

Page 1 of 3

I ask That the Senate Standing Committee on Economics consider the following points during the Inquiry into National Radioactive Management Amendments (Site Specification, Community Fund and Other Measures) Bill 2020 [Provisions]

I give permission for this submission to be made public and my name given.

I am the joint owner of an Agricultural Enterprise in the Kimba District where I have lived for most of the last 53 years. In my lifetime I have not seen any community so divided as the Kimba District is on the proposed siting of the NRWMF in our area. The announcement was made by the then Minister Canavan on February 1st, after five years of suspense and great apprehension.

Pease consider the following:

- Two Government Bodies, the National Health and Medical Research Council and ARPANSA have guidelines which state that Radioactive Waste should not be sited on Agricultural Land. Why have these guidelines been ignored in the selection of the Napandee Site?
- The Government has the responsibility to ensure that it complies with International Best Practice. Is this being adhered to?
- Will Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) be sent for “Storage” for 60 to 100 years at the selected site near Kimba under the Amendments to the National Radioactive Waste Management (site Specification, Community Fund and other Measures) Bill 2020? Are there any measures in place to restrict the activity at the Waste Site beyond those already in the 2012 Act?

Initially we were told that the NRWMF was to be a repository for Low Level Waste (LLW) only. As the years passed this changed to the temporary STORAGE of Intermediate Level Waste (ILW), including the TN81 Cannisters which contain the highly Radioactive Waste returning from France. The ILW is, we are now told to be stored above ground at the chosen site for up to 100 years. To obtain a 60% “Yes” vote at a recent Ballot, \$86 million of TAXPAYER money has been promised. The number of voters who did not wish to be “bought” by this bribe, was only slightly reduced from the earlier 2017 voting which asked if eligible voters wanted to progress to stage 2 of the selection process. This was in spite of the money offered being substantially increased and the promised jobs increased from 15 to 45.

- Why is the transport of ILW to the NRWMF being considered when this potentially dangerous material will be double handled when a final site is identified?

ANSTO’S Lucas Heights Facility is where the very necessary expertise and security is already in place to manage the ILW safely. Why not continue to safely store if there, rather than move it to a “**temporary**” site at Kimba, some 1700 kilometres away on major Highways? We are told that the proposed site is not suitable for long term storage. Considerable cost will be incurred when ILW is transported to its final repository, as well as the cost of the clean up of the temporary site!

- Of the 28 originally “volunteered” sites, why was the Napandee site decided on as the “BEST” choice for the NRWMF? Surely it would not be based on a nearby farm owned by the Federal Member for the area being put forward, then withdrawn on Ministerial advice! It was following this action that two other nearby landowners and friends volunteered land. These were subsequently deemed not suitable just prior to the 2016 election when another colleague nominated his Flinders Ranges property as the site. Subsequently two other sites in the Kimba District were volunteered, one by the owner of a property deemed to be not suitable several months before. The Flinders Ranges Wallabadinna site was removed late last year after the then Minister decided that local support was not broad enough.
- In spite of the suggested \$86 million in incentives, just under 40% of electors of the Kimba District Council Area **did not** support the siting of the NRWMF in our area in the ballot of late 2019. Broad community support was one of the factors which was to assist the Minister’s decision. Does 40% against constitute broad community support? Initially the then Minister said a 65% support would be required but this figure was soon dropped! People from outside the area were encouraged to make submissions but these 2789 responses have not been acknowledged publicly in spite of them, or perhaps because of, showing a 94.5% opposition to the proposed NRWMF site. The Kimba area is part of the wider economy of Eyre Peninsular and South Australia and thus consideration of support or otherwise from the broader sector should have been taken into account. Of interest also was a 70% against the Kimba site in state-wide polling after the site announcement.
- What measures, if any, will be offered to our already traumatised Community, if our EXPORT Grain and Livestock enterprises, and Land prices, are negatively impacted by the siting of the NRWMF. Up to \$80 million is produced annually in our district from these commodities. Grain trading, Insurance and Banking arrangements have already been suggested by providers as having the potential to be negatively affected. No guarantees can be given that this WILL NOT occur!
- The Traditional Owners of the area the in which the proposed site is situated, the Barngarla People, are at present appealing their inability to participate in the Ballot at Kimba. Surely any decision on the final site should not be made until they can, or cannot, participate in the decision. When the Barngarla held their own unofficial vote, the result from the 80 people who voted was 100% “NO”. A significant number of the Barngarla People were born in the Kimba District.
- The current South Australian Law does not allow the transport or storage of Radioactive Waste from outside the state of SA. Is this Law to be overruled? Does the state of South Australia have any rights on this matter apart from having to pay to have the SA waste stored there?

Page 3 of 3

- Many project uncertainties remain including; who will manage and operate the Facility, the Transport routes and the acceptance criteria.
- The time for consultation of the changes to the 2012 Act has been reduced by Minister Pitt from 60 days to 30 days. Why? The proposed changes are substantial and need due consideration. Australia has been attempting to solve the problem of the safe storage of Nuclear Waste for over forty years and the final solution should not be compromised at this time.
- Is the word Commonwealth to be removed from the Waste to be stored or permanently sited at the proposed site? If the removal of the word Commonwealth is a part of the proposed amendments, does the use of the proposed site extend the to the storage of International Waste, as sought by many prominent business people?

Thank you for taking the time to read, and perhaps understand, my reasons for requesting you to closely consider the proposed Amendments and their implications.

Yours Sincerely,
Christine M Wakelin