



Australian Government
Department of Industry,
Innovation and Science

National Radioactive Waste Management Facility

Kimba Consultative Committee

Meeting Notes

Thursday 17th May 2018



Agenda – Thursday 17th May

Time	Item	Lead
Tea and coffee available from 09:00		
09:30-10:00	Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Apologies – Overview of the meeting agenda – Approval of the Draft Notes of meeting of 11 April 2018 and 15-16 March 2018 – Observer Protocol – meeting attendees 	Allan Suter, Independent Convener
10:00-10:15	Project Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Site Characterisation Updates – WAC & Jobs associated with the facility 	DIIS
10:15-10:30	Morning Tea Break	
10:30-11:00	Information Timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Fact Sheets 	DIIS
11:00-12:00	ANSTO Waste Acceptance Criteria & Jobs	Mr Hefin Griffiths ANSTO
12:00-13:00	Lunch	
13:00-13:30	Community Ballot Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Vote Process – Vote Boundaries 	DIIS
13:30-14:00	Kimba Economic Working Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposal List 	Deputy Convener Mayor Johnson KEWG

Attendees:

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

Apologies:

--	--	--

Other Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Bruce Wilson	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – Project Advisor
Ian Carter	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – Community Consultation Team Manager
Sarah Hill	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team – Community Consultation Team Manager
Adam White	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Community Consultation Team
Maree Barford	DIIS: NRWMF Project Team - Community Consultation Team
Hefin Griffiths	ANSTO – Chief Nuclear Officer
Alex Sawers	AECOM – Principle Project Manager
Deb Larwood	Kimba Council – Chief Executive Officer

Action Items

Item	Status
1. Provide ANSTO's Waste Management at the Facility presentation to committee members	Complete
2. Provide a brief summary on what each job entails	Complete
3. Provide AECOM's Opportunity for Local Participation presentation to committee members	Complete
4. Add 'Other items' to the agenda for the next meeting	Complete
5. Add a discussion under 'Other items' on a possible information session to the agenda for the next meeting	Complete

Meeting opened 09:30am

Welcome

Allan Suter welcomed committee members to the meeting. Allan mentioned that at the meeting there would be information provided from Hefin Griffiths from ANSTO, Alex Sawers from AECOM and Deb Larwood from the CEO Kimba District Council.

Project Update

Bruce Wilson from the department gave an update on the project including the following topics:

- Site Characterisation work at Napandee and Lyndhurst including:
 - Deep borehole drilling
 - Wirelogging for geological and water purposes
 - Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) development
 - Jobs mapped out by ANSTO
 - Design work being done by ANSTO and Jacobs
 - Information Timeline detailed the information to be released in the lead up to the vote

Discussion

- A member asked who Jacobs were?
 - It was advised that they are a large international engineering company who have experience in providing similar work overseas. ANSTO will do the preliminary design work and pass that on to the architects and Jacobs.

Draft notes of meeting on 17 May 2018

- Members raised the following points to be amended in the 17 May 2018 meeting notes:
 - Page 12 - should be overseas grain buyers rather than 4-5 grain buyers.
 - Page 10 - should clarify that Mr. Bolton was talking about \$37,000 as a contribution for a small cell.
 - Page 10 – that the discussion on mobile coverage was around improved coverage along 10-20 kms along the A1 highway instead of 10-20 kms out of town.
- The committee approved the notes with the listed amendments.

Jobs associated with the facility

Bruce Wilson from the department spoke about the announcement of what ANSTO's estimate of jobs at the facility will be. He noted that there was a presentation by Hef Griffiths on jobs later in the agenda.

Discussion

- A member asked whether the department endorse the latest numbers given in the jobs fact sheet?
 - The department advised that the fact sheet has been endorsed by the Minister's office and we are comfortable with the estimate that ANSTO have come up with. 15 jobs was always a conservative and old estimate based on just handling the LLW and didn't include the ancillary services. This also doesn't mean that ANSTO will be the operator at the facility but that decision still needs to be made.
- A member asked when the council wrote a letter to the Minister's office on the benefits that would come to the town, are we expecting the 45 jobs to be in the letter they receive as a response?
 - Another member mentioned that a reply had been received by council before this information came out.
 - The member asked whether there will be a contract from the Minister to the community on receiving the amount of jobs listed.
 - The department advised that if we publish a document with our name on it then we support it and the commitment that it states. This fact sheet has been approved by the Minister's office. We can take the idea back to the Minister whether a contract can be developed for the jobs required over the lifetime of the facility. However statements that we put out are a commitment to the community. If the feedback from the community is that another form of commitment is needed then we can take that back to the Minister.
 - Another member mentioned that if the department can put out this information then they should be able to commit to the jobs for the lifetime of the facility. This will affect peoples opinions going forward in the vote.
 - The department responded that the community will need to make their own decision at some point. We will take this on board and look at the way in which we could provide this to the community. I can only tell you that when we put material out we mean what we say and we don't put out misleading information. I can't tell you that those jobs will be there for 100 years because I don't know. It could be more or less jobs going into the future. At this stage based on our information and what we know about running the facility we can commit to 45 jobs. As we move through the process that number might move a little bit up or down but not substantially.
- A member raised that they wouldn't have thought that the community would have a contract until we went through to phase 3 of the process. The community also needs to be realistic, in any business you understand the required number of employees could change. It's a really big ask to be locked into that contract. We would love to see this amount of jobs but the community needs to be realistic.
- A member asked about the process for appointing an operator for the facility and where that is up to?

- The department advised that we are still working through this and it is quite complex. The owner of the facility would be the government. Then we will choose an operator which could be government or private sector. We would need to go through the correct procurement process to ensure that there is value for the taxpayer. This will be a matter for cabinet to decide. We will be feeding feedback from the community whether they believe a private operator is acceptable versus a government backed operator. My feeling from feedback we've received over the last few years is that people would not prefer a private operator but we don't get to make those decisions. The operator will be separate to who builds the facility which will be private.
- A member asked how many man-hours per week will be needed at the facility and how many of the jobs will be full time or part time?
 - Mr. Griffiths from ANSTO advised that the assumption when putting together this list of jobs was that they are all full time jobs. There will potentially be job share roles such as the visitor centre could be 2 part time jobs but they will be full time equivalent.
- A member raised a point regarding a point another member mentioned on the commitment to the jobs. The concern is if the government changes and then it gets reduced to 20 jobs.
 - Mr. Griffiths said that in putting together the list of jobs one of the factors was looking at how to maximise the number of jobs for the longest period of time. In terms of the stability of the jobs going forward would form the plan for effective control which would be a licencing requirement by ARPANSA. A lot of the jobs in there would be required by the regulator so if there was a change to the plan for effective control then you would need to submit that to the regulator to justify that change.
 - The member asked whether ARPANSA back these jobs?
 - Mr. Griffiths replied that ARPANSA haven't approved anything, this is down to the operator to make the submission of the plan for effective control as part of the licencing and these jobs form part of what is called the nuclear baseline.
- The convener raised in a former role a contract had been presented to a Minister and the Minister responded that Ministers don't enter into contracts with entities. If the Minister gives his word then it is expected to be honoured.
 - The department responded that the Minister has to get the agreement of cabinet to the funding arrangements and then he would make an announcement. He will make a public and published statement on the funds but he won't enter into a contract arrangement. However a commitment to the community could be considered. I will also suggest to the Minister that he talk to the opposition to see if they will put their name to it.
- A member asked that if ANSTO aren't the operator then what impact could that have on the jobs?
 - The department responded that it wouldn't be likely to have much impact on jobs. We are confident that if you want to run the facility in the way that we would require it be run then we are comfortable with the structures and numbers that ANSTO have come up with.
 - The member raised that the problem was that up until a week ago we were told that it's going to be 15 jobs and the Minister had also said that to the

community and now it's 45. I just find it hard to believe that there's a guarantee that if on the jobs if somebody else runs the facility.

- The department replied that it is up to people what they believe and we can only say what we can. We have always said that 15 was the minimum number and that it was based on a conservative estimate around the number of jobs required for a LLW disposal facility. Now that the ILW has been confirmed we are comfortable that it has been mapped to 45. If another operator bid to run this facility they would need to bid into the employment structure. The regulator in licencing the facility will look at the staffing structures and whether they are appropriate for this facility.
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that the UK had moved to a lot of private operation of nuclear facilities. The model was that the facilities were government owned but contractor operated. For a lot of those facilities if you had changes in operator then you didn't get wholesale staffing changes. The way it was set up was that everybody apart from the General Manager (GM) would work for a holding company and that would be the employer of those people. If the government wanted to change the contractor then they would just change the GM. Everybody else stayed on the same terms and conditions which provided consistency. This is a potential option if it was operated by somebody outside of government.
- A member asked whether Jacobs operated facilities internationally?
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that they have been involved in partnerships in the UK and they are large multinational company.
- A member asked for clarification on whether the operator puts in for the licence and not the government.
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that it depends when an operator is appointed. The department could apply for the siting of a construction licence or if they've appointed they've appointed the operator, as long as the regulator has someone to hold accountable. At the moment there would be 6 six licences. One for storage, one for disposal and then you go through siting, construction, operation and closure. It would be the operator who would apply for the licence because that's who the regulator will hold to account. The government couldn't get the licence and delegate the responsibility to the operator or somebody else.
 - The department added that the department probably wouldn't apply for an operator licence and I doubt that the regulator would see the department as competent body to operate the facility.
- A member asked for clarification that the nominated operator will apply for the licence and that will be done before construction.
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that that is correct. Firstly they would apply for a siting licence once the applicant believes the site is suitable to host this facility from the site characterisation study. Secondly you would do the more detailed design to show this is what we want to build and then you get a construction licence. Thirdly you need to demonstrate that what you've constructed met the conditions you set for it before you can start operations. Each one of those phases in Australia is in the top

level of nuclear facility. As with each facility we've had constructed at ANSTO there will be a separate public consultation process at the end of each of these phases run by ARPANSA.

Approval of the Observer Protocol

Discussion

- A member raised that the Observer Protocol* still needed to be approved and finalised.
 - The department advised that they believed it had been agreed at the last meeting and the process had been finalised. The process would be that committee members could invite anybody to come along and would then send an email to the convener who would invite the observer along. The form to attend the meeting would be returned by at least 12pm the day before the meeting. The convener would then approve the observer to attend.
 - The convener added that he will automatically approve them within a reasonable limit. I believe the protocol document wasn't for circulation to the public but would be provided at each request. I believe the limit we discussed would be 10 observers. Unless I think the meeting will have too many people I will always approve people to attend.
 - A member clarified that that was the discussion previously that observers couldn't come unless they contact the committee first or if a committee member invites them.
- A member asked for clarification on the process.
 - The convener advised that the committee member could pass on his contact details or alternatively provide the contact details of the observer and he will provide the form to the observer.

*Please note the KCC meeting notes of 12 April 2018; members agreed to the use of the observer protocol. Please find a link to the notes here [KCC meeting notes 12 April 2018 Observer Protocol Approval](#).

Information Timeline

Bruce Wilson from the department gave an overview of the Information Timeline developed by the department. The paper lists the release of information fact sheets. The timeline has also been sent to the Kimba District Council (KDC), Flinders Ranges Council (FRC) and the Outback Communities Authority (OCA). The document includes fact sheets to be released prior to the vote. If the community has suggestions on other topics they would like hear more about then please contact the department.

Discussion

- A member asked about whether the long term community package for the host community would be the same for Kimba and Hawker or would it be designed separately?
 - The department advised that it would be the same package but there might be some elements that are relevant for each community.

- A member asked about the transport information and whether that will include the transport routes?
 - The department advised that we won't advise specific routes at this stage as that is a job for the experts rather than the department. It will be more general on how the material is moved and the options for how it might be moved. The department isn't best suited to identify the transport routes and the regulator of the facility will have oversight of the routes used.
 - Mr. Griffiths added that it would likely outline the Australian and International requirements for moving radioactive material.
- A member asked whether the transport information would include waste coming back from overseas and whether it would come via ship so that be more direct going to the facility?
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that the information could include multiple options but which one is used will be up to the regulator.
- A member asked whether the infrastructure information will detail what is needed at each site and the costs associated with that?
 - The department responded that the costing work will come later but it will identify the infrastructure needs at each site.
 - Alex Sawers from AECOM added that this work is being undertaken at the moment.
- The department advised that the was commissioning a study on the economic impact of the facility in the community. We are having discussions with a company at the moment. We are also looking into getting the socio-economic benchmarking done to look at opportunities for local business. We haven't quite finalised the timing on that but we are hoping to get that information to the community before the vote. The economic assessment will also include both positive and negative impacts on key industries.
- A member asked for a bit more information on the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC).
 - The department advised that the WAC is a document that will evolve over time. It won't be finalised until it is approved by ARPANSA . That process is being started now with the generic WAC which is a preliminary document and not an operational document.
 - Mr. Griffiths added that the generic WAC and the generic safety case will be used to inform the design of the facility. The designers can work out what form they expect the waste to come in and design the facility within those constraints. As we go through from preliminary to detailed design then the safety case and WAC will be used to justify the design process. At the moment it is generic because essentially it is a collation of WAC's used internationally. I can't see that the WAC would become less strict but depending on the design requirements that might impose further restrictions as part of the WAC. This will be covered a bit more in our presentation later.
- The convener asked whether the study of the economic impact of the facility would include a measurement of the cost of the job associated with the facility.
 - The department advised that they usually work that way. It would look at what the direct injection would be to the community from the construction and operation. There are various techniques to measure the overall economic benefit as an example measuring if a certain amount is spent on wages then what does that generate in terms of extra benefit or extra jobs. We will get that work done and we

have every intention to get it done by mid-July but until we have a signed contract I can't confirm that.

- A member asked where the cultural assessment in Kimba is up to.
 - The department responded that a letter has been or is about to be sent to the Barngarla people inviting them to participate. We have a contractor that we use at Wallerberdina and want to engage them to work with the Bungala people to do the cultural heritage assessment.
- A member raised a query on the agriculture report. Obviously you'll be looking at any co-habitation benefits but who will actually conduct that study? And where will they get the information from?
 - The department advised that we have conducted our work and this work will form the information in the agriculture fact. This work will also form part of our economic analysis separate to this report.

Waste Acceptance Criteria and Jobs presentation

Hefin Griffiths, Chief Nuclear Officer, from ANSTO gave an overview of the waste management principles and the jobs required at the facility. The presentation included the following topics:

- Jobs associated with the facility
- Waste management principles
- NRWMF project development
- Waste acceptance process
- General conditions of waste acceptance
- Types of waste in the inventory
- Defence in depth / multi-barrier approach

Discussion

- A member asked if anybody checks the waste before it gets sent to the facility.
 - Mr. Griffiths said that in terms of the overall assurance process there will be regular audits and inspections to make sure that what is being done matches what the contract stipulates. What has been advised to the department is that the government will take title of the waste at the consigners gate. That is the opportunity for the operator of the facility to do the check of the packages.
- Another member asked whether the operator will then handle the transport from the site?
 - Mr. Griffiths said that is the advice we've given to the department.
 - Another member asked whether these would be part of the jobs associated with the facility? That employees would travel to areas to ensure the waste is meeting the criteria.
 - Mr. Griffiths said yes they would form part of the jobs. The assumption would be that the actual transportation would be given out to suitable and qualified transporters but the planning and logistics role would be part of the jobs.
- A member asked what accreditation is needed to transport nuclear waste?

- Mr. Griffiths advised it falls under the ADR register, which covers the carriage of dangerous goods by road, under the UN transport classification of radioactive material.
- A member asked for clarification whether the transport jobs are part of the revised job list?
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that the assumption would be that there are people in the community who could do that. The jobs have been based on the ASNTO model.
- A member queried that if the waste is in glass or synroc then it's in the preferred form for disposal. If it's in the preferred form to dispose of why would ILW be stored here? Isn't the anticipation that it won't be happening for a number of years?
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that we don't have a disposal pathway for ILW disposal at this stage and we don't have a place for disposal. In terms of using synroc we anticipate that we will be commissioning synroc by the end of next year.
- A member asked how many jobs will be affected if the arrival of ILW was to stop the ANSTO CEO advised that the ILW would stay at the facility for 100 years?
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that the jobs have been based on a timeframe of 30-40 years and that he hadn't heard the 2120 timeframe before. The facility will become a centre of excellence in waste and this structure is designed to have jobs for as long as possible.
 - The convener clarified that the reason the 2120 timeline was given was due to anticipated additional suppliers of ILW over the course of the facility.
- A member asked what is the timeframe of short term storage?
 - Mr. Griffiths I've been advised about 30 to 50 years by the department.
 - The member also asked how long the TN81 canisters will last? What happens if the waste lasts longer than the canister?
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that the design life is conservative. It's similar to the reactor which is designated a 40 year design life but really we would expect it to last 60 years. The TN81 canister is also inspected every 6 months.
- A member raised that 100 years isn't that temporary for storage.
 - The department responded that the 100 years is to store the waste and we don't know how long it will take to build a disposal facility which could take 20, 30, 40 years.
 - A member asked if there is work being done to move towards ILW disposal.
 - Mr. Griffiths responded that this was a key issue that was raised by ARPANSA. They wanted a commitment to move from storage to disposal. We looked at the disposability of Synroc to show that the waste would meet the disposal options. We are committed to finding a disposal solution. I started work with IAEA on disposal solutions for countries with small volumes of waste and developing borehole disposal. A number of countries are interested in borehole disposal and countries like America and Canada have done research into disposing high level waste. For the small amount of waste in Australia the current model of disposal in deep geological caverns might well be too expensive so other options of disposal, including appropriate borehole disposal will likely be looked at before Australia goes ahead.
- Mr. Griffiths added that the safety case for a borehole will be similar to that for a deep geological cavern. We will look at creating both engineered and natural barriers like we have

for this facility and get a further idea of how much work you need to do. The amount of land required for boreholes is very small. For example South Africa have a large amount of waste and they are looking at a thousand boreholes which would take up about 100 metres by 300 metres. I would be confident that a solution could be found within a 40-50 year horizon. The investment in Synroc for liquid waste from nuclear medicine production and the vitrified product from reprocessing of spent fuel are wastefoms that open different disposal options that would be more-cost effective and quicker to implement. Not necessarily for just the medical produced waste.

- A member asked for clarification on whether hospital waste would come to the facility? It has previously been advised that it won't.
 - Mr. Griffiths replied that it will depend. The medicine is designed to be short lived and is stored for short-term decay (weeks) in hospitals, but there are some older techniques which use high-activity sealed sources that do need appropriate disposal at the end of life. Currently those are disposed of overseas so if disposal was more cost effective then it's an option but I wouldn't think a large amount would come to facility.
- A member mentioned there had been a lot of talk on the jobs. Is it possible that they could increase?
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that the initial 15 jobs came from a point of view that couldn't see less than 15 jobs being needed, just for the operational component. We looked at roles that would be required and it seems about right. We tried to be careful so that jobs disappeared if the legacy waste was disposed of quickly through and they would go down in 20 years. Even quality assurance and environmental monitoring means that jobs will be there. If we move from LLW disposal to ILW disposal this would allow people with those expertise to fill the jobs. There's also security jobs such as the Australian Federal Police (AFP) to consider as well. We think maybe 15 to 26 security jobs and it might be closer to the 26 due to the remote location.
 - A member asked whether that meant it would likely be AFP.
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that he didn't know, that would be decided by the security regulators At ANSTO the AFP have 5 or 6 people on shift but the estimates tend to be fairly conservative. We won't know until we get closer to operation but I would imagine the jobs would move increase rather than decrease.
- A member raised that the jobs fact sheet says that there won't be any fly in, fly out. Given that experts will be needed for various roles, what guarantee is there to get some of the jobs in the local area? For example if someone lives in Adelaide they can just travel here and then go home on a roster type set up.
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that normally fly in, fly out is paid for by the employer, in this case it wouldn't be paid for. Ultimately you can't stop people from doing that but it will be up to them if they wish to spend their wages on flying in and out. There are also probably fair work practices which might impact on preventing people living where they want to.
 - Another member mentioned that because they are full time jobs they probably won't be rostered like most fly in, fly out jobs which are 5 days work and then 7 days off.
 - Another member raised an example in teachers that come to the country to work. The first term they spend a lot of time traveling back and forth but after a while they start to stay here.
- A member asked how many of the jobs will be for aboriginal employees? As there is a minimum percentage required.

- Mr. Griffiths said that he wasn't sure at this stage and the department will likely dictate that number.
- A member asked for clarification on the leader safeguards and the leader safety case.
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that safeguards is ensuring the traceability of safeguarded materials that fall under the non-proliferation treaty i.e. ensuring that certain materials are not diverted to the production of nuclear weapons. So accounting for the movement of materials and ensuring that the facility will operate with compliance of the permit which is granted from ANSTO. We have two people who do that at ANSTO as a full time job. Individual safeguards responsible officers are within each of the facilities. So the safeguarding is essentially accounting for the material that is leaving ANSTO's permit into the facility. This also applies to LLW and ensuring that once it's disposed it comes off the books. So the safety case will be developed through the siting, construction and operational phases. As the construction will most likely happen periodically it will fall under the regulation 51 submission to ARPANSA for an amendment to the safety case. Through the lifetime of this facility the safety case team will need to commence developing the post closure safety which looks at the performance of the facility in the future. So the safety case is looking at the operational safety of the facility and safeguards is against the diversion of nuclear material into a weapons program.
- A member asked whether the committee could receive a breakdown of each of the jobs listed.
 - Mr. Griffiths will provide summaries of each job.
- A member asked about the new jobs in relation to the ILW and the education needed for those roles. How do you think those positions will be filled? Will we be able to find people with the right skills or whether they will be people coming from ANSTO?
 - Mr. Griffiths advised that it would likely be the normal advertising process. Generally we take people on and train them up over about a 6 month period. We will likely start off recruiting the top level of staff but the idea will be to recruit people into the community that can do the training here.

Action Item:

- *Provide a summary of each job associated to the facility to committee members*
- *Provide ANSTO's Waste Management at the Facility presentation to committee members*

AECOM's Opportunities for Local Participation Presentation

Alex Sawers from AECOM gave an overview of what to expect during the construction phase.

This included:

- Site Characterisation Study – The study will produce the data to inform whether the site is technically suitable.
- Early Works – Services and civil infrastructure such as power and communications.
- Construction Works – Trades and suppliers to assist in the process.
- Support Services - Accommodation and catering.

Discussion

- A member asked whether the construction company would be decided through a tender process? What will be given to the successful company to ensure that they will use local contractors?

- The department advised it would include a requirement in the agreement to use local contractors. The Minister has said he wants to use as many as possible. The other positive is that it might drive the companies to come out to the community beforehand.
- A member raised that at the Economic Working Group (EWG) meeting it was discussed that a local co-operative could be formed, so local businesses and contractors can get in under the tender. As an example rather than having a separate Work Health and Safety Officer for each for each contract would it be possible to just have one over all the contracts? The EWG will work with AECOM and the department to get that underway.
 - Mr. Sawers advised that this was correct and that AECOM will work with the department to move that ahead.
- A member asked for clarification whether it was advised that the construction would take 2 years?
 - Mr. Sawers advised that it was the department who had given that timeframe. Mr. Sawers added that it is difficult for AECOM being separate during the design but the 2 years would be about right if everything went very smoothly.

Action Item:

- *Provide AECOM's Opportunity for Local Participation presentation to committee members*

Community Vote Process

The convener invited Deb Larwood, CEO of the Kimba District Council, to discuss the upcoming community vote and the council's role in the process.

Mrs Larwood advised the committee that the council had agreed to facilitate the ballot for the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility. There will be two rolls, one is the house of assembly roll which most Kimba residents will be on and the other is the CEO's roll which is for ratepayers not on the first roll. The roll closes on the 31st of May 2018, the ballot opens on the 20th of August 2018 and will close on the 24th of September 2018.

Mr Wilson spoke on behalf of the department and advised that the council are doing the ballot on behalf of the community and the government. We are still developing a question to ensure we have an answer that is interpretable. The Minister is keen to hear from the committee on their preference for the voting process.

The convener added that the default boundary is the Kimba District Council boundary. The committee has the chance to put forward their preference of the boundary which will be considered by the Minister otherwise he will use the default. The convener opened the floor to discussion on the vote boundary to clarify the wishes of the committee.

Discussion

- A member asked about people on stations outside the area and whether they can apply to be on the roll?
 - Mrs. Larwood advised that the council have agreed to hold it under local election rules and they need to own land in the area. The council is comfortable with the boundaries.
- A member raised that they had been contacted by a business owner that is ineligible to vote and that opportunities should be given to those who contribute economically to the community.

- Mrs. Larwood clarified that the council has had discussions with local business owners. Under the local elections Act there are specific guidelines given on how the ballot can operate. If you have a business in Kimba and you aren't the ratepayer then you are ineligible. You must be a resident or a ratepayer. If you rent a business and pay the rate then you are eligible.
- A member asked how it would work if the committee asked to extend the boundary and how it gets done?
 - The department advised that the AEC will use the roll supplied to them. It is possible for us to come up with additional names and talk to council if they were happy to use that but it would be for this purpose only and they wouldn't remain on the roll.
- A member asked how do we include people outside the boundary? For example one of the proposed sites is right next to the boundary.
 - The department advised that they have not been contacted by the people on the edge of the boundary at this stage. We can identify those blocks. At Wallerberdina the reason we have used the 50km radius is due to the fact that the site runs between the Flinders Range Council land and the Outback Communities Authority land. We are using Geoscience Australia to identify the blocks in those areas so that we can contact them.
- A member asked about the criteria if you're not on the roll, how long do you need to be a resident?
 - Mrs. Larwood advised that it is about a month. We are directed by Electoral Commission of South Australia and take the applications at face value. Then we also have updates at the end of every month.
- A member asked whether an extension would be given to the May 31st roll closing date if something was added? And how May 31st was selected?
 - Mrs. Larwood advised that May 31st was selected because the council needs 8 weeks between the close of roll and the opening of the ballot. So 8 weeks before the 20th of August takes it back to around the 20th of June. We are only able to get the roll cut off at the end of each month so doing it at the end of June won't work so we have to use the roll at the end of May. The council is tied to those timeframes. In terms of additions to the roll we haven't been advised by AEC at this stage when they require the roll. Once the roll comes through from them we will double check it, I would expect it come through one week after the end of May. We will submit the roll through an online portal once the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC) ask for it. Essentially it would need to happen before the AEC requires the roll.
 - The department added that this is the council's timeline for finalisation required under the electoral Act. The federal government doesn't have the same requirements upon it. We can assemble names as long as we meet whatever requirement the AEC put down. We would not put our extra names inside the Kimba council roll, they would form the roll under their regulations and we would add any additional names. If the council was comfortable with that then that roll with the extra names could be submitted to the AEC.
 - Another member advised that the council has not approved for anybody to make additions or subtractions from the roll and it would need to go back to council.
- A member asked whether it was possible to add names on a submission of why people can enrol rather than the 50km radius. The 50km radius won't mean much if they never come into the town.

- The department advised that would be a decision for the commonwealth not council. Unless we had clear guidelines on who it would take the department would be uncomfortable doing that as it would raise integrity questions.
- A member raised that there will be people south of the boundary who call themselves Kimba people. So there can't be exemptions made for people to vote?
 - The department advised that there needs to be a set of rules. If we start allowing people who shop in Kimba then it becomes a matter of being able to prove that. Again the problem would be people questioning the integrity of the voting process which is a position we don't want to be in. If we did go that way we would need a clear set of rules.
 - The member added that if we allow people to the north of the boundary we would also need to include people south of the boundary.
 - The department added the point that people outside the boundary will be able to make submissions to the Minister and that will be a feature of this process.
- A member asked what is the best way to put forward our suggestions and how does that happen?
 - The convener responded that the committee can make any suggestions they like but it must be reasonable for the Minister to accept it.
 - The department added that we won't exclude anybody that was included in the process last time. If we were to change the system then we would be obliged to go back and consult them on the change. Adding people opens it up to scrutiny.
- A member mentioned that there are a number of families who felt that they were removed from the process because they are outside or along the side of the boundary. Given that they do some business in town, they should be recognised somehow. I don't think the submissions get accounted for. If they fall within the radius area then they should be able to nominate to be on that list.
- A member raised that people can prove if they work in town, if their kids go to school here or if they are part of community groups. Is there a way for federal government to say that these people can be accepted?
 - The department advised that the problem is that we would need categories that could not be stacked. That could ruin the integrity of the vote. It would be different to the other site in Wallerberdina. This partly due to the way that the OCA operates and that they don't contribute to local elections, only state and federal elections. So that has been done on a geographic decision that you must fall within a certain area rather than particular conditions that must be met.
- A member raised that the department has already said that people outside the boundary have their chance to put in submissions. We have already had one vote and if we have another one it has to stay the same.
- A member mentioned that just because we have already had a vote doesn't mean that it was done the right way the first time. However I do agree that we can't use any conditions that are subjective. If we change anything it should be a radius around the site.
- A member agreed with a previous mention that the vote had been done in the council boundary area last time and the people in that area will get a vote this time. We just need to come up with a way for people outside that area to have a say.
- A member mentioned we either use the KDC boundary or determine a radius.
- A member asked for clarification on the radius and whether that meant that only people inside the radius would vote? There are people who are far more involved in the community than just the people within the radius of the proposed sites. It would be unfair if it was just the radius.

- The convener added that it is up to the committee. There is no guarantee that the Minister will take the committee's suggestion. One possible way is that the ballot is conducted in accordance with council rules as required in the local government Act and that the committee asks the Minister to incorporate views submissions from any people in a certain radius from Kimba. That's one possible solution. The other solution is to identify a radius that goes beyond the council boundaries but that may not be acceptable to the council who are charged with running the ballot. So they're probably these two possibilities. People who are not inside the council boundaries are given a clear invitation to submit their comments to the Minister and he takes those comments into account. That might also be an effective way of everybody getting to have their say. Could I suggest that maybe we take a vote on the options? The options are the council boundaries, the council boundaries with an invitation to all other people to make a submission to the Minister which he takes into account or specify a radius from a centre point like the township.
 - The department clarified on the third point. Orima defined the community around Barndioota as a 50 km area surrounding Wallerberdina Station, and an expansion to include the remainder of the primary local government area (the Flinders Ranges Council). They are unique due to the fact that the OCA doesn't have a roll so we had to do something to incorporate that area.
- A member raised that even if we go to the council boundary plus the 50km radius there may still be people who won't be captured in this anyway. So we're changing the whole integrity of the initial numbers and it may not bring in any of the people we've just talked about. There will always be somebody somewhere who will be left out. I don't see that the council boundary plus a radius will address that.
- A member raised that we know there are people of both opinions outside the council areas so it's not somebody pushing that option for one reason or another. My understanding is that your option 2 is what already happens. Broad community support is based on the vote, the submissions which include statements of where they are located, as well as neighbours and the characterisation study. So option 2 is what is actually happening.
 - The department added that the Minister will take into account all the submissions which are provided. What could be done as a variation on that is to identify those that are within a specific radius. In any public reporting we would identify, say there were 400 submissions, we would say we got 50 from this zone around the community and the breakdown of their views were whatever they might be.
- A member asked for clarification on the third option. If we're looking at having a radius would it be 50km around each site? That's what happened at Wallerberdina, it wasn't 50km from the township.
 - The convener clarified that it was a unique situation at Wallerberdina because of the boundaries.
- A member mentioned that the easiest option will be the council boundary and then submissions go to the Minister. We will always be leaving somebody out no matter what we do.
- A member raised that the council has proposed the district council area and there's nothing wrong with that. That's what has been put forward and I think we should vote on it.
- A member asked to follow up on the 2nd suggestion. If we made resolution to the Minister that he consider people within a particular radius then we have the vote as the council have suggested. Then you could ask the Minister to consider submissions from people within a 50km radius around each site with more weight than usual.
 - The department advised that if the committee wanted to go down this road. You could also say those within a geographic zone or those that weren't in the ballot but had an interest in Kimba.

The results were:

- 10 Members supported the proposed boundary
- 5 Members did not support the proposed boundary

The department thanked the members for stating their preference and they will take the results back to the Minister and reflect that there were two sets of views.

Please note the independent convener did not vote.

Discussion

- A member asked that the minutes include a request to the Minister for him to look at submissions from the local area.
 - The convener raised that the request be passed on to the Minister that he take into account submissions from people within a reasonable distance of Kimba.
 - The department added that it is possible to include something that would highlight the views of those who have connections within the Kimba community. The Minister will already consider all the submissions but we will pass on the request.

Kimba Economic Working Group

The deputy convener, who is on the Kimba Economic Working Group (KEWG), gave an update on behalf of their chair.

As requested by the KCC the KEWG has have reviewed suggestions of possible projects that might be sought from the Australian Government if the NRWMF was sited here. Further suggestions from the KEWG have been added. Some of the themes flagged and presented to the KCC in this list include:

- Aged & Health Care
- Telecommunications
- Affordable energy opportunities
- Child care

The KEWG recommends that the KCC seek community feedback on the proposal list. The KEWG is also discussing forming a list of businesses that could contribute to the site.

Discussion

- A member asked whether this is in addition to the funds that are being requested by council.
 - The deputy convener advised that this list is separate to that fund but it is complimentary. The chances of us getting all of this funded before the facility is built is probably quite low.
 - The department advised that from a government perspective we would take this list and the council's list to provide evidence of things the community is interested in. We want to be sure that this is supported and is what the community wants.
- A member raised a question on the accommodation proposal, is this in addition to the council proposal and in addition to the \$10 million dollars. Do we know who would purchase the additional accommodation?

- The deputy convener responded that we don't have that detail at this stage. We stayed away from full details at this stage. It wouldn't be owned by the community in the first instance but it could transfer across eventually. Once a construction manager is appointed we could work with them to purchase the site.
- A member raised that the proposal mentions that a number of education projects have been committed to, what has been committed to with ANSTO?
 - The department advised that this is based on potential cadetships and education outreach. Even if ANSTO is not the operator of the facility there would still be ANSTO science and education outreach programs and cadetships.
 - The member clarified whether they had been specifically committed to?
 - The department responded that they haven't been specifically committed to at this stage. We will come back to the community with an offer in July and I would be surprised if they weren't included.
- A member raised that this was a really positive document and that the KEWG had done a good job in pulling this together.
 - Another member added that it was a good list and they particularly like the idea of having a co-op of businesses to contribute to building the facility and dealing with the federal government.
- A member mentioned that if this list is given to the community as it is then the KEWG will receive a huge amount of questions on details and ideas that people want included. You need to release this stating that they are preliminary ideas and that you are searching for feedback.
 - The deputy convener advised that the KEWG was very mindful of our terms of reference. The KEWG reports back to this committee and we didn't want to tell this committee how to do everything. We provided the overview, we provided the detail to this group as much as possible. The suggestion was that we would come up with brief detail and ask for feedback.
- The convener raised that the request is that the KCC support this idea. The only word of caution is we need to be careful handling community expectations.
 - The department added that you won't be able to make everybody happy on the list.

The committee agreed to support the report and conducting some community consultation.

- A member asked whether the KEWG had an idea of how much the list would total in extra funding?
 - The deputy convener advised that we don't know at this point. Planning the design is a bit beyond our scope at the moment. This is just an idea of where our priorities lie at this stage. For example the medical building services wouldn't be as complex as building a brand new aged care facility.
- A member asked whether the KEWG planned to write to the Chief of Staff at the hospital or the Principal at the school, to ask for their feedback.
 - The deputy convener agreed that that was a great idea. I have spoken to them in my other role and this is what they have suggested.
 - The member said they were thinking around the numbers for aged care and the numbers required to run it long term.
 - The deputy convener said that the numbers around aged care is a much deeper project. We would need federal support to get it going. We have asked the department to investigate federal support to see how we can put ourselves ahead of the group.

- A member raised that concerns in the community have been raised around telecommunications. When the department is talking about upgrading the infrastructure, that won't just be for the facility will it? It will also be for the community as well.
 - The deputy advised that it will be for more than just the facility. We have specifically asked to get rid of the blackspots. We have also expanded to asking Optus as well as Telstra to do an analysis and offer suggestions.
 - The department added that AECOM are also looking at what is the backbone of getting services to the facility.
- A member raised that there are some good ideas here and we will get the feedback in July. In the event that some of these ideas don't carry through, where does it go from there? If the facility is put here and we have the \$10 million dollars, there's a lot of good things to fund here. But if they're not giving us a package in July then where does this document sit? Do we carry it through?
 - The deputy convener responded as an individual. You're right that if the facility doesn't come then it will be difficult to do a lot of this. We don't have detail on the community benefit package yet but once we do I would suggest that we would need to have long term funding ideas. For example if council's suggestion that we have around \$1 million per year generated in interest we would need some structure around projects and priorities for the community.
 - The member added that the reality is that the capital package under the Act and that goes through consultative committees. How much of this can be captured in the Act?
 - The deputy convener advised that council has asked that the package be revised. That has been passed on to the department and the Minister.
 - The department added that it is being looked at. We are looking at a fund proposal along the lines that the council has suggested. Essentially it is looking at how to structure something so that it gives a long term benefits to the area and is controlled by the area. It is tricky with smaller funds. I have spoken to the department of finance about whether they could do anything under the future fund. They said the smallest fund is \$3.8 billion dollars and their structures couldn't manage a fund like this so they are looking at other solutions. We are also under a time pressure to get something back to the community by July and whatever we do will need to go through cabinet, particularly because it would involve amending legislation. I don't think it would be that difficult but they are the discussion that need to be had and I can't commit to anything until it goes to cabinet and the Prime Minister agrees. We are endeavouring to get that done and they will decide the level of ambition they want to add.

Other Items

Discussion

- A member raised that there have been questions in the community around how much the access payments are for the site characterisation?
 - The department advised that we don't detail payments made to individuals. I can say that there is payments made for the access to the land during the characterisation work.
- A member asked to have other items added to the agenda.
- A member asked whether it would be possible for the community to have a debate before the vote? And would the department take part in it?
 - The department advised that the community is welcomed to hold a debate. The problem is that the department is here to provide information and we can't advocate for one side or the other. We would be open to presenting information on the project but we couldn't sit at a table debating for one side. The department would not stop the community from organising a debate and we are happy to provide information without advocating for a side.
 - The convener added that the committee's purpose is to provide information to the community and not to push views on people. I think it would be best handled by the community but it is up to the committee.
 - The member asked what it was an information session. Every speaker could be given a set time to talk.
 - The convener reconfirmed that it would be best organised by the community. I think it is going away from our role of providing information. If it was an information session it would be best handled by the department or ANSTO as they have the most information.
 - A member asked if it would have a specific focus? Is there a particular topic to discuss?
 - The member said that the community has heard from lots of presenters on both sides of the argument. I feel as though the community have been limited to hearing from ANSTO and the department and haven't heard from people with other views.
 - A member added that there have been discussions from both sides but we would need to know exactly who to ask and give it some thought as a committee.
 - The member said I don't have names on them but there are people who have sat on ARPANSA boards or people from the conservation foundation. I was involved in the royal commission for High Level Waste (HLW) and we were able to hear from anybody on either side of the argument. That is one complaint of this process, that people who are opposed have been blocked from speaking.
 - The department responded that we reject that statement and we haven't blocked anybody from speaking. We've had Margaret Beavis on our webinar panel. We are here to provide information on our process and we have supported people from both sides.
 - A member added that it does feel like we have only heard from government experts and they aren't the only experts in the field.
 - A member said that they agree that it might not be the committee's role.
 - Another member suggested that instead we could hold an expo in the local hall and have all the information available in one spot. Information such as expected jobs, plan of the facility, work needed to be completed. Display it over the course of a week and give people more opportunity to come and have a look.
 - The convener said that that might be a bit more appropriate. We will put this on the agenda for the next meeting and discuss it then.

Action Items:

- *Add other items to the end of the next agenda*
- *Include in other items discussion to the next agenda on information evening*

Meeting closed 2:30pm