



Australian Government  
Department of Industry,  
Innovation and Science

# National Radioactive Waste Management Facility

## Kimba Consultative Committee

### Meeting Notes

Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> June 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>- Approval of the Draft Notes of Draft Notes of meeting of 17 May 2018</li> <li>- Observer Protocol – meeting attendees</li> </ul> | Dean Johnson, Independent Deputy Convener |
| 10:00-10:30                         | Project Update & Introduction of new General Manager and Taskforce  | DIIS, Sam Chard                           |
| 10:30-10:45                         | Morning Tea Break   |   |
| 10:45-12:00                         | Safety & Security <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring of similar facilities</li> <li>- ARPANSA licencing &amp; regulation</li> <li>- ANSTO safety case</li> </ul>   | ANSTO – Hef Griffiths                     |
| 12:00-13:00                         | Lunch   |   |
| 13:00-14:00                         | Concept Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What the facility will look like</li> <li>- Identification of operational zones</li> </ul>  | ANSTO – Hef Griffiths                     |
| 14:00-14:30                         | Rad Waste Worker – Description of the role  | ANSTO – Mitchell Timpano                  |
| 14:30-15:00                         | Other Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information session</li> </ul>   | Dean Johnson, Independent Deputy Convener |

## Attendees:

|                                |               |                |
|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Dean Johnson (Deputy Convener) | Randall Cliff | Peta Willmott  |
| Jeff Baldock                   | Kellie Hunt   | Peter Woolford |
| Heather Baldock                | Jeff Koch     | Amy Wright     |
| Pat Beinke                     | Kerri Rayson  | Toni Scott     |

## Apologies:

|                        |              |             |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Allan Suter (Convener) | Sally Inglis | Symon Allen |
| Meagan Lienert         |              |             |

## Other Attendees:

| <b>Name</b>      | <b>Organisation</b>                                    |
|------------------|--|
| Sam Chard        | DIIS: NRWFM Project Team – General Manager             |
| Ian Carter       | DIIS: NRWFM Project Team –Community Consultation Team  |
| Adam White       | DIIS: NRWFM Project Team - Community Consultation Team |
| Maree Barford    | DIIS: NRWFM Project Team - Community Consultation Team |
| Howie Fei        | DIIS: NRWFM Technical Policy Team                      |
| Hef Griffiths    | ANSTO  |
| Mitchell Timpano | ANSTO  |

## Observers:

| <b>Name</b>      |
|------------------|
| Annie Clements   |
| Laura Fitzgerald |
| Phil Arcus       |
| Robyn Stewart    |
| Kerry Cliff      |

## Action Items

| Item   | Status                                  |
|--|---|
| 1. Confirm advertising for those who wish to make submissions to the Minister for the ballot? Confirm if they all need to be new submissions or if old submissions will be accepted? | Complete                                |
| 2. Clarify the authors of the Ag factsheets  | Complete                                |
| 3. Confirm the remuneration for the positions at the facility  | Complete                                |
| 4. Clarification on Woomera Waste  | Complete – CSIRO to attend July meeting |
| 5. Review information event list submitted by KCC member   | Complete                                |
| 6. Department to respond to the CFS letter   | In Progress                             |
| 7. Clarification of what the buffer zone might be used for?  | In Progress                             |
| 8. Provide the presentations to the committee members  | Complete                                |
| 9. Circulate the Agriculture breakfast notes   | Complete                                |

*Meeting opened 09:30am*

## Welcome

Dean Johnson opened the meeting as Acting Convener and gave an overview of the agenda.

## Housekeeping

Sam Chard introduced herself as the new General Manager of the project.

### Discussion

- A member raised that at the end of the day we need to have time for other items.
  - The convener advised that from a meeting procedures point of view we want to stay away from other items becoming a big agenda item. It is more useful if members can advise the department what members would like to see on the agenda rather than ad-hoc questions at the end of the meeting. This will allow people time to consider the issues.
  - The department added that emails before the agenda released will suffice in letting us know what members would like to discuss. Please include the conveners in these requests. There will be time during presentations to ask as many questions as members want. The 'other items' section of the agenda won't be taken up by the department and this can also be used for any other topics that the committee would like to raise.
  - The member noted that this was appropriate. and queried whether the department would decide what could or could not be discussed – that they be able to discuss community issues and I didn't think it should be controlled.
  - The department advised that it won't control it the agenda – that the agenda was ultimately up to the Chair.

## Approval of the Draft Notes from 17<sup>th</sup> May meeting

### Discussion

- Members raised the following points to be amended in the meeting notes from the 17<sup>th</sup> of May
  - A member raised that the committee had discussed the dates for the ballot but they weren't included in the notes.
    - Another member clarified that this was due to the fact that the council had not signed the contract with the Australian Electoral Commission at that time and we didn't have the closing date. The dates we have now are that the ballot opens on the 20<sup>th</sup> of August and closes on the 24<sup>th</sup> of September.
    - No amendment needed.
  - Page 6 & 7 – A member queried whether there would be a contract or 'compact' between the Minister and the community in relation to future community funding.

- The department noted that the Minister required the agreement of government to future funding arrangements, before he would make a public, published statement. We also expect that he will come out to the community. The department noted that the term ‘compact’ may have been used as a turn of phrase, but that the Minister would not be entering into a contract arrangement – rather he will make the commitment on the public record.
- Page 23 – A member suggested that department has not hosted presenters from alternative views to present to the community.
  - The department advised they haven’t blocked anybody from speaking in the Kimba community, that the agenda of the committee meetings was ultimately a decision of the Chair and members, but the department would not necessarily fund the participation of people without appropriate credentials.

*Please note reference to the members question raised on page 23*

- *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?*

*March 2017 the department hosted a webinar with a range of experts and alternative views.*

The committee approved the meeting notes with the listed amendments

## Project Update

Sam chard gave an update on where certain aspects of the project are up to.

This included:

- Recently released factsheets
  - Why we need a facility
  - Regulatory framework
  - Safely managing radioactive waste
  - Agriculture.
- Site Characterisation work – Field work is complete and the draft report is with the department for review
- The department also proposed that AECOM present at the next KCC meeting to discuss the site characterisation report. The committee agreed to this.
- Structure of the new division that the NRWMP Project falls under.

## Discussion

- A member asked how the factsheets are derived, such as the heritage one, do they include input from indigenous groups? Or is it just information that the department collates?
  - In relation to the Aboriginal Heritage Fact Sheet and report, the department responded that the heritage report is developed by RPS, through the heritage working group. The heritage report is with the heritage working group for their review. The department derives the factsheets based on early drafts of those reports and plans to release the full report, noting there are some aspects that will be redacted because they are considered sensitive Aboriginal business. The factsheet is a summary of more detailed information which will be released in the reports.
  - The member queried the Agriculture Fact Sheet, and noted they were very interested to see who is involved.
    - The department said we are happy to clarify the authors once we release the factsheets.
    - The member said that if people don't agree with the factsheets they need to be able to come here and ask where the information was gathered from.
  - A member asked whether the Barngarla people are represented on the heritage working group?
    - The department advised that it had been trying to reach out to them and are very open to working with them, however, correspondence to date had been through their lawyers.
- A member asked how the heritage assessment will be done?
  - The department advised that RPS had been engaged to develop assessments in both Kimba and Hawker, and that they are experienced in this kind of work. That the department would advise on who RPS was engaging with in relation to Kimba.
- A member asked for clarification on when the announcement of the community benefits package will occur and will it be before the vote?
  - The department advised that the announcement will be before vote and it will occur in July, but the specific timing is up to the Minister and his government colleagues.
- A member asked whether the site selection reports will include which sites are preferred or which ones will be more expensive?
  - The department advised that factors which have cost impacts will be included, but specific information on cost implications of those factors would not likely be released at this stage. For example if there is flood risk that they have analysed, that can be engineered out, that would have a likely cost implication the department would need to be taken into account at a high level, but that AECOM won't be costing those engineering solutions at this stage, they will just be putting them on the table. The department noted it will provide government with business cases that goes into detail on the cost implications, later in the project, after a site was selected and more analysis was done, but that would be a matter for government.

## Action Items:

- *Clarify the authors of the agriculture factsheets*

## Kimba Economic Working Group Update

A member gave an update on behalf of the Economic Working Group (EWG) and what had been discussed at the latest meeting.

The EWG has met 4 times to date since being established. They have provided a proposal list to the KCC on services that they are looking at upgrading or increasing if the construction of the facility goes ahead. This is continuing to be developed.

An inquiry has been made on the matter of observers attending the EWG. It was noted that the EWG terms of reference are different to the KCC and the meetings are closed door meetings.

The EWG is hosting a construction workshop on the 17<sup>th</sup> of July which focuses on upskilling and qualifications for local businesses and is open to all. This will help local contractors to understand how they can learn from the process and what opportunities are available.

## Discussion

- A member asked how the construction event will be advertised?
  - The EWG member advised that it will be advertised via letterbox drop, letters to suppliers, the Eyre Tribune and the Kimba Council Facebook page.
- A member asked what experts will be there?
  - The EWG member said that AECOM, SafeWork SA and the Industry Capability Network
- A member asked whether there will be advertising in other towns?
  - The EWG member said that it will only be advertised to other towns through the Tribune as we felt that we wanted local businesses and suppliers to have the first opportunity.
- A member asked how the contacted businesses were selected?
  - The EWG member advised they've a list of 60 businesses that they thought would contribute in supplying accommodation, catering, electrics and similar services.
  - The department added that the EWG went through a lot of discussions on who would be missed and weighed up the extensive list. We will try and contact as many people as possible.
- A member raised that obviously the EWG has limited time, how are the economic and socio-economic studies coming along?
  - The EWG member advised that the economic analysis by Cadence Economics will be available in late July but the University of Queensland socio-economic report won't be available until after the vote.

## Business Arising from the 17<sup>th</sup> of May Meeting Notes

### Discussion

- A member raised that on page 18 the KCC had discussed who would be able to vote, and that those outside the district council boundary are able to make submissions to the Minister. The member queried where that is this being advertised?
  - The department advised that they will need confirm exactly where that information is being advertised, but that it will ensure that the information is on the website and provide clarification on the submission process. The department also noted that correspondence to the Minister and department would also be considered.
  - A member raised that there may be elderly people who won't see the advertising online.
  - A member raised that the Minister had said in parliament that people outside the voting area play a big part, if he says that then it should be advertised.
- A member mentioned that during the process there have been time for people to make submissions and then it closes. This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> time we had to make other submissions and the 3<sup>rd</sup> time before a vote there needs to be new submissions.
  - A member raised that the Minister said we need to make new submissions. Also when they were reported on they didn't clarify how many were opposed or supportive.
  - Another member added that if new submissions are required then it must be known to people.
  - The department noted it would accept previous submissions and would come back to the committee to clarify how this would work and what the process would be for making submissions.
- A member referred to Page 21 of the notes, and the EWG proposal list. Will they be making formal contact with the school or hospital on their preference of priorities?
  - Another member responded that they had made contact with the hospital and they had provided an indicative costing for the bedding. There are also federal beds which are funded by federal government and state government are responsible for infrastructure so there is some difficulty with that. We haven't contacted the school at this stage. There have been a lot discussions but we felt that we don't have the resources or the time to do a full business analysis.
  - Another member added that the school had been contacted early on regarding their priorities.
    - A member asked whether those discussions had gone to the school council?
    - The member responded that they haven't but it was preliminary contact.
- A member raised that one of the major points discussed in the community is to do with the security of the community package going forward into future governments. We spoke about the contract last time, which I realise the Minister won't enter into. Can anything be done that can be put to the community to demonstrate that the promises will be honoured?

- The department noted that the current commitment was legislated. It noted that this was conceived at a point of time, and may not be fit for purpose now. There is a potential for a legislation change and the Minister was considering this in the context of a broader package. The department noted that passing legislation is a lengthy process – it must be introduced to parliament and can be reviewed by committee and is debated, and involves two levels for government. The department noted that any potential legislative change would not occur before a vote, but the Minister would be making a public commitment.
- The deputy convener added that we don't know the full benefits package at this stage and this is speculation.
- A member said that this is one of the biggest issues with the legislation. The Minister has just come out and wants to get it done before the next federal election. The Act is a major part of this deal and I think this is a fair questions to know. The Act is the whole deal.
- A member asked whether the Act was something that the council had asked for the 23<sup>rd</sup> of July?
  - Another member advised that was not the case. They wanted the package and it was all speculation at this stage.

#### **Action Items:**

- *Clarify the submission process*

#### **Safety and Security**

Hef Griffiths, Chief Nuclear Officer, from ANSTO gave a presentation on the safety and security procedures that would be in place at the NRWMF.

The presentation included:

- Safety Fundamentals
- Safety for employees and the public
- Design of the facility for all scenarios
- Safety of the Environment and Monitoring

#### **Discussion**

- A member asked how the regulator ensures that the operator understands and demonstrates their safety obligations? Is it implemented through spotchecks or is it self governed?
  - Mr Griffiths advised that it is a bit of both. At ANSTO we have a number of formal inspections as we have 18 different licences which are subject to routine inspections. The difference between the UK and Australia is that in the UK they would just have one site licence. There are also quarterly reports on how we performed against the Act. If there is an instance where we are in

potential to breach the Act, we will identify it ourselves and report it to the regulator and they determine whether we are in breach.

- A member asked how does somewhere like Woomera get out of control with such a strict regulator?
  - Mr Griffiths responded that that would be a question for the regulator. The ARPANSA CEO will be coming out to the communities so this might be a question for him.
- A member asked whether external fires would be taken into account?
  - Mr Griffiths replied that it would be one of the key things looked at. At ANSTO it was taken into account given the bushfire threat and that's a key external event that we would need to consider here.
- A member asked why the rainfall causes the radiation monitors to pick up more radon being released?
  - Mr Griffiths said that is due to the rain washing the soil off the radon bound up in the ground and into the air.
- A member asked how the development of the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) is coming along?
  - Mr Griffiths advised that a draft had been released to the department.
  - The department added that we have an early first draft. The WAC is an evolving document over time. It doesn't get finally settled until the licencing. We've had an early draft of what ANSTO can tell us so far.
- A member asked what's happening with the selection of an operator?
  - Mr Griffiths responded that that would be a decisions for the Minister and the department.
  - The department added that ARPANSA and ANSTO are well known operators. When government considers the business case we will need to explore alternatives. There is no doubt that ANSTO has the expertise. What government will need to understand is what the alternatives are.
- A member raised that they thought that ANSTO wouldn't be the operator?
  - Mr Griffiths said that ANSTO have told the department that we would take it on if asked to. The main consideration is that taxpayers are getting the best value.
- A member asked whether the conditioning and sorting process had started at Woomera?
  - Mr Griffiths advised that he doesn't know. That would be a question for CSIRO.
- A member asked why is there a need for the amount of security?
  - Mr Griffiths said that the estimates were made within the organisational structure were based on a range that comes from looking at facilities overseas and looking at the experience we have at ANSTO. The requirement for security will be determined by outside agencies like ARPANSA and ASIO. The number of 10 was based on South Africa and the 26 is a reflection of what we have at ANSTO. We have a requirement to have AFP there and they set the minimum number they will operate with. It will be determined in the threat assessment. The main role of security is to prevent access so people can't just wander in. There is also a requirement to monitor internal threats such as someone who wants to take material outside.

- The department added that sometimes a workforce for monitoring a secure facility on a 24 hour basis required multiple shifts. For example if you had 5 people on shift you would have 20 people employed to run 3 shifts and have a back up. The numbers look large but there would only be once shift worth of staff there at any one time outside of an incident.
- A member asked whether it is likely that the security would be armed?
  - The department advised that this would depend on the risk assessment. Security agencies will determine what size workforce and it's capability would be needed. AFP are typically armed but we don't know whether they will be providing security or not.
  - A member asked whether there will be CCTV?
    - The department said that this would also be determined by risk assessment.
- A member raised that there is hunting that gets done in the area at night. It will need to be taken into account that there will likely be shots heard at night.

#### **Action Items:**

- *Confirm the security arrangements*

#### **Concept Design**

Hef Griffiths from ANSTO gave a presentation on the preliminary concept design of the facility which is being developed in partnership with ANSTO.

This included:

- Purpose of design
- Site plan
- ILW storage facility concept design
- LLW storage facility concept design
- Visitor centre concept design

#### **Discussion**

- A member asked how the vaults would be before they get covered?
  - Mr Griffiths said that we will need to confirm the exact height. They will probably be around 4 to 6 metres high but it will depend on the inventory at the time.
- A member asked if the site would be self sufficient? With things like solar?
  - Mr Griffiths responded that this will come through the enabling work that AECOM will do and they will determine what is needed to run the site in terms of power and infrastructure.
- A member asked Mr Griffiths when he was talking about the ILW cells he mentioned disuse in source, can you please explain what they are?
  - Mr Griffiths advised that he meant sealed radioactive material that is encapsulated within an appropriate source so that you can utilise the gamma

radiation that comes from that for a variety of things. At the end of the life of that source when it has decayed and you can't get sufficient radiation to provide the use that you want there needs to be a safe way to dispose of it. They are stored separately because they don't need the same amount of shielding as say as Synroc canister. They would be stored to contain similar isotopes with similar isotopes. So they tend to be treated slightly differently because they are non-dispersible by their nature.

- A member asked about the differences between treating general ILW as opposed to Synroc?
  - Mr Griffiths advised that would be other ILW that we generate through the waste management process. So because we are producing a nuclear medicine we need to comply with the Therapeutic Goods Administration. So we have some sacrificial items that are part of the process so that might be tubing that is used as part of the dissolution process. We place those into stainless steel retrieveable boxes and then we condition them into an appropriate form. It might be that that ILW is a lot closer to LLW than say Synroc and it may not need the same amount of shielding.
- A member asked whether the ILW will come to the facility in a form ready to be disposed and what shape will it take?
  - Mr Griffiths advised that it will come in a number of different forms such as Synroc or spent uranium filter cups. It will all be conditioned to meet transport and safe storage requirements and be as close to its final disposal form as possible. The final disposal form may require some additional processing at the final facility. For example the engineered solution might need a specific disposal container or cask. That container might be suitable for transport but is designed for disposal. So it might not be in final form as it won't be in its final container. So everything will need to be non-dispersible and as far as possible be ready for final disposal. We are looking to start this conditioning process at ANSTO, subject to funding. What we did for Synroc was to develop a disposability evaluation. In the UK they are looking at a final disposal facility. What they do in the meantime is assess how a packaged waste form is likely to be disposed and will it meet the current expectations. That's what we've done with Synroc, It could be a vault, it could be a borehole and will Synroc be disposable in both of those? That is the way we will manage the conditioning of our waste again to provide confidence to the regulator. For the host community there will be a realistic confidence that the material will have a disposal route within an appropriate timeframe for the regulator and the community.
- A member asked whether the TN-81 canisters were made here?
  - Mr Griffiths said that they are not made here it's just how the waste comes. They are made by a company that uses other facilities to put them together. When we produce on we have another quality assurance company that is used to check them.
- A member asked if there would be a minimum requirement of access to the facility? If there is a 30km road to the site would it need to be bitumenised?
  - The department advised that this is something that AECOM will look at.

- The member said it should be considered that if it is a requirement the council shouldn't have to pay for the upkeep of the road.
- The department said that this would be taken into account.

## Radioactive Waste Technician

Mitchell Timpano, a Radioactive Waste Technican, from ANSTO gave a presentation on his role at and the qualifications and skills he has earned in his time at ANSTO.

The licences and qualifications that Mitchell has earnt in his role include:

- Truck licence
- Forklift licence
- Working in confined spaces
- Working at heights
- Construction card
- Certificate 4 in waste management
- First Aid Officer

## Discussion

- A member asked whether Mr Timpano had any safety concerns in his day to day role?
  - Mr Timpano responded that he has no safety concerns due to the strict procedures and policies that they must follow. He has been there for 12 years and the worst thing that has happened is that I have cut my finger. If you are ever unsure of anything that is always somewhere to get the right information to make sure you are following policy.
- A member asked when Mr Timpano mentioned driving around and picking up waste, was he referring to just within ANSTO or from other places.
  - Mr Timpano clarified that he was referring to waste just inside ANSTO. ANSTO are not allowed to take other waste. Clients and areas within ANSTO call the waste management area when they have waste that needs to be picked up.
- A member said that in his current role there is a lot of characterisation which is something that would not happen at the facility. What would your role be if the waste is already confined?
  - Mr Timpano advised that his role would likely be to train and support the staff for the operating of the facility and the database system. In my opinion the facility would likely have the same technology as ANSTO.
  - Mr Griffiths added that there will be limited waste characterisation at the facility. The facility will look at the radioactive content of the material. We are currently having discussions with the department on whether there would be testing so that we could take a number of packages and break them down to make sure the contents match the certification. But this needs to be done with the limited capacity of conditioning that would be at the facility. Most facilities do in the quality assurance process is to go back down the line.

They will do spot checks and make sure that the facility is following the agreement in place and the WAC will be a key part of that. That will be part of the operating model of the facility. As for the title for the waste will transfer on the consigner end, the advice we are basing everything on is that that is when the government will take ownership of the waste is essentially before it leaves the first site. There will be opportunity for people from the facility to actually go out and do inspections at that site to ensure that the waste is compliant at the time that they are loading it onto the transport rather than waiting for it to come down here.

- Mr Timpano added that the drums are also inspected every 2 years to look for damage to the drums and then we scan them to measure how much the radioactivity has decreased.
- A member asked whether we had the remuneration for the positions listed at the facility?
  - The department advised that we don't have the information at this stage but we will take that on notice.
- A member raised that we had previously spoke about the projection of the waste stream and how frequently it will come to the facility, do we have an update on that?
  - Mr Griffiths said that we don't have that at the moment, it will come with the operational costings. We will also need to factor in what will come from Woomera which we won't know until CSIRO tell us. They hold about 55-60% of Australia's LLW. We anticipate a majority of their waste will be conditioned and characterised at Woomera before it comes to the facility.
- A member raised that they have asked for CSIRO to present to the KCC.
  - The department responded that they will look at adding them to the next agenda.

#### **Action Items:**

- *Confirm the remuneration for the positions at the facility*
- *Confirm what waste will come from Woomera*
- *Provide Mr Timpano's presentation to the committee*

#### **ANDRE Facility in Champagne, France**

Maree Barford from the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science spoke about her recent trip to the ANDRE facility in Champagne, France.

She spoke about how the facility is similar to what is proposed in Australia. It receives 5000 visitors a year from schools, universities and other people who are interested.

## Discussion

- A member asked whether they house HLW?
  - Mrs Barford said that they just house LLW and short lived ILW under French classification.
- A member asked whether they needed to get special permission to visit the facility and whether it was secure?
  - Mrs Barford advised that it was secure, across a bridge and into a fenced off area. We couldn't access all areas of it because I would need international clearance for some areas.
- A member asked whether the visitor centre was not in the secure zone?
  - Mrs Barford advised that that is correct, it is in a separate area.
- A member asked whether the facility was underground?
  - Mr Griffiths responded that there are two facilities in the area. One has above ground cells and the other one is for very LLW. French regulations are different to Australia. Mr Timpano mentioned that some of what we receive as potentially radioactive waste at ANSTO we can actually clear as non-radioactive waste. In France that is not allowed even if you can monitor that material is no longer radioactive it is still radioactive waste under French law and has be buried in low level pits.

## Other Items

### Discussion

- A member raised that in the first meeting it was asked whether all members had been to visit ANSTO.
  - The department responded that not all members have been but it's not a requirement.
- The department noted that it will be holding an information session for the community with a number of experts to present on the day. There will also be opportunity for the community to ask questions. The date is still being finalised but it will likely be in August.
- A member raised that at the last meeting it was discussed to have presenters from both sides of the argument and that they had compiled a list of possible presenters. The idea would be that they would have a short time to present and the community would have a chance to ask them questions. Would the department consider asking some of these people?
  - The department said they were comfortable considering some of these people. It noted it needed to review the list and the credentials of those being put forward, but also noted there was nothing to stop the community organising an information session outside those hosted by the department.
  - A member raised that it was discussed that we weren't going to have a debate but it was discussed to have a forum with experts from both sides. The government has always put their experts out there but never had them and people from opposing views in the same room. So what are people afraid of? Having them talk for 5 minutes.

- The department added that it wasn't out of concern of having them present to the community, but that it did need to consider whether it was something that the department should fund. The department noted it was interested in progressing another a webinar with a whole range of people from different views. That it was happy to facilitate that, but would will consider the names and go from there.
- The member added that as the KCC we would need to decide what to do if the department won't host the information session.
- Another member said that we are running out of time to organise something.
- The department said that they will follow up out of session and confirm as soon as possible.
- A member asked whether the committee would have funding available for such an event if the department didn't host it?
- The Deputy Convener advised the committee does not have funding.
- A member raised that there had been a letter from the Country Fire Service (CFS) around their concerns on firefighting near the facility and the lack of training their staff and volunteers would have around radioactive waste.
  - The department advised that they will respond to the letter once they get more information on the process.
  - The committee said they want to know the department's response.
  - Mr Griffiths added that he doesn't want to speak on behalf of the operator as we don't know who that will be. However based on his experience in the UK as an emergency planning manager for a couple of sites which is similar to what happens at ANSTO. One standard practice is to provide the training that would be required and the support to that. At ANSTO we support NSW fire and NSW ambulances and undertake a lot of training with those groups but we also have a guarantee that when they respond to the site we have a radiation safety specialist that would be there with them. When an emergency plan is developed it will have to take into account what the level of support would be from first responders. If that's not available then that training would have to be provided to people in house to allow them to carry out a response. In previous discussions with the department that was viewed as a potential additional support to the community along with things like making the first aid centre larger. If someone was to have an accident near the facility they could come there. The same applies to fire fighting capability within the facility could be used to support areas outside the facility. These concerns are not unusual for communities that haven't had to operate along side nuclear facilities and certainly the expectation of training with first responders before they could make that decision.
  - A member said that if there is a fire near the mine in Kimba then CFS won't respond. It has been documented that some people won't come close to the park fires. If CFS have said they won't attend fires near the facility then people need to know.
  - Mr Griffiths said that the development of the design and process would be to clarify what commitments are made. At ANSTO have a written commitment with NSW and we also provide them with support where they need.

- A member added that the CFS is registered as a hazmat brigade but that doesn't mean they could respond to a radioactive issue without a radiation safety specialist.
- A member said that this is more about a fire outside the facility that is close by.
- Mr Griffiths said this is correct. We need to make sure we don't have an impact offsite and that we won't drag the resources of CFS to come and handle something we could have dealt with.
- A member raised that the use of the buffer zone for Research and Development (R&D) would have some issues.
  - A member raised that it would need to be in the operational procedures.
  - Mr Griffiths added that the security services have issues with things like that but from a concept point of view we would be happy to look at it within the design.
  - Another member said that the department has previously advised that there would be a 200m bufferzone around the security fence before other uses.
  - A member asked for some explanation on the buffer zone?
  - Mr Griffiths said that he wasn't 100% sure at this stage. The department will buy the 100 hectares and 60 hectares will be for the buffer zone.
  - The department added that the security risk facilities might want some fire breaks.
  - A member said that using the bufferzone as R&D maybe a safer option because that is taken care of and not left bare for erosion. It will actually be managed.
  - The department said that they will come back and clarify what the bufferzone might be used for.
  - A member raised that they assumed the talk about the R&D will come down to funding so that's what it might come to.
  - Another member raised that we have been trying to organise that funding for R&D in the buffer zone. We will need monitoring there anyway.
  - A member added that there are other avenues for funding that can be explored.
- A member raised where is the department at with Agriculture. I heard about a roundtable in the Kimba newsletter but I want to know where we are on knowing the impacts on the whole. Will there be an independent study done on the risk? I think it would be good to know where those bodies stand. I would also like to know who has authored or contributed to the Agriculture factsheet? I spoke to the Minster about meeting with Big Fig, I have not received any information on that. I think the Agriculture issue is sitting out there and nobody has addressed it. I want to see that as more transparent and it's my right to see that those things are assessed.
  - The department advised that we will discuss with the Minster putting something out that describes what was discussed at the roundtable. We are also happy to take agriculture related questions if you weren't at the roundtable. I'll try and come back to the committee on who was consulted and advised on those factsheets. We are not intending to start an agriculture study but the economic studies will cover some of that information.
  - A member asked who will they consult?

- The department advised that the Cadence study would not survey people – that it will be a desktop report. The University of Queensland study will engage with people in the community but the university works along a different timeframe for their report, due their university processes, and it won't be available until September. the department undertook to talk to them about a potential to release a draft report to get something out earlier, and seek clarification on what organisations they want to speak to and I would imagine there will be some agricultural corporations in there. The department requested that if members wanted to identify anyone in particular that was important to be surveyed, they could email us.
- The Deputy Convener added that if there are questions going back and forth then everyone should be included in it.
- A member said that they have a list of questions for everybody on the agricultural issues.
- The department added that the process will need to be managed. We will do what we can and come back to it in meetings but we won't be able to handle everybody sending in questions separately.
- A member agreed that was a good point because it could reduce doubling up on the same questions.
- A member raised that they read in the council newsletter that the Agricultural breakfast was held when ANSTO was here. Is there more information on that?
  - The department advised that there are some light notes on that which will be circulated.
  - The Deputy Convener said that it was the morning after the KCC meeting and it was mainly a repeat of that with agriculture members. The department spoke to some of the techniques they could offer to rural Australia.
  - A member said that they understood that there were industry representatives there.
  - The department advised that we didn't keep a list of names for that meeting as it was a general invite.
  - The member said from their point of view there hasn't been information come back on these meetings, so what is the point.
  - The department said that the information was to the people in the room.
  - The member asked who they were representing?
  - The department advised that that is up to them.
  - The member asked whether they were invited?
  - The department said that it was hosted through ANSTO to give information.
  - The member raised that they are looking for information out of those meetings.
  - Another member added that it's similar to the committee being informed about the response to the CFS letter. We hear about lots of things that we don't know about. As members of groups, you want to know how they are representing you.
  - The department said they understood their point. We will try and increase transparency around those meetings.

- A member asked when the Minister talks about stakeholders and the fact they will be considered in the decision on broad community support, is the KCC one of those stakeholders? Will our discussions and opinions be weighted?
  - The department advised that it will provide information to the Minister to support his decisions, including a broad understanding of views from the committee meetings, but are not applying specific weighting to any particular submission or stakeholder group.

**Action Items:**

- *Review the list of names to present to the KCC*
- *The department to respond to the CFS letter*
- *Clarification on what the buffer zone might be used for*
- *Circulate the light notes from the Agriculture breakfast*

*Meeting Closed at 3pm*