



With low wind, low rainfall and no known geological constraints, the site appears technically sound. If the site is progressed it will be subject to a full technical assessment.

Key attributes - “Lyndhurst”, nominated by BA & MA Rayner

Located approximately 15-20km north-east of Kimba, the site is close to a local township that can support and benefit from the development.

The site offers sufficient land area for placement of a facility and no easements cross the site. The property is described as having subdued topography with vegetated dune crests and land packages lined with remnant Mallee scrub.

There are no identified environmental or heritage constraints on the site.

With low wind, low rainfall and no known geological constraints, the site is technically sound.

If the site is progressed it will be subject to a full technical assessment.

Will nominations still be accepted from other areas across Australia?

Consistent with the National Radioactive Waste Management Act 2012, nominations may be made at any time by landowners in any state or territory up until the final site is selected for the facility.

If a new nomination was brought forward from another community, the Government would consider it in accordance with the objectives and criteria of the MCSA.

How were these two new nominations assessed?

The nominations were assessed using a Multi-Criteria Site Analysis MCSA process.

The department assessed the nominations in line with the objectives and criteria of the MCSA which includes scoring them against weighted criteria such as technical suitability, health, safety and the environment.

The nominees requested that a further desktop analysis of the sites be undertaken prior to Minister Canavan making his decision on whether to formally progress.

Both sites were found to be very suitable, with scores (above or equal) to those in the previous round of nominations.

Does this mean the nomination at Barndioota is no longer viable or no longer being considered?

The new nominations have no impact on the status of the site at Barndioota which will continue to progress through the next stage of detailed technical assessment and community engagement.

Should a nomination from Kimba proceed into a detailed technical assessment phase, the site assessment and detailed project development will progress alongside the Barndioota site.

A final national site will only be selected if there is broad community support and it meets Australia's strict environmental and radiation protection regulatory requirements.



Thanks for tuning in

Thanks to all those who tuned into our webinar on nuclear medicine production and use in Australia.

Viewers watched the webinar live from South Australia, NSW, Victoria, Queensland and the ACT.

Transcripts and videos of the discussion are available on our website www.radioactivewaste.gov.au.

The webinar provided an opportunity to rebut recent claims made by the Medical Association for Prevention of War.

None of what MAPW argue for would deliver a positive outcome for Australians or support our world-class health system, nor would it be consistent with our responsibilities as a critical part of the global health network.

The fact is reactor-based medicines are important and will not be replaced in the foreseeable future.

Leading medical and scientific experts on the panel agreed technologies such as cyclotrons will play a growing role, but will only complement and not replace the range of services and research provided by our world-class reactor.

One of the lines of argument made by MAPW president Margaret Beavis was that Lucas Heights receives massive government subsidies – presumably to suggest this is bad – and implying therefore that production of medicines should cease and be

replaced by imports. It is irrational to suggest we should cease or scale back public health activities that are government subsidised.

Like the CSIRO and other research bodies, the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) receives funding from the government to undertake and facilitate research into major health, environment and industrial challenges Australia faces. As well as its research function, ANSTO also produces nuclear medicine – at no net cost to the taxpayer. The government does not subsidise the production of nuclear medicine at ANSTO.

The call for Australia to import rather than produce nuclear medicines ignores the fact that Australia's state-of-the-art reactor is more efficient and cost effective than other similar reactors and it would simply shift our waste onto someone else. An imported supply would be less reliable and more expensive than medicine produced here.

ANSTO's Low Enriched Uranium OPAL reactor is the envy of the world. The suggestion from MAPW that we swap our advanced production for nuclear medicines produced in older, less reliable reactors that likely use High Enriched Uranium, whose fuel could potentially be diverted for use in weaponry, and which produces higher level waste is not a good option.



Dr Beavis also remains opposed to Australia using its world class and highly efficient reactor to expand production of nuclear medicine production to supply other countries.

Because of newer and more efficient waste packaging processes ANSTO has developed, expansion will not lead to an exponential increase to our waste production, it will save lives and represents Australia giving back to the global community with a higher quality, less waste producing and proliferation-proof product.

MAPW says there is a global oversupply in nuclear medicines, ignoring that by 2030 a majority of international medical reactors will be closed.

Dr Beavis also says the department is “guilting” communities by linking access to nuclear medicines to the construction of a waste facility. We never said this.

But it is a fact that we cannot leave the waste at ANSTO there forever, nor can we operate the reactor without a waste solution. Even if we stopped nuclear medicine production, the 60 years’ worth of radioactive waste Australia already has would need to be sent to a better location.

We need to deal with our legacy waste and the waste from the future production of medicine, and its management needs to be done safely and securely, and to international best practice standards.

Assertions such as “the waste should stay at Lucas Heights”, “nuclear waste does not come from the nuclear medicine”, “the waste facility will damage communities” fly in the face of all available evidence and do not help communities, they scare and confuse them.

Australia’s radioactive waste will be managed safely and securely, and in a way that creates good jobs and a local industry in wherever the facility is eventually located.

Whether or not Kimba or Barndioota are the right places for that industry is a matter for those communities. We will keep providing those communities, and any others where a site is volunteered, with the facts they need to make a decision, and we encourage other groups to do the same.

Consultation begins on two new Kimba nominations for National Radioactive Waste Facility

A public consultation process will be held in Kimba, South Australia, after two landowners volunteered sites for Australia’s National Radioactive Waste Management Facility.

Over the course of 90 days, communities near the properties ‘Napandee’ and ‘Lyndhurst’ will discuss these proposals.

This is an early step in a process to determine if either of the newly-volunteered sites should be considered.

“A majority of neighbours, the council and others, have already told us they support these nominations being taken forward for consultation, which is why they have progressed to this early stage,” said Minister for Resources and Northern Australia Matthew Canavan.

“There is sufficient community support to begin this consultation. The next step is to assess if that support is broad enough to move to a site-specific assessment.”

The two new nominations relate to different parcels of land than those that were previously assessed, but not progressed, in the Kimba region last year.

The new nominations were made under new guidelines, which ask for an indication of support levels from neighbours and council, alongside any application.

“If broad community support is demonstrated for either or both sites, the Australian Government may move to a second detailed technical and community assessment.”

Department representatives have established an office in Kimba and will be available two days a week to meet with the community and help answer questions.

Experts from Geoscience Australia and the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) will also be available to discuss the proposal during the consultation period.

Meanwhile, the second-phase assessment of a site at Barndioota, which includes site-specific technical studies and detailed consultation, is ongoing.

Key questions about the Kimba process

The project team has returned to Kimba because the department has received two new site nominations from landowners in the area for a National Radioactive Waste Management Facility.

These nominations were received after a period of preliminary community consultation conducted by the department during November and December 2016 at the invitation of the Working for Kimba’s Future group.

The project team is returning to Kimba to understand community sentiment regarding the recent nominations and to inform people of the project.

The team will be based at 47 High Street, Kimba, on Tuesdays and Wednesdays during the 90-day consultation period. Please email radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au to book a meeting.

What is the expected process for assessment?

The Working for Kimba’s Future group announced its interest in supporting landholders considering new nominations of land in November 2016.

The department visited the Kimba community in late 2016 at the request of the Working for Kimba’s Future group to discuss the community’s views on re-entering the nomination process.

The department provided a summary report, Summary of Engagement in the Kimba Community, to all interested parties based on their visits

The report provided the views of neighbouring landowners, initial technical assessments and key points from the general community’s views.

In January 2017, the Minister received two new land nominations from landholders near Kimba, South Australia. These nominations were for the land areas Napandee, to the west of Kimba, and Lyndhurst, to the north east of Kimba.

The decision to submit nominations was that of the landholders involved and supported by the Working for Kimba’s Future group.

The department has undertaken a desktop assessment on the new nominations consistent with the objectives and the criteria of the Multi-Criteria Site Analysis (MCSA) undertaken during the assessment of first round nominations in 2015.

As the Minister has decided to formally progress a formal nomination, a minimum 60-day consultation period is required under the National Radioactive Waste Management Act 2012.

A nomination will only be accepted by the Minister after the 90-day consultation process (30 days more than is statutorily required) and progressed to the detailed technical assessment phase if he considers that there is sufficient broad community support.

Why aren’t the previous sites nominated at Kimba being considered?

In 2015 the Government spoke to the community about two nominations at Kimba. The community participated in a 120-day consultation period from November 2015 to March 2016.

The Government respects the outcome of the previous consultation process not to proceed with these sites.

Nominations for new sites may be made at any time by landowners in any state or territory.

If a new nomination was brought forward from another community, the Government would consider it in accordance with the objectives and criteria of the MCSA.

The Working for Kimba’s Future group believes that there has been an increase in community support for a nomination since the previous process and that the site identified has largely supportive neighbours.

Key attributes - “Napandee” nominated by JF & JA Baldock

Located approximately 25km west of Kimba, the site is close to a local township that can support and benefit from the development.

The site offers sufficient land area for placement of a facility, and no easements or paths of access cross the site.

The property is described as having subdued topography with vegetated dune crests and land packages lined with remnant Mallee scrub.

The land has mains water at the property entrance and mains power on the adjacent block.

There are no identified environmental or heritage constraints on the site.