Skinner	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – Community Consultation Team
Maree Barford	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – Community Liaison Officer
James Rusk (Via Phone)	AECOM
Dr Brian Hanisch	Geoscience Australia (GA)
Hef Griffiths	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO)
Dirk Mallants	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)
Jen Baxter	CSIRO
Steve Brown	Cadence Economics
George Michalas	Cadence Economics

## Observers:

Name
Mark Stewart
Margaret Milton

## Action Items

Item	Status
1. Send Senate Inquiry times for 2 August 2018 hearing	Complete – Kimba Consultative Committee (KCC) informed at 24 July meeting
2. AECOM video send link to committee	Complete – <a href="#">please find here</a>
3. Send GA website links	Complete – <a href="#">see below</a>
4. Reply to Buckleboo Country Fire Service letter	Complete
5. Publicise all events	Complete
6. Provide all presentations to committee	Complete – available on the <a href="#">website</a>

*Meeting opened 09:30am*

## Approve draft notes of 28<sup>th</sup> June 2018 meeting

Members approved the notes from the 28th June 2018 meeting with the following amendments.

- A member raised an error with a section reading 40 hectares where it should read 60 hectares.

## Project Update

Mr Wilson gave an update on the project since the last meeting.

- All information required by the 23<sup>rd</sup> of July 2018 was published, as per the Kimba Council's request. The full range of fact sheets are available on the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility (NRWMF) website.
- The heritage survey was completed. The survey was entirely desktop, as the Barngarla community has yet to engage with the department on the study. The department will continue to engage with the Barngarla community. The survey did not identify cultural issues or native title claims that impact on the suitability of the sites.
- Upcoming events were discussed.
  - Minister Canavan will be visiting Kimba Monday 30<sup>th</sup> of July, with a drop in session at the Kimba Hotel to meet with the community.
  - A community information session, with representatives from ANSTO and ARPANSA presenting on the information that has been released to the public, will take place on Monday the 6<sup>th</sup> of August. The information session will provide the community with an opportunity to have their questions answered by a panel of experts.
  - A webinar will be held on Friday the 10<sup>th</sup> of August. The panellists will consist of Bruce Wilson, Dr Adi Paterson, Dr Geoff Currie, Dr Ben Heard, Dave Sweeney, Dr Jim Green, Scott Ludlam, and Dr Margaret Beavis. The webinar will discuss two broad issues; the role of nuclear technologies, and approaches to radioactive waste. Questions can be asked in real time and will be moderated by Mayor Sam Johnson.

## Discussion

- A member asked what time of the day the webinar will be taking place.
  - Mr Wilson responded that a time had not yet been set, but it will be recorded for those who are not available to watch live.
- A Kimba Economic Working Group (KEWG) member gave an update on the construction evening.
  - A database of businesses and trade suppliers has been put together.
  - The night was very successful with 120 attendees and lots of positive feedback.
  - Industry Capability Network South Australia (ICN SA) gave good information on how to register businesses and secure contracts, and how small to

medium sized businesses could best prepare to contribute to the construction of the facility.

- The KEWG visited the mining camp near the sites to look at what is available. The camp consisted of 80 beds and rooms.
  - A member asked if there had been further investigation into how the community could own the mining camp.
  - KEWG member responded that this information had not been collected.
- A member asked about the recently announced community development package. When the payment would be delivered, and whether it would be delivered in bulk or in increments.
  - Mr Wilson said final details were not yet finalised. Discussion with the community needs to take place to discuss the delivery of the package. The fund is to be a community driven process to fund the projects the community wanted. Governance would be a requirement of the package, with a Regional Consultative Committee (RCC) to be in charge.
- A member asked about what a RCC would include.
  - Mr Wilson responded that it would require a regional representative on the committee, possibly an Eyre Peninsula representative. The structure of the RCC has not yet been determined and will be developed in consultation with the host community. This work cannot progress until after a site and host community is selected.
- A member asked what would happen to the funding if the regulatory licence for the intermediate level waste was not approved.
  - Mr Wilson responded that the \$20 million community fund would not be available until the operational phase of the facility. The \$8 million skills fund would be available for the first four years, allowing for regulatory and operational licences to be established prior to the \$20 million community fund being provided.
- A member asked if the temporary storage licence for the Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) would be required before the build, as the licence would determine the construction of the sections of the facility required for ILW.
  - Mr Wilson highlighted that the ILW was only one component of the facility, and the build could still go forward prior to the storage licence being established.
  - Mr Griffiths added that three licences would be required for; siting, construction and operation. It would be likely that two separate licences for storage (ILW) and disposal Low Level Waste (LLW) would be required, as outlined by the ARPANSA Act.

**Action** – Circulate Senate Inquiry times for 2 August 2018 hearing

## Cadence Economics Presentation

George Michalas gave an overview of the economic impact study.

- Based on 20 percent of the construction workforce being located in Kimba, \$2.5 million will move through local businesses during construction. This is a conservative estimate.
- Migrant workers coming to work on the facility will lead to \$6.5 million spent per year in the local economy during peak construction.
- During the operation phase, \$6.6 million will be generated through the facility.
- 34 workers will come from the local workforce and be retrained for work in the facility. A further 11 migrant workers will come from outside the region.
- A wage premium will be present with an additional \$2.1 million being generated through the higher wages on offer at the facility compared to current wages within the community.
- Findings were robust even with changes to the assumptions within the model regarding labour market response.

Cadence was asked to investigate the impact of a facility on economic impacts of comparable sites on agriculture and property prices. Studies on the topic nationally and internationally were limited. Cadence conducted a national and international study to determine a comparison case and did not find any evidence to support a negative impact on agriculture or property prices. Areas that were investigated Aube, France, Hope Island, Canada and Engadine, Sydney.

## Discussion

- A member asked on retrained local workers, was any allowance made for school leavers in the numbers, as they are neither migrants nor retrained workers?
  - Mr Michalas advised school leavers were not factored into the report, but they may increase the economic benefits. Report estimated that there is a certain labour market response. If labour response is limited, a school leaver might be faced with other options. How school leavers respond to higher wages at the facility and whether they stay in Kimba or go elsewhere will determine the impact. As the responsiveness increases, the benefits increase as well.
- A member asked about non-additional workers that would be workers that work at the facility not included in the job description? Whether it's maintenance or catering or something similar.
  - Mr Michalas responded that the 34 are currently employed, and are taken out of their roles and retrained for the facility. Some other movement and backfilling is also assumed. That's just the 45.
- A member asked what the impact of building a facility in Engadine would be if it were built today, as at this stage everyone is used to the presence of the Lucas Heights Facility.
  - Mr Michalas responded that the only evidence we have is what happens there currently, and people are making decisions to buy houses in the area knowing it is there right now.
  - Mr Wilson added that a new housing development is currently being developed in the nearby area.
- A member asked if there were regional areas with a similar facility nearby.

- Mr Michalas responded that Port Hope was a regional area in Ontario, Canada, but still had a similar share of agriculture and tourism to the rest of Ontario. Compared with the state in Ontario, the output was still the same. If there was an impact on tourism or agriculture a degree of divergence would be seen.
- A member asked whether the lack of information in the literature about the impact of hosting a facility was because there wasn't a lot of change, or because no change was noted.
  - Mr Michalas responded that it was mostly the latter.

### ANSTO video presentation on the life of the facility concept design

A video detailing the current design concept was played. The video outlined the different buildings that would be present at the site, and how the site would change over the operational and monitoring phases of the facility.

### Discussion

- A member asked about the permanent disposal of the LLW, and how such a large quantity of capping material for disposal would be sourced from a relatively small site.
  - Mr Wilson responded it was likely the material will be sourced externally considering the requirements.
  - Mr Griffiths added that there is more to the capping process than piling dirt over the waste. The capping procedure and what the material needs are will be developed during the detailed design phase.
- The member added that currently if the council wants to build a road they can just come onto a property and do it. They may be able to use the soil removed in the process for the roads.
  - Mr Wilson responded that during the course of developing the site, AECOM will work with the design to look at the soil types available. The EPBC Act will also be involved, and any soils brought onto the site would be part of that process.
- A member asked if soil will come from within the district?
  - Mr Wilson responded that it is not clear at this point, however, ideally it wouldn't have to come from too far away.
  - Mr Griffiths added that there will be some excavation for footing and foundation, and some soil could potentially come from these works.
    - A member suggested that it could be another opportunity for someone to have another industry contribution.

### AECOM Site Characterisation Presentation

James Rusk played a short video that outlined both sites (Lyndhurst and Napandee) and presented the highlights of the AECOM site characterisation study.

Purpose and objectives: Identify any environmental or infrastructure hazards.

The desktop and field studies are focused on characterising the surface and subsurface environments within and surrounding the nominated 100 hectare study areas within these properties being considered for siting of the NRWMF.

AECOM has utilised a range of dedicated technical specialists to conduct the studies including but not limited to seismologists, geologists, hydrogeologists, geomorphologists and hydrologists. AECOM has conducted its assessment against a range of site characteristic criteria that were developed with reference to Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA) and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) guidelines relating to the selection and evaluation of sites being considered for the siting of radioactive waste facilities.

AECOM provided a range of facts on the site and work that took place.

The study investigated the:

- Location.
- Below ground environment.
- Above ground environment.
- Cultural heritage.
- Infrastructure.

#### **Findings:**

- Flora and Fauna were observed in 10km area.
- Climate change predictions, in the future the sites will be hotter and drier.
- Bushfire hazards are low, with some separation between the vegetation and the proposed facility.
- Background radiation is low level which is good for monitoring.
- Surface water does not present an issue.
- Seismic Hazards are limited and can be designed against.
- Bedrock and rock types were looked at. No issues present.
- No perched water tables.
- Landform stable – (considered wind and water erosion).
- Enabling Infrastructure. Solar may provide a good option for electricity. There are large capacity water lines nearby. Communications are simple, with NBN being available soon, a line could be run to the site or a tower could be constructed. AECOM doing an assessment of the options.
- Local suppliers who were involved in the site characterisation process were named.
- Overall, no issues identified that would prevent either site (Lyndhurst and Napandee) from being a suitable site for the facility.
- Second stage of site characterisation work will provide extra data on top of stage 1 to assist in the specific design of the facility.

#### **Discussion**

- A member asked how a site will be selected if all sites are technically equal?
  - Mr Rusk responded that the Minister will make his decision on a range of factors, with site characterisation, hazards, and costs being some of the

determining factors that will influence the decision. Environmental impact may also be a factor that comes into play if there are threatened species present in one of the sites but not the other. These assessments go to the regulator and they will make the decision on environmental approval.

- A member asked about the impact of new infrastructure on the environment.
  - Mr Rusk said that roads covering shorter distances with less upgrades would be ideal, and clearing vegetation would be avoided if possible. Considerations would be made about where powerlines and other construction would take place to ensure environmental impact was minimised where possible.
- A member asked if the result of the assessment indicate which sites are more suitable.
  - Mr Wilson responded that the report doesn't provide information on which site is more suitable. Reports will be looked through to look at the options, however the final decision will rest with the Minister who is provided with equal information about each site. The Minister will provide a site selection report outlining how his decision was made, which will be a combination of technical, cost, and social factors.
- A member asked about whether the \$20 million in the community fund would be directly available or whether only the earnings of the fund would be available.
  - Mr Wilson clarified that the \$20 million fund would be directly available. While not all details have been confirmed, there will be an advisory board that will advise on projects and the board will control the fund with local representatives. The board will need community input and the project and fund management will need to be worked out down the track. Governance will be in place to provide transparency.
- A member expressed the view that critical infrastructure should be funded regardless of whether the facility was built in Kimba or not.
  - Mr Wilson responded that critical infrastructure for the town is an open question. AECOM will talk to co-location of infrastructure. The community fund had the possibility of being used to assist in desired infrastructure.
- A member asked about how the \$8 million fund would be administrated.
  - Mr Wilson stated it was likely to be implemented through AusIndustry, similar to the previous funding. The \$8 million fund would be different in what it funded, with the primary focus being on skills, training, and business development to ensure the town can support the facility. It will be structured around maximising the benefits the community can achieve through the facility. An Economic Development Officer would work with the community to explore opportunities for the funding. Guidelines for the fund would be developed in the following year and with the relevant consultative committees.

*Morning Tea*

## GA presentation by Dr Brian Hanisch

Dr Brian Hanisch provided an overview of the work Geoscience Australia (GA) does and how it has been involved in the peer review of site assessment for the NRWMF. GA was involved in the peer review of the site characterisation, as they are an independent government agency with extensive experience in geology and other relevant fields.

GA provided input to the AECOM technical site assessments throughout the whole process to ensure issues were not present in the final report.

GA focused on five key themes in the process:

- Landscape and landforms
- Geotechnical
- Seismic
- Radiation background
- Hydro geochemistry

Upwards of 12 scientists were involved in the peer review:

- Hydrogeologists were involved in the groundwater assessment.
- Seismic analysis was conducted by an earthquake specialist.
- Geophysicists verified the quality of the data.
- Flood modelling experts at GA assessed the modelling conducted by AECOM.
- GA shared their expertise on aerial surveys.
- A technical advice team reviewed each of the data areas in the AECOM report.

GA is satisfied that the assessment process has been formal and transparent. The internal review process at GA is highly stringent in order to maintain the exceptional reputation of the organisation in providing factual and robust scientific information.

### **Discussion**

- A member asked whether GA had conducted modelling to anticipate what could happen in the next 100 years and the impact on water levels.
  - Dr Hanisch clarified that GA role was as peer reviewers, and the modelling was not directly conducted by GA. AECOM's processes were reviewed and found to be robust for flood modelling, which looked as far as 10,000 years. Similar modelling was done to predict long term seismic hazards.
- A member asked how seismic activity in the area compared to the rest of Australia.
  - Dr Hanisch responded that seismic activity in the area was low, as was the rest of Australia.
  - Mr Wilson added that GA was a peak organisation for earthquake monitoring in Australia, and as a government run organisation, the department was well informed on seismic activity.
- The department added that the AECOM reports would be available at places around the town and they sought input from members for suggested locations.

**ACTION item:** the department to provide the links to the GA site that provide real-time data. Please find the links below.

Flood studies can be accessed here: <http://www.ga.gov.au/scientific-topics/hazards/flood>

Water Observation from Space can be accessed here: <http://www.ga.gov.au/scientific-topics/hazards/flood/wofs>

Information on earthquake risk can be accessed here: <http://www.ga.gov.au/scientific-topics/hazards/earthquake>

Information on reflection seismic survey can be found here: <http://www.ga.gov.au/about/projects/resources/seismic>

## Transportation of Radioactive Material

Mr Hef Griffiths spoke to the transport of radioactive material.

Internationally, there are more than 20 million shipments of radioactive material every year. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) dictates the regulations required for the transport of radioactive materials. Within Australia, ARPANSA has considerable expertise in the regulations required for transport and act as the principal Competent Authority for approving transport packages. Two other organisations, Australian Maritime Safety Authority and Civil Aviation Safety Authority, are Competent Authorities for the transport of radioactive materials by sea and by air respectively.

TN-81 transport and storage canisters are being used for the transport of intermediate level waste (from the reprocessing of spent fuel) within Australia. The canisters have been tested under a range of different conditions to ensure they are robust and will not cause a release of material in a transport accident. Some of this testing includes drop testing, fire exposure, and simulated jet plane impacts. This testing highlights the safety of materials stored within the TN-81 canisters.

### Transport to the NRWMF

Transport routes and modes of transport of waste to the NRWMF are not yet known. The work AECOM is conducting on the road requirements will be used to inform future transport processes once a site is selected.

Strict waste acceptance criteria mean the packages travelling to the facility must meet the requirements. TN-81s are type B packages which are the highest class of transport package. The form of the materials will determine which class of transport package is needed.

### Discussion

- A member asked about whether the facility would take ownership of the waste when it leaves the point of origin.
  - Mr Griffiths responded that the consignment, documentation, safety plans, and security would be the responsibility of the operator.
- A member asked if facility workers would be present during the packaging process.
  - Mr Griffiths responded that this is an option. With the facility being the consigner, they would have to complete a certain number of checks. ANSTO

has been involved with moving sealed sources from hospitals and has been part of that process all the way through from the point of origin.

- A member asked if additional concreting around the drums would be completed before or after reaching the facility.
  - Mr Griffiths responded that ANSTO is currently looking at compacting drums into pucks, placing into a 400 litre drum. It is possible that the 400 litre drums will be placed into an iso container, and if this occurs it is unlikely that it would be concreted prior to reaching the facility due to the weight of the final package and the inability to inspect individual drums on receipt at the NRWMF.
- A member asked about the waste returning around 2045 and whether this would be the same waste that was being prepared for shipment.
  - Mr Griffiths confirmed that the waste being shipped soon would be the waste returning around 2045. The reason for this timeframe is because this is length of time it will take to fill the TN-81 to capacity with 28 canisters.
- A member asked if the future TN-81s returning to Australia would come via ship to the facility.
  - Mr Griffiths suggested that this would be a possible strategy if a suitable port can be found, as it would be more efficient than taking the waste to Sydney before sending it to the NRWMF.

## Woomera Waste - CSIRO

### Key points

Dr Dirk Mallants provided a presentation of the material contained at Woomera:

- Landfill removal from Fisherman's Bend, Melbourne contained a range of contaminated and uncontaminated soil.
- 1991 ANSTO measured the level of radioactivity of the drums:
  - 9646 (99.2%) drums had surface dose rates  $<5 \mu\text{Sv/hr}$
  - 68 ( $<1\%$ ) drums had surface dose rates  $5 -17 \mu\text{Sv/hr}$
- In 1993 ARPANSA measured the level of radioactivity:
  - 98% of the drums have radioactive content  $<70 \text{ Bq/g}$  and would have been classified as non-radioactive for transport purposes at that time.

***Please note travel by plane return flight Melbourne to London is  $5 \mu\text{Sv/hr}$ .***

- Information on the drums:
  - They have a 40 year life span
  - Currently in use for 28 years
  - Checked every 2 years
  - No signs of deterioration
- Environmental baseline study was conducted to confirm if the site at Woomera has been contaminated by the drums:

- A gamma radiation survey conducted at the Woomera site measured Uranium, Thorium and Potassium around the shed.
- This work proved the area surrounding the Woomera facility shows no sign of contamination from the drums.
- The baseline survey also confirmed no contamination of organic or inorganic chemicals.
- In 1989 contamination was detected and clean-up efforts began.
- Since the waste arrived at Woomera, it has been monitored yearly.
- Very few drums have liquids, it's mainly dry soil.
- CSIRO has commenced scanning of drums to determine radiation levels. In the 30 drums that were scanned so far, only one had measurable radiation.

### Next steps

- Testing will be conducted to see if there is any organic or inorganic contaminants within the barrels.
- Waste drums with radioactive waste must be separated and then classified. Most is LLW.
- The Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) will play an important role in how material must be conditioned.

### Discussion

- A member asked if the drums were conditioned during transport to Woomera.
  - Dr Mallants responded that liners were used, but they were not conditioned.
- A member asked for clarification on waste being moved from ANSTO to Woomera due to legal action.
  - Mr Griffiths responded that the local council took ANSTO to court as the Act didn't allow ANSTO to take waste other than their own, as a result it was sent to Woomera.
  - A member suggested contacting the media to release a more factual story would be appreciated to counter all of the misinformation regarding the radioactivity levels of the drums.
  - A CSIRO representative responded that an ABC interview has been done recently to dispel misconceptions.
- A member asked why there was a 10 year gap between ARPANSA's audits?
  - Dr Mallants responded that some measurements were done by ARPANSA and then some later investigations were done by CH2MHILL but they were all reportable to ARPANSA.
  - The member asked were they actually on site?
  - Dr Mallants advised that yes they were.
- A member stated even with the history of the ARPANSA audits, you may not know what is there. That is irresponsible of CSIRO not to know what was there.
  - Dr Mallants said we knew about some of the material. The scans showed that it was very low. The main purpose was to make sure the drums were still in

good condition and they were safe. We needed to have the framework and WAC to resolve the issue. In the meanwhile we made sure it was safe.

- A member asked do you know the contents of every drum?
  - Dr Mallants replied that they haven't opened all of them but they have scanned them all. CSIRO opened about 200 drums and for those we have more analysis.
  - Ms Baxter said the majority of material was sourced from the carpark areas. There was lots of soil, bricks, rubble and some pipe work in there. We know the nature of the material. The way that this is stored is not ideal but the facility is full, there is physically no room between pallets to get in and have a look. There is no other location within Woomera where we can move it and process it so we need a disposal pathway. If we started moving drums we would have no place to take them.
  - Mr Wilson responded that no drum will leave the site without contents being known. Everyone knows the practice back in 1950's wasn't great. Back then that was how they did it. What it highlights is the need for a facility. We don't want things in sheds that get left behind. You get the experts to look after it consistently.
- A member asked whether it was right that only 63 drums have been tested and only 1 is something other than dirt.
  - Dr Mallants replied that in the first measurements all the drums have been scanned and some have been opened. Once we arrived at Woomera the first 100 were opened. The gamma scan from ANSTO had close to 100 scanned drums and we are continuing that work with ANSTO.
- A member asked how many more drums have not been tested?
  - Dr Mallants said he didn't have the full number but we have to go through all of them.
- A member asked whether any drums are expected to be just dirt and won't come to the facility?
  - Dr Mallants advised that lots of them will not come to the facility. A small fraction will be LLW.
- A member asked from the information you have is there any liquid waste?
  - Dr Mallants responded that from what we have surveyed the material is soil and concrete. There may have been some drums that have soil and water but the majority do not. There are no drums with exclusive liquid waste.
  - Ms Baxter added that gamma scanning and robots were used as a test run. We are doing another campaign in October 2018 with more robotic work. Rather than just visual we will measure any liquid in the drums. We know that many of the drums are not full to the top so we need to know how much free air or liquid is present.
- A member stated there is a big misconception on the liquid.
- A member asked for clarification about the timeframe. Once we have the facility, when will the classification process start on the drums? ARPANSA said that it was catastrophic.
  - Dr Mallants advised that we are still in stage 1 at this point and still scanning the nature of the drums. Somewhere between 12 to 24 months and then we should be able to take them out and start processing them. The ones that are

radioactive we will take them out and classify them. We are space constrained so the process to take them out is very slow. There are also restrictions in place by defence of when we can access the site. Access is limited to 50 days a year.

- A member asked why only 50 days?
- Mr Wilson responded that the reason it is in the operational defence zone.
- Convener added it is same with the defence land near Whyalla.
- Ms Baxter said that we work closely with defence and they inform us when we can gain access ahead of time.
- A member asked has there been any leakage from the drums?
  - Dr Mallants said that radon is a good example and a gas. The drums are not airtight so there is one pathway that gas can escape. That is why we monitor that.
- A member asked can you describe what kind of facility is needed to process the waste?
  - Dr Mallants responded that most members have been to ANSTO. Similar to the processing facility that ANSTO have for LLW. We would have to shrink it to make it fit in the space. Probably not super compaction because of the soil. Otherwise a drum scanner, then a hot cell or isolated room to open the drum and take samples. Probably a lab as well and then a cement unit. Some mobile capabilities are also available.
  - Mr Griffiths added the facility would be similar to the compacting building at ANSTO.
- A member asked what would happen to drums with LLW?
  - Dr Mallants advised that if we do detect drums with activities above the thresholds for LLW then we will condition them in a form that would be acceptable for disposal in an above ground facility. Once conditioned they will be stored at the NRWMF.
- A member asked if a suitable site for the facility is not determined, will the reprocessing still continue?
  - Dr Mallants replied that yes we would continue. We have enough boundary conditions to continue. It will not happen quickly so we have time to work it out. Once we develop the processing and things like that it will take a few years. The WAC is what we need more than the site.
  - Ms Baxter added that if we start with the robots and scanning that say no radiation, we then focus on the cold drums then we are hopeful that we can get rid of those quickly. That will give us some space to deal with the radioactive ones.
- A member asked is there a date where the material has to be out of Woomera?
  - Ms Baxter advised not at this stage. ARPANSA want it ready for a national facility. There's nothing formal from defence but informally they want it gone as soon as possible. No deadline but clear signals to get on with it.

**Action:** provide CSIRO presentation

## Engagement regarding Agriculture

Mr Bruce Wilson spoke about the engagement that has occurred in communities regarding agriculture and the facility. The department has developed a paper covering what it has done in regards to the agricultural interests. It outlines community concerns on the potential impact the facility may have on agriculture. The paper does not cover every conversation had, but does cover who has been talked to and the major groups involved.

- A member raised concerns about the agricultural dinner, and why it had been described as an agricultural dinner when it involved many people who were not involved in agriculture.
  - Mr Wilson acknowledged that calling the event an agricultural dinner was not the best description.
- A member expressed they wanted more transparency and participation from farmers. Events with organisations representing farmers were not well discussed and the member was displeased about the lack of information provided by the organisations involved.
  - A member added that they were invited on behalf of an organisation and that they will report back to the agriculturalists.
  - Mr Wilson responded that the purpose of the agricultural dinner and breakfast and later presentation was to allow Dr Adi Paterson the opportunity to meet with farmers to discuss agricultural research. The presentation dinner and breakfast both covered the same content. We didn't have a big turnout for the breakfast but we tried to get who we could.
- A member expressed concern that the KCC newsletter did not contain the content of the discussions had at the breakfast or dinner presentation, and that the organisations in attendance have not since engaged with farmers.
  - Mr Wilson responded that engagement is up to the farmers and the organisations that represent them. The department has engaged with major organisations including arranging meetings with the Minister and hosting events. The level of information coming from the representative organisations is not the responsibility of the department, and the department is reliant on the organisations to pass information to their members. Information provided at the breakfast presentation and dinner are contained within the publicly available factsheets.
- A member asked if the rise of block chain and point of origin had been discussed in regards to produce at the agriculture breakfast?
  - Mr Wilson acknowledged that there is a big push for point of origin, however it becomes harder with bulk produce such as wheat. The department does not believe the facility will have an impact on the commercial value of agricultural resources, as there is no evidence of stigma from other nuclear countries. The department has taken the issue seriously and conducted research and no evidence has been found.
- A member expressed their satisfaction with the factsheets for being factual and based on extensive research and consultation. The member believes the KCC's role is to provide information into the community and bring information back. Consultation with farmers has been good throughout the process and a number have engaged with the process. 11 local farmers attended the breakfast meeting, some attended

the enquiry, and others came to the construction workshop. What organisations give back to their members is up to them. The member agreed that they should make a statement to the public.

- A member asked if any of the industries have made submissions to the department.
  - Mr Wilson responded that he cannot remember all the submissions received, however recalls a submission from Viterra in the first round.
- A member asked if the submissions can be made public.
  - Mr Wilson responded that the submissions can be made public when they explicitly state or ask to be made public, if this does not occur the submission will not be made public.
- A member raised that perceived contamination in dairy powdered milk overseas had led to people attempting to buy from other countries instead, and the facility may have similar consequences.
  - Mr Wilson clarified that in the case of powdered milk, there was actual contamination present. The department has found no evidence to support this concern around similar facilities where no contamination occurs.
- Mr Wilson spoke to the agriculture roundtable held in Canberra. The Minister encouraged associations to talk on the issues raised and make their view known to their members.
- A member spoke on behalf of Big Fig as a member of the organisation. They highlighted that lots of information will be coming out in the next Big Fig newsletter, and the committee are open to all questions. Not many questions have come through recently but we will answer as many questions from farmers as possible. If people are after answers then they are welcome to approach Big Fig with their questions.
- The convener highlighted that no agricultural bodies have been blocked from attending meetings. Any issue with communication back to farmers is the responsibility of the organisations and not the committee.
- Mr Wilson added that there is a community information session on the 6<sup>th</sup> of August. There will be a number of presentations relating to the site, this will be a chance for community questions to be answered by a panel of experts.
- The deputy convener expressed the view that they do not think it is within the committee's scope to criticise other organisations, instead the organisations should be contacted if anybody has any concerns.
- A member added that they regularly engage with organisations, but some organisations are not getting involved because they believe it will damage their membership.

## Other Items

- The letter tabled from Mr Hunt Captain, Buckleboo Country Fire Service (CFS) stating their concerns around the facility was raised. The department outlined that there was no formal response, and the information on safety was already addressed by Mr Griffiths.
  - The convener responded that a formal response addressing the concerns should occur.
    - Department agreed to formulate a response.

- The date of the next meeting was raised. The department advised that the meeting did not have to occur after voting had commenced, and would be preferable if it occurred before the start of the vote. Mr Wilson explained that the Consultative Committee in Hawker would be having a Q&A session to answer questions around all of the recently released information such as the fact sheets and reports.
  - Members agreed no meeting should happen during the voting period, however a Q&A session before the vote would be valuable.
  - The committee took a vote and agreed to an evening meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup> of August.
    - Department informed the committee the format would be a Q&A session. Mr Wilson requested the committee to ask people in the community for any questions they may want answered and report back.
- A member asked if it would be possible to move the time for the meeting with the Minister.
  - Mr Wilson responded that the Minister cannot arrive any sooner in the day, and he will be attending meetings as soon as he arrives. Changing the time would be unlikely. Final clearance of the itinerary of the Minister's trip will be arranged shortly and the department will provide a table summary for the events to the community.
- A member raised that the community should receive the right information about the Community Development Package. Comments from outside the community imply the value of the package tripled immediately before the vote, however it is important for people to know the value of the package was arranged based on consultation with the KCC, KEWG, and Kimba District Council. The member believes people should be informed about this.
  - The Convener agreed that it is important that members of the committee make it clear that various bodies had given the input into the package.
- A member asked about how the Indigenous fund may be used in the community?
  - Convener responded that it is not the communities place to decide, instead it is a matter between indigenous groups and the government.
  - Mr Wilson highlighted that the money does not have to be spent in the community, instead it can be spent on Traditional Owners who live outside the area. There is a requirement under the procurement rules for the Government that there is a certain level of Indigenous engagement. There may be potential opportunities for Indigenous and non-Indigenous businesses to work together. Mr Wilson mentioned that another business expo looking at Indigenous collaboration could be possible. Mr Wilson also noted EPBC act applications have a requirement to preserve Indigenous history in the area. There may be potential for the fund to be involved in this process.
- A member asked if there had been any feedback from University of Queensland (UQ) regarding the socio-economic study, and how the report was progressing.
  - Mr Wilson responded that formal feedback will be provided, but it has not yet been sent out.
  - Mr Wilson noted that UQ had provided the department with feedback on support services that might be necessary post site selection. He noted that

there are support facilities from the state government available in the area, and encouraged Committee members to let the department know what support services might be useful.

- Member asked if an interim report from the UQ socio-economic analysis will be made available prior to the vote.
  - Mr Wilson advised he believes this is unlikely.
  - Another member added that UQ did tell her that the information being collated would not be used by the Minister.
  - Mr Wilson responded saying the Minister is not likely to receive the report in time. Work may be split between UQ and Cadence in order to get the information sooner.
- A member asked if advertising would be released for the community information session on the 6<sup>th</sup> August?
  - Mr Wilson responded that flyers would be approved once the timing is confirmed, hopefully released before the end of the week. Posts will also be made on social media and websites. At the information sessions questions will be taken and provided to the panel through a moderator.
- A member asked if the new process for submissions will be advertised?
  - Mr Wilson affirmed that information on the new process will be provided to the public. The department will direct people to the NRWFM website and likely put information in the local papers once approval is given.
- The convener expressed that he was pleased with the conduct of the members regardless of differing views, and this was a credit to the members.

**Action Item** – Dates and time for the Minister’s meeting to be emailed.

*Meeting Closed at 3pm*