

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS



Phone: 1300 502 819
Email: clientservices@sparkandcannon.com.au
Web: www.sparkandcannon.com.au

Adelaide | Brisbane | Canberra | Darwin | Hobart | Melbourne | Perth | Sydney

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE ROYAL COMMISSION CONSULTATION and RESPONSE AGENCY – CITIZENS' JURY

SPEAKERS:

MS MEL LAMBERT
DR LISSA VAN CAMP
DR STEVE HILL
DR JIM GREEN
MR QUINTIN FLOWERS
MS ILKA WALKLEY
MS GILL MCFADYEN
MS ANNE BAINBRIDGE
MS CECILIA WOOLFORD
MR MARK SUTTON
MS ENICE MARSH
MR PARRY AGIUS
MS EMILY JENKE
MR GEORDAN GRACIS
MR IAIN WALKER

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

ADELAIDE

10.27 AM, SATURDAY, 9 JULY 2016

DAY THREE

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY SPARK AND CANNON

MS LAMBERT: Welcome back to day three of the Citizens' Jury. We've all got warmed up, done our mid-ducks and had just, I guess, got back into your role as citizen jurors in this process. We'll do some introductions. We've got some witnesses who can join us in the room today, but we also have two
5 witnesses who will join us by telephone link-up. So please bear with us; there may be a few clunky pieces that we have to work through to get their voices heard in the room as well. One we'll phone at 10.40, the next person at 11. So we just might need to disrupt the flow at some points. One is in an airport lounge and the other one is only free for half an hour, so we just need to roll
10 with that a little bit. So if we can accommodate that, that would be fantastic.

I just want to remind people of the various roles around the table before we kick off as well. My name is Mel. I'm your facilitator. You will hopefully hear my voice as little as possible because this is your process. We do have
15 two lead jurors who will hold this topic through the day and will be the citizen holders of it and will share what you discuss in a balanced way, the different voices, but also share what the second group say into the third group where we'll be writing up the jury's report. So our two lead jurors are Juror here and Juror who is off camera. So they will summarise this morning's discussion.

20 You are obviously jury members. Your role is to deliberate over the content, to ask whatever questions you need answered of the witnesses who we have with us today. So really take advantage of the time that we have them to quiz them, to challenge them, to ask them, to confirm things, whatever it is you need from
25 them for the next 75 minutes. We have an advisory board member in Deb who is here to really observe the process, listen in on your deliberations, to really give the advisory board an understanding and a sense of how you come to the recommendations that you come to.

30 MS: So you won't hear my voice a lot (indistinct)

MS LAMBERT: Well, thank you for joining us. And also we have some Agency and ex-Royal Commission staff. Who do we have in - we have just David. So if you have particular questions about the content of the Royal
35 Commission report, if you're wondering, "Where does it reference that? Does it say anything about this?" David is our go-to person. So he'll be able to answer any questions we have specifically about the Royal Commission report. Does that all sound okay? Great.

40 Well, let's kick off with the three witnesses who we have in the room. I'll just ask the three witnesses to introduce themselves and say a little bit about what it is they can share with you. We'll not question them at the moment. It's really just an introduction for you to know who's in the room, what sort of questions you might want to pose to them, then we'll refresh our memories as to what this
45 issue is and what some of the questions from the last week were and if there are

fresh questions. Okay. So, Lissa, I might hand over to you to kick off.

5 DR VAN CAMP: Yes, thank you. My name is Lissa van Camp. I work for a company called Golder Associates. It's an engineering and environmental company, so by that, I mean we do a lot of impact assessment-type work, and I looked at some of the questions that you developed in your last session and it's really well aligned with the type of work we routinely do.

10 I was also really lucky enough to get along to one of the tours that has been organised. So I just came back from Helsinki where I looked at the Finnish waste repository that they're developing. I got to go underground in France, 500 metres, to the geological testing laboratory that they've been doing, and I also visited a range of the regulators, the agencies that have helped to frame the nuclear industry overseas. So I'll just keep it really brief and look forward to
15 the questions that you ask.

MS LAMBERT: Thank you, Lissa. Okay.

20 DR HILL: Hi, my name is Steve Hill. I'm the South Australian chief government geologist, but I'm also the director of the South Australian Geological Survey. The South Australian Geological Survey has been with us for over 130 years and our role is really to be the custodian and also the provider and also promoter of what we sometimes more broadly call geoscience, information about the state. That's really important, because I
25 believe that everything starts with geology and this is a great example.

The uranium resources actually start with the geology of South Australia, and now we're starting to talk about waste repositories and geology is a big factor there as well. So I hope that I can help you with areas of understanding around
30 particularly South Australia's geology, or geology in general, if those matters come up, and I look forward to today. Thanks for having me along.

MS LAMBERT: Thank you, Steve. Jim.

35 DR GREEN: Hi, everyone. My name is Jim Green and I'm with Friends of the Earth, and I've prepared a briefing paper today which I've handed out. If you missed out, then just let me know, and I guess there's a couple of sets of issues that I would hope to field questions on: one is the mismanagement of waste around the world, in particular at the world's one and only underground
40 nuclear waste repository, which is the waste isolation pilot plant, or WIPP, in the United States, which gets one token paragraph in the Royal Commission's report.

45 And the second set of issues that I would be glad to field questions on would be the mismanagement of radioactive waste right here in South Australia, whether

it's the clean-up of Maralinga under the Howard government 15 years ago, Radium Hill where there's a substandard nuclear waste dump (indistinct) where there was illegal low-level waste dumping which was not detected by the South Australian regulator; and failed attempts to impose nuclear waste dumps on
5 Aboriginal communities. So those would be the two sets of questions that I could most usefully offer something on.

MS LAMBERT: Great. Thank you, Jim. Also, just to draw your attention to the written responses that we have on the table and in your hands, so we have a
10 number of witnesses who couldn't join us but submitted their thoughts and reflections in response to the questions you were asking. So we have a written response from Alistair Brown, technical director with INS and director of the World Nuclear Transport Institute; we have a written response from Dr Sami Hautakangas, product manager with the nuclear expert services, Fortum Power
15 and Heat; and a written response from Timo Äikäs who's a former executive vice president of Posiva which is a nuclear power company, and I think that's the three written responses.

20 Can I just suggest as a point of clarity, I'm deaf in my left ear. So if I ignore anyone along this side, I apologise. I just haven't heard you. It means you've got permission to throw stuff at me.

25 So let's refresh our memories as to what this topic is. The notes I have from the last session, the questions that seemed to be being raised around safety and disaster management were about an overarching question: how do we manage risk throughout this entire process? How do we choose the right site, seismic, water, geological factors that help us know what is the right site for something like this? Are there terrorism risks? Are there health risks? The question of transport and transportation came up, really just a question about how
30 dangerous is this. How do we know how dangerous it is or not? What could go wrong and what are the consequences if something does go wrong?

35 Does that sound like a fair reflection of what you came up with in the last session? I've got some Post-It notes and we can write up any additional questions or lines of inquiry that we want to explore today so we don't forget them. Is there anything else people want to add in? Jim, do you want - - -

40 DR GREEN: I would just add social dimensions of risk assessment, because it tends to be framed as a technical issue but there are also social dimensions to these problems.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Is that something that the jury feels is an important question? Yes. I'm getting some - - -

45 JUROR: Is that covered by the consent question we've got in the other group?

MS LAMBERT: I'm not sure, but if we feel that it's an important issue - - -

JUROR: Do you feel that that's - - -

5

DR GREEN: No. I would say they're quite separate.

JUROR: And why is that?

10 DR GREEN: Because the social dimensions of risk assessment include such things as having scientific and nuclear illiterates managing a nuclear waste project, which is exactly what we had here in Australia from 98 to 2004, to give one example. So there are direct risk dimensions involved to rising deficient consideration of the social dimensions to these problems. So it's not
15 just a question of consent. It's a question of increased (indistinct)

JUROR: Is that social questions or regulatory questions?

20 DR GREEN: Social and regulatory. So regulatory and operational you could divide them into, I would say.

JUROR: Okay.

25 DR GREEN: And those are quite separate from the issue of consent.

JUROR: Okay, sure.

30 MS LAMBERT: Okay. So let's put it there and if the citizen jury feel that that's something they want to dig into, then we know that Jim and others will talk to that. Does that sound okay, Juror?

JUROR: Yes.

35 MS LAMBERT: Yes. So I'll pop it there so you can see it. Anything else that the jury feel has maybe come up through your reflections and reading through the two weeks in between?

JUROR: Do we have that list on our handouts somewhere?

40 JUROR: So which - - -

JUROR: Of this list.

45 MS LAMBERT: Would you like to write them up?

JUROR: Sure.

OFF THE RECORD

[10.39 AM]

5 **ON THE RECORD**

[10.46 AM]

MR.....: - - - unlikely scenario but I guess you'd draw – you'd draw from
comfort from the fact that you have a stable political environment at the
moment and hopefully these situations don't eventuate but – yes, to my
10 knowledge it wasn't considered in the report.

JUROR: It's comforting at the moment but I mean this thing goes for a 100
years.

15 MS LAMBERT: I think Jim; you wanted to speak to that.

DR GREEN: Yes, well I think it embraces the issue of the fundamental,
arguably the greatest contradiction in the Royal Commission's report which is
that the plan is to import the waste first and then to establish a repository for
20 final disposal of that waste, so you would have literally tens of thousands of
tonnes of high level nuclear waste sitting above ground on the assumption that
they can build one of these deep underground repositories but many countries
have failed to build deep underground repositories. They've tried but they've
fallen at one or another hurdle and that's a huge risk for South Australia and if
25 that does eventuate, we're stuck with tens of thousands of tonnes of high level
nuclear waste at an above ground store with no repository for final disposal and
no return to sender clause and almost certainly no option to off send it to a third
country. So I mean it's a huge contradiction in the Royal Commission's report.

30 JUROR: I agree with that.

JUROR: The last meetings we had here it was quoted they actually had a fire
(indistinct) and that (indistinct) hundreds of people and one of (indistinct)

35 DR GREEN: No, that's not correct.

JUROR: Well, that's what somebody said; there was a fire in Mexico, at New
Mexico at – New Mexico, at a waste (indistinct) depot.

40 DR GREEN: Yes, what – that was - - -

JUROR: And (indistinct) fortnight ago, said they've actually been over five
(indistinct) but I'm in the same opinion as this gentleman. It's metal, metal
rusts, concrete does not even like radiation. And I think we've got a plant
45 somewhere where they pour in the concrete here, pour in the concrete in to kill

the radiation and it just - - -

MR FLOWERS: Maybe we can ask one of the – just to speak to that.

5 DR VAN CAMP: First of all, the canisters themselves are some stainless steel with fuel rods in them. Have you looked – have you seen them being – have they been shown here?

JUROR: Yes.

10

DR VAN CAMP: So that provides some shielding in itself. That then goes in to a copper overpad and you're right, if there's oxygen and water then you will have some erosion of that. But then the idea is that it goes in a bentonite clay, so you've got already three barriers for what's housed in ceramic, okay.

15 Because those fuel rods are ceramic. So that bentonite clay then provides a barrier for oxygen and water coming in and equally going out. Then it's backfilled and then it's in a host rock of – that's 500 metres below ground. So you have a number of barriers - - -

20 JUROR: Well, I'm not worried about underground, I'm worried about where it's going to sit somewhere - - -

DR VAN CAMP: Yes.

25 JUROR: - - - waiting to go underground.

DR VAN CAMP: Sure.

JUROR: We're going to have to put it somewhere - - -

30

DR VAN CAMP: Yes, so - - -

JUROR: - - - and how safe is that?

35 DR VAN CAMP: So concrete doesn't - - -

JUROR: It's supposed to be cooling down. South Australia doesn't have very many cool parts (indistinct)

40 DR VAN CAMP: I think you're taking that as a literal – situation.

JUROR: I know I am but that – you know, I mean we've got to build a port, we've got to build - - -

45 DR VAN CAMP: Well, actually - - -

JUROR: - - - the facility.

5 DR VAN CAMP: In reality we don't have to build a port. Everywhere else in the world that's importing and exporting nuclear waste is using common user facilities. So what they do is they close it for a period of time while the ship comes in and the transfer occurs but it's a common user port. I was on – I was travelling on trains in France on rails, on rail links that are also used by the nuclear fuel waste trains.

10

MS LAMBERT: I am going to interrupt briefly because Quintin is available. I just want to make sure that we hear his voice because he's only got 10 minutes. Let me try this again and see, I'm going to try and magnify him too by putting him in a glass which apparently will work. Hello, Quintin?

15

MR FLOWERS: Hello, yes hi. How you going?

MS LAMBERT: Hi, it's Mel here with the citizens' jury.

20 MR FLOWERS: Hello Me, how you going?

MS LAMBERT: Good thank you. Apologies for the earlier connection. I'm going to try to magnify you a little bit.

25 MR FLOWERS: Sure.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Could you just speak for us and say hello, Quintin?

30 MR FLOWERS: Yes, hello everybody. My name is Quintin Flowers.

MS LAMBERT: Can anyone hear that? Hang on, two seconds.

MR FLOWERS: Can you hear me now?

35 MS LAMBERT: Is that better?

MR FLOWERS: Can you hear me now? I can hear you.

40 MS LAMBERT: Yes, we can hear you roughly. We're doing some acrobats to get you heard. Quintin, could you tell us a little bit about yourself and then the jury will come back with a few questions relevant to your area of expertise.

45 MR FLOWERS: Certainly. My name's Quintin Flowers. I currently work with Jay Gibbs. Jay Gibbs is a global engineering company and we were as part of the Royal Commission bought into, with our partners MCU develop a

(indistinct) of specific security and safety risks of transportation. (indistinct)
26 years in the Australian Army and the last 10 and a half years I've been
working with Jay Gibbs doing a range of things, primarily security, security
consulting, security risk management, infrastructure protection and related
5 fields and my part now (indistinct) I guess really was specifically looking at the
security related aspects of the transportation of nuclear waste.

MS LAMBERT: Okay, great. Thank you, Quintin. Do any of the jurors have
specific questions or issues they'd like to discuss with Quintin while we have
10 him on the line in response to his specific expertise?

JUROR: I think what he's talking about (indistinct)

MS LAMBERT: Yes.
15

JUROR: When he's talking about the risk of some (indistinct) whatever X
location (indistinct) what is the risk of that being target over say blowing up the
CBD?

20 MS LAMBERT: Can you hear that question, Quintin?

MR FLOWERS: Not well enough to be able to answer it.

MS LAMBERT: No, let me relay that to you. We've just been talking
25 actually about the risks of in war time around nuclear storage and nuclear
waste and the question is is there, what are the risks of direct attacks on nuclear
storage facilities? Can you talk to that for us?

MR FLOWERS: We didn't, yes, I can in a roundabout fashion. We didn't
30 specifically look at that major risk. We were specifically in this commission
looking at the risks around the transportation of nuclear waste so we were
looking specifically at the risks while the material was in between storage
facilities so we looked at, you know, when it went by ship, we (indistinct)
security of facilities themselves and that was outside of our scope.

35 MS LAMBERT: Okay.

MR FLOWERS: The area (indistinct) the facilities themselves and that could
be built to withstand any level of security risk depending on the risk equation
40 so the risk based approach in their construction which is the same principle as
managing the security and safety risks of protecting the material during transit.
So that was slightly outside our scope.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Members of the jury, do you wish to explore that
45 further with Quintin or the transport element? What are your---

JUROR: Does he feel that the nuclear storage facility would or wouldn't (indistinct)

5 MS LAMBERT: Do you have an opinion, Quintin, as to whether a nuclear facility would or wouldn't be high profile target during war time? We appreciate you weren't looking at that specifically but do you have an opinion on that?

10 MR FLOWERS: It would be my personal opinion not a professional opinion but a personal opinion would be that in selecting targets, you know, with a military background I understand the process by which targets would be selected but a sensible adversary selecting targets would be looking for the best bang for buck both on a not waste time on targets that would not be likely to
15 provide a really positive outcome and it would be difficult for me to imagine that a nuclear waste facility would be anywhere near the top tier of targets in a conflict. There would be others that would be of much more significant benefit to an adversary, including you know national power, including you know
20 power stations, including military headquarters, commander control nodes, political places. I would think that it would be very surprising if nuclear waste was anywhere near the top tier just from a personal opinion.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. We have another question from Juror.

25 JUROR: Even if it's considered low risk in your personal opinion, what would the impact zone sort of radiating out from the aboveground storage facility be and what sort of distances would that have quite a dire consequence for it if it was a target and a bomb went off?

30 MS LAMBERT: So Juror's curious to know if it was a target, albeit that you consider it to be low risk, if it was what would be the impact of that, what would be the distance, the magnitude and distance that, and the zone that that would impact?

35 MR FLOWERS: I'm sorry, I can't answer that question. That's well outside my scope. I wasn't involved in and haven't been involved in any of the discussion about the actual design of the (indistinct) and exactly their level of resistance. That would be best directed to someone from the condition that was involved in the original paper.

40 MS LAMBERT: Yes, and perhaps we can hold that question and if other witnesses want to respond to that we can do that when we bid farewell to Quintin.

45 JUROR: There was another massive question in there as well which was what

is it (indistinct) what is the zone (indistinct)

MS LAMBERT: Is that a question you would like to answer, Juror? What is the zone that ---

5

JUROR: If the aboveground storage site, for example, was in Glenelg how far along the coast in each direction out to sea and also inland would be impacted should an explosion go off.

10 MS LAMBERT: So my understanding is Quintin doesn't feel he can answer that question so we can take that on notice to other witnesses. Any other specific questions before Quintin jumps on a plane?

15 JUROR: Can I just broaden that away from the specific topic then? Quintin, his focus was on transport risks. What does he feel the greatest risks are? Where are the significant points (indistinct)

MS LAMBERT: Could you hear that Quintin?

20 MR FLOWERS: Yes, I did and so I understand the question is where did I feel the most significant risks are in transport? Is that correct?

MS LAMBERT: Yes, that's correct.

25 MR FLOWERS: Yes, so it's an open ended question really so the most significant part of the whole piece, I think, at least at face value is while the material is moving. While it's not in a secure, solid, designed facility and therefore the transport piece of the equation in theory presents the highest level of safety and security risk. What we did in our examination is we postulated, we tried, you know, to get up the absolute sort of worst case type scenarios that can possibly be imagined and we came up with five different scenarios where transport, while securing transport an adversary and we didn't base this on any particular threat analysis but someone that wanted to get at the stuff, how they might dream up mechanisms to do that.

35

What we found was that none of them, given the design of the containers which are really enormous, incredibly heavy, difficult to move and need specialist equipment, they're very difficult to someone, even if they captured a vessel or a train or a vehicle that's carrying the stuff, very difficult for anyone without the specialist gear to actually do anything with them. That dealt with a whole range of risks. Then the next risk we thought about, the risk of release through a significant impact or attack and probably surprisingly to me, when we went through it all and you put in the normal layers of protection that would be expected to be in place in terms of escort and route security and changing routes on a regular basis where feasible and then the design of the containers

45

themselves, there were no really outstanding or significant security risks during the transport piece either.

MS LAMBERT: Okay.

5

MR FLOWERS: So it would require a significantly determined, well-equipped and trained adversary to mount some sort of an attack in the first place and then the levels of protection that you'd expect to be in place would be expected to more than be adequate to intercept and then to respond to an attack before an adversary was able to actually get access to the material itself. So there were none.

MS LAMBERT: Thanks, Quintin. I'm just going to cut to Lissa, one of the other witnesses who'd like to speak to this as well, from Golder Associates.

15

DR VAN CAMP: So just on that transport risk, I think Quintin has done a really good job explaining that. The experience that I had when I was overseas was also - I got to see some of the test work that was done on that transport risk. So as I mentioned before, in France it's on the rail network to get from port to site, and being on the rail network there are some risks to the public that needed to be managed.

So what they did with the casks that Quintin has talked about - highly engineered facilities, highly engineered - they drove a train at full speed into that to see what would happen and whether or not there would be a breach in the welds or what would happen to the concrete, et cetera. And they went through, chiselled all the concrete away, and then ran the canister through x-rays and there was not a single breach. So a train at full speed going smack into this engineered cask was fine. And they did something very similar for the port side of it.

So again, it's a different type of transport cask, and if you think about it, they've got to get it from ship to dock. So they looked at what the height could be and if they dropped it, and they replicated that Myth Buster style, dropped the cask, again had a look at whether or not the welds and the integrity of the cask remained, and the answer is it did. So those are just a couple of tests that are being done. It's not an exhaustive list. It's just the risk pathways are being looked at quite seriously, and the tests and the science that backs it up shows that it's safe.

40

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Thank you, Lissa. I'm going to just check Quintin's time skills here. Quintin, how are you going for time?

MR FLOWERS: I've probably got another 10 minutes if there any questions along the transport-related security risks.

45

MS LAMBERT: Okay. So let's ask Quintin any remaining questions. One more here.

5 JUROR: I just wonder how easy the canisters or the big casks - I appreciate a hundred times they're massive things and they're probably quite secure for the most part, but how easy would it be for a terrorist if they did get hold of them to open these things?

10 MS LAMBERT: So the question is, "How easy are the canisters to open?"

MR FLOWERS: They're extremely difficult to open. They're designed not to be opened except with the correct tools and equipment. So even if you can get access to the containers themselves, and, you know, that supposes success in a whole range of areas where success seems extremely difficult, if not, you know, close to impossible. Then if you get access and then you need to get into it and you're trying to get into these things, without the correct tools - and the tools are not readily available; they're only available in conjunction with acquisition of the casks themselves - I heard some of those explanations about, you know, impact testing of these things. It's not possible to hack your way in. So you couldn't use an oxy torch, you couldn't use, you know, hard machinery, cutting devices. None of those are likely to get you in to these casks, certainly not in a short enough time frame before anyone was able to respond.

25 MS LAMBERT: Okay.

MR FLOWERS: So extremely difficult, is the answer.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to say any final questions to Quintin, because we need to actually phone-in another witness as well, Quintin. So apologies, time is tight. One more here.

JUROR: Is there an international sort of regulation of that actual concrete, because here, in theory, concrete at the moment - and you're finding it in buildings and things like that. So is there an international standard of work and who organises or recognises the actual standard that the concrete is going to be made to?

MS LAMBERT: Did you hear that question, Quintin?

40 MR FLOWERS: No, I didn't. Sorry.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. So the question is are there international standards to govern the concrete and manufacture of these - that manufactures these storage facilities and how are those governed, who makes those decisions about the

standards.

MR FLOWERS: Well, my understanding is this: there are, and we refer to
5 some of those standards that apply in transport, but again, the actual design of
the facilities themselves was outside my scope, I'm sorry. I was focused purely
on the transportation-related security and safety.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Great. Thank you, Quintin. I think we're going to
10 need to leave it there, but thank you so much for making the time while in
transit to phone in and we really appreciate having heard from you.

MR FLOWERS: You're welcome, and hopefully I've been able to answer
some of your questions. Sorry I couldn't answer others that are outside my
15 field of knowledge.

MS LAMBERT: No, that's fine.

MR FLOWERS: I'm sure others can.

20 MS LAMBERT: We appreciate your honesty. Thank you, Quintin.

MR FLOWERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Bye.
25

DR VAN CAMP: If I could just finalise that one, there is the International
Atomic Energy Agency. It has a whole raft of standards related to this
industry, so they do go through transport. In terms of concrete, even - yes,
there are different concretes available. In Finland they have spent the last
30 20 years optimising the mix that they need for their situation, and so there is a
lot of engineering and science that goes simply into the design of the concrete.

JUROR: That might be Finland.

35 DR VAN CAMP: Yes.

JUROR: We might be getting it from there.

DR VAN CAMP: No. So we would have to do the same. We would have to
40 go through - - -

JUROR: I think the point she's trying to make is that when the material is in
transit it's going to have to be packed obviously at the source site, not the
destination.
45

DR VAN CAMP: Yes.

JUROR: So if, say, South Korea or whoever, is shipping it to us, then they have to pack it into the container.

5

DR VAN CAMP: Yes.

JUROR: How do we know that that is a robust container?

10 DR VAN CAMP: It still has to pass the International Atomic Energy Agency and all of their guidelines. So there's that over - - -

JUROR: Yes, but who's in charge of that?

15 DR VAN CAMP: The International Agency?

JUROR: Yes.

DR VAN CAMP: A bunch of scientists and engineers and - - -

20

DR GREEN: United Nations.

DR VAN CAMP: Yes. Like, it's multifaceted.

25 JUROR: (indistinct) there's an international standard.

DR VAN CAMP: Yes.

JUROR: But it mightn't be our standard, Australia's standard, and - - -

30

DR VAN CAMP: I would suggest that it's very closely aligned. We can't do anything unless we meet the standards of the International Agency. So it's dovetailed. We have to meet their very high standards.

35 JUROR: Yes, but you can't guarantee, say, for instance - I'm not trying (indistinct) say (indistinct) you know, North and South Korea. How do we know - - -

40 DR VAN CAMP: It won't be North Korea, by the way. It won't be North Korea.

JUROR: No. How do we know that they are going to actually do that particular standard?

45 DR VAN CAMP: Well, there's got to be a quality assurance list.

JUROR: Who's going to go - are you going to go up there and say, "I'm going to test this"?

5 DR VAN CAMP: I would suggest that that's exactly what would happen. Australia will be - - -

JUROR: Right.

10 DR VAN CAMP: If that's the country of origin, we will be there.

MS LAMBERT: Can I ask other jurors if they want to chip in, maybe if they agree, disagree, have a comment on this topic, or move onto a new - - -

15 DR GREEN: My understanding would be that, no, it's our contract. We would have a contract with whoever that other agency is. That contract will specify whatever it needs to specify. It's our choice to accept this should that be the case, in which case we have an opportunity to (indistinct) you must pack it to X standard that we are happy with before we'll consider accepting this."

20

JUROR: Yes. Well, I sort of agree with that proper (indistinct) the other way.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Any other witnesses want to chip in?

25 DR GREEN: Yes.

MS LAMBERT: Jim.

30 DR GREEN: Yes. South Korea is a really interesting case study, I think, because just four or five years ago, roughly 100 people were arrested for a safety scandal that involved the falsification of safety data. Now, the IAEA has advised that we don't have to meet the standards and also, I get a bit nervous about the idea of international standards because I'm aware of examples of them being breached, including examples right here in Australia.

35

And one example right here in South Australia was the shallow burial of long-lived waste at Maralinga during the clean up just 15 years ago. It's a clear breach of international standards. It's a clear breach of Australian standards, as set out in the NH and MRC code of practice, but that's exactly what they did.

40

So standards are of no use if they're not being met.

JUROR: I've got one (indistinct) about breaching and so on, if one knowing (indistinct) or terrorist pack or whatever, if one was to breach - and that goes back to your question - say it was in (indistinct) whatever, so more (indistinct) one was to breach, how far would the radiation breach, but how far would it

45

spread if one of these canisters - say, as soon as it got off the dock something happened and it breached. How far would it reach?

5 DR VAN CAMP: It would be really convenient if I could answer that because I know those levels of details are wanted, but it's, you know, what is in there? How long has it been in there? Is it just one container? There's so many unknowns that it's not actually helpful to give a distance when we don't know what we're dealing with.

10 JUROR: How far – how far did Chernobyl go from the (indistinct)

DR VAN CAMP: That's a very different situation - - -

15 JUROR: I know it's a completely separate but that's the – that's the most extreme to say - - -

DR VAN CAMP: There's also been - - -

20 JUROR: - - - this is how far it can - - -

DR VAN CAMP: Yes.

JUROR: - - - go.

25 DR VAN CAMP: Yes.

JUROR: But that's an explosion isn't it? That's the sort of scenario I'm talking about in a war situation?

30 JUROR: That's what I mean, how far - - -

JUROR: That's an explosion.

35 JUROR: - - - if it's 100 kilometres then you can say, all right, 100 kilometres is the most - - -

40 JUROR: But most breaches would just be, you know, if it opened, even if a fuel rod came out, they could probably get specialists in, stick it back in and I don't know there might be a little bit of clean up but there may – but the idea that it's going to spread for a long distance – am I right? Is probably - - -

DR VAN CAMP: Can I put it into some context? So Chernobyl is a power station - - -

45 JUROR: Yes.

DR VAN CAMP: - - - right, and so you don't have any decay that's happened. So the bit of – can you see this?

5 JUROR: Yes.

DR VAN CAMP: All right. So you've seen - - -

JUROR: (indistinct)

10

DR VAN CAMP: It was – it was horse and cart technology whereas everything else is basically a Mustang and that's the only thing – you know, the horse on that – and that's what connects it but it was horse and cart technology compared to a functioning vehicle. So that it was – it shouldn't have happened. The disaster dealt in this space here, hot – very hot, not temperature but in terms of its - - -

15

JUROR: No, I understand what (indistinct)

20 DR VAN CAMP: Yes.

JUROR: (indistinct)

DR VAN CAMP: Okay.

25

JUROR: (indistinct)

DR VAN CAMP: Yes. So then after it's gone through the 20 years, it's more in this space here. So you've taken out a lot of the toxicity and the heat straight away. So then it's – you can kind of see why I can't answer the question because there's nothing – there is no definitive components that I actually respond to it.

30

JUROR: Mm.

35

MS LAMBERT: I am going to cut here because I'm aware there's two Steve's that we haven't heard from yet. Steve McIntosh is from Australia Nuclear Science and he's expecting us to call him right now. So I'm going to call him in because it feels like there's a lot of questions about international standards and the actual technicalities about nuclear that he could maybe speak to. But then I'm really keen that we also bring in Steve's voice from a geological perspective on this topic too. So let's try this Steve first. Hello, Steve it's Mel here. Apologies for the delay. I'm just going to put you on speaker and we'll try and link you and – as well as we can. Okay. Would you like to say hello and we'll check we can hear you.

40

45

MR McINTOSH: Hello.

MS LAMBERT: Can everybody hear him a little?

5

JUROR: Faintly.

MS LAMBERT: On the desk, okay. Okay, Steve we've got the citizens' jury here. We've just been having some conversations about the scale of spread
10 should there be an incident with a nuclear storage container in transit. Also been - - -

MR McINTOSH: Yes.

15 MS LAMBERT: - - - had some questions about how can we be confident in international standards around storage, containers, specifications for concrete and materials? So just some uncertainties about how we can be confident on that. Could you speak to some of those for us please?

20 MR McINTOSH: Yes, sure. I think the basic (indistinct) that there's never been an accident in the course of transport, which has had significant result (indistinct) that level and whether that's (indistinct) isotopes or industrial sources or spent fuel. There's never been an accident (indistinct) provides a level of reassurance, a level of reassurance. I guess it does mean that
25 (indistinct) a real life consequence analysis because (indistinct) And so it's - in a sense it's - in that way it's different from nuclear power reactors where there have been a couple of accidents and you can see consequences (indistinct) for the future.

30 MS LAMBERT: Can you just hold there a second Steve, we're just having some - - -

MR McINTOSH: Yes.

35 MS LAMBERT: - - - problems hearing you and I'm getting hints and tips from around the room. Juror what was your - - -

JUROR: May I suggest, even moving the glass aside and taking the microphone off and holding it just above - almost the same angle that you
40 would if you were holding the microphone here.

MS LAMBERT: Yes, I don't think the microphone's helping here, that's the - - -

45 JUROR: It's going over there.

JUROR: It's picking up the sound from the actual speaker on the phone.

MS LAMBERT: Yes. It sounds like quite a crackly line as well.

5 JUROR: All this - - -

MS LAMBERT: Can you just try saying hello to us again Steve, sorry about this.

10 MR McINTOSH: Okay. How much did you get of the last - - -

MS LAMBERT: No, it's not - - -

15 JUROR: Are you able to connect your phone to your computer and use the computer speakers.

MS LAMBERT: I've tried that. That didn't work the first time.

20 JUROR: Are you able to just tell us what he says.

MS LAMBERT: I'm struggling to hear it too, to be honest.

JUROR: Okay.

25 MS LAMBERT: Okay, Steve. Are you there Steve?

MR McINTOSH: (indistinct)

30 MS LAMBERT: This is quite a poor line. Is anyone – are you able to pick him up better than me? Sorry, I also have poor hearing which isn't helping this situation.

JUROR/MR McINTOSH: I can try and relay.

35 MS LAMBERT: Juror is going to try to just relay what you're saying to the rest of the group but we may just need to give it a few minutes and see if we can get it to work.

40 JUROR/MR McINTOSH: Okay. I'm just going to take this back of speaker because – all right. Can you hear me Steve? All right. This is Juror. I'll try and relay what you say, so if you can keep things brief and just go sentence by sentence. Great. There's never been an accident with significant radioactive consequences in transport. So that's talking about transport of medical, spent fuel – sorry, what did I miss there? Yellowcake, all forms – all forms of it.

45

JUROR: (indistinct)

JUROR/MR McINTOSH: Sorry?

5

JUROR: (indistinct)

JUROR/MR McINTOSH: Okay. So because those safety records are quite good, we don't have an experience – because no incidences have occurred, we don't have an experience to look at, to say what would it look like if something went wrong.

10

MS LAMBERT: Is there anything very particular we want to speak to Steve about? Because I think otherwise we should cut to the other witnesses to really make the most of this time.

15

JUROR: What was his speciality again?

JUROR/MR McINTOSH: So there's been a bunch of analysis done on what might go wrong - - -

20

MS LAMBERT: (indistinct) industry.

JUROR/MR McINTOSH: - - - but that hasn't been able to be tested against real life occurrences.

25

MS LAMBERT: He's an expert on nuclear liability. Anything else? I think otherwise we're going to move on.

JUROR/MR McINTOSH: Yes, I'll cut you off there. One of the previous witnesses has actually – well, we're out of time as well but one of the previous witnesses also said that. I'll just hand you back to Mel.

30

MS LAMBERT: Steve, I'm sorry but I think we're going to need to cut it there because the audio has been hard and it's hard just to engage the group in this sort of third hand way. So I really apologise and that's been such a brief encounter. Thank you for phoning in.

35

JUROR/MR McINTOSH: Actually can you just (indistinct) now, well we've got a question over here.

40

MS LAMBERT: I'm just going to have to cut it there. Sorry, Steve we will – but thank you for the information and we can follow that up with you afterwards. Apologies. Okay, thanks. Bye.

45

JUROR: (indistinct) ability (indistinct) South Australia.

DR HILL: Okay. Just to make sure everyone heard that, it was a good point about the seismic stability of South Australia. In general South Australia on world standards is a – has a stable geological environment and that includes seismicity. We have a very good series of stations for recording earthquake activity and from that, we're getting an interesting picture that shows that although we're broadly stable and we broadly have low incidents and low intensity events, we do have areas that are more susceptible to seismic activity compared to other areas and so that's been one of the really interesting challenges for us is to start, particularly in the geological survey is to start mapping out those areas and we do that by the recording of the earthquakes and then we can work out where they're located and then start to see the patterns emerge and that's done, that's been previously done partly through the South Australian geological survey but also our Commonwealth agency Geoscience Australia have a national network of stations for that and quite a large team is very sophisticated in that sort of monitoring.

JUROR: The report talks about improving our geological data. That ties in exactly with what you're talking about there?

DR HILL: Yes. The report mentions that in two, in the context of two things. Firstly, it mentions it in the context of exploration so finding new resources towards mining but the other way, and this is really important for the discussion we're having here is really being able to properly document the geological context for a waste storage facility. As I say, geology is absolutely critical, be it the geological stability, the seismicity, also just the inherent characteristics of the rocks particularly their ability to be secure and really their inability to transmit material particularly through fractures and ground water and then the hydrogeology context is important. Look, you've got a question. I'll stop.

JUROR: Do we have any clay areas that could be used?

DR HILL: Definitely. Yes, we have and most of the clay areas are located in many cases ancient sedimentary bases are particularly good for that but also we have younger sedimentary bases that have a lot of clay.

JUROR: And how do they relate to the (indistinct)

DR HILL: We do have some areas that are part or closely linked to those systems but we still also have a lot of areas that are isolated from those major, particularly the great Artesian basin. We have areas that are isolated from that.

JUROR: Can I interject for a second? For those of us that don't know, what

the heck is an Artesian basin?

DR HILL: Sorry, yes. Good point. It's a famous part of, you know, Australian culture that we talk about. You know, the Artesian water or the
5 Artesian basin. What we're talking about there are large sedimentary basins that are able to store ground water but in particular they get most of their recharge from the margins of the basins which is, in the case of places like the great Artesian basin in Australia, a lot of the recharge there comes from the ranges in eastern Australia. You can recharge from Queensland, New South
10 Wales - - -

JUROR: From Papua New Guinea, I thought.

DR HILL: Yes, that's exactly right. Yes, these are big basins.
15

JUROR: So my other question, presuming you can find a place that is stable, not going to affect the water, what would happen in the future if you found that area had some rare earth that you really wanted to mine?

DR HILL: Yes, and that is, you know, there's a really important precedent that's happened in a lot of the other storage areas around the world and that is that there's a great body of geological work that goes into the background for choosing the correct site. It's about those criteria for storage but it's also basically trying to find an area that's going to be sterile, as close to sterile as
25 you can predict for other resources so you don't want to set up this facility and then find in a few years' time you then want to start mining in that area. I think from what I've read that the Finland example, they did something like 20 to 25 years of ground work, surface geological work following up with drilling and so forth to be absolutely sure about the quality of the characteristics of the
30 geology in that area.

JUROR: Would we be looking at that time frame ourselves?

DR HILL: We would be, yes. We have a great background. We're off to a,
35 thank goodness we do store our geological data very well. We have a world leading storage facility and accessible. It's all available free online through our South Australian resource information geo-server so you can look any of this up, including earth quakes and so forth. We keep a large number of our drill cores in a drill core library so we have 7.5 million metres of drill core stored in
40 this brand new facility so that's enough drill core to lay out from Adelaide to Shanghai.

It's an enormous amount that we've got that we can work from but we still have gaps and particularly as you start to hone in on the detail that will be
45 required here, this is a serious, you know, we know this. This is a very serious

decision and a very serious path forward. We need to get it right. As right as we can.

5 JUROR: Can I ask you roughly what part of South Australia you're looking at at the moment?

10 DR HILL: We're not looking at any particular area at all at the moment. We haven't been asked to do that. What we're doing at the moment is making sure that the data that we have available is absolutely tip top and we're also starting to identify where those major gaps are so that if the time comes, because that's all based on the recommendation that comes out of this work, if that time comes, we're ready to start moving towards making geological or scientific recommendations towards suitable areas but we haven't been asked to do that yet.

15 MS LAMBERT: Just to reinforce Daryl's point, this is about this group thinking about what does the public need to think about and look at in the report, not make a recommendation.

20 JUROR: I've lived on a lot of sheep stations in my time. I understand the Artesian water (indistinct) majority of our (indistinct) from Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland border to the West Australia border, if you haven't got your Artesian water you don't have sheep and cattle, all right. I can't quite see where we're going to have a place in South Australia to put this on (indistinct) without upsetting the Artesian bores. Like, you know what I'm saying?

DR HILL: I think I understand what you're saying.

30 JUROR: I've been there and I've had to put a bore down and (indistinct) pull out like they get (indistinct) Artesian bore. The outback Australian, not the city people, live on Artesian bores. We used to be a country where you lived off the sheep's back, right, and I'm sort of like thinking about where I lived, right, and what we depended on and I know that you know like you're talking about (indistinct) doesn't concern us (indistinct) doesn't concern us but I'm biased. Maybe I'm biased because I've lived in the (indistinct) my eldest son's father died from radiation poisoning 25 years ago so I (indistinct) massive deformities.

40 My eldest son-in-law is now dead. I've lived on a sheep station up near Broken Hill. My husband (indistinct) radiation, he died 12 months ago tomorrow so I've seen and it has affected my family so maybe I'm a bit biased but I've lived on the land. I can't see where we're going to put it because we've got to have our land. We've got to have, we've got to think about our heritage even.

45

MS LAMBERT: Can you speak to that?

5 DR HILL: Yes. It's Juror, isn't it? Yes, thanks Juror and you're a hundred per cent right. It's a really serious issue because we're dealing with people and their livelihoods into the future but getting back to, if I can just get back to your original point where you said it's difficult to conceive, sorry I'm paraphrasing, it's difficult to conceive areas that aren't part of these Artesian basins. Let me tell you, there are. There are areas that are not part of it and I
10 guess one way to think about that is that if Artesian water was completely prevalent across the state and it was everywhere, it would be very easy to find water and I think you know that it's not that easy. We have big parts of the state where - - -

15 JUROR: I witnessed that but (indistinct) going to be a big thing underground. That's a big area we're talking about.

JUROR: No, it's not. It's the size of Adelaide oval. That's what we were told last week. The size of Adelaide oval. We're not taking, think it's going to be
20 square kilometres. We're talking an area of about maybe one square kilometre maximum.

JUROR: Juror, is that spot on?

25 JUROR: (indistinct) storage is going to be for a hundred thousand years. We can't say how the earth is going to be like in a hundred thousand years so how do we know, say for instance we have a big earthquake or some sort of disaster, could actually place up through central Australia like (indistinct) years and years ago. We don't know that and apparently (indistinct) sea level.
30

DR HILL: That's right, yes.

JUROR: So therefore if we do have something - - -

35 MS LAMBERT: So how do we deal with uncertainty I guess?

JUROR: And how do we - - -

40 MS LAMBERT: Jim wants to come in too, I think. Steve you speak and then we'll have - - -

DR HILL: Should I answer this question and then - - -

45 MS LAMBERT: Yes.

DR HILL: - - - or just say a little bit of a comment that might help you with that. One of the really – you’re right, we don’t have a crystal ball, we can’t tell the future and in so many things in life. But one thing that we can do is use the – really the criteria of what’s happened in the past and understanding what has
5 driven that and how that works. And one of the things that we know from the geological history of South Australia is that large parts of our state are quite remarkable, particularly on a world scale, in their stability. And what shows that are that we still have very ancient rocks preserved in many areas but also very important here, is that we have landscape remnants that are many
10 millions, in fact many hundreds of millions of years old, that are still expressed in the South Australian landscape. So you can walk across land surfaces that are hundreds of millions of years old, in South Australia, and it’s an incredible feeling. Dinosaurs would’ve walked across similar surfaces - - -

15 MS LAMBERT: Okay. Let’s draw Jim’s voice in and then move to some other jurors for comment.

JUROR: I had a question actually for Steve, which is the timing of this. As I understand it, the Royal Commission thinks that you could do all this survey
20 work and test drilling and licensing and construction and have all that done in the space of 27 years. That seems to me to be absurd and I’m wondering what you think of that – those timeframes Steve? And if you would care to give a more realistic timeframe?

25 DR HILL: David did you want to – I just noticed you reacted to - - -

DAVID: You can answer and I can fill in any gaps.

DR HILL: Okay, that’s great. Well, as I said – look we are in a good position
30 with our geological data and knowledge and particularly using that to identify the unknowns. So we’re not coming in to this completely blind about the – not only our interpretations of geology but the actual samples and the data that’s needed. But because of the importance of this and because of the scale that we’re looking at, you know fairly – you know it’s going to be a site, not you
35 know a region. We’re going to – we will be needing further detailed work, and as I said, that would commence with detailed surface work, so mapping, taking samples, understanding the properties of the materials, the age of the materials, really important. And then following that up and working in hand with getting subsurface samples and drilling. We have areas of the state that are very
40 intensely drilled but we have big areas of the state where we have very few drill holes at the moment. I’ll give you an example, the geological survey that’s been – and not saying that this is a site we’re looking at, we’re looking at it from a geological perspective, is understanding what’s underneath the Nullarbor Plain. We have very – we only have a couple of drill holes that tell
45 us about what’s under that area.

JUROR: (indistinct) earthquakes not so long ago.

5 DR HILL: Yes. Yes, they have. They have, and we know – we know little, or have known little about what the deeper geology in that area is like and that’s what we’re trying to address at the moment and that’s going – that’s the sort of thing that’s going to be important. Those scientific knowledge foundations on the geology.

10 MS LAMBERT: So let’s just get – David do you have a sense of what the timescale is? If that’s correct? And maybe just a - - -

15 DAVID: So it’s actually on page 297 of the report, there’s a short (indistinct) details about the timelines in terms of sizing or building an underground rock lab and I think it’s important to consider that this is – this is a concept for people to consider as sort of a learning experience for the state but nobody’s held to these timelines, these are just, you know, conceptual – they’re based on experience but you know, if it took longer to develop these facilities, you know it’s going to take longer and the commission has found that, you know you need to develop your safety case before you can start accepting waste and so if 20 that safety case took longer to develop than the 13 years that is stated then we wouldn’t accept waste.

25 JUROR: But David that is the plan to accept the waste while they’re developing the repository, so that’s why I raise that question is it’s going to extend the time you’ve got, tens of thousands of tonnes of high level waste above ground.

30 DAVID: Yes.

JUROR: At various locations.

35 JUROR: And in the – in the timeline it states that the initial safety case is (indistinct) before we start accepting waste and you need to be sure that – and have a reasonable amount of surety that you can safely store this and do have the right conditions to (indistinct) that includes the (indistinct) barriers and the geological - - -

40 MS LAMBERT: But can we just move to juror, she’s been trying to come in for a few minutes.

45 JUROR: Just with the degree of uncertainty, not knowing what’s going to happen between now and you know, hundred thousand years in to the future, are there any other areas around the world that have very similar closely aligned geological makeup where there’s evidence that has been gathered, for

the potential consequences of something going wrong within that geological substructure? So it (indistinct) are there examples that we can present to the community, so that there's understanding of what the consequences are? The likelihood of something going wrong? Even if it's a low likelihood, based on
5 presumption, what those consequences are and how you'd measure that.

DR HILL: That's a really good question, I think it's probably getting a little bit close to some of the overlap between my work and this, so I'll say a little bit but I don't want to put you on the spot Lissa, so you can - - -
10

DR VAN CAMP: No, that's okay. You've given me some warning, that's - - -

DR HILL: Yes.

15 MS LAMBERT: Also just to let you know in the next few minutes we have to start summarising our conversation so - - -

DR HILL: Short answers.

20 MS LAMBERT: - - - aware of that.

DR HILL: So yes, we do have other parts of the world that have some similarities to our geology although it's incredible how coherent the areas of stability are in South Australia. So we do have, as I worded it, a remarkable
25 situation in the state. The other thing about it is that we have – and it's one thing I haven't touched on that's important, and that is we have natural analogues of uranium in our landscape. We have some of the most uranium rich rocks in the world in South Australia and they've been there for millions, in fact billions in some cases, of years. And so we have a good understanding
30 of how they have behaved in the geological environment of South Australia over an extraordinary timeframe. You know we have uranium deposits that we understand how they've expressed themselves at the surface, as well as depth. So I think there's a really important key there.

35 MS LAMBERT: Lissa, do you want to add anything to that?

JUROR: Sorry, I should have probably added, which I didn't maybe articulate well, with that similarity of geological makeup, that is there another place that has that? That also stored uranium waste underground.
40

DR HILL: I don't think so but then that's where I - - -

DR VAN CAMP: There is a new (indistinct) so a couple of things I'll just raise before I get in to a specific example that hopefully helps your
45 understanding. Finland started this process when I was two years old, right.

It's not going to happen – and I'm now 40. I know I look great, but you know – so it's not going to happen in – in the next 20 years, it's just not feasible. They have gone through so much rigor to test it, have it assessed, test, assess, test, assess. And at various points it can stop. So putting fear out there to say
5 well, we've signed a contract and then it's ours, it's not necessarily going to be all that helpful because I think there are numerous checks and balances along the way. This is the start of the mature conversation, that's what we're all here for.

10 MS LAMBERT: Okay, so you've got one more minute - - -

DR VAN CAMP: In terms of - - -

15 MS LAMBERT: - - - and then we need to wrap up.

DR VAN CAMP: - - - knowing what's happening from geology, in Finland again, they have predicted in their modelling for a glacial event, for another Ice Age because they know it's coming, because we've got previous evidence that it has happened. Now they've had to adjust their timing a little bit because
20 climate change has pushed that out but they still know that the Ice Ages are coming again and that's in there. And they've modelled and positioned their repository in that context.

JUROR: It's really about consequence. How do we know what the
25 consequences would be if we haven't – if people haven't done this before?

JUROR: (indistinct) countries?

MS LAMBERT: Okay. I do – we do need to start wrapping this up.
30 Remember there's another group, so what I'm going to ask you know is what have we resolved? What have we not resolved? What do you feel is answered, what's not answered. The next group will pick up these themes that you feel are unresolved. So don't feel we've got to wrap it up and know what we want people to consider in the report. Let's cut to that now. So what do you feel
35 clear about now and what do you feel is still not clear? Can we pull that out from the conversation thoroughly?

JUROR: Can I just ask one quick question of Steve?

40 DR HILL: Yes, sure.

JUROR: In your opinion, what would be the best safe repository area, a hard rock situation or a clay situation?

45 DR HILL: Yes, and there's also a salt situation too. Let's not forget that. So

there's a range of options and there's a whole lot of other variables besides just the substrate. Sorry, I'm not avoiding an answer, but - - -

5 MS LAMBERT: Can we take that question and add it into the next round? So let me ask that question to the next group. So the question is what are the right conditions - - -

JUROR: Which is the most recommended situation, rock, clay - - -

10 DR HILL: You want me to pick a favourite.

JUROR: Mel.

15 MS LAMBERT: Yes.

JUROR: On behalf of all the jurors here, does anyone have any questions that they'd like to be asked of Jim Green out of session? I feel like we maybe haven't heard - there were a few things that you identified at the beginning that we've run out of time and haven't had the opportunity for you to speak to, but
20 are there any questions that we'd like to maybe put forward?

MS LAMBERT: Yes, and the next group can pick those questions up.

25 DR GREEN: Yes. Juror briefly mentioned the New Mexico WIPP done, but we didn't get time to discuss it. So perhaps we could do that in the next session, and also examples of the mismanagement of radioactive waste in South Australia. They were my two sets of issues and, as you say, I'd like (indistinct)

30 MS LAMBERT: Okay.

JUROR: (indistinct) about the disaster that happened.

35 DR GREEN: Yes. That's the WIPP one and I'll be talking about that in the next session, and we can also talk about it over or after morning tea if you like, and it's also mentioned in the four-page handout that I distributed earlier.

40 MS LAMBERT: Okay. Anything else from this group to summarise the conversation that you think has helped to clarify things for you or that is still unresolved?

JUROR: Well, I'm more clarified about the topography, or the 'under-ography' or whatever it is (indistinct)

45 DR HILL: That's great, yes.

JUROR: There actually was a question I wanted to ask you, sir, but maybe I better put it down for the next one, or should I quickly ask it?

5 MS LAMBERT: No. If we can capture that for the next group, that would be great.

JUROR: It was a good try.

10 MS LAMBERT: Yes, that's right.

JUROR: Everyone wants one more question.

MS LAMBERT: So what is that question, so we can all hear it?

15

JUROR: My question would be, given that it's going to be about the size of Adelaide Oval, and when the plant is all built what area of a no-go zone or prohibited area will there be, bearing in mind that all of that country out there is used by Aboriginal people if not white people? So I'd just like to know the
20 no-go zone of the area that's built.

JUROR: Is there a quick square-kilometre reach you can say?

DR VAN CAMP: Look, certainly, it's about risk and safety and security.

25

JUROR: And that's why I want to know how big an area - - -

JUROR: Okay. We'll take that to the next session.

30 JUROR: - - - it will likely be, given that it's going to be the size of Adelaide Oval for the actual depository.

DR VAN CAMP: There would be a definite buffer zone.

35 JUROR: But what is that?

DR VAN CAMP: You've also brought in there that that's - - -

JUROR: Well, it's (indistinct)

40

DR VAN CAMP: - - - Aboriginal land. So we'll make sure that's captured.

JUROR: Depending on the condition, wouldn't that - yes.

45 JUROR: (indistinct) should be examined.

DR VAN CAMP: In Finland they have - to be perfectly honest, they have a UNESCO heritage site within 15 K's, and we spoke to the mayor and said, "Were you ever concerned that this is so close?" and he's like, "What are you talking about? It's 15 K's away." So they exclude people that aren't working on site from about two or three kilometres again.

JUROR: That's not very much.

DR VAN CAMP: No. It's also next to summer houses on islands just across the way.

JUROR: They're not even educated either.

DR VAN CAMP: No. They're highly educated.

DR HILL: Finland.

DR VAN CAMP: They have - - -

MS LAMBERT: Okay. We have two minutes left and I'm aware that some jurors have been very quiet and haven't spoken. If they're comfortable with that, that's fine, but I also want to give people an opportunity to have their say in this conversation. So is there anyone who's not participated yet who has something they want tabled at the next group, something that they have learnt or want to think more about, anything at all to capture other voices? No pressure if not.

JUROR: You mentioned storage aboveground. Then build the storage area while it was done, build a storage thing to - - -

DR VAN CAMP: Sorry, I'm not sure I captured that question.

JUROR: You mentioned as a method, aboveground storage of high-level waste, then you build your storage.

DR VAN CAMP: So is there a period of aboveground storage?

JUROR: Yes.

DR VAN CAMP: Is that the question?

JUROR: Why don't you build the storage (indistinct)

DR VAN CAMP: Okay.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Let's capture that for the next group because we are going to move on, but we'll explore that aboveground - okay. Okay, and, Juror, a suggestion here from Juror that in the economic session that is maybe an economic question. So ask that question in the economic group as well, but we'll capture it here too. Thank you for your - Jim (indistinct)

DR GREEN: Earlier on I wanted to weigh in on that discussion of worst-case scenarios.

MS LAMBERT: Yes.

DR GREEN: So I could either do that now very briefly, or (indistinct)

MS LAMBERT: Let's hold that for the next group, but we will touch on that. Thank you for your patience with that. I'm sorry that was a little disrupted. We knew that was going to be technically quite challenging to pull two people in. Apologies you didn't hear so much from Steve.

DR GREEN: (indistinct) I think the class of questions that have come up, each group is concerned about the future, but I do feel that there has to be a balance between what that concern is and what the likelihoods are. There's not been much discussion about what the potential consequences might be versus the likelihood of those consequences, and consequence and likelihood is a pretty fundamental tool for managing safety.

MS LAMBERT: Okay. Let us capture that for the next group. Thank you for that. Okay. Thank you so much. Any closing comments from our lead jurors?

JUROR: If you've got something to add, just - - -

ADJOURNED [11.46 AM]

RESUMED [12.10 PM]

MS WALKLEY: What I would like to do now is firstly introduce your lead jurors. Between us, we are going to share with you how your last group of jurors, how they, what they discussed, what they saw the topics were, what they saw the recommendations and remaining questions are. We did not have an opportunity to hear from one of our witnesses who has recorded a 10 minute video so once we've shared with you what the group came up with so far, we'd like to prioritise listening to that witness which is Corina Lester. That is going to be a very interesting experience as I turn my laptop around and we try and ignore the sound over there and listen as best we can to Corina's 10 minute video.

What's good is that's not very exciting for live stream, right. All us huddled around my laptop and admiring my husband and my son 10 years ago so we're not going to go onto live stream, I don't think, until we've heard that. How
5 does that sound? Does that sound okay? I should confirm people did expect to be in the social and community consent, yes, which includes the topics of impact on remote communities, communities, remote communities and particularly Aboriginal communities, fuel cycle, education and community engagement. This is where you're meant to be? Excellent. All right, so where
10 did we get up to ladies again?

JUROR: I think we had a lot of issues. It was quite confusing. We sort of jumped all over the place in ours. It was a lot about, I think in the long run it's about gaining consensus and how do we gain consensus in everybody having
15 their views going in. I will just let you know a bit about the speakers who we had and I guess a bit of quick summary on what they spoke about to help you out.

JUROR: If I go by the witness and I am going to summarise what the person mentioned to us previously, then if I (indistinct) how are we going to use the community centre, we need to take into consideration that there are people with language, literacy and numeracy problems. It's a 40% in the Australian population struggle with the language, literacy and numeracy and how are we going to support the diversity of our community. If I go to Anne, represent the
20 Youth Affair Council of South Australia, how are we going to involve the young people? We need to ask the young people how do they want to get involved? How do they feel comfortable with this process?

If I go to Cecilia, we need to take into consideration the people that are in the small communities, in the small rural areas, how they feel about this topic and how are we going to get involved with these small communities or rural areas which is different from the people than we live in the city. You correct me if I'm wrong.
30

JUROR: Can I just add to that? Cecilia also made a really good point about consultation. She said if you're going to go to a town like in the outback area where she is, another town six kilometres away might have completely different views so it's really important to engage with all the communities and don't just assume that if someone six miles away, that that town will share the same sort of views as somebody else as well so that was really important that we took that on board.
35
40

JUROR: And each member of the Aboriginal community, she shared with us her feelings about how important it is for them or for us to do oral submission when English (indistinct) and I include myself. When she wanted to talk her
45

own language, the Aboriginal language not in English, that is correct and also she mentioned, she shared with us how they approached John, I don't know where John is sitting, yes, the approach John used was more effective or she appreciate more that approach and then that's something that she shared with us and also how the land is sacred and how is the dream time land what she shared with us.

MS WALKLEY: Fantastic. Did you want to go through some of the points that were raised by the other jury?

JUROR: I'm just wondering after Ms Juror, is there anything you'd like to add that you heard in the previous session that has been, we haven't covered yet in the report back? Is there anything that really stuck out for you?

JUROR: I think the point that I tried to make and I think it's still a valid point to include somewhere is the differentiation between what's happening at a state level to what's happened at the Federal level and the very main ingredient in engaging people, in order to have consensus we have to engage people. Whatever the consensus is it's not going to happen without engagement and people need to trust in order to engage.

If these are not presented in a clear way, people are not going to feel that they, it's important for them to think about it. We need to really encourage people to think this is important and we can think about, you can have the information. I don't know how to put it in any other way but I feel very strongly about that. If there's confusion there, it's not clear.

JUROR: Building trust is important is what the other jurors said in the previous session.

JUROR: I think that's different from the people who are talking about trust in general about we're clear and whether we're getting the right information or not. I think what I'm talking about is trust on the very basic level that people feel they're getting information to help them rather than confuse them.

MS WALKLEY: Anything else?

JUROR: Something else I could add is somebody said how do you measure consent? Should we have a referendum on this issue? That was one thing. Another thing was the timeframe. People felt that they didn't want to be rushed so to get consensus and to have people educated there should be no pressure and that the timeframe should be, like it should be lengthy so people shouldn't feel rushed. Also, I guess it goes back to that consultation, face to face consultation is better than screens and handing out pamphlets as well. That's another issue that was raised.

JUROR: Sorry, a witness also mentioned not to use electronic stuff because now everybody got access to the internet and we would be maybe more successful if we use a face to face consultation as she mentioned. Very much
5 also we mentioned the word polarised, like there are a yes and then you say no. We also mentioned.

JUROR: And another thing was with the public consultation, the public need to know that they need to have more information than just the Royal
10 Commission report because there are other opposing views and different views out there so the, yes, the public should be aware that they need to get other information as well to make an informed decision.

MS WALKLEY: I wonder too because we've referred to some of the
15 witnesses and witnesses have spoken but I have been remiss in not properly reintroducing or introducing our witnesses. Since you've on my left this time I won't start with you, I'll go right this time shall I? I'm going to ask our witnesses to introduce themselves, where they're from and very brief dot points on your perspective on the issue. Also, if there's anything else in this report
20 that have been missed from your perspective and once we've done those, I'm going to reaffirm what our role is now in this session. So start with Gill, who you are, where you're from, your perspective on the issues and anything else that we might have missed in the report so far.

25 MS McFADYEN: Gill McFadyen from Community Centres SA which is the peak body for over a hundred community and neighbourhood centres across the state. The focus of our sector is community development and there is some information here about community centres if you want to know a little bit more about them. As far as our perspective would be and it's been very well
30 covered, it's about how the information is accessible to the diversity of our communities and to each of (indistinct) again that each of those communities themselves are quite different. And that electronic again is not necessarily the way we're going to be speaking with everyone and how, when you just looking at the literacy levels across the state in functional literacy, whether that be
35 around computer or with language, numeracy, whatever that might be how is the information going to be accessible so people can engage in an informed way with the truth.

40 Make use of all of that local knowledge, the social infrastructure that's there as well as the physical infrastructure, engage people who are quite hard to engage with so that we're not speaking with, just speaking with the people who would normally put their hands up ready to be part of the conversation.

45 MS WALKLEY: Thank you, Gill. Around to Anne in the red jumper.

MS BAINBRIDGE: Hello, everyone. I'm Anne Bainbridge. I'm the executive director of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, or YACSA. We're the peak body that represents young people aged 12 to 25 and the non-government youth and community services sector that supports them. As
5 the peak body, our core functions are advocacy and representation, research, policy development, analysis and advice, capacity building, information dissemination, and consultation and coordination. Our interest in this issue is that we literally wrote the guidebook on engaging effective engagement with young people on behalf of the state government and our interest is ensuring
10 that young people have the opportunity to contribute to decisions that affect them. Thanks.

MS WALKLEY: Thank you, Anne. Cecilia.

15 MS WOOLFORD: I'm Cecilia Woolford and I'm the chair of the Outback Communities Authority, and with me is Mark Sutton who's the director of the Authority, and for those who don't know, the Authority is the peak government body, ie, almost like a local council, for all areas that are called incorporated. So it's for all areas that don't have a local council in South Australia. So that's
20 literally 630,000 square kilometres. We've got between 28 and 30 townships, communities, settlements, ranging from five people at Kingoonya to 450 people in Andamooka. We are now taking responsibility for Lee Creek (indistinct) as well.

25 Our role is to provide community services, more or less local government, also to seriously look at the aspirations and the voice of all the different diverse communities that we work with and make sure that that is always brought to the table in the most pragmatic way possible. We've been looking at this issue now for quite some time. We did a formal survey of all of our townships and
30 we've also had lots of informal conversations as well because we've got a lot of people on the ground out there.

35 So we've really come from the very "No, no, no" to the very "Bring it on" to a very pragmatic centre that says they need to be engaged, not only consulted to, but with. They actually feel that often this huge area called the outback has decisions made for it by people who don't know what the value systems are and how diverse it is out there. So they want to be brought to the table in a very respectful way.

40 We work with trusted bodies out there. We work with progress associations or we work with Aboriginal councils, and so our main point is that instead of reinventing a blank piece of paper and starting all over again with engagement is to use trusted bodies. They know how to talk to their own communities, recognising that a community in Andamooka is so different than even Roxby
45 Downs down the road. Oodnadatta is a million miles different than William

Creek. They're the sort of things that we'd like to bring to the table.

MS WALKLEY: Thank you (indistinct)

5 MR SUTTON: I'm Mark Sutton, director of the Outback Communities
Authority. Just to support what Cecilia said, but just something I picked up
from the previous session is that - and we have had to deal with this matter in
our world - is that the emotional understanding of an issue and the intelligence
- I understand there's EQ versus IQ, and one of the things is that if you can
10 bring a community along for a ride and understand what's going on at an
emotional level, the intelligence stuff seems to help in the understanding
process.

So, for example, we have the power to rate the way a council - and in one or
15 two communities our mechanism in an act says, "Do you want to pay rates?"
Now, if I asked you as a ratepayer do you want to pay rates, you're going to say
no. These two communities do pay rates. They voluntarily agree to pay rates
because they know it's in their best interest and we've gone through the journey
with them. That's really probably what I picked up this morning.

20

MS WALKLEY: And Enice.

MS MARSH: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Enice Marsh
Adnyamathanha (indistinct) Aboriginal woman and elder, and only this week I
25 was awarded the Female Elder of - for NAIDOC week, I was awarded the
Female Elder award for 2016. So I've been very busy this week. I was born at
Balcanoona in the Flinders Ranges in a camp and according (indistinct)
according to camp law.

30 So today I'm here as the Adnyamathanha person to represent Adnyamathanha
people and as well, the camp law mob. We're a little group of people that need
to discuss things, issues, matters on land and in our community at a community
level so that we get the message across to each other loud and clear in language
if we want to, in Ngawarla, which is the spoken language, and we feel
35 comfortable in that little situation, in that little gathering.

And also, the main reason why I'm here to be a witness is because I've been
heavily involved with the nuclear industry for, it seems, nearly all my life and
because now we are faced with the one proposed site of the radioactive waste
40 dump will now be on our traditional land, on Adnyamathanha land, and it is a
sacred place (indistinct) is a sacred place. It's near a mound spring and it's only
500 metres away from an IPA, which is an Indigenous Protected Area, and also
it's on a fault line. So we are standing in solidarity to say absolutely no to this
idea of a radioactive waste dump on our land.

45

MS WALKLEY: Thank you, Enice. I'm now going to introduce some witnesses who are not physically here, and then I'm going to ask jurors to identify themselves and people who are not jurors to introduce themselves very briefly as well. So we have some videoed evidence shortly from Corina Lester
5 who was not able to be here. We have some written submissions that were provided by witnesses on this theme who - I posted on Basecamp, the jurors' online platform. Hopefully people have had an opportunity to look through those. If not, or if you want to refresh, you can get hold of those on the table and have a flick through as you're listening to other things. Okay. I'm going to
10 ask Parry and Nat to introduce yourselves.

MR AGIUS: Parry Agius, one of the council members.

MS COOK: I'm Nat Cook. I'm a member of parliament for the seat of Fisher
15 which is in the southern suburban area of Adelaide.

MS WALKLEY: It feels quite momentous that happening, wait for the arrival of the (indistinct) all right, and so, jurors, could jurors just put up their hand so people know who the jurors are? Excellent. Okay. Less in number but not in
20 influence in this session. Okay. So what I would like - - -

MS: I'm Rebecca. I'm the advisory - - -

MS WALKLEY: Yes, sorry. I thought you - I went and (indistinct)
25

MS: I thought you were going to go in a circle. Rebecca from the advisory - - -

MS WALKLEY: Okay. Right, and also we have here Justine Clarke. Justine
30 is Enice's granddaughter and is here as a support person for Enice. So there was some discussion following on from Enice's introduction just now. I think there was briefly mentioned there was quite a bit of discussion in the previous session where Enice shared her experience and her community's experience, which was and is under a commonwealth consultation program. We know that
35 our remit here today, your jurors' remit, is about what part of the South Australian Royal Commission into nuclear fuel (indistinct) report need to be discussed so we're hearing from, about the impact on Commonwealth processes and today we're here to talk about the South Australian document and I think that's picked up in what the jury (indistinct).

40
MS WALKLEY: Okay jurors, you may like to now, this is going to be so much fun because we can't project, if you want to come around, jurors come around behind me and I'm going to show you along with your fellow lead jurors what we have documented from what your jurors, fellow jurors
45 (indistinct) conversation so you can see. Then you can stay behind my

shoulders, you can give me a massage if you like or you can watch the witness video (indistinct) and once you got to the video we'll go into proper discussion and I'll give a nod to live stream.

5 Doesn't it work when it's pointing in that direction? Juror, are you able to
come around? I'm going to read it out but it will be, if you are able to move a
bit closer so you can hear as I'm reading it out. Do you need some assistance
in coming around? You okay? Okay. All good? Okay, jurors (indistinct) so
10 here's where your fellow jurors got up to. They said the topic is community
education, engagement and consent and what is the process for effective
engagement. Can you hear me okay over there? Am I doing a nice school
ma'am voice?

JUROR: You're doing very well.

15

MS WALKLEY: It's very school ma'am.

JUROR: In economics we always tell everybody had to use (indistinct) voice
so you would hear them clearly.

20

MS WALKLEY: I will be like my grandpa then. It's not what's needed here
right. The topic was important because it reflects our core values. It respects
our rights as humans. The premier wants to know if consent exists. People
will therefore make an informed decision and we can move beyond polarity.

25 There was quite a lot of discussion about that, that there are very polarised
views on this topic and that effective engagement and consultation is important
to move beyond that polarity. We can be factual and unbiased using
scientifically proven information but include emotion and feeling.

30 So it was a balancing act, wasn't it? Yes. Then (indistinct) the next thing was
recommend the community discuss and I have five bullet points here that jurors
had. Community discuss how people want to be consulted so not just start
consulting but actually ask how do you want to be consulted but using tried and
35 trusted networks. For example, some of our witnesses. People want to discuss
how the final decision will be arrived at. Are all communities being included
in the engagement process? Then there's a bit question, is it safe to store
nuclear waste or not? There was a point about encouraging people to learn
more beyond the Royal Commission report. These things might not be in the
right headings but, people how are you going? If you weren't in the room, is it
40 making sense how I'm describing it?

JUROR: Yes.

45 MS WALKLEY: Beautiful. Now, when it said what people, the last two
things are what we jurors have confidence in and what we, jurors, still have

5 questions about or unclear on. What the jurors said they felt confident in was that the best consultation won't be rushed or pushed and this must be clear to people from the start. Any final decision must be transparent. The second main thing that jurors said they have confidence in is that building trust is important and this picked up on the witness submissions about you can do it by going local, make sure you're talking to people who might not necessarily be engaged, use existing infrastructure, respect local knowledge, don't assume that one community speaks for another and face to face engagement is important.

10

Still questions were to how much consensus is enough and is a referendum a good idea or not. Good. So jurors who were not a part of that discussion, it makes sense? Is there anything in that that stands out for you?

15 JUROR: No, it's clear as mud.

MS WALKLEY: Clear as mud. Can I put that in here? Okay, so how about we hear from Corina which is going to be 10 minutes of you looking over my shoulder or maybe another juror would like to sit and then we go to really working out what it is we want to have in this final document conversation with witnesses. How does that sound? Are you ready? Corina is available on the phone if we want to call her. Can you (indistinct) she's currently in Brisbane and here's these strangers watching her. Okay, she's doing an online stream people. Excuse me. I'm going to turn it up.

25

I'm wondering if, I'm trying to think what might be the best thing to do so we can't hear. I could hear her when we were in the other room when we didn't have the background (indistinct) okay.

30 JUROR: Can someone type it up very quickly and give us a piece of paper?

MS WALKLEY: It's 10 minutes long. I've listened to it. Can I, what I'm going to do in the meantime and I'm very conscious here I am the facilitator, I am not speaking with Corina's voice well and truly. I would tell you my summary of what I heard when I listened to this last night that it's very limited. It's not meant to replace you hearing her. To say to I've spoken to Corina on the phone. I've spoken with her three times and I've met with her face to face (indistinct) and I can summarise, I think, in as I know this is not your presentation but if you hear something and Harry can do the same, what she says is that she speaks for her people. She speaks for her father, Yami Lester, and the rest of her family.

45 She speaks to the impact of the British nuclear testing, the direct impact on her family, the impact on her community. She is absolutely opposed to a nuclear waste facility. She spends sometime talking about that and she also says the

process, any process of consultation should not be rushed, should be done in a way that people can understand, that things should be described in a way that people can respond to and that people need to be heard.

5 JUROR: Did she mention anything about how to approach the indigenous community? How (indistinct) information to them?

MS WALKLEY: I saw this last night on this very reluctant (indistinct) because it's not my voice. I think I'll leave it there because I don't want to speak (indistinct) thank you. Okay. So Corina Lester is the daughter of Yami Lester who was directly impacted by the Maralinga British nuclear testing. She is a representative of her people. She is also an activist.

JUROR: What are her (indistinct)
15

MS WALKLEY: Let me get my pronunciation correct here.

JUROR: Because there are many, many - - -

20 MS WALKLEY: Pardon?

JUROR: That's not Mrs - - -

JUROR: It's not evident.

25 JUROR: No, I know.

MS WALKLEY: Let me get my correct - as you saw on the witness list, let me just - excuse me, people, because I want to get my pronunciation - especially with Enice here, who's going to tell me if I'm right or wrong.

MS MARSH: Yankunytjatjara.

MS WALKLEY: Thank you. Yankunytjatjara - - -
35

MS MARSH: Yankunytjatjara, yes.

MS WALKLEY: - - - Native Title Aboriginal Corporation. She is the chair, but when I spoke with her and when she speaks here, she said, "I am speaking as the chair," but she mostly said, "I'm speaking as the daughter of Yami Lester."
40

JUROR: Right. Okay.

45 MS WALKLEY: So she said, yes, that might be the formal position - - -

JUROR: She's talking about personal experience.

MS WALKLEY: - - - but that's not what she (indistinct)

5

JUROR: So she's talking about her personal experience.

MS WALKLEY: She is speaking about her personal experience.

10 JUROR: Right.

MS WALKLEY: So now that we know that we are going to have the chance after we've confirmed that she's happy to be on the big screen, would our jurors like to come and sit back down, take a breath, and then we're going to go to live stream. Okay. So after that lovely technical interlude, can I just say thank you, jurors, for being happy to come and stand. Yes, it says a lot about your commitment to this process.

20 Given what you've seen about what you - and you heard what your previous jurors discussed and documented, what other questions might you have or comments you might have of the witnesses in order that we can then, by the end of this session, have an agreed document that you are comfortable with? We're going to live streaming, people. Okay. Corina is very happy to be broadcast on the big screen. She's a brave woman. Okay. Fantastic. Okay.
25 So what questions - Juror?

JUROR: I have a question. It always seems to me that in our community there are lots of differences in opinions between different ages, different sexes, and I would like us to somehow or other make some attempt to get some idea of the various opinions of people in different age groups of men, different age groups of women, so that we've got a real consensus of community, because mostly we only hear from people like me with a loud voice. So it always seems to me that's (indistinct) hear from everyone.

35 MS WALKLEY: Okay. So we're at the point of asking questions and jurors answering those questions. So is there anything you want to add to the listing recommendations, or do you have confidence in or have questions based on what Juror has said here?

40 JUROR: Enice, you are representing all of the Adnyamathanha people. Is that correct?

MS MARSH: Because I'm an elder I am classed as a leader as well.

45 JUROR: Yes.

MS MARSH: Yes. So I am speaking for Adnyamathanha people.

JUROR: So you've had consultation with the rest of the elders there?

5

MS MARSH: Yes, and with the native title group, the native title which is the Adnyamathanha Traditional Lands Association, and they oppose the radioactive waste dump on Adnyamathanha land as well. So I am comfortably speaking on behalf of the camp mob and of the Adnyamathanha Nation.

10

JUROR: Okay. Thank you. So we could not get consensus then from the landowners. That would be a bottom line, wouldn't it? If they are 100 per cent opposing this, the rightful owners to the land will not allow it. Is that correct?

15 MS MARSH: That's right.

JUROR: That's right. There are (indistinct) information (indistinct) that in the land and (indistinct) so (indistinct) one nation and there are others as well and they will speak for themselves, I imagine.

20

MS MARSH: The Adnyamathanha people aren't the only ones (indistinct) waste dump on their site - - -

JUROR: The proposals on their land.

25

JUROR: The proposals on - - -

MS MARSH: - - - in their life on their land. Yes.

30 JUROR: The commonwealth proposal.

MS MARSH: Yes.

JUROR: Okay. Thank you.

35

JUROR: Commonwealth.

JUROR: The commonwealth.

40 JUROR: Here we go again.

JUROR: (indistinct) such that has to do with federally-passed law to have a waste dump in.

45 JUROR: Yes, because the legislation has to be changed.

JUROR: Can I ask Enice, I don't know how much conversation you have with other tribes, would there be a consensus among the Aboriginal people that maybe a waste dump shouldn't be on any of the land or - - -

5

MS MARSH: Aboriginal law is that we cannot speak for another man.

JUROR: Fair enough.

10 MS MARSH: We can only speak for our own land.

JUROR: No.

MS MARSH: (indistinct) that.

15 JUROR: That's just a question.

MS WOOLFORD: Perhaps this lady here who's on the - that gentleman could give us some idea about what they know is the opinions of other people (indistinct)

20 JUROR: We would respect other people (indistinct) there. You won't speak for other nations, but perhaps Parry can speak. Is there a general consensus or view from the different nations as opposed to only Adnyamathanha?

25 MR AGIUS: Well, one of the questions about this place is seeking (indistinct) right, and one of the tools to go and get that (indistinct) where, and the time they're going to have it (indistinct) so that's going to be part of (indistinct) they can recognise that there are Aboriginal groups from different locations throughout South Australia and they will all need to be asked to make a contribution to it from their perspective and they're traditional people.

30 So in this case, the Adnyamathanha people are making a statement. Another (indistinct) might make another statement because you might be seen as another side, but until that is (indistinct) attempts to go and talk to them we won't know that. We know that a judgment for people is standing up and making a statement because some (indistinct) comment from another point of view is coming and saying (indistinct) something is going to happen on your land and (indistinct) is responding to it. That's what we're doing.

35 40

MS WALKLEY: Thank you. In terms of the sound, we're going to ask that - it's a bit quieter there. John and Parry, can you feel comfortable in moving even closer in? Just to be very clear again, Enice is speaking about her experience as a leader - - -

45

JUROR: Yes. I understand that.

MS WALKLEY: - - - in her community in a commonwealth process which has been going on - how long has that been going on for, Enice?

5

MS MARSH: I think since about October last year. John, do you remember?

MR: The process itself has been running for a while, but the site selection has sort of narrowed down in the last nine (indistinct)

10

MS WALKLEY: And so the previous group of jurors was hearing Enice's experience. Enice described some things that had been actually positive in that experience, which were about how the consultation had gone with support from John and those things that Enice had said were effective or positive, your fellow jurors put in to their report here. To an extent, which because there was the comment – and I wonder Enice, where maybe this is a good opportunity for you to say again the things that you said were effective about being able to do things in language to feel respected, maybe to share those now and jurors may want some of those things to be added in to this report or not. So the things that may – knowing the whole process may not be supported by you but what were the things that did work within the process that the South Australian experience (indistinct)

15

20

MS MARSH: Yes, thank you for that. I think it all started with the Royal Commission in to the Nuclear Fuel Cycle and of course, you know when you hear anything that – of interest that happens which I've always been interested in the nuclear industry, of course I've got myself along there, being a nosey parker to see what was happening. And then I found out that the Royal Commissioner was presenting it in the – doing a presentation in a way that I couldn't understand it because it was above me and I voiced my opinion to Commissioner Scarce and said to him that is it possible for you to simplify your presentation and sort of make it easier for people at a community level, like myself, to be able to follow and understand this. But of course, this didn't happen because you know, time doesn't allow some of the things to happen, to take place. But then I went to a couple of sessions with John sitting here next to me, and John – I thought John was absolutely wonderful, he was very understanding and he – very helpful and in the end he – he was even willing to go one on one, after the session had finished, to talk to me about different issues. And I really appreciated that and I didn't know John was going to be here because I had already put his name on my paper, so sorry about that John.

25

30

35

40

And so – and then the final announcement came. We knew at one stage that there was six nominated sites in South Australia but then the final announcement came in the early hours of - some time in April, I forget when it was. And I got a message from the media at 2.30 in the morning to say that the

45

nuclear waste dump had been narrowed down to one site. From six sites yesterday, it had been narrowed down to one site which will now be on Adnyamanthanha land, Wallerberdina Road, Barndioota on Adnyamathanha land. I was absolutely shattered. Like anyone would who was getting a phone
5 call at 2 o'clock in the morning – half past two in the morning to tell you this kind of news that you'd been opposing for months and months anyway. And my reaction was I felt as though I'd been struck a blow to the back of the head by an axe. That's just how I felt. I was absolutely shattered. And throughout the morning, I tried to collect myself to get my life in order, to try – at 6.30, I
10 sat down at the table to try and eat my breakfast but I was bombarded by phone calls from the media asking me questions about how I felt about this. Well, I was a mess but I had to get myself together to do – do some kind of report, which I did.

15 And then of course I had family members too ringing me and calling me, what are we going to do? Shall we meet? You know, how can we stop this, and so on and so on. So it's been a really experiencing task, it's been a terrible task and it is a task that we're still living with today and the answer at this stage, to this day, is no. We don't want this radioactive waste dumped on our sacred
20 land. And we called this land (indistinct) means (indistinct) is spiritual land. We believe that our spiritual people are still walking with us when we go there for picnics and go camping there. And then the other thing we describe the land is that Moondayata. When we say Moondayata, it's sacred land, it's secret land. Be careful how you go there and treat the land and that is our
25 custom, it's in our culture, that is our custom and we say no to the radioactive waste.

MS WALKLEY: Enice are you okay if I ask for (indistinct) questions from – okay, so the jurors who are new, what the previous jurors said is that the best
30 consultation won't be rushed or pushed and this must be clear to people from the start. Is there anything that Enice has provided there in her evidence that means that you would like to add or change that statement?

JUROR: Well, should the first round of consultation, prior to going any
35 further, be with the actual Native Title owners of any of the sites and give them the information and whatever they need to make a decision about whether it goes any further from that point. Because the respecting – you know, the native land owners is one of the things that's paramount that's in that report. It forms part of that report, so prior to going to the mainstream of society,
40 shouldn't it be put out to these community leaders in a format that they can use and talk to their people about, prior to going any further and - - -

MS WALKLEY: Juror, I'm going to ask – I saw Parry was here. Parry, and also John maybe, because we heard earlier about some of the consultation
45 that's already underway - - -

JUROR: Yes.

5 MS WALKLEY: - - - including with Aboriginal communities, so I wonder if juror and – if juror has – juror could just restate for Parry and for John and then if other jurors want to chip in, of course you’ll do that. So would you like to - -

10 JUROR: Yes, my suggestion was that prior to going, as a broad base discussion pamphlet, campaign whatever you like to call it, information campaign to the broader Australia, should we be going to – firstly to the native owners of all the prospective land in a way that they can understand what we’re talking about to gain their consent to even discuss it any further, prior to going to the general public, so to speak. That is - - -

15

MR AGIUS: I suppose one way to think about it is this is the South Australian process and everybody needs to be part of the process.

JUROR: Okay.

20

MR AGIUS: And the state government, through the agencies has got a plan to go out.

JUROR: Okay.

25

30 MR AGIUS: And part of that plan includes the Aboriginal communities and the Aboriginal leaders and the Aboriginal organisations and the traditional owner groups. So that process will be running out concurrently. The question would be the amount of time it’s going to be out there, the amount of information that’s going to be out there, the amount of information that’s going to be out there, access to information, the stuff that John talked about this morning when he did the opening speech here about what’s going to happen and those sorts of things. So my point of view, it’s a South Australian process, we’re all part of it and there will be different parts that will be focussed on

35 Aboriginal matters for Aboriginal people to have a say about it.

JUROR: Yes.

MR AGIUS: And that will then be fed back in to our overall process.

40

MS WALKLEY: Thank you. I just want to – do you want to add anything juror? Excuse me, juror, does juror anything to add?

45 JOHN: With the consultation and response agency and I was also the regional engagement manager for the (indistinct) Royal Commission. I think the only

thing that I would like to add to what Parry has said is that the agency quite deliberately is approaching this as a state-wide consultation. We respect that Aboriginal people have quite unique rights and interests and perspectives but at the same time we value them as members of our overall community so we
5 don't want to have (indistinct) focus just on one type of group. As I said we also take into account how we access people in remote areas, how those leaders of different organisations to get behind the views as we've had the opportunity to hear from his today (indistinct)

10 MS WALKLEY: I think Juror would like to add something. We then had juror and then I'm trying to capture this in a phrase that I need to check with jurors.

MR PARRY: This is your process. You (indistinct) this information back to
15 the premier so if you think that it needs to be reconsidered, by all means make your statements (indistinct) the agency has got one process, one way of thinking based on previous experiences and that's fantastic but you've had witnesses here from the locations where communities are and so that needs to be considered in your respective so I suggest that you think about that as well
20 (indistinct) give to the premier tomorrow your deliberations about what consent is.

MS WALKLEY: Thanks, juror. So juror and then if any other jurors - - -

25 JUROR: I don't know whether it's a simple or complicated question. Are there any maps of the actual areas of Aboriginal people and are there any maps which show where Uranium is in those areas because that is something which combined both sorts of information and I just wondered if that sort of map, those sorts of maps were available for us to look at.

30 MR PARRY: I can answer both those questions. In relation to the mining I will get John to talk about that. The Aboriginal (indistinct) groups in South Australia, there are maps and they're also under the Native Title Act (indistinct) brought in 1994 that actually ask the Aboriginal groups to show to
35 the court who you are, where you are, what your rights are, what your activities are, what your cultural background is, all that sort of thing the act said you identify, here you are if you want to (indistinct) and in South Australia the South Australian communities through the state government and through the peak bodies were able to come to an agreement in the court system about
40 people's country.

So the (indistinct) people they said to the court we are who we are, we have a set of rights in this country, we have a set of our culture is still strong and reliable and so those, and also this is our map and so that map is available for
45 everybody to look at.

JUROR: So that's really about everyone, available for anybody who wants to look it up?

5 MS WALKLEY: I'm conscious that we have, I believe, 13 minutes left. That was in the previous session I think and it's only just gone. I believe we have 13 minutes left for this session. I know, can I just check who else might like to have, to say something or ask a question so we can make sure that everyone has the opportunity because we need to leave time at the end for jurors to make
10 sure you're happy with how this is documented. Have I missed someone or is Juror the next person? So Juror and then Juror?

JUROR: I would like another question.

15 MS WALKLEY: And Juror and to put it to you that we do have witnesses here who are able to speak for remote communities which are not Aboriginal communities, witnesses that are able to speak to engagement and consultation with young people and with Gill, engagement and consultation with people in their local communities who might not normally be engaged in other
20 engagement processes. I'm going to go to the jurors, we're going to hear from all of the jurors first and then we can go - - -

JUROR: Enice, you can probably answer this one quickly. I just wanted to know what, so we can learn from your experience, what level of consultation
25 did you have from the Commonwealth government and learning from that they obviously didn't (indistinct) were there community meetings in your area?

MS MARSH: Yes.

30 JUROR: Thank you.

MS WALKLEY: Thank you. Juror?

JUROR: Yes, mine was actually very similar, yes. Once you found out and
35 Mr Parry as well maybe, once you found out the location of the site, was there any consultation between the location of the site and the (indistinct) sent out?

MS WALKLEY: John?

40 MR JOHN: The only thing that the report recommends is the fact that there was a commonwealth process. What the report contemplates is much broader than what the commonwealth is looking at so the commonwealth is just citing it's one location (indistinct) that's generated from within Australia. The Royal Commission report is looking at the whole of the nuclear (indistinct) South
45 Australia so there is literally no relationship other than the mention of report

names of the commonwealth process between the two processes. They run completely independent. They have routinely been interrelated by those people who live out in those areas so there has been an issue with people not, finding it difficult to differentiate between the two.

5

MS WALKLEY: So in my role as a facilitator I really need to make sure that jurors have heard and appreciated that that is two different processes, two different issues which inform, experience and feelings about the issues but there is a commonwealth process, it's been underway for a long time which has had an impact which has been described and there is a state process which you, jurors, are right at the start of.

JUROR: That was my question.

15 MS WALKLEY: Juror?

JUROR: One of the things that (indistinct) about the whole process is the lack of knowledge about radiation in our community, the actual, actual knowledge and so therefore it seems to me that knowledge of the radiation, about radiation is important (indistinct) to have before they can make an informed decision about any of these things. You must have talked about that in previous sessions because it seems to me that the media and all of this must be responsible for getting some factual knowledge about radiation out to the community before we really seek their input into a decision. You can't talk about something you don't know anything about and that's - - -

MS WALKLEY: Can I check with jurors now and this is only jurors, I have been hearing your comments and your questions. I have documented two additional phrases to what the previous group came up with and I'm going to ask you if you are happy and this is what you want to go in your final reports. The point that juror just made here, you had the topic and it's important because. Then there's a sentence that this be education, engagement and consent is important because we can be factual and unbiased using scientifically proven information but include emotions and feelings and the bit I'm hearing is to help people make informed decisions. That wasn't documented from the previous group.

My memory was there was an in order to make informed decision. Do you want that bit added in to pick up from juror's point that the facts, the previous group also said emotions and feelings and then the additional bit is to help people make informed decisions. Jurors, are you comfortable with that?

JUROR: Yes.

45 MS WALKLEY: Is it yours jurors? Do you own it? Then the other bit is

following on from Enice's evidence, Parry and John's contribution and the questions that jurors asked. In the bit of your report it says we have confidence in, there was a sentence which said the best consultation won't be rushed or pushed and this must be clear to people from the start. Hearing your questions
5 on the evidence and your comments I have put in or you, the best consultation must be (indistinct) what works for the people being consulted.

JUROR: Yes.

10 MS WALKLEY: Jurors, yes?

JUROR: I have one question. I did the economics session before and it's patently obvious that it cannot be a 20 or 30 year decision if we're going to get the (indistinct) that they're talking about getting (indistinct) because other
15 countries are also looking at doing what we're looking at.

MS WALKLEY: So it's going to be more rushed, you're saying.

JUROR: No. I'm just saying you've got to be a bit careful about time frames, not sort of things that you talk about the next 50 years, or the next 20 years, because by then prospective people who are going to use the facility will have to own it.

MS WALKLEY: On the bit adding the consultation that works or the people
25 being consulted?

JUROR: Yes.

MS WALKLEY: You're happy for that?
30

JUROR: Mm.

MS WALKLEY: How do you feel?

35 JUROR: Can you read it out again?

MS WALKLEY: Yes. So the sentence says - or do you want to come and have a look, come and look over my shoulder? Anyone else?

40 JUROR: Am I the only one who wants to hear it again, or - - -

JUROR: No. You can say it in a loud voice.

JUROR: Yes.
45

JUROR: Yes. We all want to hear it.

MS WALKLEY: Yes. Okay. So under the heading in your report, We Have
Confidence In, "The best consultation must be what works for people being
5 consulted, won't be rushed or pushed, and this must be clear to people from the
start." Alternatively, you could write, "The best consultation must be what
doesn't work for people, can be rushed and pushed, and shouldn't be clear from
the start." Sorry, but sometimes, like - would you like to have another look?
Anyone?

10

JUROR: I just need a process, that's all.

MS WALKLEY: Yes.

15 JUROR: (indistinct) up there on the - - -

MS WALKLEY: Come and have a look and while reading - it might be a
good thing for all jurors to do. This is going to be going up on the screen.
They're going to be able to have another look at it and all your jurors will be
20 having a look at that with you. So all I added is that bit in yellow.

JUROR: Does it have anywhere in there - I can't remember - about
consultation with the native title holders? I think that was the first point that
was raised here and I think perhaps we actually specifically need to put
25 something in about that.

MS WALKLEY: Do other jurors - - -

JUROR: Does anyone think that that's - - -
30

JUROR: Sorry, I didn't hear what you said.

JUROR: I said that I don't know that we've got anything specifically in there
about consulting with the native title owners or (indistinct)

35

JUROR: I think (indistinct) the appropriate people or something or other, that
should cover - - -

JUROR: That covers it.
40

JUROR: Okay.

JUROR: I don't know (indistinct) I would like if we could put it as a headline.
We need to consult the Aboriginal people. I understand better today that there
45 is different nation groups and I need to go and consult every nation group. I

understand the need to be using an easy language and we need to do it in their own language, to use interpreters. That's my understanding, and also to consult the remote areas.

5 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: Yes. Actually - - -

10 JUROR: Like an Aboriginal consultation headline, I think, also to consult the remote areas, but also the language that we need to use to communicate to transfer this information needs to be easy, needs to be oral. That's my learning from today, and I also need to consult the remote areas.

15 JUROR: Can I just ask one question, that is probably dumb, but this nuclear waste dump for South Australia, is it an ethical question or an economic question? Why are we wanting it? Are we wanting it for ethics because somebody has to bury the waste where it's safest - - -

20 JUROR: Well, if you read the - - -

JUROR: - - - or are we wanting it - - -

JUROR: No.

25 JUROR: - - - to make money?

JUROR: You read the report, it's all about the - - -

30 JUROR: No. It is money.

JUROR: It's all about money.

JUROR: Okay.

35 JUROR: Yes. It states when it recommends it that it's the only economically viable prospect and it can generate a good - in the nuclear field.

40 MS WALKLEY: We now have two minutes. When I say "we", I mean you, jurors, have two minutes. Here is your report as it stands at the moment. The previous group's report, you having had a look and made some additions, would you all like to come and have a look and see how you feel about it, because at the end of this session it will be saved, it will be send upstairs, apparently electronically, and then produced and turned around into something that you can have a look at after lunch.

45

JUROR: Just offer your best consultation should - I can't remember exactly the---

MS WALKLEY: Yes.

5

JUROR: That should also have, like, a subclause that especially whoever owns the land wherever it may end up, they should be first and foremost the - wherever the land is chosen, the people of the land should be happy before the next part of that consultation goes ahead.

10

MS WALKLEY: I'm thinking about what we know is in the Royal Commission report, which talks about a general social consent and then a consent if given for a site.

15

JUROR: Mm'hm.

MS WALKLEY: So there is information in the Royal Commission report about that, that there are two levels of potential consent or not. You could refer to that section in the Royal Commission report, or the words we could put here are about both the state and the site, or what are the words that would work best there, jurors?

20

JUROR: Traditional owners or rightful owners or - - -

25

JUROR: Landowners.

JUROR: Landowners in general.

30

MS WALKLEY: That would cover - - -

JUROR: Traditional and/or - I don't know.

JUROR: Or non-traditional landowners.

35

JUROR: Traditional or non-traditional landowners.

JUROR: (indistinct) that you have to say in the time frame (indistinct) time. I think that we have to sort of include some time sequence, even if we said within a workable time frame or a workable period of time, something like that, because this could just go on forever and ever and ever and never be solved if you have it so that it can be talked about forever. So I think you'd have to set some sort of a time frame because it is a decision we can make, yes or no, in the community. Whether the no decision or the yes decision, it has to be made so that it becomes economically (indistinct) the report is about economics and economically possible.

45

MS WALKLEY: What do other jurors think about that? So at the moment it reads, "The best consultation must be what works for the people being consulted with traditional and other landowners" - we need to fix the language here, but - "won't be rushed or pushed, and this must be clear to people from the start." Juror is suggesting that there should be some indication that it is still within a time frame.

JUROR: So the report suggested when we're talking social concerns then there should not be any time frame. Community members need to have time to process, digest all this information and it is not an easy process. And also the report mentioned about how they were successful in other countries when they were consulting the people and there is no time frame, sorry to disagree, which my understanding - - -

JUROR: That's fine. I mean, I'm happy for anybody to disagree with me, but I just feel (indistinct)

JUROR: Well, I follow what the report said and also, it is not an easy process when we consult people.

JUROR: No, I know.

JUROR: And we should not have a time frame, so - - -

MS WALKLEY: Can I ceremoniously hand over my laptop to our lead jurors?

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS WALKLEY: May I hand it right back, and perhaps this is the time for jurors to gather together to have a look at what's here, because once you say you're happy with what's here, this is what we'll save and we'll send to go into the report that you have a look at as a whole group after lunch. You'll have a chance to explain to your fellow jurors and for people to make some decisions on the contents. Can I ceremoniously hand over?

JUROR: Certainly.

MS WALKLEY: I did wipe the keyboard earlier. It's a touch screen, so you can scroll. Over to Juror. Jurors want to gather round and have a look at your report?

JUROR: Sorry, but I need to say it again. I personally believe we need to mention to consult the Aborigines as to how we're going to consult (indistinct)

consult the other nation. Sorry I need to say again, but - - -

MS WALKLEY: So where are we going to fit that in (indistinct) no.

5 JUROR: (indistinct) traditional way, rightful owners (indistinct)

JUROR: Yes, but if we could explain it a little bit more (indistinct)

MS WALKLEY: I think we can go right into that, but we can say consult - - -
10

JUROR: I think we can say traditional owners. That includes all (indistinct)

JUROR: Whoever is rightful today (indistinct)

15 MS WALKLEY: Okay. So where do we want that bit?

JUROR: So it was just under here, this one here. "The best consultation must be what works for the rightful- - -"

20 MS WALKLEY: "People making" - - - we sound like a politician.

JUROR: Perhaps (indistinct) or - - -

JUROR: In my experience - - -
25

MS WALKLEY: Okay.

ADJOURNED **[1.19 PM]**

30 **RESUMED** **[3.36 PM]**

MS JENKE: Do we have everybody back? It feels like we've lost people but I think I've put more chairs in. I'm having problems today. Do you want me to hold it? Okay, I'll hold one. Well done guys. Varying levels of quality, no
35 I'm only joking. Fantastic job so we've asked a massive amount of you today. Who's got a fried brain? Starting to fry off, yes? Beautiful. That's the goal. What we've done in the break I've been frantically busy trying to, I might just ask all the back people, can you come and sit in these chairs because they're making me, bothering me because they're empty. Come and join the circle.
40 Come and join in. You want them free?

Red lanyards from juror onward, so black lanyard people could you take a new view point so we're going to do an activity and we've worked out a way to keep the red lanyards out of it. Come on, jurors. In the circle. Come into the
45 circle. The circle of love. So what's happening as we speak is that the four

word documents that we've created have been sent off to the graphic designer to pop into a template so you can see them. She's busily doing that but what we need to do is have a look at this piece of work so there are four pages and my approach for this is simple in that I would like whoever has been nominated
5 to talk to the document to give us a bit of a run through on what they came up with, okay.

It looks like the economics one is up first and where is the juror? There he is. Okay, now the bit at the top's not meant to be on there but anyway.

10 JUROR: In our group we basically talked about how the economic obviously benefits and risks but we talked about how there's both a possibility of it being a success in the end and also not a success because in the economic group all the experts, one was disagreeing, one was agreeing with whether it's possible
15 or not. In there we talk about how there is a potential, key word potential to provide a significant income to South Australia however there's too many risks and uncertainty at the moment and we think that potentially further research is possible and that further research will cost more but, you know, in the end if it is followed and if it's followed through and if it's successful then it could
20 provide a significant income for South Australia.

That's essentially the gist of the whole economic one because we don't have enough to just say yes or no at this stage. That's pretty much it.

25 MS JENKE: (indistinct)

JUROR: Okay, so if anyone has any thoughts.

MS JENKE: Do you want to read it?

30 JUROR: Yes, sure. I can read it. "The Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission report recommends a nuclear fuel storage facility to be implemented in South Australia. This facility has the potential to provide a significant income for South Australia. There are risks and uncertainties with this endeavour that still
35 requires more research. This research requires further financial commitment by South Australia. Until this further research determines that the risks are acceptable, this project will remain at a preliminary stage.

40 There is the possibility that further research may determine that this project is not viable however there is equally a chance that this project will be viable in the future and provide a significant income for South Australia. As a jury there was a very diverse range of views. Some felt uncertain that there was sufficient detail in the economic modelling to feel comfortable progressing to the next step, which is changing legislation to enable further study."
45

MS JENKE: Can you scroll down?

JUROR: "There are many questions still unanswered by the Royal Commission report, these include what benefit can be made available to South Australia now and in future generations, how can we be sure that the economic analysis completed by the Royal Commission is robust. How will the South Australia brand or external reputation be affected? What reliance is there on other countries to pre-commit to storing high level nuclear waste at a fixed price? How will the benefits be realised and how will the wealth be distributed? Many of the citizens' jury members are still uncertain in the economic assumptions made by the Royal Commission. The general feeling is that whilst this is a first step, there are many more questions that must be answered before we'll be comfortable progressing to the next phase. Over the next few years there is a real opportunity for South Australians to increase their knowledge in the nuclear fuel cycle, including South Australia's current participation and to better understand the potential benefits and risks.

The jury suggests reading Appendix J, page 290 "Analysis of Viability and Economic Impacts". If there is further interest, read chapter 5, page 73, "Management, Storage and Disposal of Nuclear and Radioactive Waste". What does everyone need to discuss?

MS JENKE: I think that's it. Juror, that's - - -

JUROR: No worries.

MS JENKE: - - - where we kind of left with the document – with the – that's not meant to be there. I was meant to cut and paste that bit.

JUROR: No worries.

MS JENKE: Okay. So there are a number of questions there that we can have a look at tomorrow but in general I'm interested in what you think about that and how we're going to do this is the "I can live with it" activity. So this line, this line, this line is the "I can live with it". "Sorry, I can't live with it." Okay. Given what juror's just read to you, where do you stand on the line. Before you move. The red lanyard people need to be here. Okay, this is very – this is very – you know, we're very clever. So red lanyard people need to be there. We want you to be a part of it. We were thinking of dropping and rolling on the floor but. Okay, so "I can live with it" and "I can't live with it" – let's – we'll talk in a minute, let's go. Can we do page 1 and page 2? Can you put it on to one page? Okay, so go back to first page. Okay. Can you live with it? "I can live with it" and I'm here, and "I can't live with it" I'm over here. There's always one. Okay, we've got to – were you not in the room then?

45

JUROR: No (indistinct)

5 MS JENKE: That's all right. Okay. Take a look – there's a couple on the line. It could be edited. Okay, let's not get distracted by the editing because as you know, we've had a really challenging little while to come up with that. All right. Okay, sort of can live with it, sort of can't.

JUROR: Why? Because there's still lots of questions I want to ask.

10 MS JENKE: Okay. So it was a theme running through this economics thing about lots of questions. Are you comfortable to be there? I can't kind of nudge you over – hip and shoulder you over the line? Okay. Right.

15 JUROR: The scepticism which I thought I'd been put to the back of my mind has come forward a little bit and – and yet I'm hoping that it will be overcome by that side.

20 MS JENKE: Okay. So can you live with it? Can you say live with that? Going in, we might have another look at it tomorrow. Okay. All right. Can't live with it.

25 JUROR: It's the last sentence that (indistinct) feel comfortable progressing to the next step which is changing legislation to enable further study. Can't we study without changing legislation?

30 MS JENKE: So – okay, so the wording might not be clear but the understanding – who wants to tell us what they understand? Juror? Who wants to – where are you juror? You can talk, you've got a microphone. So about the legislation?

35 JUROR: That was with the – the fact that also you can't ask the other countries for how much they'd sell their uranium for. You can't actually – yes, it's illegal to ask other countries what actually would you sell me, you know your uranium for. So I think that was the issue there, or one of the issues.

40 MS JENKE: So the issue is that we can't actually start having those conversations until we change the legislation which lets us have those conversations. So until we do that, we are still in the unknown land. So what would help you live with it?

JUROR: Maybe I need to understand more about what the legislation is that's going to be changed.

45 JUROR: I just think study is a little too general, if that's the aspect to enable further study to – to me, if I was just the every man reading that I'd want more

clarification on what study is. Is that – is that digging holes to find – are we not allowed to further research? Or I mean if that’s specific to international conversations or so forth, is there – is there another way that we’re able to explain that?

5

MS JENKE: Okay. So a suggestion from someone? Is there a suggestion here? Juror?

JUROR: Could study be changed to analysis or economic analysis or project analysis?

MS JENKE: Or economic market research or market – it was about that. So it was not about digging holes, it was about being able to have conversations with other potential – with the potential market. If we clarified that, could you live with it?

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Okay. So I’m wondering whether we might just pull someone in, juror? A Royal Commissioner person to – juror, do you want to come?

JUROR: Emily, I’m not sure it’s exactly the same legislation that we were discussing in ours, section 13 allows public consultation of using state money for public consultation.

25

MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: Where the public consultation includes the ability to talk to somebody in Japan or South Korea about this question, would have to be clarified by somebody that knows the law as it’s currently written. But there was amendment made to the current law which doesn’t allow us to have a nuclear waste facility but does allow us to use public money in public consultation.

35 MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: Whether that includes overseas consultation as well as local. Because we’re part of the amendment. The reason we’re existing - - -

40 MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: - - - is because that amendment went through this year.

MS JENKE: Yes, okay. So I’m seeing a huddle, so juror, can you give us some clarity?

45

5 MADDs: The answer is, it's complex. So you're absolutely right that section
13 places some limitations around what public money can be spent on,
specifically in relation to a waste storage facility. You know, so that
legislation doesn't necessarily relate to other aspects of the
Royal Commissioner's report. Now it is, I guess, open to interpretation a little
bit, just like every bit of legislation in relation to what work can be undertaken
to support that community consultation and I think, you know, should we hear
out of today, a really strong theme about those questions that are needed to
10 inform other members of the community, a case could be made for that work
being undertaken now, to inform future community conversations. That's
something the government needs to take advice on from Crown and from other
legal experts to determine whether this sort of framework provides that scope
to undertake that further analysis.

15

JUROR: (indistinct)

MADDs: It is, and as I said, it's quite complex.

20 JUROR: Maybe the fact that we're mentioning legislation there is a problem,
so if we don't get caught in the words of - sorry, if we're not getting caught in
the words of exactly how further study and further investigation goes, right,
like is it legislation? Is it this? Is it that? If that sentence were to say
something more along the lines of the jury feels comfortable with getting more
25 information or doing more research, would that be enough? Okay. So let's
make it less technical and more - - -

JUROR: Hang on. Sorry. Can I just - and, please, anyone in my group,
clarify this for me. I think what we were saying there, from a legislation point
30 of view, is actually getting - or should I say, a better understanding of the
commitment from customers. Right? Understanding whether there was a
market there versus - so we can actually contact them or have them say that
they're going to pay for us to store their waste because of legislation. Am I
correct in saying that?

35

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: Is that what we were saying?

40 JUROR: That's right. What I heard from your group was there was a
conversation that happened around - there's lots of unknowns. We can't resolve
the unknowns until we're allowed to talk to other countries about this and that's
currently blocked by legislation. So just recognising that we can go a little bit
further, but at some - we actually need to unravel some things in order to get
45 the clarity we need. I think my comment in response to that would be I think

there's probably a sequencing dimension to that as well.

5 So what needs to come first in that process to be confident that talking to
potential partner nations - what needs to precede that, you know, and some
would argue that community consensus - as exactly what we're doing today -
around what our response to the Royal Commission's report is in the first
instance might be step number 1, and there might be a series of things you need
to do as part of that next body of work, next tranche of work. So I think, for
me, the answer a little bit lies in how you sequence these questions a little bit
10 and to when they may become more pertinent.

Okay. So I'm wondering if I've got a suggestion for you; entirely
inappropriate, but I'm going to have a go. So, "As a jury, there was a very
diverse range of views. Some felt uncertain that there were sufficient detail in
15 economic modelling to feel comfortable progressing to the next step," full stop.
Can you live with that? If you can live with that, go over there. Righto.
What's happened? Why did you move? You're not meant to be moving.

20 JUROR: I moved because if I was reading that, which I am now, I would like
some more information quantifying what the financial commitment by the state
would be to undertake the necessary research and what else would be impacted
by channelling funds in the direction of that research? What then would that be
taken away from?

25 JUROR: Okay. Someone from the group want to talk about that? We did talk
about that.

JUROR: What we discussed was we did learn about it in economics from the
witnesses. So they said, "You're looking at 300 to 600 million dollars in the
30 initial feasibility stage," but we didn't put it in there because it's not actually in
fact in the report. They're just making an assessment, and we were discussing
it and assuming that it's coming from taxpayers, it's not coming from the
international parties. Yes. So, yes, I guess I would've liked something like that
in there, but I don't know if we - - -

35 MS JENKE: So it's probably something that needs to come out in
consultation, but the group were uncomfortable in putting it in just because it
was not completely right and accurate (indistinct)

40 JUROR: Can we put that it's in the millions or not?

JUROR: Pardon? I - - -

45 JUROR: Can we put that it is hundreds of millions of dollars? It's not a
dollar.

JUROR: It was questioned within the group and we all agreed that there is taxpayer money being spent right now. We're part of that. Okay? So we know that. What we were saying is we want to understand what that
5 investment will be. Is it 300 million? Is it 600 million? How much is coming from the overseas investors to participate in that? How much is coming from the state. None of that's clear for us. So that's what we were trying to say. We need clarification on that spend. Yes.

10 JUROR: (indistinct) quantifying.

JUROR: Correct. Yes.

JUROR: But we don't have numbers.
15

JUROR: We don't have the numbers. So - - -

MS JENKE: Okay. Can you live with not having the numbers at this point? It could be something that the next jury does. Half of you can. Okay
20 (indistinct) why have you moved, Juror?

JUROR: Sorry.

JUROR: (indistinct) on me.
25

JUROR: Maybe I'm being a little picky. Can we scroll down to the last sentence? It talks about the next step. What's the next step? I think if you ask that of 10 people, you'll get 10 different answers. So just because it's that ambiguous, I'm a little bit concerned about that wording.

30 MS JENKE: Okay. Have you got any suggestion? "As a jury, there was a diverse range of views. Some felt uncertain that there was sufficient detail in the economic modelling to feel comfortable progressing to the next step," statement.

35 JUROR: It kind of goes to the motive of the question, right?

MS JENKE: Yes. Okay.

40 JUROR: So what is it that they're uncomfortable doing, right?

MS JENKE: Okay. "Some felt uncertain that there was sufficient detail in the economic modelling," full stop. There are many questions still unanswered. No?
45

JUROR: It would read clearer if some felt that there was insufficient detail in the economic modelling. It would read more clearly if you took out "uncertain" and made it "insufficient detail in the economic modelling".

5 MS JENKE: "Some felt that there was insufficient detail in the economic modelling to feel comfortable progressing to the next step." Okay. Are we living with it yet, Juror?

JUROR: What's the next step?

10

MS JENKE: So the next step is the questions. So you could make a link. So the next step, what the group might - because I was with this group all day and I think they were saying these are the questions that are the next step.

15 JUROR: It was suggested to remove the words "next step" to "the next consultation process."

MS JENKE: To "the next consultation phase".

20 JUROR: Phase, next stage of consultation.

MS JENKE: Next stage of consultation.

JUROR: Are you happy with that?

25

MS JENKE: Okay. Oh, my gosh. Stop. Look. Don't move anyone. Okay. We're living with it. We can have another look at this in the morning. All right. Let's have another look at it in the morning. We need to look at this with the whole document. You're flying blind, yes, to some extent. All right. So we're comfortable. Let's leave that for now. Juror, can we go to the next page, which is - - -

30

JUROR: Hang on a minute. Are they going to remove that "next step" to "the next" - what did we say?

35

MS JENKE: To "the next consultation phase".

JUROR: Phase.

40 MS JENKE: I'll do it. It's public. It's on the camera. "The next consultation phase". All right. So are we up to consent? Who's speaking for consent? Grab a seat. Who's our consent person? Okay, Juror, off you go.

JUROR: Okay. This was consent. To start off with, I just want to say it was quite difficult to design something to present to people on consensus, because

45

that's probably what we're trying to get out of doing this whole process. So we found ourselves going off target a lot of the time, but when we got steered back we had a few common things, which are up here. So the topic is important because it's a large commitment state-wide and the community opinion is valued. That was one thing we thought people needed to know. It is a huge commitment for South Australia. At the end, I can't remember who said it, but they said we want people to change their stance from apathy to engagement on this issue.

10 Number 2, what do we need to discuss and why? We need to discuss further how to educate the public and empower them. A lot of themes were education, as you can see from this. Educate the public on how they can be involved. The community needs to have access to information on the fuel cycle as part of the educational process. We need to have information available in multi
15 languages. The best consultation must be what works for the people being consulted, particularly Aboriginal landowners. It won't be rushed or pushed, and this must be clear to people from the start. However, we do need to be conscious that the economic opportunity is time sensitive. Any final decision must be transparent, clear and easy to understand to the average person.
20 Building trust is important. You can do this by going local. Make sure you're talking with people who might not necessary be engaged, use existing infrastructure, respect local knowledge, don't assume one community speaks for another and face to face engagement is important. Use interpreters and oral submissions and easy to understand language. We need to be inclusive with
25 the consultations.

The next line I think should have been deleted. Come down to three. So the questions that remain, how do we measure the consent and how would the decision be made. How long is the process going to take and when will a no answer be acceptable? I should say when or if and how can I be involved? That is it, I think. Those other things are just notes.

MS JENKE: That's it?

35 JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: Okay. So we'll take that bottom bit off just for the purposes of - - -

40 JUROR: Yes, we ran out of time so it's kind of - - -

MS JENKE: That's all right. We can have another look at it. So juror?

JUROR: The word "when" should be changed to "if" for that.
45

JUROR: Yes, that's what I just said, yes. We ran out of time so it's rough.

MS JENKE: So changing the word "when" to "if". How long is the process going to take and when will a yes or no answer be acceptable? Yes.

5

JUROR: Why is it time sensitive? Like if I'm reading this, why is it time sensitive? You need to be clearer.

MS JENKE: Scrolling up it talks about time sensitivity.

10

JUROR: I was just wondering on that why is it time sensitive, is there anything in the commission report that your group could reference to highlight that point? So if a community member is wondering why is it time sensitive you can say see, you know, chapter 2 point whatever and then they can read and understand.

15

JUROR: No, it didn't come from there it came from our second group. We had someone who had been to the economic group and they came and they said the economics are that the opportunity is soon. It's not going to be there forever so in terms of discussion and the fact that we were saying that we needed to be slow in the process and people needed to be heard so it needed to be a long, sort of, public consultation and the comment was made that it can't be 30, 40 years of consultation because then the economic opportunity for South Australia has gone. That's why we included that in there.

20

25

MS JENKE: Juror, can you help us here? Is there something about the time sensitivity in the report? It's in, I recall the commissioner talking about the economic opportunity is soon. Is that in the report somewhere? No.

30

JUROR: I don't believe there's anything about time sensitivity in the report. It's just that the changes that are occurring in the nuclear industry are happening quite quickly and it may be that there won't be any time by the time we decide to do this for any of it to be of any value to the community. I think we have to be aware of that, that's all.

35

MS GEORDAN: The report mentions that community or social and community, I should say social consent might become apparent within six to 18 months of a government undertaking a community consultation or engagement programme. What it then says is that once you've got that social consent, when the government believes that there is sufficient social consent to take further investigations, further steps, that you would then establish a rather long process of investigation with multiple investigations running in parallel so you'd start looking at technical site and criteria.

40

45

You'd start looking at communities that might be interested to participate in a

deeper learning process. You'd have deeper engagement with countries to talk about the prices that they might be willing to pay. All sorts of investigations that might take place over a decade or so.

5 MS JENKE: So there's nothing specifically that says the economic opportunity is time sensitive which is what the group has drafted?

MS GEORDAN: No.

10 MS JENKE: That's what we're looking for. Is there a reference in the report somewhere?

MS GEORDAN: That's 2030 that the commissioner has made an assessment or made the conservative assumption that there would be no new reactors built after 2030 so that it's just assessing the available market at the moment. In
15 terms of the economics of proceeding, it notes that there could be competition from other countries.

MS JENKE: Okay, all right. That was that. So let's have a look at this as a
20 group. Where do you land? I'm changing the scale so listen carefully. It's not hard. This side is I can live with it, okay. This side is I can't, all right. Off you go. Where are you? I can live with it, I can't live with it. So what's the key? Who wants to kick us off? We can't go through them all but what are key problems?

25 JUROR: I don't think it's written for the general public but in particular point number 2, most of those points down there are actually covered by John (indistinct) earlier about how the public was going to be educated, how they can be involved, the fact there will be multiple language coverage of this
30 particular stuff so to me some of that stuff is not questions to be asked but there's facts already given to us today.

MS JENKE: Okay, all right. Other problems? Who's got something to add?

35 JUROR: Only about the economic timing. I think it gives a sense that we're trying to rush it through or something so I don't think we need to mention that.

MS JENKE: Who has the timing, the economic thing? So if that had some work done on it - - -

40 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Yes, okay.

45 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Yes. So that time sensitive stuff is a pinch point so needs another look. What else needs another look? What else is worrying you?

5 JUROR: (indistinct) existing infrastructure.

(Reporter's note: momentary audio disruption)

10 MS JENKE: That line was deleted however we need to be conscious that the economic opportunity is time sensitive. Imagine that that line is deleted. Don't actually delete it. Imagine it's deleted. Can you live with it? Can you still live with it? Okay. So it's a significant pinch point but there's still some work to do on this one. Okay, let's have another look at this in the morning. Grab a seat and we'll go to the next one. We've got a bit of luxury of time, 15 which is lovely. Lovely, lovely thing. Okay. Juror, who's our trust person?

JUROR: Juror.

MS JENKE: Juror. We've got 20 minutes so we need to crack along.

20

JUROR: Okay. I'm just going to read it out. The topic is important because changes to legislation in relation to the nuclear fuel cycle will not proceed without community trust. The implementation of many recommendations cannot proceed without changes to existing legislation. Why do we need to 25 discuss this? The factors that promote trust or transparency needs to be built in to the design of any regulatory system thus referring to legislation in order for it to enjoy community trust and a belief in the integrity of that regulation system. And also we have a choice. We really discuss this a lot, we had longer sentences, shorter – longer descriptive sentences and we ended up saying we 30 have a choice. And then we need to decide as a state, whether we accept any moral or ethical obligations to the world as a major producer of uranium. Moral and ethical considerations are central to the ownership and integrity of whatever decision the people of our great state makes.

35 MS JENKE: Lovely.

JUROR: For example, the international principle that the society that generates the waste is responsible for managing it and in section 13 of the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility Prohibition Act 2000, currently prohibits public money from 40 being spent in the construction of a nuclear waste storage facility. We had some discussion in relation to that Act; it was changed in May for us to actually exist as we are now. To community consultation at pivotal points in any nuclear project should be identified as gateways for community decision making. These gateways must provide opportunities for community to provide 45 a deliberative process for the gate to remain open or be closed. This enables

the community to have a say in all aspects of the process and ensures that shifts in community sentiment are included and reflected in the project design. Any regulatory regime must have robust structures to reflect the values and priorities of our citizens. The community needs to discuss a system that is responsive to community concerns in a way that is transparent and accountable to the community. The community needs to discuss principles of independence that promote community confidence, accountability and safety. These specific measures for further discussion may include strong whistleblower protection, and initiatives designed to reflect diversity of our community in any monitoring, decision making body or watch dog - any decision making or watch dog body. And then the question was, that remained; the difference between low to medium Australian origin waste versus what we're discussing is international or high level international waste.

MS JENKE: Okay. Before we open it for questions, I'm going to ask you to jump up. Over there is "I can live with it", here is "I can't". Let's go. Okay, juror has a question.

JUROR: Can I just have some clarification on the international principles that society – on that example?

JUROR: Okay, the international principles, we had a discussion about that, in that it specifically states in the report that the community that generates the waste is responsible for the waste. Then - - -

JUROR: (indistinct)

JUROR: - - - Professor – what was his name, I can't remember. Professor Haydon Manning discussed what happened about 40 years ago in the seventies where a report in relation to the Ranger report, I think it was referenced, where it was stated in that report that as the producer of the product, we have a moral and ethical obligation to manage it. That's been as what Professor Haydon Manning said was kind of put to the side, ever since it was raised and tabled in that report and has not been referenced really moving forward. That's why we brought it in.

JUROR: So like saying that we should take the waste back because we sell the uranium?

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Just grab a mic, juror.

JUROR: My interpretation said that – of what he said was that it had been discussed as to whether or not we did have a moral obligation or an ethical

obligation, not that we did or that we didn't. So it's always been on the table and because it's been on the table then perhaps we do.

5 JUROR: I think that would just be digging ourselves a hole here, in that that could only be discussed on an international level.

MS JENKE: So what would help you live with it? What would help you live with it?

10 JUROR: We can't do it as a state or as Australia in changing something like that. Has to be international.

MS JENKE: Yes, okay. So you'd remove it to help you live with it?

15 JUROR: Yes, I was wondering whether just to change the word "principle" in that sentence?

MS JENKE: Okay. So there's a suggestion to change the word "principle" to?

20 JUROR: Because he did, he mentioned that there have been those discussions, like and assumptions. Yes, I'm - - -

MS JENKE: International assumptions, mm.

25 JUROR: Discussions.

MS JENKE: Discussions.

JUROR: The Royal Commission report uses that word, it says in the
30 Royal Commission report, "the international principle". They call it that.

JUROR: Okay.

35 MS JENKE: Okay. So that's a pinch point. Any other pinch points? What have you got? Juror, why can't you live with it?

JUROR: I think what it says is exact opposite of what people are trying to say. Surely the society that generates waste are the people with nuclear reactors, that produce the waste. We don't, it's Germany, France, Finland, whatever. If
40 this says what I think people want it to say is that the principle that society that produces uranium is responsible for managing nuclear waste.

JUROR: (indistinct) the principle in the Royal Commission report says "the
45 international principle is that the society that generates the waste from using the nuclear fuel in their nuclear reactor to generate electricity is responsible for

the waste from that nuclear reactor.”

JUROR: That’s not us.

5 JUROR: That’s not us.

JUROR: No, it’s not.

JUROR: So - - -

10

MS JENKE: That’s not us.

JUROR: (indistinct)

15 JUROR: The example - - -

MS JENKE: So Germany’s responsible for - - -

JUROR: Germany’s waste and Sweden’s responsible - - -

20

MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: - - - for Sweden’s and USA - - -

25 JUROR: No, but what we’re saying is this, (indistinct) had a choice, as a state we have a choice. One choice is we take either international principle, which is whoever generates the waste keeps it, or do we have a moral, ethical stance that says because we export a lot of uranium, should we in fact be involved in the nuclear fuel cycle and take the spent fuel rods back. That’s what we’re saying
30 is the choice.

JUROR: (indistinct)

35 JUROR: Yes. And then if – whatever one of those choices we decide, if we decide the yes choice, then we need to do something about section 13. So which covers the legislation part.

MS JENKE: Okay. So that needs a reword and change. Can I suggest - - -

40 JUROR: So it’s really the choice.

MS JENKE: Can I suggest that tomorrow when we have another look at it, that you’re part of that rewording. Okay. Problems down here are a bit wordy. Bit wordy and not sort of easy to understand. Some nods. You guys, nodding
45 on that. Yes, okay. So maybe needs a bit of finessing. Nothing else. Okay.

Another pinch point. What is it?

JUROR: We're talking about trust and the legislation got changed in May, and I didn't hear anything about it, and it was only done in 2000, 16 years ago. So we changed the legislation again, does it mean in another 10 years. Like what confidence do we have in legislative – confidence do we have in legislation because it changes?

MS JENKE: Yes, okay. All right. Okay. So this one needs a bit more work. Just remember we've got time, the ability to draft it. We're not handing to the premier in the next half an hour, which is a great thing. So I've just a message from Iain that we're actually able to print you a copy of this to take home tonight to have a look at and reflect upon and then when we come back tomorrow we're going to get it – slam it right. Okay. Yes.

JUROR: Is this supposed to be confidential, or can we discuss it with friends and family? This – the draft?

MS JENKE: It's being live-streamed at the moment, so go your hardest. Okay. Grab a seat. Let's do the last one, which is safety. Who's the safety guru? Now I've got 25 microphones. Who wants it? Safety? Okay.

JUROR: Sorry, I've been speaking too much in this. Right. We also ran out of time, so be gentle. So we were looking at safety and security. We've mainly got sort of bullet points. This is important because of the breadth of the consequences, so if something goes wrong it can go wrong far and wide; because of the potential human cost if something goes wrong. Someone will have to clarify what social dimension to risk. No, you don't remember. Juror, do you remember?

JUROR: It was raised in one of the sessions this morning that there is also a need to consider the social impact to any risks associated with the whole cycle and consequences. That was one of the things that I'd written down. It was one of the - - -

MS JENKE: Okay. It might need a bit of fleshing out. Yes.

JUROR: Sure. I think there might be some overlap between bits and pieces as well. The timescales. So we're talking about very long timescales, so, yes, safety becomes quite important there. Balancing safety with economic gains. Yes, at what point do the risks outweigh the potential benefits. The question of safety is fundamental to whether we actually proceed with this whole process. I'm sure that no one would disagree with the idea that if it's not safe we shouldn't do it.

Risks in context, so understanding what the risks are for the activities that are being discussed. There was a fair bit of discussion about things like Chernobyl and Fukushima and where the comparisons are valid and where they are not, which sort of informs the discussion about safety. Categories of risk, so again, sort of describing how risks are associated with the different processes, and importantly, the point of no return. So there's a point at which, when we've made a decision or we've started doing something, where we can't turn back. So that's quite important to look at.

So we recommend the community to discuss the following themes: geology and seismic stability, because it is important that a geographically stable area is selected for the potential site, specifically referencing finding 72 and appendix I; how international standards and a national regulator would work, particularly in light of failures that have happened here and abroad. So in our discussions we had people raising the point that things have gone wrong. So that needs to inform how a regulator is formed in Australia if we were to go ahead, and chapter 9, the findings marked up there, discuss that.

Environmental impacts, because the decisions made now to proceed or not to proceed will directly impact the environment beyond the lifetime of the people making the decisions. The report contains some information about environmental impacts, but further impacts could be explored. Flora and fauna were something that came up in our discussions, that that wasn't really something we could find in the report. Specific risks identified with each stage of the fuel cycle. So that was more something that we wanted to flesh out where we discuss what risks are involved with mining, refinement, power generation and storage, just so there's context.

The topic of human safety and impacts to health. So I think that's fair to say mainly how radiation impacts people. The security of the waste during transport and the security of storage facilities to minimise hazards and impacts on the environment and human health, so discussing things like terrorism or accidents, negligence, that sort of thing, and how the timelines and sequencing of events relate to safety or how safety is covered off in the plans that we have.

We still have questions about the timelines surrounding the research and site scoping. The cost of information gain, the cost of doing the geological surveys is that point. Yes. We're still a little bit uncertain about the consequences of disasters. In the meetings it was pretty clear that it's kind of hard to quantify that, so there is a lot of uncertainty there. We're also a little bit unsure, because there was no mention of, say, a war-type situation and what future threats might eventuate from us undertaking this activity.

MS JENKE: Okay. Right. So it probably needs a little bit more fleshing out, but in general, where are you thinking? So down that side is "I can live with it"

and this side is "I can't." So (indistinct) is "I cannot live with it." Okay. Juror, didn't you write it? Juror wrote it. Okay. Filled with confidence. Okay. Let's get some new voices. What's the pinch point?

5 JUROR: Just for me, it's, I guess, a bit incomplete to be happy with. There's a lot of discussion outside the dot points.

MS JENKE: Yes. Okay. So it needs some more work. If it had more work - we'll have another go. So lots of nods. Something new, something different.

10

JUROR: In this morning's discussion in the safety section, it was quite clear at times the actual amount of safety that was discussed, and yet most of that document talks about risks, you know, deaths and all that sort of thing. Well, if you remember back to last weekend, one of the actual experts told us how many deaths there had been in the nuclear industry over the last 20 or 30 years. Forgetting Chernobyl and Fukushima and Maralinga, which are not relevant at all to the discussions, there's been virtually none. So to me, that's against a lot of the stuff that was said this morning.

15

20 MS JENKE: Okay. So some stuff to work on. Juror?

JUROR: Just to respond to that, we did have a point in there about putting risks in context and that, I think, is a very important point from our group. Obviously the document is not complete. I'm not going to - - -

25

MS JENKE: So it might be worth fleshing that context out.

JUROR: Yes. I'm not going to stand here and pretend that's finished; it's not. You're quite right with that criticism.

30

MS JENKE: Okay. Juror.

JUROR: Just for me, it's about actually narrowing it down to storage, because that's in fact what we're talking about. Because you're asking for specific risks around mining, refinement, et cetera, but in fact we're talking about storage.

35

JUROR: We're talking about mining as well. We're talking about transportation as well.

40 MS JENKE: The whole fuel cycle. Okay. Right. Juror?

JUROR: Juror reflected a lot of my opinion actually. If we are supposed to be summarising the report, that's still a lot of questions and a lot of concern not really talking about the investigations that were made in regard to the safety issues, and I think out of the previous fortnight's weekend, safety seemed to be

45

one of the subjects and concerns that nearly every single one of us had. So I'd like to think that this is one of the most important things that we need to put across to every person.

5 MS JENKE: Okay.

JUROR: So I think it needs - - -

MS JENKE: All right. So it needs a bit more work.

10

JUROR: - - - a hell of a lot more clarification. Yes.

MS JENKE: At the moment (indistinct) economics people are going home tonight. Juror, did you have anything else? Okay. Sorry, Juror. Nice and close.

15

JUROR: I believe that - - -

MS JENKE: Closer.

20

JUROR: - - - any report on safety.

MS JENKE: Really close.

25 JUROR: I believe that any document on safety should include relative risk. In other words, cars, fires, terrorism so you can sort of look at it in perspective with the other things we live with our lives.

MS JENKE: Okay, all right. Good point. That one needs a bit more work but well done guys, as a you know, while you're looking at some of the things we currently live with make sure you look at, you know, other people who are really generally happy. Grab a seat. I think the team are just about to hit the print button so if you can wait 10 minutes we'll have a copy for you to take home. I'll put it on base camp as well so there's a little bit of tidying up that I need to do on the economics one because there was stuff there that didn't need to be there. Did you have a comment?

30

35

MR WALKER: So hopefully you get a sense this is the reason you do a rough draft. This is why it's not 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon and this is the night where you get homework. This is where we push back because as I sat there, I've pictured myself sitting in a café down the road thinking what are you telling me? Tie it back to Royal Commission report, tell me in plain English and you're a lot of the way there but you just kind of need to push that test, can I give it to anyone? I need you to apply that test because that's what this ties back to and you've done it - - -

40

45

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Yes, we can email it to you.

5

MR WALKER: And yes, it will go base camp live in 10, 15 minutes.

MS JENKE: Yes.

10 MR WALKER: That's really the test to apply as you look at that, can you give
this to whoever you're living with at home, can you give it to a neighbour and
you're part of the way there but keep applying that plain English test and as
you do think I sat there as a lay person and comments were made and I thought
15 I wonder if the Royal Commission says that or says the opposite. Tell me if
it's supportive or opposing. Either way is fine, just make that link and you
start to make that case compellingly. I hope you take away a strong sense of
you've actually started to prioritise really well. Use the time that you have
overnight to make those links and if you can come in having done one little
piece of homework you help all 50 people around the room.

20

JUROR: If we could put it in plain English, I'm not talking about for us and
we know how to read and write in English, I'm talking about this is for the
community, they need to be able to read what we're showing them. Plain,
plain English. Does some words there are very - - -

25

MR WALKER: I think what you just said, when we do go home you can
basically give it to your wife, husband or anything, read that without telling
them anything because just assume they haven't heard any of the stuff over the
last weekend, do they understand it and they go what the hell you talking about
30 there and you go all right, that doesn't make sense. They will be able to pick
up clearly what makes sense and what doesn't.

MS JENKE: Good idea. Test it. What we'll do, sorry Iain were you done?
Okay.

35

MR WALKER: I am done because you've accented on the point I wanted to
leave with. It's test it. It really has to be a lay reader who picks this up. Don't
assume and you're actually close having this working draft so use it and the
stress test we will apply is I'm going to sit there and look at you like a goof
40 half the day tomorrow, say is that in the report or not. Do you agree with it or
not. Are you saying the same or the opposite? You're half way there so look
at the parts where you get it right and reflect on the parts where your partner is
looking at you like what on earth have you written here, I don't understand.
10 minutes we'll have your print.

45

MS JENKE: Beautiful. So we're just tidying up some bits and pieces because in the frantic mail drop there was some bits that shouldn't have been in there and Adam and Patrick is just coming over as well to tidy up some bits. I want you to just pause for a minute, pause for a minute and think, right there, think
5 about how far you've come today. So this is a 320 page report. You've spent, you know, two and a half, three days trying to understand it, digest it and make it into something that's clear and I think you've done a cracking job. Give yourself a round of applause.

10 Now what we need to do is we need to stand up, stand up, take one step sort of into towards the middle, nice big step, turn to the left, pat the person in front of you on the back. Pat on the back, well done jurors. Turn around, do it the other way. Pat on the back. Okay, so well done. We'll see you tomorrow
15 morning at 9.30 for a 9.30 start. We're going to change, we need to change things a bit because we need to spend some more time in these but fantastic job. Travel safely home and we'll see you in the morning but hang out for 10 minutes and we'll be able to hand you the document.

20 **MATTER ADJOURNED AT 4.35 PM UNTIL
SUNDAY, 10 JULY 2016**