

From: Barry Wakelin [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 22 July 2021 9:18 PM
To: Committee, Public Works (REPS) <pwc@aph.gov.au>
Subject: Public Works Submission - Barry Wakelin OAM - ANSTO ILW New Facility Enquiry.

Public Works Submission - Barry Wakelin OAM

For the perusal of PWC Members.

Chairman,

Public Works Committee,

Sir/Madam,

I present this submission as someone with 15 years of Federal Parliamentary Service: and as a former Public Works Committee member and citizen of Kimba observing the machinations of a proposed "temporary" site for ILW (Intermediate Level Waste at Kimba.) Mainly, promoted as a Low Level Waste site by government representatives . I was closely involved with the Woomera attempt at a nuclear waste site.

The great thing about being free of party politics is the time to become better informed and to develop my own clearer, fairer and individual opinions.

Despite assurances from responsible Ministers, that a permanent ILW site selection process decision is in train, there is no evidence that the Parliament is making any endeavour to fulfil that promise, particularly when it is recalled that the construction (in 2007)of the OPAL nuclear reactor was conditional upon that promise being kept ,which it is too apparent never happened.

Small communities like Kimba and its 95% agricultural dependence, have no government guarantee against health and economic damage from **a ILW** nuclear waste facility.

The defacto international nuclear waste via the suggested sixfold increase in the ANSTO export of nuclear medicine is in conflict with South Australian government policy and should not be inflicted upon a small rural community which is ignored by policy enforcers. The question must be asked: why should a community of 0.00004% of Australians be bribed or emotionally blackmailed by the government using taxpayers' funds to bludgeon 400 people at \$200,000each, in to accepting a nuclear Dump on behalf of 25million Australians who predominantly say NO . Not least of all are government organisations like the Department of Defence who say the nuclear waste is too dangerous to be placed on their land ,the size of Tasmania.

If it takes this much money from government to convince a small community to accept the government's argument which only gives the country a "temporary" nuclear waste facility of very limited value and a sad waste of taxpayer's funds.

A commitment to the search for a **permanent disposal site** for **ILW has not occurred** and considering 2037 is the timeline; it is reasonable to accept that a **“temporary”** storage will not be required due to the new facilities at Lucas Heights The nuclear reactor will always have some temporary ILW storage.

It is clear to me that there is a reasonable prospect over the next fifteen years to find a suitable site for permanent disposal of ILW with suitable geological and seismological

It is a privilege to be able to offer from my long term involvement in this difficult issue a view on the justice or otherwise, which has been inflicted upon my magnificent community for the past six years.

I offer my best wishes to the Committee for your considerations.

Barry Wakelin, Kimba, S A.

████████████████████