

**Economics Legislation Committee**  
**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**  
Industry, Innovation and Science Portfolio  
2017 - 2018 Budget Estimates  
31 May – 1 June 2017

---

**AGENCY/DEPARTMENT:** DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, INNOVATION AND SCIENCE

**TOPIC:** Correspondence or Communication on the Proposed Facility

**REFERENCE:** Questions on Notice (Hansard, 1 June 2017, page 105)

**QUESTION No.:** BI-57

Senator LUDLAM: I understand that representatives from your department and maybe you yourself presented on the facility to the board of ATLA at a meeting in the Flinders Ranges in early May. Can you tell us firstly if that is an accurate characterisation and what the response of the board was and what kind of communications you have had with them since.

Mr B Wilson: I did not do the presentation to ATLA—I think Mr Sheldrick did so I might let him answer that.

Mr Sheldrick: The meeting did happen, and we were not taking something to the board for a response. It was an information exchange—it was an opportunity to provide more information about the project to the board. We were not asking for a decision or anything like that at that time.

Senator LUDLAM: Are you able to characterise whether a response was positive or negative, or was it just a dialogue at that stage?

Mr Sheldrick: It was a good meeting. That is a difficult adjective, I suppose, but it was very receptive. We got a good hearing. The board had organised for different people to present to them on that day about the project, and we got a good hearing. There were some questions asked of us about the project, so I would characterise it as being quite a positive meeting, although not positive in the sense that we were looking for an outcome—I would keep stressing that.

Mr B Wilson: We should also point out that, after the presentation, we left the meeting and the board had their discussions.

Senator LUDLAM: They had their own deliberations after you were out of there. Thank you. Has the department received any other correspondence or communication on the proposed facility, I guess, from any other stakeholders?

Mr B Wilson: The answer to that is yes. We get a lot of correspondence from various stakeholders. We can take that on notice if you would like.

Senator LUDLAM: Yes, if you like. Privacy concerns notwithstanding, if you are able to provide us with any info about who you have heard from, that would be appreciated.

Mr B Wilson: We will look into it to see what we can provide.

**ANSWER**

The announcement that the land nomination at Wallerberdina Station was progressed to Phase 2 was made by Minister Frydenberg on 29 April 2016. Since this time the department has registered over 1 250 instances of direct engagements with relevant stakeholders associated with this nomination and the two new nominations at Kimba. The department has also received over 516 formal written submissions and correspondence from various stakeholders.

Prior to the commencement of Phase 2 at Wallerderbina Station, *The National Radioactive Waste Management Facility (NRWMF) Phase 1 Summary Report* was produced. This report outlines all communications and engagement with the community from Phase 1 of the project and is publically available on the projects website.