

**From:**  
**To:** [Legal and Constitutional, Committee \(SEN\);](#)  
**Subject:** senate inquiry on nuclear waste dump  
**Date:** Thursday, 11 March 2010 4:04:55 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

I oppose the proposition that Muckaty become the site for a nuclear waste dump. The Muckaty site is highly contested by the people that live there and the way it has been chosen is like the voices of these people have just been ignored. There was an unanimous decision that Muckaty would not be chosen as the nomination "was not made with the full and informed consent of all Traditional Owners and affected people and as such does not comply with the Aboriginal Land Rights Act". Also the case for a remote dump has never been made. Nuclear waste should be moved as little as possible, and should be stored above ground close to the point of production, close to centres of nuclear expertise and infrastructure. The Lucas Heights nuclear agency ANSTO is by far the biggest single source of the waste, and all the relevant organisations have acknowledged that ongoing waste storage at Lucas Heights is a viable option — the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency, the Australian Nuclear Association and even Mr Ferguson's own department. Additionally, requiring ANSTO to store its own waste is the best — and perhaps the only — way of focussing the Organisation's collective mind on the importance of waste minimisation principles.

Yours,  
Stacey Kendall

---