

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 VIVIAN LAMBERT
MS EMILY JENKE
MR IAIN WALKER
MR GEORDAN GRACIS
MR ASHOK KANIYAL
MS ILKA WALKLEY
PREMIER JAY WEATHERILL

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

ADELAIDE

9.56 AM, SUNDAY, 10 JULY 2016

DAY FOUR

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY SPARK AND CANNON

MS V. LAMBERT: We are about to start live streaming when I let them know, but I just want to do a couple of little, quick logistic things. So I've got a few documents for you as well, but what we don't want to have this time is actually have all the bits and pieces of paper on the table if you can avoid that.

5 Okay. So just so that we're clear, this table will be live streamed first of all, and then there will be a table in the middle. When the two groups of nine each come together, there will be a table in the middle and you'll all be in the live stream. Okay? Everyone is clear about that? Thanks very much, everyone. So we're okay? Good.

10

So thanks very much, everyone. As Emily has already given you a briefing, this group is going to revisit the work that was done yesterday and to actually write what is going to be in the report. So two groups will work together. This is the safety group and that group is the trust and regulations and the
15 community consent because we figured that they were together. The purpose of this is not necessarily to separate them in the report but so that we don't have some overlap. Okay? Is everyone okay about that? And although you've got the writing from yesterday, which is very valuable and I know that some of you have already done the work as well on your particular pieces.

20

What we want you to do is bring that collective thought to address - this is not exactly a template, except we do need to have the statement, what the Royal Commission report recommends. We then want you to think about what are the challenges and opportunities that this represents (indistinct) what's the
25 diversity of views? Capture the questions that are unanswered, and what should the community focus on reading, learning about, and also if you can have part that says, "We recommend you read". Is everyone okay with that?

JUROR: Yes.

30

MS V. LAMBERT: So this group will do safety and economics; the group over there will do the trust and the community consent, because there's a lot of overlap with those two. Then we'll bring you together and we'll put you out into the middle of the room. You'll be able to see everything that's written up
35 on the slide and you'll be able to work on that together. Okay? Any questions, everyone? So you've got 45 minutes to do that work. I'll be dropping between the tables. This group will be live streamed and if you can speak into the microphone so that they can pick you up, and when we move over to that table over there (indistinct)

40

JUROR: And what's happening at that table there?

MS V. LAMBERT: That's the two groups coming together to look at the whole lot of the bits of work that you've done each. So you're the first test, if
45 you like, and then your whole group, so the whole 18 of you, the work that

you've done will then go at 12 o'clock to the whole of the jury room and you'll see the work that they've doing as well. Okay?

5 JUROR: I hate to see doubt on a face. When you think, "What am I doing?" just keep going to the big screen: what is that part?

10 JUROR: I get that. I get that, but, you know, couldn't we have a - you know, how do you want this, so that we can add them together rather than mash them together again, because I think we've done a lot of mashing and in that we lose bits.

15 JUROR: Yes. So that's following this. It's a guide you don't want to see the headings. It's actually following those steps. So using the work that you've already created and putting it into those steps, because some of the discussion on base camp and the work that we did last night in looking at the issues that have been raised and the questions that have been raised, this is what we came up with. This actually needs to answer what are the parts of the Royal Commission report that everyone needs to discuss.

20 JUROR: So are we going back to the 12 recommendations?

JUROR: Yes.

25 JUROR: And do we end up with 12 little paragraphs that refer to each of those recommendations?

30 JUROR: No. I'd like you to look at this and - the 12 recommendations, as I understand it, people have already asked for that to be in your report anyway, so that table was made up. So they will be there with that table. So we want to you to address these things (indistinct)

35 JUROR: My understanding will be - I have read chapter 10, which I have read recommendations and I will pay attention to the ones that mention about trust I'm concerned, plus chapter 6 which is concerned whether it recommended, and then with our own words we put it in a piece of paper.

40 JUROR: Yes. So I think from other groups that Juror has been in, you've got a lot of material. You've been through the report and you can provide that to each of group.

JUROR: Is there any need to do one page on this now?

JUROR: Yes.

45 JUROR: Because yesterday these were two pages. Now there's only one

page.

JUROR: We want one page, because remember that your entire report is six to eight pages. So the two other groups that are upstairs are actually working on the other parts of the report, so how did the jury come together, what was - - -

JUROR: Yes, I understand that. I just wanted, like - - -

10 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: We can probably give pages of those. We need to kind of (indistinct)

15 JUROR: Yes. No, one page, but we do want it written in a conversation type, so - - -

JUROR: That's still one page per the four - - -

20 JUROR: That's two pages at that table and two pages at this table.

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: One page they've got, but - - -

JUROR: But rather than statements it's more - or questions, it's more about fact that's related to what's in here.

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: It's actually two pages, because you're doing the two topics together, not separately.

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: Okay? So it's two pages here in total and two pages there for your particular topic.

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: That's good. Keep the questions coming.

JUROR: We got it.

45 JUROR: Or you're ready to go?

JUROR: Just about ready to go.

JUROR: Okay.

5

MS V. LAMBERT: I'll be coming backwards and forwards between the tables, but it's essentially about your work. So Juror, do you - - -

JUROR: I need the document, otherwise I can't edit it.

10

MS V. LAMBERT: You need the document.

JUROR: I think we'd be right, to be honest.

15

JUROR: You can't edit in there, can you?

JUROR: No.

JUROR: Which one do you want to do first? Economics or safety?

20

JUROR: Look, safety is really incomplete, right, I think it's fair to say. Right?

JUROR: Absolutely.

25

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: There are a lot of sort of dot points and thoughts, but we haven't got anything very well covered because - - -

30

JUROR: Point 1 there has not been covered.

JUROR: What's point 1?

35

JUROR: Point 1, summary of what's in the (indistinct)

JUROR: Or this, safety and economics.

JUROR: Is it a statement?

40

JUROR: Yes, but in terms of recommendations for safety, there's no recommendation specifically pertaining to safety in the report.

JUROR: Yes. It's discussed in the report.

45

JUROR: Safety is discussed in the report, but there's nothing in - - -

JUROR: Yes. It's part of the processes of doing things, right, so - - -

5 JUROR: Yes. The recommendations are. There's nothing in the report that is specific to safety.

MS V. LAMBERT: Okay. I'm a bit concerned that the people over here, that you can here. You're welcome to sit back. It just feels like you're not quite
10 connected.

JUROR: Are we starting from what we got yesterday?

JUROR: Yes.
15

JUROR: And are we starting with economics?

JUROR: Well, I've got a blank document right here.

20 JUROR: So we've got a statement. What the Royal Commission (indistinct) you don't have to write that as a template. So you just have to make sure that we cover all the (indistinct) so the documents there that were really good, I'll bring you - we wrote some notes on the top last night and I'll bring that to you.

25 JUROR: Can I ask a question? Why was there not any information that was discussed at the first meeting yesterday morning with respect to the fact that the site would be 500 metres below the ground, which I think is what the general public need to know? For example, photographs of the proposed capsules they're going to be, so how they're stored. That's not mentioned
30 anywhere in any of that stuff. The fact that the head of the geological board here said there are sites around South Australia which, with further exploration, will provide safe repository areas. None of that's mentioned. We need to have some information for people - - -

35 JUROR: I absolutely appreciate what you're saying, right. We've got a bunch of - - -

JUROR: I think it's more information from the ones upstairs.

40 JUROR: Yes, but we're going to give it to everyone and everyone has got to have the information before they can discuss it.

JUROR: Yes, but it is a safety and economics - - -

45 JUROR: We're pointing to them through the information that's in the report.

We're just saying go there if you want this question answered.

JUROR: So think of it this way: what we've got so far is - - -

5 JUROR: Joe Citizen is not going to look up the report.

JUROR: But we can't put a document full of facts because it's too much information. This is directing them towards it.

10 JUROR: We've got questions in the safety bits that we did yesterday. That's basically all we have, right?

JUROR: All negative questions, and that's my - - -

15 JUROR: I'm not sure I totally agree with that, but I appreciate what you're saying there.

JUROR: Human cost of the - - -

20 JUROR: But we do have to flesh those out into something that's a bit more substantial, right. I think everyone can agree on that.

MS V. LAMBERT: So I'll leave this with you. It's some notes that Emily wrote last night on the safety one, the work that's been done. This is close.
25 The content is there. So this is not the time to be recreating content. I didn't hear what you were saying, so I'm just (indistinct) it just needs to be (indistinct) into a narrative.

JUROR: Sure.

30

MS V. LAMBERT: Okay? Suggested to remove the documents - obviously we're talking about conversational work - and craft some sentences that make the section a more wholesome read. So that's our suggestion to you. You're the jury and you get to do it however you want to, but you've got to think about
35 the person that picks it up in a coffee shop; what is it that's going to keep them interested. So this is a very good body of work, this note on safety.

And on economics, it's suggested to move dot point 2 out of the list below because it already has its own paragraph. I'll leave these papers with you and
40 get it into the text. Do a spell-grammar check. So as we said, the economics one was critical yesterday too. It's pretty much done. It just needs a little bit of you being happy - - -

JUROR: Some of us have discussed it and we know what was missing, so,
45 yes.

MS V. LAMBERT: Right, good.

JUROR: That were in that group yesterday.

5 MS V. LAMBERT: Good. Away you go.

JUROR: So do I have to take that all out again?

10 MS V. LAMBERT: No. No, use what's in there - okay. Yes.

JUROR: I've got a blank document, right?

MS V. LAMBERT: Yes.

15 JUROR: So am I just going to be stenographer? What's - - -

MS V. LAMBERT: Yes. So answer these questions. So people will tell you what (indistinct) come in, or would you rather cut and paste it?

20 JUROR: I'm afraid I had an old that one was (indistinct) oversee (indistinct)

JUROR: I think particularly the economics one seemed pretty (indistinct)

25 JUROR: The story is starting to get told.

JUROR: Like, you know, I don't really want to write all this out again.

MS V. LAMBERT: Right. Okay.

30 JUROR: I feel that's just going to burn time.

MS V. LAMBERT: Yes. Okay. Just that I couldn't get into the base camp this morning to pull it up and I can't, so I'll have to take that out and get it - so

35 if you can just keep on working on that first topic.

JUROR: All right. Yes. We'll look at safety first.

MS V. LAMBERT: Yes. I understand exactly what you're saying, Juror.

40 JUROR: I might suggest as a starting point, it's kind of like the document that was left around yesterday about what we've asked and where it is in the report, and it's kind of like one - the first sentence could be something like, you know, "As a jury, we listened to experts about the management of risk and site safety,

45 terrorism, health risk, transport," and then we just direct people to where it is in

the document, like, appendix 1, chapter 5, those sort of places.

5 JUROR: I think recommendations 2 and 3 are the only ones where I feel like safety comes into it and that's more geophysical, but I definitely agree that we need to put in there that the report addresses the effect of radiation - I started with radiation exposure on humans throughout all stages of the nuclear fuel cycle and that's discussed in chapter 7, and that we've also heard from multiple members of the scientific community who agree with the relative safety of the radiation when it's in containers, and I think there's probably somewhere where we direct them in the report to that as well.

JUROR: (indistinct) pages for the work that was done yesterday.

15 MS V. LAMBERT: Have you actually written proper paragraphs instead of just me nothing that, that we could actually put here?

JUROR: I've written a starting point.

20 MS V. LAMBERT: Yes.

JUROR: That was the middle paragraph there.

JUROR: So can you enter into your desktop economics?

25 JUROR: Where will our witness list be, you know, like the Royal Commission has a witness list and I think people would be interested who we've heard from because, you know - - -

30 JUROR: If we're going to do it, that can be done upstairs.

JUROR: Yes, I just wanted to make sure.

JUROR: I don't think anybody cares who we've heard from.

35 JUROR: I think somebody will care that we heard from Dr Jim Green from Friends of the Earth.

JUROR: Yes, the (indistinct) would.

40 JUROR: Okay.

JUROR: I think we can mention that we've heard from different witnesses with different perspectives and your man can address who we've heard from in another group.

45

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: As a jury we heard from expert witnesses on property surrounding safety. Do you want to have a nod towards - - -

5

JUROR: I've just got a couple of comments, things I put together at 5 o'clock this morning. So we know that the current geological profile on seismic stability of many parts of South Australia can provide a number of potential sites that could be used for the long term storage of high level nuclear waste.

10 Okay, that was a fact.

JUROR: Any reference from the report?

JUROR: That was, yes, I can provide references. It was also part of the witness yesterday who said that we have a lot of geological information available now and we also know that we have low seismic and we've had a stability of geology over a long period of time in South Australia that we know won't change over time. I've then gone on to say - - -

20 JUROR: The point is well made but you need - - -

JUROR: We need to reference it, yes.

JUROR: It needs to be from what was in the report, granted what the witness said is valuable but we're talking about what's in the Royal Commission report.

JUROR: I need to read through, I need to find out where it is.

30 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: And you're directly relating it to recommendations two and three which is exactly what we want.

35 JUROR: Correct.

JUROR: I've got on my notes here next to the dot points of the activities, I've got what findings are associated with - - -

40 JUROR: Okay, all right. I'll try and pull them out. I've also then gone on to say in terms of - - -

JUROR: Hold on, I can't type that fast.

45 JUROR: I can give you this.

JUROR: You've got it written down?

JUROR: I've got it written down.

5

JUROR: Have you got it on - - -

JUROR: Unfortunately I didn't bring a soft copy. I'll just go through all the points and then I'll give it to you depending on if people agree that they're right. We also know that these do not currently exist in other countries around the world so again they're facts that are not disputable, okay. There are a large number of current international standards that can be adopted and these would be supported by an international independent regulator that would ensure that lessons learnt around the world would be included in our safety regime. Again, there was discussion yesterday in the safety about issues that has resulted in Germany et cetera and I note there's also safety things that have come up in the report.

Globally there are a number of manageable safety protocols that have been successfully used in the security and safety and nuclear high level waste during transport and storage. These processes ensure no impact on the environment, human health as well as removing security risks that are associated and again that was discussed by the, and it's also in the report. So it's really just trying to take out and provide information that is factual on safety and hopefully then people will then understand that. I'm not sure if anybody agrees with that type of statement but, so you're saying that that's with references on there?

JUROR: Yes. If you go against the list of activities somewhere half way through, I've got some volumes and so forth.

30

JUROR: I think the only danger, I really liked that. I agreed with it that the only danger is saying where you said there's no impact on environment. I think you should try to avoid saying something so absolute.

JUROR: Definitely.

JUROR: There is no, the reality is that product is currently stored above ground today in other countries that have got power stations with no impact to the environment. That's all I'm saying. Whether there's an impact if we build a hole and bury it, that's a different story.

40

JUROR: The word though is contentious, may be negligible.

JUROR: Or maybe unknown.

45

JUROR: Unmeasurable?

JUROR: Unknown.

5 JUROR: Unknown.

JUROR: Unknown without further, what's the word?

JUROR: Research?

10

JUROR: Research or, yes.

JUROR: I think it's pretty clear that there's been quite a lot of research on it and the impacts are kind of negligible. Getting into the nuts and bolts of statistics is really hard.

15

JUROR: I'm just concerned that someone would pick up on such an absolute term, someone like Jim Green and he would turn around and go well, that's ridiculous.

20

JUROR: I think the issue would be that because nobody has buried it up until today, they don't really know what the impact is.

JUROR: Yes.

25

JUROR: That's probably where we say there's no so there's currently no known impact based upon the fact that there actually hasn't occurred because nobody has actually buried the stuff.

30 JUROR: How are we going to know?

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: There are unknowns.

35

JUROR: In terms of underground storage.

JUROR: We know from above ground storage today there is no impact to the environment or human health. There's been no deaths associated with it but we don't know because nobody has actually done underground storage.

40

JUROR: No environmental impact as of today.

JUROR: Correct, as of today.

45

JUROR: Yes.

5 JUROR: Which is basically one of the questions, what time could we actually make sure that this is actually going to not cause that. That's one of the gateways potentially which those guys are looking at.

10 JUROR: Do we need to mention that there are a number of countries, eg, Finland and France that are a long way down the track with respect to the underground storage?

JUROR: We need to talk about safety cases that they've got because that's the best information we have.

15 JUROR: We can reference that where it was just mentioned that other countries have started researching and they know that they don't (indistinct)

JUROR: We can direct people to overseas - - -

20 JUROR: Yes, I just need to try and find where it is.

JUROR: Do you have - - -

JUROR: Yes, somewhere.

25 JUROR: So while you're typing down I will just read out so everybody can understand so we can keep this moving, so it says here, this is appendix 1, geological disposal is regarded as the permanent solution to management of the most highly active and long lived waste from nuclear power generation and other applications in nuclear technology including medicine and industry. It
30 removes hazardous materials from the immediate human or dynamic natural surface environment to a stable location where they will remain protected from disturbance by destructive natural processes and activities of people. So that's a statement in the appendix. That's the sort of thing we're saying probably should get pulled out for people to review. Correct?

35 JUROR: And for further information see appendix..

40 MS V. LAMBERT: So are you all working as a group? You're all in agreement? Just looking things up. How do you feel you're progressing? We've got about 25 minutes left for this session.

JUROR: Okay, we need to start - - -

45 JUROR: Nowhere near it.

JUROR: Maybe while juror is working on typing that up we should move on.

5 JUROR: Juror, you were a leader yesterday and I think you can't concentrate on discussion and typing. I'm a pretty quick typist, and then you can join the conversation a bit more.

10 JUROR: So with the geological disposal, I'm not sure if you want to catch up to page 345. Yes, I'm not sure they'll extract all of it. That's that I'm saying, there may be particular paragraphs that – because if we talk eight pages, you're not going to be able to take out five pages of this and put it in a document (indistinct)

15 JUROR: I'm hoping that once this is completed, we're able to get digital copies of high points, that would make it so much more effective.

JUROR: Is that sort of thing closer to what you're looking for juror, in terms of - - -

20 JUROR: Certainly - - -

JUROR: - - - that type of statement?

25 JUROR: Certainly statements like that, I mean I still have this worry that people will not be aware of what a repository is.

JUROR: What a storage facility is?

30 JUROR: Yes, and the fact you know, it's going to be 500 metres below the surface of the earth.

JUROR: You think they don't know this?

JUROR: I'm sure they don't.

35 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: Should that be part of the - - -

40 JUROR: We keep using the word dump.

JUROR: Dump, yes. That's - - -

JUROR: Dump, you know - - -

45 JUROR: That's absolutely right.

JUROR: - - - down at - - -

JUROR: Is that part of this document - - -

5

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: - - - part of the document?

10 JUROR: I just need to make a note that when they come back from their work upstairs, that an explanation of what a disposal facility actually looks like, or what is disposable facility as part of their – it's a bit like – you know, what is the nuclear fuel cycle. That should be part of their explanation.

15 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: What is a nuclear facility.

JUROR: And which recommendation - - -

20

JUROR: 500 metre - - -

JUROR: Yes. And then we're doing the recommendation site.

25 JUROR: Yes.

MS V. LAMBERT: So what was the question?

30 JUROR: We're trying to clarify whether this part of the document should say something like here is what a GDF looks like.

JUROR: No.

JUROR: No. Okay. So - - -

35

JUROR: No, that's what I'm saying. I think it should be something upstairs.

40 JUROR: Well it's up to you but if you go down to that granular level of detail, you won't get the whole picture. What you want is you want to imagine that someone really has had nothing to do with this, picks it up in a coffee shop, looks at it to see whether it's interesting and not and whether they can get it within – you know, the first 15 seconds.

45 JUROR: That's exactly the point, if they don't know what a facility is, they won't get the point.

JUROR: So you just have to reference it, in the - - -

JUROR: The reference is a little bit weak.

5

JUROR: You're talking about people reading stuff in a coffee shop. Hang on, let me get my laptop out and I'll just go to look up the report and file through 313 pages to find the particular – not going to happen.

10 JUROR: What does the group think?

JUROR: I still think the more information that we put in, and I do, I take it on board but the more words, the less likely people are going to read it.

15 JUROR: I agree.

JUROR: I think that's an option over the whole thing, is to have a diagram which is a time period and pictorial of the stages.

20 JUROR: Okay, let's just remember that your document that's going to go in to the coffee shops and with the community consultation, a diagram might be a good idea - - -

JUROR: Yes, but no-one would do that.

25

JUROR: - - - but we'll be finished this afternoon. So there won't be time to insert a diagram in to it.

30 MS V. LAMBERT: Can I – conscious of the time, while we're typing up safety, shall we have a look through economics and work on that and then come back to safety.

JUROR: Good idea.

35 JUROR: I've been trying to reference some of these safety parts.

MS V. LAMBERT: Yes. So did everyone read through – re-read the economics portion overnight?

40 JUROR: Yes. Again, we need to just take out some of the – to me, some of the questions about how it's been structured. So for instance when you're talking nuclear waste repository, the Commission report recommends that a nuclear fuel storage facility should be implemented in South Australia. The facility has the potential to provide a significant income to South Australia but
45 there are risks and uncertainties with this endeavour that still require more

research and this requires additional financial commitment by South Australia. There is a possibility that future research may determine that this project is not viable, however there is equally a chance that this project may be viable in the future to provide significant income. But it's more about the fact that the
5 information that we have, there's a recommendation to say we should go ahead with the waste facility but the economics is not proven based on the information we have today. Because it's still pie in the sky stuff. And until we can go to countries like Japan and (indistinct) them, which currently legally we're not allowed to.

10

JUROR: Because of current legislation.

JUROR: Correct. And that point needs to be made too.

15 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: I think I'm sticking on the first line here, where it says "Recommends that a nuclear fuel storage facility be implemented in South Australia."

20 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: We don't direct – it doesn't directly recommend that at all. That's too far down the track. I think it's more so that we pursue that as the most viable option in getting in to the nuclear fuel cycle.

25

JUROR: No, it says here "pursue the opportunity to establish used nuclear fuel and intermediate level waste storage disposal facility in South Australia consistent with the process and principles outlined in chapter 10".

30 JUROR: Intermediate but we're talking high level here.

JUROR: No, "used nuclear fuel" - - -

JUROR: Nuclear fuel, okay.

35

JUROR: Is high level.

JUROR: Okay.

40 JUROR: That's what used nuclear fuel is, it's high level waste. So definitely recommends that we - - -

JUROR: So if we can put maybe – just pursue the opportunity in there and that
- - -

45

JUROR: Yes, so that's basically what I said wasn't it?

JUROR: Yes. No, it is. It's just - - -

5 JUROR: It says "recommend a nuclear fuel storage facility be implemented in South Australia". So we can write exactly what recommendation 11 says if you like.

JUROR: Maybe just I would reword – I would like to have in there pursue the
10 opportunity to establish and then the rest of it is - - -

JUROR: Okay, that's fine.

JUROR: Yes.

15

JUROR: So basically we should lead with recommendation number 11, which is what this says here. But however, we need to have the ability to further research and validate the - - -

20 JUROR: To make it viable.

JUROR: See the other recommendations cover that, you know like undertake further geophysical surveys, you know.

25 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: Almost wonder whether those 10 points should be actually included in the report as recommendations.

30 JUROR: Well, I think it's part of safety.

JUROR: All 12 of them will be in there.

JUROR: They will be.

35

JUROR: They will be, they've already said that.

JUROR: Okay, well that's fine.

40 JUROR: Just we don't have a copy of this.

JUROR: Sorry, I didn't bring the soft copies. Sorry about that.

JUROR: No worries.

45

JUROR: It was something I played around with this morning. It doesn't have to be used, just some thoughts that I had that – and then whether we can then refer some of those back to the report is what I'm trying to establish, so that gives us that meat on the bone if you like.

5

MS V. LAMBERT: Could I just get a check on how you feel that you're progressing?

JUROR: We're nowhere near at the moment.

10

MS V. LAMBERT: Okay.

JUROR: Forty-five minutes.

15 MS V. LAMBERT: I think I heard you say that you thought economics was pretty much there, so you were going to focus on safety? Yes?

JUROR: No, we just said we'd start safety first.

20 MS V. LAMBERT: Okay.

JUROR: The thing with economics is we need to take – a lot of it's, again, a lot of subjector rather than saying well what is the – so what we've thought we should do is use the recommendation as the first statement.

25

MS V. LAMBERT: Yes.

JUROR: Out of here.

30 MS V. LAMBERT: Yes.

JUROR: But then counter that with the fact that the economics that have been provided in the report are subject to further scrutiny - - -

35 MS V. LAMBERT: Right.

JUROR: - - - but that further scrutiny can't exist under current legislation which is really part of what those guys are doing.

40 MS V. LAMBERT: Yes. And when you come together as a big group, just important to note that and to keep that in.

JUROR: Yes.

45 MS V. LAMBERT: So can you wrap this section up within 15 minutes, so that

you can move on to the safety?

JUROR: If you can call up an economic one and somebody else can type that up, because I'm still typing?

5

JUROR: Are you saying we should be spending 45 minutes on safety and 45 minutes on economics?

MS V. LAMBERT: No. No, you - - -

10

JUROR: The total.

MS V. LAMBERT: This session you've only got another half an hour. I'll stretch it.

15

JUROR: While you were talking, we were discussing the safety one, something sort of similar to the economic one that was previously – I've just come up with what you were talking about in all that, so something similar along the lines of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Commission report and then you can say wants to pursue the opportunity to establish used nuclear fuel and intermediate waste storage facility - - -

20

JUROR: Yes.

25

JUROR: - - - 500 metres underground, somewhere in South Australia.

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: There is no facility like that, that is operational yet anywhere in the world. High level waste is a fuel rod that has been pulled out from a nuclear reactor and has already been cooled down for 30 or so years, or whatever we (indistinct) The nuclear waste requires permanent storage as it's radioactive. The radioactivity is harmful for hundreds of thousands of years. The jury has read the RC report and it has quizzed many witnesses. Many safety and security considerations have been deliberated and pulled apart. The considerations include but are not limited to, geological, seismic, acts of terrorism, any other (indistinct) we talked about. The jury has so far been convinced that the entire process of underground storage, including transport and transporting is it's going to be safe, or (indistinct) the nuclear material is stored in storage containers that have been thoroughly tested. Refer to chapter X for information, something along those lines.

30

35

40

JUROR: Is that part of the safety - - -

45

JUROR: Yes. So that would cover some of the safety stuff you were going to

talk about.

JUROR: Yes.

5 JUROR: You are a mastermind. You did this yesterday.

JUROR: I just sit back and listen.

JUROR: As long as we can sort of encapsulate the fact that we've gone
10 through some of this process and we know that the transport, storage, et cetera,
have a degree of - - -

JUROR: (indistinct) including (indistinct) too, because - - -

15 JUROR: Yes. There was the parts - yes.

JUROR: Yes, good wording.

JUROR: Something along the lines of - what was that point 11 in the
20 recommendations? It was, "Pursue the - - -"

JUROR: "Pursue the opportunity to establish". Yes.

JUROR: So basically the (indistinct) whatever it is, recommends - or pursue
25 the opportunity to establish a - - -

JUROR: To establish used nuclear fuel and intermediate-level - - -

JUROR: What recommendation is that?
30

JUROR: 11.

JUROR: Yes. Where's the economic numbers?

35 JUROR: It's just (indistinct) and somebody might (indistinct)

JUROR: Yes, that's fine. That's all right. I'm still looking.

JUROR: Facility (indistinct) facility 500 metres underground (indistinct)
40 somewhere in South Australia.

JUROR: There it is down the bottom here.

JUROR: Do we need to state that this has - so that there's not that confusion
45 about the federal system and say that the report did not look at a site and there's

further research needed there to separate - - -

JUROR: (indistinct) however siting has not been - - -

5 JUROR: It's really the fact that we know that we have the safe geological and seismological environment.

JUROR: But we need to (indistinct) people that that hasn't been looked at, so they're going to (indistinct)

10

JUROR: Yes. A site hasn't been decided yet.

JUROR: There are a number of prospective sites, but further analysis and - - -

15 JUROR: Site selection was not part of (indistinct)

JUROR: Because they are only prospective because (indistinct)

JUROR: There is no facility (indistinct)

20

JUROR: Which one of you (indistinct) prospective sites. There's a number of potential sites.

JUROR: (indistinct) anywhere in the world.

25

JUROR: In relation to (indistinct) yesterday for Enice, were you there when - and she said nothing has been decided.

JUROR: No.

30

JUROR: (indistinct) she said no.

JUROR: That's why there are potential areas that could be looked at that require further study and analysis.

35

JUROR: Investigation, yes.

JUROR: Now, we went to high-level waste. Now, high-level waste are fuel rods that have been pulled out from the nuclear reactor.

40

JUROR: So Juror gets to make some notes on where we can pull out information to support this. So page 89 - - -

45 JUROR: As long as we can direct people where that process is in the report, I reckon. I think we put a ref there so that people can go if there interested.

JUROR: So page 89 talks about the underlying geology of South Australia (indistinct) that sort of support we're talking about in terms of the stability. So page 89, and page 83, statement number 68.

5

JUROR: Is that finding 68?

JUROR: Yes. Finding (indistinct) and I'll just - you don't have to write it down, but this is what it says:

10

There is international consensus that geological disposal is the best technological solution to handle (indistinct) and two country, Finland and Sweden, have successfully developed long-term domestic solutions.

15

So again, so people understand that there is - and if they want to get more information that (indistinct) that information.

JUROR: Yes. Okay. I'll put it in and then we'll mash it around.

20

JUROR: Yes. It's going to be mashed all together with the other one.

JUROR: Finland and Switzerland, was it?

25

JUROR: Finland and Sweden.

JUROR: France is also developing a solution. Include it as well, yes.

JUROR: I thought Switzerland was somewhere in there.

30

JUROR: No, not Switzerland, Sweden.

JUROR: Just capture - I'm just sort of reading some of this. On economics it says, "Globally, there are substantial quantities of used fuel from nuclear reactors in temporary storage awaiting permanent disposal." So again, that will hopefully help support the economic solution.

35

JUROR: What page was that?

40

JUROR: Page 91.

JUROR: Is there a finding?

JUROR: 75.

45

JUROR: 75.

JUROR: They're the ones in a different colour, aren't they? Is that the findings in the - - -

5

JUROR: Yes. So that's the overall summary of the text that follows. I find them quite helpful as touchstones.

JUROR: And I'm not sure whether it's - - -

10

JUROR: Health.

JUROR: There was health, because I wrote them up there. Transport was the other one.

15

JUROR: Yes. Health, yes.

JUROR: Geological, terrorism, health. I'm not sure - - -

20 JUROR: And, Juror, I'm not sure if it's relevant, but on page 292 it shows the current used fuel that is sitting in aboveground storage in the world today. There's actually a graph. So it's page 292, and what I did I put on base camp - because I actually pulled out North Asia, because we know that the EU are going to have their own solution and we also know the US is going to have their own solution. So from our point of view, the opportunity is North Asia, Japan, Taiwan, South Korea. So I extracted those to give people understanding of what potential still currently resides in the world.

25

JUROR: Yes. What's the diagram number?

30

JUROR: It's table JT. Because that's what they've used for the (indistinct) modelling. So I think it's worth actually, if we can, including that as part of - I'm not sure how much of this they can include.

35 JUROR: It's going to be a challenge kind of finding the right balance between detail and (indistinct)

JUROR: Well, I reckon we type it out and then if it comes up (indistinct) people - - -

40

JUROR: Let's put dot, dot, dot, and when you do that are you comfortable (indistinct) maybe we could put - - -

45 JUROR: Why don't we just put "The" and then in brackets put "either majority/most/some/ - - -"

JUROR: Okay.

JUROR: All right.

5 JUROR: So that way (indistinct) can pick it out - - -

JUROR: And we'll have to do a vote to see who thinks what.

10 JUROR: Yes. Okay.

JUROR: So "almost few" and I'll put a question mark further to that.

JUROR: Yes, and we'll figure out - yes. So we've covered the "almost
15 few/whatever have been convinced" so far.

MS V. LAMBERT: Does Juror need to have the microphone? Yes. Juror,
could you just speak into the microphone so that you'll be picked up?

20 JUROR: Sure.

MS V. LAMBERT: It will come off there.

JUROR: Is it being streamed?

25 MS V. LAMBERT: Yes. Just so that they can pick it up.

JUROR: Okay. So far been convinced that the entire process of underground
storage including transporting.

30 JUROR: Sorry, Juror. Again, we're talking economics. If we start capturing
the stuff now I'll be typing. Page 102.

JUROR: Is safe.

35 JUROR: Table 5.9 is the current projection for the financial - - -

JUROR: Sorry, I lost those numbers.

40 JUROR: Page 102, table 5.9, currently has the financial projection for the
economic benefits of a storage facility. Now, obviously we need to then go on
from that and say these numbers haven't been quantified and need further
investigation to - and obtain pre-commitment prior to engaging in the costs
associated with a waste storage facility.

45

JUROR: I think we have to keep going back to, "The report says".

JUROR: Yes.

5 JUROR: What I put together for the nuclear waste repository is a
recommendation. So obviously that's the recommendation that needs to be up
the top, which is also the same recommendation we put into safety because
both of them are the same. But there are risks (indistinct) requires more
research. We can't rely on the numbers provided to be the actual financial
10 (indistinct) and the issue we've got is of course we can't do that research until
we change the legislation. It then ties in with what those guys are doing.

JUROR: Don't we direct across if that's the case?

15 JUROR: Refer to chapter X or whatever it is. Page whatever it is.

JUROR: I've just given the numbers.

20 JUROR: Because that provides the information of what's projected economic
benefits for South Australia, yes.

JUROR: I think we need to be cutting and pasting.

25 JUROR: Financial bonus and we want information that provides that.

JUROR: There's that which talks about safety cases.

30 JUROR: In terms of economics I think if we're saying, I asked the question
yesterday what are we doing it for. Is it just the money and if so, I think
something about the estimated revenue would help maybe, the state wealth
fund looks like as in that's going to provide ongoing revenue.

JUROR: More details.

35 JUROR: Is that in here?

JUROR: No sorry, that's geological stuff.

JUROR: It is because I definitely remember it.

40

JUROR: It's all part of chapter 5. Around page 183 onwards.

JUROR: State wealth fund.

45 JUROR: Yes, there's the whole state. Given the intergenerational nature of

the proposal it would be essential to develop enduring mechanisms to secure funds to ensure that benefits are shared across the community in the form of a state wealth fund. Secure funds for decommissioning, remediation and monitoring in the form of reserve funds and establish the scientific and research capabilities to ensure knowledge and skills are developed with the focus on use.

JUROR: That's exactly what we're after.

10 MS V. LAMBERT: Are we capturing that, this conversation?

JUROR: What I'm trying to do is as we've doing safety is capture additional, because we can't type both at the same time so I'm trying to capture some additional things of economics that we can then process.

15 MS V. LAMBERT: That's great.

JUROR: Otherwise we going to finish up still here at 3 o'clock.

20 MS V. LAMBERT: That's really good. That's what I'm just saying. It's fine to have that side conversation as long as it's being - - -

JUROR: If the report, the financial analysis is fair dinkum, let's say robust, how does South Australia benefit? How would the wealth be distributed? Produce that, I think, different words maybe.

JUROR: Yes, so the whole of chapter 5 but then I would direct more towards 1990.

30 JUROR: One should read 1995.

JUROR: Because it shows the intergenerational nature of the proposal. We're not saying we get all the money now and in a hundred, 200 years when they've still got the waste in the ground, too bad for you guys. We're not saying that.

35 JUROR: You see this is actually kind of a simple task, so what do you want to tell me? You want or what you want to point to.

JUROR: I've been getting some of the, I've sort of got some top line statements and then some points out of here so then he can then capture that.

JUROR: Future steps?

JUROR: Yes, intermediate steps up to future steps.

JUROR: I don't think people read it. There was some, many, all. You just have to read it as a group.

5 JUROR: The discussion as a group because the language at five, those steps and then say what they did in adding an amendment to the legislation rather than what it says in the future steps.

JUROR: You tell me you want me to read future steps on page 174.

10 JUROR: Okay, I'll do that. Immediate steps. Why are you pointing that to me?

JUROR: You can tell me directly.

15 JUROR: I'll put that in there.

JUROR: You've basically done this.

20 JUROR: You guys have done really well. You've made a couple of clarity points over the day.

JUROR: My main focus has been clarity on the safety issues which I think have been not dealt with.

25 JUROR: Dealt with at a later stage.

JUROR: As far as the report's concerned. No, we don't need to go there because there has to be some additional clarity or focus to ensure the delivering processes is correct.

30

JUROR: This is a long piece. If you just give me five great points.

35 JUROR: I would actually say that I think I learnt more about the relative risks from this report than anything else. The economics is not the thing that I focused on but in terms of the science behind it, that was something that I felt that I had enough information to move forward and to think about it more.

40 JUROR: It was interesting, I took the rough draft from yesterday. Last night we had a 70th birthday party that I sponsored. I gave it to somebody who had a completely negative response to nuclear processes. She read through the four pages and at the end of the four pages she said to me I've now changed my mind. That was four pages of top line that has no real substance to it but she changed her mind and I showed my wife this morning and she read through some of the revised draft and she said this (indistinct) that I need to know to
45 give me, and we had some things out of the report that would give me enough

information to make a decision. A forward decision. The one that really struck me is somebody who went from a no to a maybe yes just by understanding and having more information.

5 JUROR: So your point being that there was enough information for that person to make an informed decision.

JUROR: To start changing her opinion. It doesn't necessarily give her the ability to give consent but it then started changing what, getting into thinking
10 about different things she may want to get.

JUROR: So the job, it's kind of important to remember though that the job isn't to convince people one way or the other, right.

15 JUROR: No, no. To give them information.

JUROR: It's an interesting thing that having had more information that they're able to reflect on it in a more deep fashion.

20 JUROR: This thing about changing minds or even just promoting conversation is information so that's why this particular summary is going to be so powerful because we're giving them the tools if they want to continue the conversation to go.

25 MS V. LAMBERT: Thank you. That's a really important point. How are we going? Are you thinking that you know that you're doing parallel jobs so you probably don't need as much time to get to economics but I'm hoping that we'll wrap up this particular job at quarter past 11.

30 JUROR: We still haven't done a lot of checking yet but we're in progress.

MS V. LAMBERT: Then we'll converge but it is important for you to have - - -

35 JUROR: I think we've only captured safety.

MS V. LAMBERT: Okay.

JUROR: Then we might be able to read something out to you.

40 MS V. LAMBERT: I will make it 10 to 11 and I'm hoping that this, that both of your subjects will be finished by quarter past 11 because you've already done some work on the economics. Thank you. Are you saying yes?

45 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: So just on that, for instance we've identified that we want page 106 section 90 be included in the report. Do we have to type that?

5 MS V. LAMBERT: Yes, just for the time being.

JUROR: All I'm trying to get to is if we don't type it out, unless somebody stands up and talks about the point (indistinct) what it is that you want in the report.

10

JUROR: I think we reference the state wealth fund and the intergenerational nature of the proposed economic model. It gives a lot more information at 1990.

15 MS V. LAMBERT: Are you agreed on that?

JUROR: Yes. But wouldn't that information need to be on the document we produce because people aren't necessarily going to go and get on the internet and try and go to the Royal Commission report and get that information.

20

JUROR: I know and the point keeps coming up but we're keeping in mind the size of the document that we're trying to put out and the fact that - - -

25 JUROR: I understand but people aren't going to go and find it anywhere else, if you don't provide it to them.

JUROR: If they're interested they will. If it's not something that sticks to their heart, that is something that's important about making this decision, they're not going to bother reading; they'll accept what the - - -

30

JUROR: Sorry, this point about the longevity of the waste as being part of the important considerations that - - -

35 MS V. LAMBERT: How many conversations are happening here and - - -

JUROR: They're just trying to finalise the first one.

MS V. LAMBERT: So is there any way that we can speed up the process on the second one?

40

JUROR: Only if we had a second laptop. That's the only way you're going to speed it up because then we could have then started capturing some of this on a - - -

45 MS V. LAMBERT: You've got some of that done already haven't you?

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: We've captured some of the pages that we want to reference.

5

MS V. LAMBERT: Have you captured – is it just a matter of sitting down at the laptop and working it through because you've already covered it all?

JUROR: So I guess on the - - -

10

JUROR: The problem is, because the economic one was just a pile of statements rather than information. So we're almost – which is what's happened with safety. So we're almost rewriting it.

15 MS V. LAMBERT: So I guess that's what I'm saying, do you have all the information that can - - -

JUROR: Yes, I think we – yes, we're pretty close to it.

20 JUROR: So is there anything that we want to take out of this one? The economic one and - - -

JUROR: I think similar to safety; I think we almost need to start from scratch.

25 JUROR: I actually thought this one had more – like less work to do on it.

JUROR: Economic. Yes.

JUROR: Personally I thought that that was - - -

30

JUROR: The gut feeling I had when I first saw it, was that it was fairly well written.

MS V. LAMBERT: How are we landing juror and juror with the safety?

35

JUROR: We've got something.

JUROR: We need to add more references which we've got here. We can direct people to the health effects of radiation and security risks. We've got actual chapters and stuff, so we'll put that in as well.

40

JUROR: I'm a little concerned that (indistinct) high level waste, geological disposal that we're talking about, whereas there's many activities involved (indistinct)

45

JUROR: You mean like what the mining?

JUROR: Like mining, like environment - - -

5 JUROR: I guess people want to be interested in the safety of all mining possibly.

JUROR: Can we just mention that we've looked at the safety cases throughout all aspects of the Royal Commission but obviously this is the one we're
10 focussing on, this is the recommendation we make.

JUROR: Did somebody capture what she said?

15 MS V. LAMBERT: Somebody written it down?

JUROR: I actually think I wrote that.

JUROR: I've typed in also, we're just – might need to move that sentence
20 somewhere else.

MS V. LAMBERT: So are we using our time well? It seems like some people
are thinking - - -

25 JUROR: Well, we are just really waiting for what's happening here, so we then start on the next one.

MS V. LAMBERT: Right.

30 JUROR: And that, like I said, unfortunately that's the issue with only having one laptop with two subjects. Potentially assuming - - -

MS V. LAMBERT: So the (indistinct) was for the whole group.

35 JUROR: We need to put them down.

JUROR: Yes, I know but then to have it completed and the assumption from DENFO is that what was captured yesterday is sufficient with some additional refinements and that's actually not the case.

40 MS V. LAMBERT: Well, the best of what you got yesterday should be fed in to these documents and don't be too hung about those things. It's really – it just comes down to those couple of things. What's the Royal Commission report (indistinct) need to know.

45 JUROR: Yes.

MS V. LAMBERT: And where do they go to find it?

5 JUROR: Yes. But we've got to make sure the document that they get, which they do get, has sufficient information because like I said, out of one million people there's a small proportion of them physically are going to go and find those (indistinct) so the key part of the repertoire has still got to be in the document that we provide. And the issue of supporting information - - -

10 JUROR: He had some more stuff to add in.

JUROR: Well, I think so. But if we don't refine what we've got in economics then potentially - - -

15 MS V. LAMBERT: Guys, don't necessarily see the safety and economics as separate things. There can be all - - -

JUROR: Well, the recommendation is the same.

20 MS V. LAMBERT: Yes.

JUROR: Okay. So we believe the recommendation for safety and the recommendation for economics is similar or the same recommendation fundamentally.

25 MS V. LAMBERT: That's why we put them together. But there was - - -

30 JUROR: But then the reasons for – on safety are different to the issues relating to economics and of course the issue with economics more comes down to the substantiation of the forecasts that have been provided and the ability to investigate that further before the next gateway opens, if you like.

JUROR: Would you agree that we are focussing on recommendations 2, 3, 4, 7 and 11 in safety and economic?

35 JUROR: No, I don't.

JUROR: Okay. Which ones then?

40 JUROR: Well, 11 definitely and then in terms of safety number two, three. Unfortunately I think four is linked to - - -

JUROR: To two and three.

45 JUROR: No, to one I would have thought because it's – some of that is - - -

JUROR: We already do casing here, that's already happening.

JUROR: Yes. But isn't there a suggested change in the way that we - - -

5 JUROR: Just (indistinct)

JUROR: - - - take in - - -

10 JUROR: It's an economic recommendation.

JUROR: Yes. It's counter-cyclical investment.

JUROR: From an economical viewpoint or from a safety view point.

15 JUROR: Economic.

JUROR: It's economic.

20 JUROR: Okay.

JUROR: Actually we should put five as well, when I'm thinking about that. That is kind of like the fund is linked to that isn't it? And we've got 10 is an economic one too.

25 MS V. LAMBERT: Just to add something more to the mix, morning tea is ready but I recommend that you don't have it. No, that you don't get up as a group but that you actually keep on working. It is scones and jam and cream, so that's not necessarily going to be easy to handle but if you wanted, if you

30 just get up and go - - -

JUROR: Dribble out and dribble back.

MS V. LAMBERT: Keep the flow of the conversation going. I'm looking

35 now at still hoping that we'll be done here to converge at 20 past 11. You okay with that at this point?

JUROR: Yes, okay.

40 JUROR: We're looking at like a regulator. I think it does bear if there's some acknowledgment of values. I actually (indistinct) talk about values and it looks like a whitewash. Would you agree with that?

JUROR: Yes.

45

JUROR: So I think that saying something like, the public needs to be confident in a transparent regulator, particularly in light of those failures.

5 JUROR: So is it possible to pull up yesterday's economic - - -

JUROR: In the report, in section blah, blah, blah.

JUROR: Have we had any regulatory - - -

10 JUROR: At least that way what we do believe need to say there, we can then type around it, rather than typing from scratch, otherwise we're going to - - -

JUROR: We won't say too much about that because - - -

15 JUROR: I don't think we want to give too much detail about it but we have to acknowledge that that's happened, otherwise someone (indistinct)

JUROR: Well, they didn't even know about that.

20 JUROR: That was in the report, you said, somewhere.

JUROR: I'm not sure if (indistinct) specifically mentioned, but the importance of transparency definitely is.

25 JUROR: The regulator and stuff (indistinct)

JUROR: There's, like, a whole chapter of regulations.

30 JUROR: Yes. I'm trying to find out which it is, so that we can do that in - - -

JUROR: We can (indistinct) that in and (indistinct) does that seem fair to you?

35 JUROR: I think so.

JUROR: Okay.

JUROR: How are we going?

40 JUROR: No. I just asked for a second, because if we don't start that way we're not going to get finished, because we're basically trying to revalidate what we done on safety, make sure we're on the right track. We haven't even started.

45 JUROR: So this is kind of - I was kind of trying to tidy with the statement

before. There's (indistinct) number of (indistinct)

5 JUROR: Yes, the economic input. So we can start with what we have rather than start (indistinct) what I might do is - we've identified from an economic viewpoint, that there's three or four recommendations that should be included as the top line, if you like. These are economic recommendations. So rather than physically typing, what we might do is just list them here, recommendations 2, 3, 4 at the top, rather than physically typing.

10 JUROR: And that will be easy to refer to because they're going to be in our report.

JUROR: Okay. So these two are kind of tied together.

15 JUROR: Which is where you'll knock a couple of up this afternoon (indistinct) really hopefully punchy brief.

JUROR: What is the report? What's it called?

20 JUROR: Economics are on paper, I think.

JUROR: Just say there are international standards.

25 JUROR: Okay. So maybe this is an introductory sentence. The public needs to be (indistinct) I mean that's kind of very much an introduction, right. So this is emphasising the report. There are international standards, research, data, experiences that can be used to support introducing an independent regulator, an Australian - we've already talked about independence. Let's not double up on words too much. An Australian regulator to ensure lessons learned abroad will be included in our safety register.

30 JUROR: Do we need this statement? There have been many improvements in the way - - -

35 JUROR: Can I just point you to the use about the regulation? This is not part of the terms of reference of the report.

JUROR: It's emphasising that it's important, right. That does talk about it. The report doesn't actually set out a regulator. Maybe that's what's a - - -

40 JUROR: So, guys, if you want to come around this side and just help me get some clarity on economics, not to exclude, at least that way we're on a start. So recommendations for economics. We're saying recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11? 5?

45

JUROR: No.

JUROR: Yes.

5 JUROR: It's a big reference.

JUROR: From what we have read, it is absolutely a fact that the exact nature of a regulator would be determination later (indistinct)

10 JUROR: Okay, sorry, but we've got to point to a reference with (indistinct) here.

JUROR: Yes (indistinct) regulatory and it's - - -

15 JUROR: A reference there (indistinct) that's in the nuclear fuel cycle.

JUROR: I write in very formal terms though. That might be a problem. Let's just say (indistinct) less words.

20 JUROR: Yes. I reckon it's okay.

JUROR: Yes, I've got it. Yes, just put chapter 9, brackets, "Chapter 9", and then we've got them going to the reference straightaway and we can work out where we're going to put those sort of references.

25

JUROR: Yes. That's what we were told originally.

JUROR: Yes, I know (indistinct)

30 JUROR: The thing is I'm not sure how much ground I'm covering that's going to be - - -

JUROR: So, "The Royal Commission has identified", should be, "The Royal Commission report".

35

JUROR: Yes, and this is where it was clarifying that wording.

JUROR: Has identified that there are (indistinct) steps or stages in the nuclear fuel cycle?

40

JUROR: Won't that be in (indistinct) section? The other group that's doing - - -

45 JUROR: In (indistinct) That's the thing. Like, it kind of speaks to what we're talking about here, but I don't know what (indistinct)

JUROR: That document is different to this one.

JUROR: I see.

5 JUROR: Did you guys take that out to - - -

JUROR: This is what's, like, breaking my brain a lot.

10 JUROR: This is what was given to me (indistinct)

JUROR: Yes. No, I know. I think we took that bit out.

JUROR: We've got the dilemma we don't know what the groups are, so - - -

15 JUROR: I think it was included and then you guys took it out, but it must have been safe, so we're starting from here.

JUROR: Don't forget the economics is related to the nuclear fuel cycle. The

20 nuclear fuel cycle should include all four of those parts, because there is economics (indistinct)

JUROR: This should be included in a different section. This is not related to - - -

25 JUROR: It's not in operation yet, but, yes, that's probably - - -

JUROR: Economics has a relativity to all four stages of the - - -

30 JUROR: Collectively we took that out yesterday.

JUROR: So you want to take that out?

JUROR: Yes. So that - - -

35 MS V. LAMBERT: So as you can see, folks, there's no live streaming at the moment.

JUROR: So it needs to go on?

40 MS V. LAMBERT: They will wait until we converge over there and start live streaming again.

JUROR: Okay. So I'll assume that stages are discussed elsewhere. Each

45 stage comes with (indistinct)

JUROR: An opportunity.

JUROR: Okay. So nuclear force (indistinct) South Australia (indistinct) has the potential to provide significant income for South Australia. There are risks and (indistinct) requires more research. This research requires - - -

JUROR: Can we change that wording, sorry, the finding 11 wording?

JUROR: So you want it to be the - - -

JUROR: Yes, pursue the opportunity to establish (indistinct)

JUROR: Recommend to pursue or wants to pursue?

JUROR: Recommends that would pursue the opportunity to use nuclear fuel and intermediate-level waste storage and disposal facilities in South Australia.

JUROR: And disposal?

JUROR: Yes, facilities in South Australia, and you could probably (indistinct) brackets, recommendation (indistinct)

JUROR: I think it's something that people are going to want to know is discussed, right, because it's a safety thing. There are risks at different stages.

JUROR: And then I'm kind of happy with the rest of that paragraph.

JUROR: Yes, sure, and maybe that's putting in thoughts about background radiation and stuff. I'm trying to put on that (indistinct) against it (indistinct) right, because if we don't mention that stuff can go wrong, then it sounds like (indistinct) we're being really (indistinct)

JUROR: So this part here about, "until further research risks are acceptable (indistinct) I think we should take that out.

JUROR: So try to, like, play devil's advocate, right, think about this sort of stuff, yes, and we can absolutely say how low some of those risks actually turn out to be. Let me get (indistinct) bit.

JUROR: But it goes with the sentence prior to it: "This research requires further financial commitment by SA," however we need the research. Like, one doesn't come without the other.

JUROR: Yes, I know, but I don't think we need to say - because that's what got bogged down yesterday. There were people who didn't think that that was

actually a statement that should be in there.

JUROR: Okay.

5 JUROR: When we did the comfortability and not comfortable.

JUROR: I was going to say only take out (indistinct) not the rest of it.

10 JUROR: Maybe if we leave, the more we have in there because we can take it out and people can agree or disagree if it's in there.

JUROR: Maybe if you put a comma.

15 JUROR: (indistinct) is required. It's already got it here. Information is required to justify, what's the word?

JUROR: In order to even consider.

20 JUROR: Well, see in the report it states 45. It's not considered so we need to quantify rather than just understand. Additional information to quantify the benefit that's been set out.

JUROR: No, no.

25 JUROR: We're going to take that out. We can't, it's not our opinion.

JUROR: (indistinct) which people read to make a decision?

30 MS V. LAMBERT: I love these discussions, it's fantastic. I just want to insert here we're not going to converge so you have up until 12 o'clock to address.

JUROR: So we're not going to converge?

35 MS V. LAMBERT: We're not going to converge. They might do a little bit of live streaming from here but probably unlikely. So you have, it's more important for you to be finished with your product here than to have that conversation with that group. But you do need to be finished by 12 o'clock.

JUROR: Yes.

40

JUROR: Are we hoping to facilitate as part of the process? I'm not sure whether our document will be (indistinct)

45 JUROR: Not what about the report recommends. This is not something that is (indistinct)

JUROR: That's what I'm trying to say.

JUROR: For now.

5

JUROR: Sorry to interrupt, have you got those reference points that I gave you so that I can recapture what you said? You were writing down some, sorry.

JUROR: Do I have to read?

10

JUROR: That's why I didn't offer to type this one.

JUROR: The report will note that, this is not relevant.

15

JUROR: The jury is (indistinct)

JUROR: You need to say the report looked at that and the finding is.

JUROR: This is my shorthand of saying exactly that.

20

JUROR: It doesn't matter. It's not relevant.

JUROR: We're not putting out name to it.

25

JUROR: What you're saying, we're producing a document for people to read. Our opinion doesn't matter.

JUROR: They're dealing with information upstairs about what the jury (indistinct) we don't have to include it in our documentation. Economics should be about facts. The facts are that they put on the table a potential \$54 billion. That's \$54 billion that needs to be quantified by additional research and validated. If you want to put down that experts - - -

30

JUROR: Let's still put it not relevant.

35

JUROR: Economic experts, the information is provided. No problem but you can't say we are jurors disagree. Economic witnesses or economic experts from around the state have disputed the validity of the numbers that have been provided in the Royal Commission report so additional processes need to be taken into account to ensure the robustness of the numbers because they disagree. Where we disagreed doesn't matter because none of us (indistinct) but it's the economists that we talked about.

40

JUROR: The other guys are involved with the Royal Commission report, both of them completely disagree with each other.

45

MS V. LAMBERT: We're not going to converge but don't take our foot off the pedal.

5 JUROR: After having just read the observer thoughts someone makes the point about cross over so maybe we should work, when we're talking about the economic model point out a number of terms. Conservative. That is conservative estimates. I guess that alludes to the fact that we know that there could be (indistinct)

10

JUROR: We can have different opinions. I like robustness.

JUROR: I think the jury have to be (indistinct)

15 JUROR: We don't have an opinion. We cannot have an opinion. The key is the economists' dispute and the robustness of the information provided, right. It doesn't care what we - - -

20 JUROR: What's the point of saying this is the jury and this is what we've done?

JUROR: Because that's what the (indistinct) says.

25 JUROR: But that's what I meant.

JUROR: Sorry, I have to disagree. We don't have a voice. We have an opinion but it's not the voice.

30 JUROR: I think importantly people are listening to us as citizens and they want (indistinct) them not the experts though because the experts can say whatever they want and they will on every topic.

JUROR: This is supposed to be finished by three.

35 JUROR: So we can change it.

JUROR: I was going to say something like far below what is considered safe and what comes from natural background radiation.

40 JUROR: Yes. I think there does need to be a point about the natural background - - -

JUROR: (indistinct) refer them to that diagram.

45 JUROR: All of us are exposed to environmental radiation daily. But because

of differences of the (indistinct) and the robustness of the information. I don't believe the jury – I am saying the jury part should come out. It should be the fact that what we've heard - - -

5 JUROR: I made this point earlier and I make it again, I think we put it in and it can get taken out. We put in more and we can take it out. (background discussion) That's what I mean; our body is made to expel that but with the nuclear isotopes they connect to our genes. So I don't want to mention bananas in our report.

10

JUROR: Sure, let's just say that they're contentious.

JUROR: Yes. Yes, I do. I don't think the jury should be - - -

15 JUROR: What we're saying is the economists have varying views on the robustness of the economic (indistinct) needs to be undertaken to progressing with a nuclear waste disposal.

20 JUROR: But as a sceptic if you were reading that and if you read that in the paper and you went experts say, economists say et cetera and you'll be like but that's because they have to say that, or they've got an agenda.

JUROR: No.

25 JUROR: Don't want you to know that Jo Blow down the street thinks it.

JUROR: No.

JUROR: That we are all exposed to on a daily basis.

30

JUROR: Yes, pages 136.

JUROR: That we are daily exposed to.

35 JUROR: We are all exposed to – read through on this.

JUROR: The word natural has to be in there somewhere.

40 JUROR: Yes, I understand that. But I want to have less amount of reword as possible.

JUROR: Exposed to daily.

45 JUROR: Yes, we are on a timeline as well so.

JUROR: That's it.

JUROR: I know that it's a sticking point for you but I say we put it in because that's something that we all need to - - -

5

JUROR: Page 136.

JUROR: Even the next question, there are many questions (indistinct) by experts - - -

10

JUROR: And 100 per cent you can say, I can't live with that when we get to the - - -

JUROR: And I will have to say that.

15

JUROR: I said, I don't think we should have it in.

JUROR: Yes. And that can be your I can't live with it and we can just (indistinct) that as a 50 not as a - - -

20

JUROR: We've got a heading health, that might have to move up to health.

JUROR: I think without government influence, without like obviously we've heard witnesses et cetera but we're supposed to be making our mind up and they want to know that this is what we think.

25

JUROR: And the rest of this talks about transport, so (indistinct) about transport.

30

JUROR: Yes, this is about providing information. That's what I'm coming back to. We're not making anybody's mind up. We don't have to tell the state government what they have to do next. What we're saying is this is the information - - -

35

JUROR: But we're saying we don't think that there's enough information.

JUROR: Well, there isn't. That's because the robustness of the information is not – the information's not robust. Just because we, as juries don't think it's robust, fundamentally the information here is not robust.

40

JUROR: But someone from the Commission report's going to turn around and say but it is there and that's their opinion.

45

JUROR: Okay. It will go up on the board and if it gets knocked out, it gets knocked out. But all I'm saying is I think that - - -

JUROR: It's a valid point.

JUROR: So what I've put down here is - - -

5

JUROR: Have we put in the state won't fund it yet.

JUROR: No, so we're going to – so we've got page 292 we have table J2,
which show the existing inventory of the spent fuel rods currently. So that is
10 the basis for the economic modelling. So the economic modelling was based -
- -

JUROR: Yes.

15 JUROR: So it's page 292, table J2 which shows current forecast stockpiled, so
maybe table J.2 which shows the current and forecast stockpiles of used fuel
and intermediate level waste - - -

JUROR: This one just put your reference that we're in chapter 9.

20

JUROR: Current and forecast stockpiles.

JUROR: Is there a recommendation that we set up (indistinct)

25 JUROR: No. What page is that one on? Was it 192? Nuclear reactor –
instead of countries, I would put down nuclear reactor in countries.

JUROR: My feeling is that we should be focussing on the countries that I've
highlighted which is Japan, Taiwan - - -

30

JUROR: Considerations, if you're talking about – expert, so based on what
that person says, we are assuming the - - -

JUROR: And the other diagram could be reference to is page 102, which is
35 table 5.9.

JUROR: Okay. So look, I feel like most of this paragraph is not useful. Most
of this paragraph, I feel like I don't want to include most of it. I think - - -

40 JUROR: So it's page 102, table 5.9, the financial projections which is what
we're saying is robust. Page 102, table 5.9.

JUROR: That is very relevant, we were told that yesterday that we have to put
things like most, many, all - - -

45

JUROR: And these are the projections that need to be further investigated.

5 JUROR: All right. So this is the modelling we've talked about and that's what we're saying, the – are these numbers correct? Yes, just really showing the number because we haven't talked about the number so – and the numbers in the report.

JUROR: So what are we going to put in there?

10 JUROR: We don't know. We wondered if we could do that (indistinct) No, it's not going to stay like that, that's why it's got question marks. We don't know if there's all - - -

15 JUROR: On a pre-tax basis.

JUROR: We can all agree that we don't want this to be biased, right. We want it to be as (indistinct) or non-leading as possible.

20 JUROR: I think I feel like this is important because we want to show that if necessity – I think it's important to show that if it's established that we're not spending all the money now. I didn't finish the thought because I'm not really sure. I wanted to say to ensure blah, blah but I've already said that.

25 JUROR: This is the actual statement in the report. So you basically need to sort of summarise that and maybe even reference people to - - -

JUROR: It's waste. Whatever it is, it's waste.

30 JUROR: Future generations.

JUROR: I'm thinking to kind of - - -

JUROR: (indistinct) so there's definitely high-level waste and we don't - - -

35 JUROR: South Australia.

JUROR: But we're kind of putting in, like - it's almost like insurance. Like, it's going to be the --

40 JUROR: Used fill.

JUROR: Yes. That was a separate one though, wasn't it?

45 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: Glossary.

JUROR: A glossary, yes.

5 JUROR: Because where people are going to go, "Yes, but what about my grandchildren and my grandchildren's grandchildren?" and they go, "Well, at least we can say if this is what it is," then theoretically, there's still money for them. It's going to cost a lot of money. It might make a lot of money, it might not, but it's go to get paid upfront, I guess. So should we say something
10 around, "This is not state money we're spending"?

JUROR: Yes, because we wouldn't go forward without (indistinct) kind of.

15 JUROR: No. I think that's important, because we're not going into debt for this. I don't (indistinct) actually.

JUROR: Yes. I'm not sure if the report talks about the testing of the equipment. We've heard about the train and so forth.

20 JUROR: Well, can we say that?

JUROR: Hold on, hold on. The train is something different. The train is completely different. That's transport.

25 JUROR: That was, what, 51 billion? It's on page - - -

JUROR: The train stuff is the transport. Transport casks. It's an important distinction not to foul up, yes.

30 JUROR: Well, it's the same and the geological guy for safety talks about \$1 billion to identify the right site over 20 years and you can't get pre-commitment for that.

35 JUROR: No, you can. Well, the money that we get, the pre-commitment - - -

JUROR: The whole thing?

JUROR: - - -is the whole entire process.

40 JUROR: Yes, but I don't believe that they would pay you money upfront to decide where you want (indistinct)

JUROR: The money that we're getting, yes, it covers that.

45 JUROR: Yes. I submit you find you have to spend it first, 1 billion, anyway.

You wouldn't build a site (indistinct) commitment. You have to find a site you're going to build.

5 JUROR: I feel like that's really wordy.

JUROR: That all looks terribly vague, "The jury has heard that." What about, "The jury considers that"? Heard that. I mean, where from? The guy outside?

10 JUROR: Which part are you looking at?

JUROR: Okay.

JUROR: Yes. It's not pedantic, but I think - - -

15 JUROR: Sure. No, it's good (indistinct) think about wording.

JUROR: Be careful of "the jury". Most, all, many, some. You cannot say "the jury".

20 JUROR: Most, all, many, few.

JUROR: Yes.

25 JUROR: That's why I was saying "has heard", because we have heard from expert witnesses.

JUROR: Yes. We said that at the beginning. We don't need to (indistinct)

30 JUROR: Yes, true.

JUROR: Yes, but on this topic?

JUROR: No.

35 JUROR: Because we can't say this on the report, I don't believe.

JUROR: Well, then we can't put it in there, because (indistinct) doesn't go in.

40 JUROR: People (indistinct)

JUROR: Well, then we need to direct them to online video.

45 JUROR: Do you guys happen to know where anything about pre-commitment is from other countries?

MS V. LAMBERT: Are you guys okay?

JUROR: I think we're getting somewhere maybe.

5 MS V. LAMBERT: Yes. I'm sure that you are.

JUROR: I think we are here.

JUROR: Which one?

10

JUROR: This one. I just typed - - -

JUROR: Should this project go ahead, the project will be funded by a client
(indistinct)

15

JUROR: Let's ignore the testing (indistinct) because I'm not sure whether it is
in the report.

MS V. LAMBERT: So you're okay?

20

JUROR: Yes. Thank you.

JUROR: It will cover expenditure.

25 JUROR: There is a possibility that future research may determine this project
is not viable (indistinct) yes, it has to, otherwise (indistinct)

JUROR: Yes, because I can't believe that that hasn't come up yet until now.

30 JUROR: Yes, because we just keep forgetting that (indistinct)

JUROR: So who asked the question, because that was a good question about
what is (indistinct)

35 JUROR: Yes, but the problem at the moment is we can't go and get those
(indistinct) even a suggestion of pre-commitment, because legislation doesn't
allow us to do it.

40 JUROR: Yes. I still would like to have - so get the jury, but where it goes to
the Royal Commission report - - -

JUROR: The report follows that - - -

45 JUROR: Yes. Well, I just think that's suspicion. I don't know (indistinct) feel
comfortable progressing to the next step. The reality, as I've said, upstairs

they're going to be talking about (indistinct) some of those (indistinct) financial (indistinct) or making financial commitments is what we'd really be doing. So until we can justify it's really making - it's an additional financial commitment.

5 JUROR: Yes. So that's chapter 9. Particularly the first finding on chapter 9 does say that.

JUROR: Did you check to see if there was a guy here from the Royal Commission? So we've got to be careful we don't repeat ourselves. So I think
10 that's a repetitive of what's already there, because we've already talked about being unsure of the robustness of the numbers. So we don't need to - 86. Yes, that's right. Yes. So that should actually go in there.

JUROR: Yes. We want to emphasise that it is very well tested like train
15 rating stuff that - - -

JUROR: Here we go. "Breach" was the right word. "Accidents have occurred during shipment with used fuel but none have resulted in either a breach of the packaging containing the radioactive material."
20

JUROR: So they have to (indistinct) packaging, do they?

JUROR: Well, that's what (indistinct)

25 JUROR: Yes, fair enough.

JUROR: In fact that sentence could probably go in and we could actually (indistinct)

30 JUROR: Transport routinely and safely.

JUROR: It just says accident have happened - so it can't be too glowing, that fact - during shipment of used fuel but none has resulted in either a breach of the package, whatever we called it.
35

JUROR: Yes, I do, but that's important because are going to go, "Why are we wasting all our money on this? We're not (indistinct)

JUROR: "Packages" is kind of a more broad term for all of the types of
40 things.

JUROR: No breach of package - - -

JUROR: Containing radioactive material or any harmful effect due to
45 radiation, or we could even just say - - -

JUROR: No breach of the packages or release of radiation (indistinct) radiation.

5 JUROR: Containing radioactive material.

JUROR: Okay.

JUROR: Yes.

10

JUROR: I think we're close.

JUROR: We can actually reference that as page 163, be more precise than chapter lines do.

15

JUROR: I think we say to them, "This is what we took out of the previous report and what we thought was important", but then we got to a point where we said what's important to you, what would you tell your neighbour and it came out. We hadn't spoken about the pre-commitment from (indistinct) nations which we thought was a critical point.

20

JUROR: Juror, can you take a photo please?

JUROR: Can you guys, I'm trying to come up with the transport section.

25

JUROR: I would like to as well.

JUROR: Just so that we at least have a note of that. We're putting down somewhere further the full economic proposal of revenue, yes, but there's other parts here as well.

30

JUROR: Where does that start?

JUROR: The key part is revenue which is what we're saying under question for robustness. Page 102. Estimated revenue.

35

JUROR: Accidental damage nods to the fact that accidents have occurred.

JUROR: Page 102, estimated revenue.

40

JUROR: I think we're sort of close on this. What do you want to do now?

JUROR: Can we swap? Can we validate the orders?

45

JUROR: Sure.

JUROR: And you validate ours. Does that make sense? At least that way before it gets a cut there at least we've had a chance to log each other's work.

5 JUROR: We can always talk back and forth about it, what everyone's thinking.

JUROR: We've only got 15 minutes. That's fine. The question was which parts of the recommendation do you have on economics and those all cover
10 economics. Have you saved it?

JUROR: Are you speaking from experience?

JUROR: Absolutely.
15

JUROR: Shall we look at each other's work?

JUROR: I beg your pardon, I misread the word. There's terrorism again.

20 JUROR: It's just a bit more focused, that's all.

JUROR: It's something that we can talk about.

JUROR: So why don't we finish up down the bottom with other questions
25 because I can't see with my glasses, I can't see without them. That's the problem with getting old.

JUROR: I think I like that.

30 JUROR: It's a bit more straightforward.

JUROR: It is if it affects tourism but I think maybe we can always discuss that with another group. Should we add that on? How will it be affected and will this have an impact on tourism and trade?
35

JUROR: Should we have a sentence that says - - -

JUROR: Will this have an effect on tourism and trade? Tourism and trade or
40 tourism and industry.

JUROR: I don't think it was effect trade. I couldn't see a nuclear waste depository in (indistinct) would make a difference to - - -

JUROR: Half-life?
45

JUROR: I guess the question of growing there. It's the perception as well which we all now know that that shouldn't affect people in the area.

JUROR: There's a question that needs to be - - -

5

JUROR: It's one that will come up, yes.

JUROR: Longevity.

10 JUROR: That's not an invalid point though.

JUROR: That's significant. I don't think we can, and even if you downplay that. They absolutely agreed on the procedure but we're talking about a minimum of a thousand years before it's safe-ish, do you know what I mean.

15 That's a long time.

JUROR: But that's safety from the point of view of the radioactivity from the capsule. It does tend to suggest the capsule which will last much longer.

20 JUROR: Absolutely. Maybe if we take a step back and we say we've got nuclear waste, right. This is a fact of life. We have to manage it. This is also a fact of life. That nuclear waste is going to be hazardous for a very, very, very long time. That is a fact of life. So safety is of utmost concern. Is that the way we frame that? That's kind of where I'm coming from with that. To say that
25 we have strong concerns about (indistinct) still going to be really hazardous (indistinct) is to say that starting off from first principles, that's the sort of stuff that we need to add.

JUROR: Are you guys ready to do a first cut reviewing each other's work or
30 not?

JUROR: We're just going to put in a quick sentence and then you guys can re-jig and we'll be good to go.

35 JUROR: What the commission is saying (indistinct) negotiation, cost (indistinct) intergenerational measure, various views of experts, insufficient detail (indistinct) uncertainty, opportunity in the future, what you should (indistinct)

40 JUROR: I think more is less. The rest of the group can then come up if they need to, if we want to.

JUROR: Swap over so we'll validate their work and they can validate ours before it goes to the (indistinct) group.

45

JUROR: Reading it aloud sometimes helps.

JUROR: So you ready? Let's swap.

5 JUROR: Clean slate. If you've got questions for us or we've got questions for you.

JUROR: Can we avoid cutting and anything that you would like to cut and we would like to cut we'll discuss?

10

JUROR: Yes, highlight changes.

JUROR: I've got question marks around bits.

15 JUROR: Happy? That's what we like to hear. You're happy. If that's in your way just, if that's box is in you way, it's got the top of the folder on it.

MS V. LAMBERT: You've got about seven minutes.

20 JUROR: That's what we should have done.

JUROR: We'll highlight and well, yes.

JUROR: Do you want to read it slowly?

25

JUROR: Read it and once we've read it ,we talk about it or do you want to read it?

30 JUROR: Safety is an important consideration because of the potential impact of radiation to people and the environment in the long time scale (indistinct) before the material becomes less hazardous. The jury has read the RC report and it includes many (indistinct) presented and discussed.

JUROR: Will we say it was not in the scope of the NRC?

35

JUROR: Where exactly a site.

JUROR: Was not, however site selection was not within (indistinct)

40 JUROR: Site selection was not part of the – what do you want to change there sorry?

JUROR: Scope of the NRC.

45 JUROR: My understanding is you've got containment when it's above ground,

there's other containment needs to be done before you go below ground.

JUROR: Below levels that are expected.

5 JUROR: Can we just take out safety levels? The expected doses are far below that which we are naturally exposed to.

JUROR: Yes. Far below natural levels background radiation - - -

10 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: - - - we are all exposed to daily.

JUROR: I'm not sure of the process upstairs but from my point of view, there
15 should be an explanation of what is nuclear – the nuclear fuel cycle and then
what is high level waste? So what is a – so for instance it says there 30 years,
(indistinct) the fuel rod is extracted from the nuclear reactor and put into water
for 10 years to cool down. Post that it's then put in to above ground storage,
encapsulated and cooled for another 20 to 30 years before it would even be
20 transported. So there's some an understanding. At the moment it's 10 years
and another 20. Now it's fundamentally (indistinct) years because there's been
no below ground (indistinct)

JUROR: I think only one document on there exists.

25

JUROR: Where's the document that we saved?

JUROR: You can select and hold and add it to the other one.

30 JUROR: If you want to select all and put it in. We just want it all onto one
document. It's all there?

JUROR: Yes, I saved the whole document.

35 JUROR: Okay. You want to put it all onto this one. We're going to try and
get to add it so it's one document.

JUROR: So you're going to put all documents on the one USB.

40 JUROR: It's okay.

JUROR: Hopefully they're going to format that section.

MS V. LAMBERT: How do you guys feel?

45

JUROR: Pretty happy that we're done.

JUROR: It's saved on the USB.

5 JUROR: We've got enough to take to the rest of the jury.

JUROR: Yesterday when all this general talking about engagement with the community, it's definitely enough to (indistinct) so the total process.

10 JUROR: I think it's going to be a different conversation.

JUROR: I hope so. Who's going to talk to it?

JUROR: Yes, you had a few highlights.

15

JUROR: I think we should have this conversation with everyone, not just us.

ADJOURNED

[12.04 PM]

20 **RESUMED**

[12.13 PM]

MS JENKE: Okay, all right, so jurors come and grab a seat. I need the people talking to section 1. I need someone who's talking to section 1 and I also need someone from section 1 to sit at the laptop and make any changes. Yes, I'm just about to do that. No, I was not section 1. We were three and five but we've made it all into one section. Okay. Juror, you're the man. Who? You? We need the microphone. Do you each want one? Jurors, all right, I'm taking a seat. Do we have everyone ready? How we're going to do this is I just want you to listen, right. I just want you to listen to what the section 1 group have come out with and if you catch yourself thinking about something that you want to interrupt, catch it, sit on it. No interrupt – hear the story. Let's hear the whole story.

25

30

We'll have the opportunity for some discussion but coming into this, I'm really going to challenge you and push you to be thinking can I live with it. Might be quite right if it was writing it myself but can I live with it. General comfort. Juror. Sorry, juror. Over to you.

35

JUROR: So firstly about the jury. Our purpose and role. The Nuclear Fuel Cycle Citizens' Jury was engaged to review the Royal Commission report and summarise into an independent guide. The goal is to help every South Australian understand the opportunities and risks of increasing South Australia's involvement in the nuclear fuel cycle identified by the Royal Commission. Who we are. The process to select the Citizens' Jury was random. 2500 invitations were randomly sent to citizens across the state using

45

the Australia post data base. There are a total of 1121 respondents that were willing to participate in the jury.

5 Of these people a jury of 54 was randomly selected to align with census data for age, gender and location. We have a little diagram there that will be changed to fit our things. So we're going to have, yes, so we're going to have the jurors ages ranged from 20 through to however old and we're a diverse range of social and cultural backgrounds. The jury was provided with a copy of the Royal Commission report and access to information and a diverse range of
10 experts enabling an informed discussion. Details on individual witnesses can be found at your, say, we'll put the link there.

MS V. LAMBERT: Keep going, juror.

15 JUROR: So now the nuclear fuel cycle. What is it? The nuclear fuel cycle can be summarised into four areas. Mining and milling, enrichment and fuel fabrication, electricity generation, used fuel management and disposal and we also have some diagrams here taken from the report and some that we've designed.

20

MS V. LAMBERT: So you've got a concept there.

JUROR: So these will be colour coded so we had that in the report. We had that circular diagram of the four stages and we were going to colour code with
25 those circles the different stages and dot point the recommendations. The nuclear fuel cycle Royal Commission focused on the storage of international used fuel, high level waste, as opposed to the storage of Australian produced low and intermediate level nuclear wastes. Then we're going to put in a box there that just like a little glossary that just is really simple, it just states what
30 the different types of waste, high level, intermediate and what is nuclear waste.

JUROR: And a descriptor of what it is there.

JUROR: Okay. So this will be in a table format.

35

*Mining. So these are the recommendations. Continued involvement, investigate reduction of red tape and undertake further geophysical surveys encouraging further private investment. Further processing and fuel fabrication. There's currently no international market for
40 additional services in these areas. Remove legislative prohibitions to enable further processing activities and fuel leasing should a market appear. Promote and support increased use of the existing cyclotron summary.*

45 I've lost my place.

5 *Electricity generation. Nuclear power generation is not commercially viable in SA under current market rules but could be considered as a future low carbon energy source to contribute to national emission reduction targets. Remove existing prohibitions for nuclear power generation. Used fuel management and disposal. There is potential for economic benefit in providing a storage and disposal facility for internationally generated, high-level used fuel waste; remove existing prohibitions and complete thorough analysis and discussion on the opportunity to establish a used-fuel facility in South Australia.*

We have some footnotes there, the Royal Commission. Okay. So now the focus for the citizen jury.

15 *Over four days of deliberation, the jury discussed all stages of the nuclear fuel cycle. Following the initial education and awareness sessions, the jury spent the majority of its time focused on the key recommendation to pursue the opportunity to establish an international used-fuel storage facility. The jurors recognise that there are potential economic benefits, but there are also substantial risks to consider.*

20 *There is a high level of uncertainty around both the benefits and risks associated with establishing such a facility. Significant additional research, economic analysis and public engagement is still required before South Australians will be in a position to make an informed decision if this is in the best interest of the state.*

30 MS JENKE: Okay. Right. So, applause. I don't know. Does that mean good work or does that mean, "Yes, we love it"? So there's some graphic stuff that needs to be added to that, which is okay, but in general, can you leave with it? Yes. Let's do a show of hands. It's a bit boring, but let's do that. Can you live with it? Okay. So we might run the mike around just with some comments for who can't.

35 JUROR: I can live with it, but there were just some things that I'd like clarified. With the table that has the summary of what's in the report, I may have missed it, but is it possible to outline that the table is actually what's proposed in the report as opposed to just clearly putting forward that it's not what the jury recommends, it's a summary of the report? And that might be - - -

MS JENKE: So being really explicit?

45 JUROR: Yes, being a bit more explicit. And then I just wanted to understand

what details of the jurors will be on the YourSAy website. You've made a point that details can be found.

5 JUROR: No (indistinct) jurors, the witnesses.

MS JENKE: Details about the witnesses.

JUROR: The witnesses. Okay. Sorry. And then the sentence that says, "25,000 invitations were randomly sent," maybe putting "randomly" at a
10 different point in the sentence, because the process was actually - - -

JUROR: We took that from the invitation. So that was actually the piece in the invitation that went out to every single person that was sent an invitation. So we just used the same wording as that.
15

JUROR: Okay. I get that the process is random selection, but the technique of sending them isn't random.

MS V. LAMBERT: My understanding, Iain, is that the technique was random
20 by Australia Post.

MR WALKER: (indistinct) invitation there. Yes. We pull a random extract of addresses in the first place and then it's a second - it's a two-round, random, stratified draw. I'm just going to check that wording, but, yes, the addresses
25 are pulled at random.

MS JENKE: Okay. Let's have a look at it. So the process to select the Citizens' Jury was random. 25,000 invitations were randomly sent to citizens across the state using the Australia Post database. Total of 1121 respondents
30 that were willing to participate in the jury. Of these, a jury of 54 was randomly selected to align with census data for age, gender and location.

JUROR: (indistinct) 25,000 invitations were sent to randomly selected citizens.
35

MS JENKE: Okay. All right. 25,000 invitations were sent to randomly selected citizens. Randomly selected addresses? Yes?

JUROR: Yes.
40

MS JENKE: Randomly selected addresses. So hang on a minute. It was addresses. Iain said that's perfect, yes, because Iain did it. So the other suggestion was do we take the first sentence out there? No, leave it? Okay. So we're leaving that.
45

JUROR: What's the (indistinct) for the (indistinct) is that random?

JUROR: Yes.

5 MS JENKE: Yes. Okay. So comfortable? Comfortable. Juror can live with it. Yay, progress. Okay.

JUROR: I just had just a thought. I understand the point that Juror is making about the process itself, whilst being a random one, the process was very
10 structured and measured. So maybe saying the process to select the Citizens' Jury was unbiased. I'm happy with "random", but just - - -

JUROR: I completely understand what you're saying. We stuck with the word "random" because it's - I mean, it's a word that a lot of people use in - it's
15 just easy, general terminology. Biased and unbiased and so forth, I think everything was quite wordy, so we were trying to - because we'd get into a bit of technical stuff trying to just make some of the easy-to-read stuff that people are just going to browse over, yes, just a little more general.

20 JUROR: So can I suggest, "Citizens were selected at random"? Does that sound fine?

MS JENKE: Okay. Can we live with this? Let's just leave it. Can we live with it? It is one sentence. We've got bigger fish to fry, children. Okay.
25 We're comfortable to leave? Yes? There are hands everywhere.

JUROR: It was mentioned that we come from a diverse social and cultural background, but as I've discussed with different people over the couple of weekends, we also come from different educational backgrounds too. We've
30 got a lot of qualified people here. Like, social, cultural and education background, simple (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Okay. Yes. It makes it nice and stronger.

35 JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: Social, educational and cultural backgrounds. Okay. Juror, you've got a comment.

40 JUROR: Just a very quick one. If Nick can go down to the bottom, right down the end. Is that the end?

MS JENKE: Yes, that is the end.

45 JUROR: You've talked about a used-fuel storage facility, but you then also

referred to it as fuel storage disposal. I just like the facility as being common, so the descriptor that we're using - - -

MS JENKE: Needs to be consistent?

5

JUROR: Yes, and we've also talked about the fact that if we do go down this path, there is a potential some of these used fuel rods could be used as power sources in the future, so therefore you may not necessarily dispose of it. So "storage facility", I think, is a better vernacular to use through the entire document rather than "disposal", that's all.

10

MS JENKE: Okay. So a used-fuel storage facility being the language - okay. Comfortable with that? Okay. Good. All right. Did someone else have a non-live, "can't with it"? Juror?

15

JUROR: I can live with it. It's just the grammar of the first sentence.

MS JENKE: Can we come back? Let's do grammar in a bit. Juror?

20

JUROR: So at the very end, there's a section that says something like there's a high level of uncertainty regarding risks and benefits. The wording, "high level of uncertainty", I'm not super comfortable with that. I think the people that put the report together put in quite a lot of effort to try and take out a lot of that uncertainty.

25

JUROR: Yes. I think that was just one of the editing things we missed out. We ran out of time at the end before we got to take out a couple of the wordy words as well, and so we were going to remove that. Thank you for that pointing that out.

30

JUROR: So just saying there's a level of - - -

MS JENKE: So it's been changed?

35

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: Thank you.

MS JENKE: There's a degree of uncertainty?

40

JUROR: Yes. Okay, that's fine.

MS JENKE: Okay. Look at that. Look at us go. Okay. Juror, I think you're going to be my last one and then we're moving on.

45

JUROR: Thanks (indistinct) yes. Coming back to the random selection, I'm interest to know whether the profile of the respondents, the 1121, were similar to the random profile of the 25,000.

5 MS JENKE: All right. We might park that one, because I don't think it needs to be in - what we're doing is looking at this report. So we might park it. We'll get Iain to answer that question for you if you like later. Is that okay? Yes, okay. All right, I'm being a hard taskmaster.

10 JUROR: Why can't we call it high level waste?

MS JENKE: Yes, fair enough.

JUROR: You've got intermediate level, low level waste, high level waste.
15 Why do we keep changing the name and trying to sugar coat high level waste?

MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: But you want to use a common word for it. It's - - -
20

MS JENKE: No, so it's the facility. The name of the - - -

JUROR: Well any time used fuel is used, it should be high level waste.

25 JUROR: It's there, yes.

JUROR: Yes, we've got that.

JUROR: Well, can't we use that all the time instead of used fuel?
30

JUROR: Because it's not weapons related high waste, it's only used fuel.

JUROR: But that's still high level waste. If you don't call it high level waste, it reduces the impact of the title of it. It makes it sound nicer than what it is.
35

MS JENKE: Okay. So the thing is high level waste, the facility is a used fuel storage facility.

JUROR: High level waste facility, storage facility.
40

MS JENKE: Okay. All right, let's just pause. Let's just pause and go to what's at the root of this problem? What's at the root of this problem? What's making you really unsettled?

45 JUROR: It feels like it's being sugar coated with a new title.

JUROR: In which part?

5 JUROR: Anywhere – the whole report has there’s hundreds of referrals to used fuel, once in the book, page 30 or something it says “high level waste” in brackets. It should be high level waste the whole time.

JUROR: But there is also low level waste that needs to be storage.

10 JUROR: I just want the waste to be called waste and not renamed in any aspect.

15 MS JENKE: So what you’re saying, let me have a go at this, what you’re saying is instead of calling it used fuel storage facility, you want to call it a high level waste storage facility?

JUROR: Even if it can have low and intermediate, it can have - - -

20 MS JENKE: High level - - -

JUROR: - - - high so that’s - - -

JUROR: Can I just point out - - -

25 MS JENKE: Grab the mic.

JUROR: If you look up there, we’ve actually used exactly your terminology, high level waste. If you scroll where we – even in that part, in that paragraph. Go back up sorry to be a pain in the proverb. It might be reused. I don’t think
30 you’re referring to the storage facility as such but it’s where we used the term -
- -

JUROR: It’s the terminology that bothers me. Yes.

35 JUROR: Yes. So not necessarily in that sentence there, it’s up higher.

JUROR: Well any time that we try and write used fuel; it should be high level waste.

40 MS JENKE: Can I ask a question?

JUROR: I just want to point out that it’s actually there and I think juror made a point – see we’ve got used fuel; do we take high level waste out of bracket and just say used fuel, high level waste as opposed to storage?
45

JUROR: Well, if you'd like to make it used fuel, high level waste, fine.

MS JENKE: So I'm wondering, there is actually a definition opportunity here. I'm wondering whether you want some help from the Royal Commission
5 around definitions, or whether you want to resolve it yourself? Because this sounds like a sticky point. Geordan, are you in a position to give us a bit of what you know. I'll get you a microphone. We're looking for clarity here so -
--

10 MR GRACKS: There is actually a difference between used fuel and high level waste. So Australia is party to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the International Atomic Energy Agency classifies the types of radioactive materials. What it says and on radioactivewaste.gov.au says that used fuel is
15 not high level waste, that is the international classification because used fuel can be later used. It can be reprocessed. So high level waste is not the subject of the Commission's report. We would be taking used fuel should this go ahead.

JUROR: The used fuel, while it's not classified as waste because it can be
20 reprocessed, is what level of radioactivity?

MR KANIYAL: The level of radio toxicity, right? So you have been introduced to that concept, is outlined in the Commission's report, so you see that big graph which shows what it is when it comes out of the reactor and how
25 it changes over time. So that is what defines the radio toxicity, which is a combination of radiation effects and potential biological effects, defines that.

JUROR: What we'd like from you then is a simplicity – or simplify that. Okay, so what we're asking right now is to have a terminology - - -
30

MR KANIYAL: Yes.

JUROR: - - - that clarifies what we're trying to say. So used fuel is what we've used in there and behind that we put in brackets high level.
35

JUROR: Are you saying it's low?

MR KANIYAL: No. I'm not saying that used fuel is low level waste but - - -

40 JUROR: (indistinct) the radio toxicity of it?

MR KANIYAL: No, it's not – it's very high, I'm just saying that it starts off at X level, in the Commission's report - - -

45 JUROR: So back to that where we state – see we've got storage of

international used fuel and then in brackets we've got high level waste, is that correct?

MR KANIYAL: We can – we'll confirm that.

5

MS JENKE: Okay. So this is a – let's just pause on this, we'll come back to this after lunch. Okay. So just shade it – just shade used fuel and high level waste yellow or something. We're not going to forget about it so temperatures down, children. Let's relax, this is good. This is progress. Okay.

10

JUROR: Can I just ask one more question? Whatever terminology, I know that we're handing over a word document at the end of today which will require obviously some finessing. Will that finessing, so the same language be used throughout?

15

MS JENKE: Yes. So this needs – it needs a little really fine tooth over it but hopefully a couple of you will do. All right. Come back. Let's come back and centre ourselves. Progress. So I hear we can live with this if we resolve that little niggle. Okay. Well done. Good job. All right. So we're going in to – let's do one more before lunch. So that was section one and two. I'm thinking maybe we go to the group that I was with because we had three and five but we kind of smashed it together. So who's our typist and our talker for the group that was with me.

20

25

JUROR: So we worked on section three and section five which was engaging the community and the gateways going forward. The decision making process involves many stages. The first stage was the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission. Following the Citizens' Juries and community engagement process which is currently underway, the government will make a decision on whether to proceed to the next stage. The community will be involved at every stage. We're not sure – I think we talked about maybe not having this title but this is the next stage of really engaging the community.

30

35

We the Citizens' Jury call on you, our fellow South Australians, to join us and be part of the process in deciding our state's future. This is a unique opportunity to be involved in a decision making process in shaping the future for South Australia. Any future decision about the nuclear industry in our state will have long long-term commitment and consequences. The decision will affect not just us but future generations. We encourage you to participate with an open and inquiring mind. Your voice will shape the future of our state and our descendants have #@YourSAyNuclear. Everyone's choice. Everyone matters.

40

45

And then, "Get involved at". We'll have the details with the web address, the

phone and the email. We then wanted a section about the principles of the decision-making process.

5 *We, the Jury, were asked to consider the principles we believe are important for all people to use when discussing South Australia's involvement in the nuclear fuel cycle. These are:*

Legitimacy: a legitimate decision must include all people;

10 *Inclusivity: there must be continual community consultation;*

Transparency: all sources of information must be freely available

15 *Consequences: due consideration must be given to people, our economy and our environment;*

Accountability: decision makers are accountable to the community;

20 *Consider the future: there must be serious considerations and more debate of other alternatives. We also must consider future generations of South Australians through all stages;*

Distribution: potential economic benefits must be shared and accessible to everyone;

25 *Ethical: all decisions should be ethically and morally sound, what's good, what's right, what matters.*

30 MS JENKE: Well done, great job. All right. Let's start with who can live with it. If you can live with it, stand up. Okay.

JUROR: Just a question about how deceptive it might be in the start there about saying being part of the decision making to say "sound individual" and maybe changing that to something like "shaping".

35 MS JENKE: So you mean the first paragraph?

JUROR: Yes. "We, the Citizens' Jury, call on you, our fellow South Australians to join us to be part of the process in deciding our state's future."

40 MS JENKE: So the word you're looking for - - -

JUROR: Shaping or - - -

45 MS JENKE: In shaping?

JUROR: Yes, having a part, because ultimately not every individual is going to be deciding.

5 MS JENKE: Okay. Comfortable with shaping? Yes. I see nods. Yes, there we go. If you can live with it, up you get. Okay. Who else can't live with it? Yes, you need to keep standing. Come on, this is good for the blood. If you can live with it, you need to stand.

10 JUROR: There is one word that I'd like changed. I think we should include in the - and I can't remember where it was because I can't read it on the screen, so I'll have to just rely on somebody else's knowing where it is on the screen.

MS JENKE: Yes. We can find it for you.

15

JUROR: I think when we have - there's a sentence about the community. I think we should include "informed community" make a decision, because there's no point in people making a decision if they don't understand what they're making a decision about.

20

MS JENKE: Maybe scroll down, Juror. There were a series of principles in there. Okay. So maybe up a little bit.

JUROR: We've got a point in there that says, "We encourage you to
25 participate with an open and inquiring mind."

JUROR: I think it was that "informed" one, because one of the aspects of having this big community program is to inform people about what the decision is about and it seems silly to spend - - -

30

MS JENKE: So that sentence, when I was up there listening to the group, was about the spirit in which they wanted people to participate, so an open and inquiring mind instead of block, block, block, or go, go, go. So this openness to learn and participate authentically was what they were trying to get to. I
35 think that's right.

JUROR: We could maybe add a point of "be engaged and informed"?

MS JENKE: Okay, be engaged and informed. Juror?

40

JUROR: Okay. That's similar to the point that was raised - another juror actually said the same thing I was thinking, was that being informed comes after being inquiring. So saying, "Come in and have an inquiring mind," and then they look through this and hopefully they come out more informed later.
45 You can't start out informed, I think is the - - -

MS JENKE: So is there a change, Juror.?

JUROR: I don't think there's a change.

5

MS JENKE: No change?

JUROR: I agree with what's already there. I think saying that someone should start out informed is kind of putting the cart before the horse.

10

MS JENKE: Yes, okay. So, Juror?

JUROR: When we say, "We encourage you to participate with an open and inquiring mind," what's that mean?

15

JUROR: (indistinct)

JUROR: Yes, but if you could give me some examples. Participate how? What do I need to do?

20

JUROR: This is what we've been doing.

JUROR: It's only a question.

25 MS JENKE: There will be links about where you can participate. Is that what you mean?

JUROR: I mean if we could give these people examples about you could participate when you go and read, when you go and talk, when you meet with other - I don't know. I'm asking a question. What's the meaning of "to participate with an open and inquiring mind"? It sounds beautiful, don't get me wrong. I love it, I accept it. I want some clarification about what is that.

30

MS JENKE: Juror, you can respond to that.

35

JUROR: I don't know if this would make a difference, but we encourage you to get involved and participate with an open and inquiring mind.

MS JENKE: And so there's a "get involved" bit which will be there. This is the way you can do that and find out more.

40

JUROR: Because we didn't want to put too much detail in there. We thought we'd put "Get involved at" and then have the links to the website and the phone number and hopefully there's more info in that. Is that not enough?

45

JUROR: May I just make a quick point as well? We had a small discussion on this as well. Not everyone has Internet access. Not everybody that we're providing this information to has access to telephones and so forth. I think what you're saying is where we're saying, "Participate and get involved," we
5 need to give reference to how they can do that and not just put a link on there, because, as I say, this is a print media. A link on a print media isn't going to help someone who doesn't have access to the Internet or can't use the Internet for whatever reason. I think maybe that was just clarifying what you said?

10 JUROR: I want to hear the how, because yesterday we heard (indistinct) they don't use Internet.

MS JENKE: So potentially we either make a change or we actually ask the Agency to provide us with a companion bit that has that information.

15 JUROR: So a mail box - - -

MS JENKE: Yes. Well, a bit of that information we need anyway from the Agency. I mean, there is a lot out there, so - - -

20 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Yes. The Agency is doing that, yes. Yes. There's a whole range of ways that John took us through yesterday morning, so we need that in
25 something simple. Juror.

JUROR: I was just thinking, we could start that sentence with, "Great! You've taken the first opportunity. You picked up this brochure. Now we encourage you to get more involved and participate." Because remember
30 they've picked up this brochure to read that sentence, so we're just, like, encouraging them to go further and dig. So that was one comment there. And my actual statement was actually about "the" community, remembering that we are multiple communities.

35 MS JENKE: Our community?

JUROR: I don't know the language going through, but we can't use "the" community.

40 MS JENKE: So what do you want to say? "Our community"? Is that what you're looking for?

JUROR: Or "all communities throughout South Australia", something like that.

45

MS JENKE: What do you like?

JUROR: What about "the community of South Australia"?

5 MS JENKE: Okay. "The community of South Australia," or "South
Australians"?

JUROR: But we are one community. At the end of the day, we're talking
about South Australia as a community, surely not just individual communities.
10

MS JENKE: So the South Australian community will be involved in every
stage?

JUROR: Yes.

15

MS JENKE: You comfortable? Okay. Who else? Boys? You can't live with
it. You're happy? You just don't want to stand up. Come on. Happy?
Comfortable? Right. Comfortable? You're not comfortable. Look at him.
He's in the middle of the circle. Here he is. He's still sitting down.

20 Microphone.

JUROR: There's a section in there on the (indistinct) alternatives, alternative
fuels.

25 MS JENKE: Yes, there is something in there about alternatives. To consider
the future there must be serious considerations and more debate of other
alternatives.

JUROR: I read that as an indication that the report does not consider other
30 alternatives that, whereas I think the report gives a pretty balanced view of how
nuclear fuel would sit in as in the mix of available fuel types so that, the
wording in there make me uncomfortable because of that.

MS JENKE: Okay. Hang on. Need a microphone. Don't know where
35 they've gone.

JUROR: Could we just put in further serious considerations? To imply that
yes there has been consideration but there should be further.

40 MS JENKE: Juror, have you got additions?

JUROR: Yes. I just wanted to clarify the intent behind the debate around
other alternatives. Are we saying other alternatives to this particular part that
we're focusing on in the commission or other alternatives other than the
45 nuclear fuel cycle?

JUROR: All other options. Any avenues.

MS JENKE: Okay, so the suggestion was for the re-word?

5

JUROR: That the considerations must be for like wind, water, wave, all, anything. Not just - - -

MS JENKE: Okay, so what are we writing?

10

JUROR: Everything.

MS JENKE: What are we writing?

15 JUROR: There must be further serious considerations.

JUROR: Yes, further serious considerations of all other alternatives.

MS JENKE: There must be further serious considerations of, there must be further consideration of - - -

20

JUROR: What are we actually trying to say with this sentence? I think consider the future as a principle is a good one. Considering future alternatives is very frankly wishy washy to me. It kind of, using the word alternative kind of springs to mind alternative energy which I think is kind of dangerous area to get into.

25

JUROR: Economic options.

30 MS JENKE: Okay. You've got an option?

JUROR: I'm thinking leaning towards alternatives to engaging further in whatever the wording is the nuclear fuel cycle.

35 MS JENKE: Okay. What's on the table is do we have, I suppose we've got a decision in front of us. Do we either talk about we need to consider other alternatives or we remain silent on it. If we say it, how do we say it? Has someone got a suggestion for us?

40 JUROR: I think in one section we had a nice bit of wording that said it is our choice whether we go ahead or not. Does that basically cover what we're trying to say here?

MS JENKE: So the suggestion is under consider - - -

45

JUROR: Is someone in there trying to say something? I can't hear.

MS JENKE: Yes, sorry. Really close. It has to be really close.

5 JUROR: My point is that they haven't actually considered any other sort of technology. All they are is sort of putting their views about the nuclear waste so why can't they also think about new technology as well.

10 JUROR: Let's talk about (indistinct) versus alternatives. Alternatives are great. I'm not against them but, just to reiterate I think alternatives are a valid point. I'm not trying to denigrate them at all. I think they do form part of the mix but I just like that part of the mix, part of it to be clear. This is not an alternative of nuclear or alternatives. It is, there are nuclear parts to this discussion and there are alternatives. We should do them but that doesn't do
15 we don't do this.

MS JENKE: So we need some words. You can sit down if you want to sit down. It's taking a while.

20 JUROR: Is that, so one sentence right? So consider the future. Future considerations are more debate or other alternatives or other sources of power, waste disposal, you know, do you want to elaborate on that. Economic growth actually. That's a good one. Economic growth because then that covers everything, doesn't it?

25 MS JENKE: So the sentence, what's the sentence?

JUROR: Consider the future. Future considerations and more debate of other economic growth opportunities.

30 MS JENKE: Further consideration and more debate of other economic opportunities.

JUROR: Consider the future of economic debate?

35 MS JENKE: No, consider the, so it's consider the future, dash, further considerations and more debate. You can go up, juror, up to where it was. Further considerations and more debate of other economic alternatives.

40 JUROR: Could it just be consider possible futures? It doesn't have to be economic, social, you know, that's everything encompassed. No?

JUROR: Can I just clarify maybe the intent behind what we were trying to say. We were asked to consider principles of decision making process so just as part
45 of any person or group of people moving through their process of arriving at a

decision, it's important to consider alternatives. It wasn't alternatives to, that's just a part of the process that people go through.

5 MS JENKE: So it's about all alternatives. Juror, you've got a, or all options.

JUROR: Options was the word I was going to try and put out there.

10 MS JENKE: Consider the future. Further consideration and more debate of other options. We also must consider the future generations.

JUROR: Maybe something along the lines of we should be open to what options are available. We must also consider future generations of South Australia (indistinct) stages.

15 MS JENKE: Can we live with this as it is without changing it too dramatically? Further considerations and more debate of other options. We must also consider future generations of South Australia. Yes? We can live with it? Well done. Juror, you opened another can of worms. We've got one more.

20 JUROR: Could we go back to the open inquiring mind, please? It was just above that.

25 MS JENKE: We encourage you to get involved and participate with an open and inquiring mind.

JUROR: To become as informed as possible. This group as a whole seems to be ambivalent about this education and information. On the one hand we're asked to recommend pieces out of the commission report but whenever the question of education or information which is part of our responsibility comes up, it tends to be moved on one side so I think information about our fellow citizens is one of the most important things that we have to consider.

35 MS JENKE: All right. Carry on. Do you want to - - -

JUROR: My understanding in layman's terms is that we're actually just putting a document together about the Royal Commission document. The education of the community is down to the programme that will follow this.

40 MS JENKE: So there is a suggestion by the juror to add that little bit that's highlighted in blue to become as informed as possible. Juror?

JUROR: What do other people want to do?

45 JUROR: This is us informing them that they can be involved. I don't think

putting that in, we're telling people what to do and that wasn't our job. Our job was to do exactly what we've just done. I don't think that needs to be there. If they want to find out more, they are going to.

5 JUROR: It's up there. What parts of the Commission report should we encourage our fellow citizens to read?

MS JENKE: So what I'm hearing is it's picked up – can you get us out of the mess?

10

JUROR: I have a comment to make about that. I'm a very, very insistent that I say it. All we have to say is to participate in informed discussion because you can talk to people about anything, it doesn't matter. We want them to - - -

15 MS JENKE: It says that - - -

JUROR: - - - talk about - - -

MS JENKE: Participate's there.

20

JUROR: Yes, participate in informed discussion, not (indistinct)

JUROR: It's not up to us to tell people what to talk about and I think that's what you're trying to say.

25

JUROR: No, I'm not; I'm saying that you can talk to somebody about something and make a decision about something and the thing doesn't have anything to do with what you're making your decision about. We want people to participate in something they know something about. I mean everybody can vote, even - - -

30

MS JENKE: Sorry, what's written up there is that we encourage you to get involved and participate with an open and inquiring mind.

35 JUROR: Just quickly - - -

MS JENKE: Just go to juror first.

40 JUROR: I've been waiting a while. Excuse me. Yes, I can't live with that either. I feel that language is very value laden. And I think informed – yes, it's sort of got this – what's the word – yes, about telling people and I mean from my experience - - -

45 MS JENKE: Okay, there's some grids there.

JUROR: - - - when you – I have discussions with uninformed people all the time. I don't have a choice about that but I've developed the skill and ability and an open and inquiring mind in to their way of thinking. So – and for my family and my community and my future generations, the way we make
5 informed decisions may not be in the way that is acceptable to you, or to you, or you but in my culture, it's good enough. You know it's acceptable. So just because – I sit on committees with people that can't read and write, so when I have to take a role in informing them, or I sit on committees where people, like my elders, they rely on me to be informed and they trust my judgment and if
10 I'm not sure about something, they ask – they expect me to go back to them. But they – it's not about being – being informed is not necessarily, this is the standard of - - -

MS JENKE: Okay. Great. Thanks. So I'm sensing a bit of – there's a bit of
15 grip on that - - -

JUROR: Just - - -

MS JENKE: - - - two more comments.
20

JUROR: - - - a quick one. There's going to be people that are going to want to participate in this, who choose not to be informed.

MS JENKE: Yes.
25

JUROR: They'll actively choose to not read this, to not do further investigation, they've already made up their mind on some things but they'll still want to participate in it.

MS JENKE: Yes, okay. Have you got one more? Hang on I'll come back.
30

JUROR: I think it's good how it is.

MS JENKE: Just hang on. We need calmness. So I'm hearing that we don't
35 like that bit "to become as informed as possible" because it's a bit directive. You want to close us out on this?

JUROR: Yes. Would it be better to just finish the sentence with "we
40 encourage you to get involved and participate. Your voice will shape the future." The people that don't seem to like the "open and inquiring mind" and the ones that don't like "to become as informed as possible", would it be better to shorten that sentence. We encourage you to get involved and participate.

MS JENKE: Okay. I'm hearing out of the corner of my ear that like the
45 "opening and inquiring mind" is that what - - -

JUROR: I think we're all just talking about the informed bit.

MS JENKE: The informed bit.

5

JUROR: Your choice, my choice, who wants to be informed? Do what you want.

JUROR: Further to the point that not everyone is going to choose to become informed, they might have made a decision and they're going to enter the conversation without an open mind. We're inviting the whole South Australian community, whether they're open minded or not, whether they're informed or not. So those kinds of words may be seen as excluding those people.

15 MS JENKE: Okay. Last one and then we're going forward, we need to resolve this and then go for lunch.

JUROR: So the way I see this is that the language can be taken as kind of preachy or condescending. So how about we say something like, we encourage you to participate and learn more.

25 MS JENKE: Okay. So I heard – no, that's a non-winner. Bad luck. Let's have lunch and we'll start back on this when we – because we – and we need to resolve it. I sense we're still – and just a little bit, just have a think about what you can live with. We've got one minute when we come back. Hang on a second. Hang on before you go, we're running late, so if we can come back – be back in the room as close to 1.30 as possible because we've got big work to do for the last couple of hours. Enjoy your break. Well done guys.

30 **ADJOURNED** **[1.05 PM]**

RESUMED **[1.37 PM]**

35 MS JENKE: So whoever's doing safety, make yourselves known to me. While everyone gets settled, so we need a speaker and a typer. So what I've done is I've dropped it all in to the one document, so that's a good thing. Who can type from safety?

40 JUROR: Where's our safety people? We already organised who's going to do the typing. Yes. Juror doing the speaking.

45 MS JENKE: Juror doing the speaking. And we need a safety typist. Now just for your information, in the break, made a small decision on your behalf to move on and come back to that, where I left that thing we were stuck about informed decision making, informed – whatever it was, being informed. Just

because a few jurors told me that it was picked up in trust and consent, so I think we just see what's in there and then we go back. Is that okay? It's yellow, so I'll be back on it. All right. So juror's on the computer. Juror it is over to you.

5

JUROR: Okay. Safety from a point of view of what the report recommended, safety is an important consideration because of the potential impact from radiation to people and the environment and the long time scales involved while the material becomes less hazardous. The Citizens' Jury have read the Royal Commission report and quizzed a number of expert witnesses. Many safety and security considerations have been presented and discussed and there's still some question marks there, particularly as to whether something needs to be put in there or not. But considerations included but not – were not limited to geological, seismic, it's limited discussion on acts of terrorism, but health and transport. All members of the jury agreed, all South Australians need to feel confident in all of the regulatory processes, so we can all feel confident in the safety of themselves, the environment and for future generations.

20 Another outline sentence which may or may not stay there, depending upon on maybe some other people's thoughts. It is important to discuss safety and security because of the timescale of the proposal to develop a GDF and the longevity of the high level waste. Health situation, the NRCR examines the effects of radiation exposure on humans throughout all stages of the nuclear fuel cycle as given in chapter seven. The jury heard testimony from expert scientific and technical witnesses on topics surrounding the various stages of the NFC transport, health, security and safety. The report addresses the effect of radiation exposure on humans and most of the expert witnesses were of the opinion of the relative safety of the storage containers. There is some uncertainty about the impacts on flora and fauna which will obviously warrant further study as is done in Finland.

35 Seismic and geological aspects, this is finding 72 from the book. We know that many parts of South Australia are remarkable with regard to geological and seismic stability which are well suited for a geological disposal facility but obviously, not that it's up there but more research and study will be involved in deciding if that's going to be the place to put it. Nuclear storage. The report recommends pursuing the opportunity to establish a GDF, refer to recommendation 11 on facility – which is a facility 500 metres underground, somewhere in South Australia. However, a site selection was not part of the scope of this particular report. There is no facility like this that is in operation anywhere yet in the world but sites are being developed in Finland, Sweden and France. Part of the process of the GDF is to store the used fuel in specialised containers. The NRFEC report concluded the storage containers have been rigorously designed. If you're interested in more information on the

storage of nuclear waste, refer to Appendix I. The public needs to be confident in an independent transparent regulator, particularly in light of regulatory failures, both internationally and locally. This is emphasised in the report in chapter nine.

5

There are international standards, research data and experiences that can be used to support introducing an Australian regulator to ensure lessons learned abroad would be included in our safety regime. The exact nature of a regulator would be determined at a later stage. The report looks at many different activities at different stages of the nuclear fuel cycle. Each stage comes with its own set of risks and opportunities. The report does look in detail at risks associates with mining, refinement, power generation and waste management. It is important to note that the most well known incidents are associated with power generation and the report does not recommend power generation in South Australia. And to some degree, I think that's probably been covered anyway from point one.

10
15

The report finds that there is minimal impact to the public and to workers as a result of the recommended activities. The expected doses are far below natural levels of background radiation that we are all exposed to daily. And see chapter seven for that particular information.

20

Transport, the transport of spent fuel is already done internationally using specialised casks or capsules which are designed, probably capsules and casks, which are designed to withstand extreme impacts, including deliberate attacks and accidental damage. The report finds that nuclear material is transported routinely and safely. Accidents during transport have occurred that there have been no breach of packages or release of harmful radiation. See chapter nine for that. There was diverse opinion from some of us of the jury, however the question marks have so far been convinced, again the wording here, however probably members have so far been convinced that the entire process of (indistinct) including the transport of waste is safe. High level waste are fuel rods that have been pulled out from a nuclear reactor and has already been cooled down. Refer to whatever for half a century or so. Nuclear waste requires permanent storage as it's radioactivity is harmful for hundreds of thousands of years, there's still a little bit of a question mark there when you look at chapter six, which shows a decrease in the actual amount of radioactivity over a period of time, which I think went up to about 100,000 years.

25
30

35

40

45

I think that's it. Sorry, informed - - -

MS JENKE: That's a new - - -

JUROR: That's the next one.

MS JENKE: Okay, well done. So questions, shall we start with – let's do a couple of questions, let's batt a few of those away.

5 JUROR: Okay. Just one, and again it's more of an opinion to getting some of the question marks we need to fine tune. We need to make sure that the reference to the report is the same throughout the entire document. So in some cases we've used NFC, other times it's NREFC. In the other – what we saw earlier, which is RC, just need to try and make sure the vernacular we use to
10 describe the Royal Commission report is consistent throughout the entire document.

MS JENKE: Yes, thanks. I'm just keeping a note of these few things. All right. Other questions or comments?

15 JUROR: I'd like to just mention where the jury is mentioned in any of this, can we not say all or most, or few, can we just refer to us as the jury, because unless we've actually done a vote, we are misinterpreting what we're saying because you don't know what I think about that. I don't know what you think
20 about that.

MS JENKE: Okay. So just going with that one, therefore you'd be saying there was diverse opinion from the jury, within the jury, however the jury have so far been convinced that the entire process of GDF, including the transport of
25 waste is safe.

JUROR: The reason the "all, most and few" is left there because we can't write the jury because that means everyone. And I don't think everyone's convinced so - - -

30 MS JENKE: Yes, okay. So there's diverse opinion from within the jury and there remains – okay, there was diverse opinion from within the jury that the entire process including the transport of waste is safe.

35 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Yes. So that blue bit suggestion is delete it, maybe do it as I'm going and then you can just go back if you need to. From the jury, that the entire process of GDF, including the transport of waste is safe. Whether the
40 transport of waste is safe.

JUROR: (indistinct) transport of waste, high level waste exists today in Europe.

45 MS JENKE: Okay, so we need a microphone.

JUROR: Sorry. Can you just wait for the mic.

JUROR: Does that include travel overseas?

5

JUROR: Yes. We send high level waste today to Germany, as a state, as a country today, already, from Lucas Heights because we don't have a storage facility for high level waste.

10 JUROR: Okay.

JUROR: So we send – and so does other countries, send some high level waste overseas today for storage, above ground storage, not below ground, above ground storage. There has not been one accident or cause of human death or exposure to radiation as a result of transportation. So I'm saying that's indisputable.

15

MS JENKE: Okay. So I'm wondering, I've got something to suggest to you here about – so I think what we're getting reactions from is to the judgment about whether the jury believes it's safe and we haven't had that discussion and agreement. So I'm wondering if you can say there was diverse opinion from within the jury and something about witness, you know the evidence provided by witnesses – the jury acknowledges the evidence provided by witnesses, said it was safe or something.

25

JUROR: But this isn't just about transport, GDF is mentioned too. It may be in the wrong area.

MS JENKE: Okay. All right. So give me a change? Hang on. So you need to give me a suggestion of what we do with that sentence?

30

JUROR: I think it should be written that the jury was – members were convinced that the process of transporting the waste is safe, because that is a - - -

35

MS JENKE: So there's people shaking their heads which is the problem.

JUROR: I'm just trying to move like – sorry, it's different points but I've got three things in here. Like the language seems to be okay for an average person but there are things that – like the abbreviations need to be clearly – you know, what are the abbreviations for, like NFCR for example, what it is. The other thing, see chapter seven in every section here, that just putting this then that means like we suggesting that everyone in South Australia will have access to a report, which I don't think it is the case, because we will be talking to people who like juror has said that earlier she's talking to people who doesn't read or

45

write. So we need to make that a bit clearer and maybe we can add some charts here, like the level of radiation, everyone would be exposed to. Maybe a chart will be better and yes, just try to get (indistinct) see chapter seven, see chapter, page 100 whatever. The other point is used fuel, go back to what is used fuel? We need to mention it's high level - - -

MS JENKE: Yes, I've got that on my notes to come back to in a sec. So can you hold that one?

10 JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: I think we need to resolve this sentence.

15 JUROR: If you, sorry, if before that sentence you were to write the report suggests that transport is safe however there was a diverse opinion within the jury whether the entire process is safe therefore one is, so we're sceptical because of experts.

20 MS JENKE: So the report suggests that the transport of waste is safe. There's diverse opinion from within the jury. There remains a diverse opinion within the jury or something.

JUROR: It's not just about the transport. We're happy talking about transport.

25 MS JENKE: So this is about transport this little bit?

JUROR: No, it's in the wrong section. We didn't get a chance to cut and paste.

30 MS JENKE: Okay.

JUROR: It's not just about transport but it's under the (indistinct) heading. It needs to be moved but I can't think where. Near the end probably. Maybe after the final sentence.

35

JUROR: My comment was going to be about in the transport context. A lot of our conversations for the whole past three and a half days have, we come back to the sort of conclusion about somethings we can't make decisions or draw conclusions about unless we have, you know, like for another gateway.

40 They're questions for another gateway, the other side of another gateway. For me, the issue about the safety of, and I accept that there's a diversity of opinion but I don't know if this is the place to put that at all because for me, I would have liked to, and again from my life experience with dealing with proposed waste depository sites on my country at a place called (indistinct) about
45 10 years ago in this state the safety considerations need to be considered on a

case by case basis.

5 I wouldn't make my mind up about safety here in this forum with you guys unless I knew where it was and how far things were going and I knew all the facts about all those things. For me, I would like, I think the broader the statement the better because I think all the safety considerations depend on the context. That's all I wanted to say.

10 MS JENKE: Thanks juror. So juror, you've got a suggestion. You've got a microphone right there in front of you.

15 JUROR: I've got a slightly different wording just there. There's a suggestion that we move the entire sentence out of the transport section. If we did so then it would become a more broad sentence and I think it's fair to say that the report does suggest that we can manage waste safely so if that's my sentence, what do you guys reckon?

20 JUROR: Can I just say in the paper that we put forth earlier where we explained who we are as a jury, it has already been mentioned that we have a diverse range of opinions and views and I can't remember the exact wording and so basically the sentence that we're talking about could be written underneath every single title so can we just leave it that we've already said it once in this whole, not just this one particular subject but in everything. We've already said that we all have diverse opinions and points of views and do we not need it under particular headings because really, as I said, it could be under everything if that was the case.

30 MS JENKE: So what I'm hearing is a suggestion to take out that sentence there was a diverse opinion and, so yes?

JUROR: Yes.

35 MS JENKE: Chop? Delete. Then the report suggests that the management of waste can be done safely wherever that belongs, finding the right place, that might belong up higher and on page blah blah. Whatever page that is. Or in chapter whatever. Yes? We need mac drivers on the mac. I think we're moving that one.

40 JUROR: Can I just go back to the power point? Scroll up, please. Sorry.

JUROR: Let me just paste this before I lose it.

JUROR: Sorry.

45 JUROR: Up here somewhere?

MS JENKE: Somewhere in there, yes.

JUROR: So for the time being we can just jam it in there. What section?
5

MS JENKE: Okay, juror, where are you?

JUROR: Where you were talking about power facilities.

10 MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: Right there?

JUROR: You said the report recommended power generation does not but it
15 actually did state that that's right now, that that may change in the future and I
think that's important part for comment.

MS JENKE: So does not recommend power generation is (indistinct) at this
20 time.

JUROR: Yes, within the current market.

MS JENKE: Yes, okay, good. At this time.

25 JUROR: Is that wording that I've highlighted there.

MS JENKE: You've got at this time written up. Yes, okay.

JUROR: Yes.

30 MS JENKE: Good. Tick. Get rid of the question marks and the not relevant
bit and maybe you can un-yellow it which will help. I can un-yellow it for you
if you like. Okay, so other burning questions? It's not close enough to your
mouth or on. Is it on? Don't turn them off.

35 JUROR: Very last line.

MS JENKE: Very last line. No, keep going. You're right there.

40 JUROR: Okay. If the waste (indistinct) storage has its radioactivity is
potentially harmful for hundreds of thousands of years most of that duration is
well below background limits.

MS JENKE: So there's a reference in there too for the required in that bit
45 where we need to find - - -

JUROR: Potentially harmful.

MS JENKE: Radioactivity can be harmful.

5

JUROR: I'm just trying to avoid big words.

MS JENKE: Big words. Trying to avoid big words. Be harmful.

10 JUROR: Is that reasonable?

MS JENKE: Yes. Thanks, juror. Okay, question over here.

JUROR: I understand the question regarding references to pages and
15 everything else but we were instructed as part of today's exercise to pull out
reference data so that if people wanted to go and investigate what that meant in
the report we were supposed to do that. We had discussion at the end
(indistinct) was one of your documents you provided to us that we can't
20 include everything from the report into a four, five, six page document so
there's particularly reference points that we think are pertinent that if people
want to go and understand more about that, this is where they should go in the
report.

25 We can take those pieces of information out and drop them in there but you're
going to be finished with a large report. We just need balance.

MS JENKE: We're just tagging where to find it.

JUROR: Yes. Correct.

30

MS JENKE: So we need to find where that tag is so if someone's onto that
looking at the report they can have a look or maybe someone, one of you guys
can help us with a tag, a page number or something for that bit. High level
waste, a few words that have been pulled out from a nuclear reactor that has
35 already been put down, ref, page, blah blah for half a century or so. Juror?

JUROR: I also just wanted to mention that there's a table in appendix L
regarding the probability of accidents in transport and a table is an excellent
thing to include and if anyone else wants to have a look at that, perhaps that's
40 something that could be considered for the transport section.

MS JENKE: Okay, table L. Chapter 9 or appendix L. Yes? Appendix L?
Thanks, juror.

45 JUROR: What page?

MS JENKE: 309. Page 309. So this is more useful - - -

JUROR: Is it like what I've got there?

5

MS JENKE: It's a tag. Don't talk without the microphone. Juror and then juror.

JUROR: As part of this process do we have time to go back to the beginning
10 of this section and very quickly go through it in order?

MS JENKE: Back through the whole section again?

JUROR: Yes. As part of this group yesterday and then not being involved in it
15 today, to me it seems quite changed and if I was reading this for the first time it appears to be very leading. I'm interpreting it as leading me in one direction rather than just generally outlining considerations around safety.

MS JENKE: I'll tell you what's in front of us. We've got this, we've got
20 consent and trust which has gone into one. Am I right? Yes? We've got economics to have a look at. Economics we're pretty happy with. I don't know how much that's changed. We've got an hour to do all of that. We can but we do need to keep moving because otherwise we're not going to get this report done.

25

JUROR: Okay, because this particular section to me seems to be one that would be important to - - -

MS JENKE: Yes.

30

JUROR: - - - big part of the community. And yet I don't - what I heard and what I remembered of what I've heard today doesn't present very balanced.

MS JENKE: Okay. So can we scroll back up to the top of this section? Let's
35 have another look at it. Safety is an important consideration because of the potential impact from radiation to people and the environment and the long time scales involved while the material becomes less hazardous. So need to pick them out as you see them. The jury has read the report and quizzed many expert witnesses. Many safety and security considerations have been presented
40 and discussed. The considerations include, but not limited to, geological, seismic, acts of terrorism, health and transport. The report suggests that the management of waste can be done safely. Someone needs to find where that tag is. All members of the jury agreed, all South Australians need to feel confident in all of the regulatory processes, so we can all feel confident, that's
45 a bit repetitive in the safety of themselves, the environment and for future

generations. It's important to discuss safety and security because of the time scale of the proposal to develop a GDF and the longevity of the high level waste.

5 Any red flags yet?

JUROR: Just some grammar but that - - -

MS JENKE: Okay, grammar's okay. We'll forget about grammar. Okay.
10 Anyone else? Comfortable? Let's tick that bit.

JUROR: (indistinct) GDF - - -

MS JENKE: We'll just – I've got a note to describe that, to reference it
15 properly.

JUROR: Shall I just delete this text?

MS JENKE: Yes, delete the “all feel confident” second bit. Yes. Okay,
20 definitions. Right, health. Need to put these back on. The report examines the effective radiation exposure on humans throughout all stages of the fuel cycle, in chapter seven. The jury heard testimony from expert scientific and technical witnesses on topics surrounding the various stages of the nuclear fuel cycle, transport, health, security and safety. The report addresses the effective
25 radiation exposure on humans and most of the expert witnesses were of the opinion of the relative safety of the storage containers. There is some uncertainty around the impacts on flora and fauna, which warrant further study, as is done in Finland. No red flags? Okay, good. We know, so seismic and geological, finding 72, we know that many parts of SA are remarkable with
30 regards to geological and seismic stability, which are well suited for a geological disposal facility. That's our definition. Okay, red flag? I seem to only have two microphones.

JUROR: We've got a geological disposal facility, a nuclear waste storage
35 facility, a high level waste storage facility, we need to have something. I know this is related to geological but I think we need to keep – in relation to the facility, it needs to be the same.

MS JENKE: Okay, can we resolve that right now? Is there technical - - -
40

JUROR: (indistinct) that it's in fact a GDF, so there is a different – and there's a difference in terms and safety of transporting - - -

MS JENKE: Okay. Let's think about how we make this easy for people out
45 there to read? How do we make it easy? A storage facility?

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Okay.

5 JUROR: Can it just be generalised as a storage facility or high level or - - -

JUROR: Could I just say - - -

10 JUROR: - - - used fuel?

MS JENKE: Sorry, what you potentially could do is mark, say the definitions are - - -

15 JUROR: When I sat down and saw GDF, I had no idea what it was and I asked people near to me and none of them knew what GDF meant.

MS JENKE: Okay.

20 JUROR: And we're at the end of - - -

JUROR: So just call it a storage facility.

MS JENKE: So are there – does anyone have a problem? No, we like storage facility? Thumbs up? Sorry?

25 JUROR: (indistinct) waste (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Waste storage facility. No, storage?

30 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Waste and storage facility.

35 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: All right, this is going to keep us – we're going to get stuck in this and we're not going to get any further.

40 JUROR: Can I just point out that - - -

MS JENKE: I need to find a way through.

JUROR: - - - in the interests of time saving, we used acronyms, I think we accept that they'll be expanded and then put in conform – like conformatively

45

throughout the document. Similarly with references, we expect that we use one way of referencing but another group might've used another, so again we'll just agree and that it's going to be conformed throughout the document. I don't think we need to keep rehashing that.

5

MS JENKE: The question is who does that? So if you like, I'm happy to have a go at that and provide that to you tomorrow with – but it's – you know, I'm just – I think this is a big thing.

10 JUROR: In section one we were going to include one of the cartoons that talked about storage and we were going to modify to talk about surface and underground, so it's defined in section one.

MS JENKE: In section – well, we've already done?

15

JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: (indistinct)

20 MS JENKE: Yes. Okay, so that's on page - - -

JUROR: That's in section one.

MS JENKE: That's the bit you're - - -

25

JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: You've designed.

30 JUROR: So it's actually in the summary of the report, the diagram in there has a number of pictures and descriptors and it actually states above ground and below ground storage.

35 JUROR: (indistinct) storage, my understanding of what I read, storage is above the ground and disposal is underground. That's it.

JUROR: We had a good suggestion which might be a compromise in terms of how we refer to the facility, because people don't want to downplay it and people don't want to up-play it. A nuclear storage facility.

40

MS JENKE: Nuclear storage facility. So in here, do you say that this talks about – does there need to be a sentence that this talks about a geological disposal facility which is underground thing?

45 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Okay. So the suggestion was nuclear - - -

JUROR: Storage facility.

5

MS JENKE: - - - storage facility.

JUROR: Just in terms of having a consistent term through the report.

10 JUROR: Nuclear storage and disposal facility.

MS JENKE: Nuclear storage and disposal. Hang on, you need a microphone over here.

15 JUROR: Management, storage and disposal.

MS JENKE: Management, storage and disposal.

20 JUROR: Can we just put it in there too that it's a high level radiation. It's high level - - -

JUROR: (indistinct)

25 JUROR: Yes. But the government has another – there's already another thing going on where they're trying to decide where it is, so I don't want people to get confused.

JUROR: (indistinct)

30 JUROR: (indistinct) about GDF, the next bit is about storage. We're talking about geology, so that is the GDF, the next one is the interim storage facility which is - - -

MS JENKE: So do we need a clarifying sentence?

35

JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: In there?

40 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Or is there a reference in the report?

JUROR: (indistinct)

45

MS JENKE: Okay, someone needs to dig us out of this.

JUROR: Sorry, the report here says “use nuclear fuel and intermediate level waste storage and disposal facilities in South Australia”.

5

MS JENKE: Okay. So you (indistinct)

JUROR: I’m not suggesting that we use that but I think whatever everyone’s suggesting is all technically correct. There’s no one or two words.

10

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: So we could call it “the facility”.

15

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Take the mic.

20

JUROR: Could we make a reference at the very beginning that this is what it is, have the long winded explanation that’s got the 10 words that follow it and then we will be referring to it throughout this pamphlet, brochure or so forth, as the facility - - -

25

MS JENKE: The nuclear facility - - -

JUROR: - - - or GDF or something or other.

MS JENKE: Okay. So a sentence, up the front - - -

30

JUROR: Emily, I understand that Ashok who was asked before lunch - - -

MS JENKE: Yes.

35

JUROR: - - - has actually had something to contribute to that.

MS JENKE: Okay, sure. So the suggestion Ashok, I don’t know if you were just listening, the suggestion is that at the very start of our report, we say it is a – whatever it is in the report, but we’re going to refer to it as the facility or the nuclear facility, nuclear storage facility.

40

MR KANIYAL: So large proportions of the suggestions are correct. But fundamentally it’s a facility to store, manage and ultimately dispose of used fuel and intermediate level waste. So it’s to do all of those things. All right. So simply speaking - - -

45

MS JENKE: Can you just write that.

MR KANIYAL: You first store it, you manage it and ultimately when you close all of the facilities, you've disposed of it. All right. You don't dispose of
5 it at the start, you're storing it. Then you do other management activities to make it safe and in year 120, according to the Commission's concept, we dispose and we close the facility and walk away.

MS JENKE: Let me get those words again. A facility to store, manage and
10 dispose of?

MR KANIYAL: Used fuel - - -

MS JENKE: Used fuel.
15

MR KANIYAL: - - - and intermediate level waste.

MS JENKE: Used fuel and intermediate level waste.

MR KANIYAL: Correct.
20

MS JENKE: What do we want to call it? The facility. Do we like the facility? Let's - this is about how do we make this easy for people to read?

JUROR: Let's call it the bin.
25

MS JENKE: Okay. So come on, the facility? Are you comfortable with the facility? Once we make that distinction at the very top of the document or wherever.
30

JUROR: (indistinct) facility.

MS JENKE: The nuclear facility.

JUROR: (indistinct)
35

MS JENKE: So that's the definition but we are going to refer to it as the nuclear facility.

JUROR: (indistinct)
40

MS JENKE: The facility. Make it easy.

JUROR: (indistinct)
45

MS JENKE: Okay. All right. Can we live with the facility? Who can live with the facility? Okay. That's most of us. Let's live with it. Yes, can we live with it? Right. Okay. Let's move on.

5 JUROR: (indistinct) fuel (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Yes. Of used nuclear fuel, intermediate nuclear level waste or something. Yes, so we'll put the word - - -

10 JUROR: (indistinct) high level (indistinct)

MS JENKE: So why is high level not mentioned Ashok? Intermediate and high level?

15 MR KANIYAL: So used fuel is high level waste but not all high level waste is used fuel.

JUROR: (indistinct)

20 MR KANIYAL: All right. So it's a very important distinction because other high level wastes includes weapons grade plutonium, decommissioned nuclear warheads and nobody is talking about accepting any of that.

MS JENKE: So is there a way to put the word high level?

25

MR KANIYAL: Yes. So as it was earlier, if you say used fuel and in brackets, high level waste.

MS JENKE: High level waste.

30

MR KANIYAL: You're acknowledging that used fuel is a form of high level waste.

35 MS JENKE: Okay, high level waste and intermediate level waste. We're calling it the facility. Right, let's get (indistinct) with the facility. Yes, okay we're moving on.

40 JUROR: This is still on a different part of this but just in seismic and geological is it possible to consider a different opening, rather than "we know", considering just different words?

MS JENKE: So the report recognises?

45 JUROR: It is recognised that, or research has shown, or - - -

MS JENKE: The report? So at finding - - -

JUROR: The report - - -

5 MS JENKE: - - - 72, recognises the report recognises that many parts of SA
are remarkable with regards to – okay, draw a line, red line going back. Okay,
nuclear storage. The report recommends pursuing the opportunity to establish
a geological disposal facility, refer to recommendation 11. Five hundred –
there’s two f’s there, get rid of the facility. 500 metres underground
10 somewhere in SA, however a site selection was not part of the scope of the
Royal Commission. There is no facility like this that is in operation anywhere
yet in the world but sites are being developed in Finland, Sweden and France.
Tick, good. Scrolling down please. You’ve just lost something. So part of the
process of geological disposal facility is to store the used fuel, in brackets high
15 level waste, in specialised containers. I don’t know, are you doing that every
time?

JUROR: (indistinct)

20 MS JENKE: Used fuel, brackets high level waste, this is making – let’s make
it easy for people.

JUROR: Can we just call this waste here?

25 MS JENKE: Okay. All right. In specialised containers. The nuclear fuel
cycle, I think that’s meant to be Royal Commission, RC report concluded that
the storage containers have been rigorously designed. If you are interested,
refer to appendix I. The public need to be confident that an independent
transparent regulator, particularly in light of regulatory fails both
30 internationally and locally. This is emphasised in the report in chapter nine.
There are international standards, research data and experiences that can be
used to support introducing an Australian regulator to ensure lessons learned
abroad would be included in our safety regime. The exact nature of a regulator
will be determined at a later stage. Tick. Happy? The report – yes, flag.
35 There’s one here, and one there. You need a microphone though.

JUROR: The section that says “if you are interested in” I mean we could have
done that all the way through it, you know refer to this report.

40 MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: Can’t we just say at the end of that sentence, just go refer appendix J.
Refer appendix I.

45 MS JENKE: Let’s leave it – let’s not – let’s leave the personality as it is,

because I think it's there for this one. You can live with it? Yes. Okay. And then I'll go to you.

5 JUROR: Only question with that one is it's discussing the storage containers but it's not indicating that they're above ground.

JUROR: That was going to be my point.

10 JUROR: And I would think that would want to put in there the timeframes that it's above ground because when I've been speaking to people, a lot of them had no idea that was part of the process.

15 JUROR: Yes, I think that was an omission and my suggestion might be to include something like part of the process being considered is to store the used facility – sorry, store the used fuel above ground in specialised containers, like the above ground is an omission there I think. So not part of the process of the GDF but just part of the process and that we need to import that – that this particular component is above ground.

20 MS JENKE: In specialised containers.

JUROR: That's the part that we wanted to change that diagram in the report to use in our summary, was specifying I guess, surface and underground and also the timelines.

25 MS JENKE: All right. Okay. We need to move on.

JUROR: (indistinct)

30 MS JENKE: In specialised containers for - - -

JUROR: (indistinct)

35 MS JENKE: How long Ashok, is it being above ground, roughly? Forty years? Sorry? How long is the – how long is it being stored above ground? We'll just get an answer to that; I'm just getting some power for the laptop. So we're looking for a time there? Is democracy in the making, watch me trip over this now. I'll just trip over. I have been promising haven't I? You watch. Okay. We're getting the clarity, what's the timing?

40 MR KANIYAL: So some waste is – some used fuel is stored at the interim storage facility from project year 11 to project year 120.

45 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Above ground? Yes, go.

JUROR: (indistinct) pardon my ignorance here though, I think if we start talking the years in this brochure that we actually have to then give them the whole timeline. I think we're going too granular right now.

MS JENKE: For many years?

JUROR: For many years. I just – otherwise you've got to go right through every single part of the timeline.

MS JENKE: So you can put where that is for many years.

JUROR: Yes. And refer to the timeline.

MS JENKE: Refer.

JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: Refer page - - -

JUROR: Yes, many - - -

MS JENKE: For many decades?

JUROR: Yes. But not specific - - -

MS JENKE: Or for decades? Many decades?

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Sorry, I'm standing there looking at you with the microphone in my hand.

JUROR: Before this process, I thought okay yes, it's going to be buried under the ground, but it's going to be sitting for a 100 years, so none of us will actually see it buried, so I think it's important to perhaps put that time in.

JUROR: I don't think that's true, I think what was said is a little bit misleading. A single container, as I understand it, will be above ground for 40 years roughly and that container will go underground but there will be other containers in that 40 years that arrive. Is that correct?

MS JENKE: So each container would be there for about 40 years?

JUROR: For the lifetime of the whole project, it will be 100 years or whatever, but each container will only be there for 40 years.

MS JENKE: Okay. So - - -

5

JUROR: I've written down some timeline quotes from the report, so this is how it's written in the report, that it will be 14 years for the establishing the regulatory systems and expertise. In 2030 the Commission considers the earliest is that the nuclear power would be expected to come to South
10 Australia. In 2030 it will start to be stored above ground for 20 to 30 years, to cool, before being permanently stored below ground. Estimating that 2050 it starts to be put below ground and then in about 100 years, it will be the time that the below ground is closed.

15 MS JENKE: Okay. So what we're looking for here is how long it's above ground and we're suggesting 40 years.

MS WALKLEY: Would you like to hear from Ashok?

20 MS JENKE: What page is that?

MS WALKLEY: Would you like to hear from Ashok on that?

MS JENKE: Page 291. Yes, go Ashok.

25

MR KANIYAL: So from the beginning until the end, the – so the geological disposal facility starts operation on the Commission's model from year 28 to year 120. Following year 120, the geological disposal facility is closed. So what that means is that it's backfilled and all of the above ground sites are
30 decommissioned, all sites related to these facilities, the above ground facility, everything else involved in the management of used fuel is decommissioned, the sites are remediated and we walk away. So that's - - -

35 MS JENKE: All right. So now we've got 20 to 30. Twenty to 30 is correct. We can move on. Okay. Let's move on and I'm really, really worried about time now because we have a lot of work to do, so we need to be moving.

JUROR: (indistinct)

40 MS JENKE: Yes. So the – yes. So you're comfortable – are we comfortable? Where are we at with this? So I've read through the last little bit, is the report looks at many different activities and different stages of the cycle. Each stage comes with its own set of risks and opportunities. The report looks in detail at risks associated with mining, refining, power generation and waste
45 management. It's important to note that the most well known incidents are

associated with power generation and the report doesn't recommend power generation in SA at this time. Report finds that there is minimal - - -

JUROR: Excuse me.

5

MS JENKE: - - - impacts – yes.

JUROR: Sorry, can I just say if it's not recommended in the report why do we even put that in our document.

10

MS JENKE: Because it's a big issues. Okay, let's not take too much away. The report finds there's a minimal impact to the public and to workers as a result of (indistinct) activities. The expected doses are far below natural levels of background radiation that we're all exposed to daily. See chapter seven, page 133.

15

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: There's a diagram there. Okay. Can we – can you live with that chapter?

20

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Let's go. I can live with it and I'm standing up shaking out my sillies. Go on. Up you get, have a shake. Can live with it. Okay. General living with it, we've done the really good going over on that one, so well done. Good job, congratulations. Well done safety team. All right. So we're now on consent. Consent. Who's speaking to consent and who's typing? Who's typing for consent?

25

30

JUROR: Informed community consent is valued. You should know that there needs to be broad social; informed consent and specific community consent must be obtained for any new nuclear activity to start in South Australia. Your opinion is valued. Your challenge is to be informed, educated, so that you can make an informed, educated decision. I'm not sure how the words there – you have an opportunity to invite expert witnesses, to view facilities and be provided with a translator if required to enable your community to make an informed decision. And there's a reference. You need to be aware that the law needs to change for any new nuclear activity to be developed in SA. You need to ensure the government is accountable and transparent in this process. Lack of community consent inevitably leads to failure of these projects. See that reference. And then some questions. How is the community's consent measured and made? And how can I be involved? And that's it isn't it juror?

35

40

45

JUROR: Recommended reading.

JUROR: We recommend that you read the report summary which is at the start and the basic information about radiation risks. That reference. Disposal of nuclear waste and the recommendations of chapter 10.

5

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: So there will be – yes, there is a recommendations, a few of them there. But I think that’s talking about the recommendations in chapter 10?

10

JUROR: Correct.

JUROR: Yes, so (indistinct) already going to be in the top part, we don’t need to then put it down as recommended reading that was all.

15

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Okay. So all of that doesn’t need to be there? Or just one bit of it?

20

JUROR: Still recommend that people read them, whether they read the summary first and then go and read the final recommendation.

MS JENKE: Okay. Let’s leave it. Let’s not die in the ditch over that, if we’re comfortable. All right. So what’s on your – who’s got some – harbouring some discomfort there?

25

JUROR: Sorry, at the end of that I was like is that it? I feel like is that it because that is the lowest common denominator of consensus between you guys because I mean if so, I accept that but what I don’t – why I don’t understand this is because it seems to me to be the most contentious and interesting topic for all of our communities and society in South Australia to discuss how we arrive at consent and consensus and how we measure it, what it looks like, that’s for us as a state to - - -

35

MS JENKE: So can you be a bit more - - -

JUROR: - - - really deal with - - -

40 MS JENKE: - - - specific - - -

JUROR: I don’t understand - - -

MS JENKE: Tell me what’s missing?

45

JUROR: Well, it seems very short for the sort of depth of the issue but if it's because it's complicated and you're trying to avoid it, that's fine. But for me, as well, I would rather see something put in about – and I'll say for me, Aboriginal, the unique perspective of Aboriginal people as the traditional owners and first peoples of this country.

JUROR: We – can I respond?

MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: The specific community consent was reference to where a facility will be sited, that was our thinking. So the overall community of SA has to be involved and informed, as well as specifically for that community that will host that facility. So that was the specific relates to that community that actually hosts - - -

JUROR: I think it needs to go back to the gateway (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Okay. Have you got something to - - -

JUROR: I just sort of wanted to say that I was pretty happy with the conciseness of this section, largely because I feel the issue of what is consent, how do we determine consent is an issue which yes is very engaging and concerning but is not an issue that needs to be summarised from within the report, which is what we need to do with this task.

MS JENKE: So I'm wondering is there an opportunity here to say something about the jury recognises the importance of good engagement and understanding, whether consent is there, or something like that.

JUROR: I would like to say, yes I was in that group. I don't feel comfortable with this because when I read from the report, they mention three pages about the principles for engagement with Aboriginal people. I think that needs to be mentioned. Needs to have – the report is spending three pages telling us how to engage with indigenous people, I think my opinion, that's make me uncomfortable because it's not there, there is no mention about how to engage with indigenous people. Sorry, (indistinct) to say, and also there is information, two pages about the land, the heritage and respect the rights of indigenous people and it was not mentioned.

MS JENKE: Okay. So we're picking up a gap, some uneasiness with the – just some text that's missing. Can I have one of those mics to run the other side? Go?

JUROR: I'm kind of translating this to someone else in a way but I do

understand where she's coming from. I think it's the way we're directing it, so it's very you should and I think we want consent to be more an open thing in regards to the community and all the communities that will be involved with it. So (indistinct) the wording.

5

MS JENKE: All right. So we're at the point where I need you to not tell me what's wrong with it, and you're feeling that it's missing something. I need something – someone to add something in as a suggestion. Put something on the table for us that juror can type up.

10

JUROR: Without even reading it, all of this, I'm just highlighting some of the things that are in chapter six, social consent is the ongoing public support that is necessary for an activity to be undertaken in a society. Social consent is not given once but for the life of an activity. I mean there's a whole chapter in here - - -

15

MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: - - - it covers - - -

20

MS JENKE: In chapter six?

JUROR: Yes. That I don't know - - -

25

MS JENKE: So you've reference chapter six throughout this bit, so that can just be referenced. What I think I'm hearing is that – and I'm testing this with you, what I think I'm hearing is that we're missing a bit with Aboriginal, regional whatever.

30

JUROR: Can I just say, I didn't know what social consent, individual consent, community consent even was. Even after being in that group yesterday, I understood what we were discussing but I disagreed with the terminology. Last night I sat at the computer and read the definition of consent and I felt that the definition of consent was not this. So I don't know whether we want to word it differently or whether we put in that description that juror so lovely just read out, because that to me is what I was searching for last night and I couldn't find it. So I think that that should be included because people reading this will be, what is consent.

35

40

MS JENKE: So you could say, under that first line, the report states - - -

JUROR: Social consent is the ongoing public support that is necessary for an activity to be - - -

45

MS JENKE: Yes, keep going.

JUROR: - - - to be undertaken in a society.

5 MS JENKE: I think at the start of that sentence you need to say the report states that because you've just read that directly out - - -

JUROR: Can you tell me the page number?

10 JUROR: 121. I quite like also that social consent is not given once for the life of an activity.

MS JENKE: The report states that social consent is the ongoing public support that is necessary for an activity to be undertaken in society. The report also states that social consent - - -

15

JUROR: Is not given once for the life of an activity.

JUROR: That's on the same page?

20 JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: Social consent is not given once but – for life - - -

25 JUROR: For the life of - - -

MS JENKE: Of the activity. Okay. Comfortable with that addition? Starting to help just pull out that bit about social consent that everyone needs to discuss. I think we need to go back to what's missing. Juror have you got something to add?

30

JUROR: Just with the repetitiveness of some of the opening sentences, could we look at changing the first one to something like there needs to be, or know that there needs to be, rather than you should know.

35 MS JENKE: Or the jury recognises? The jury recognises that there needs to be both broad social, informed consent and specific community consent obtained – take out maybe the must be, the jury – what did I say? The jury what – recognises that there needs to be both broad social informed consent and specific community consent obtained, so take out the must be, for any
40 nuclear activity to start in South Australia. We can play with recognise because we can recognise what's in the report. Yes. Okay. What else do we need to add to that? Do you want to add anything else?

45 JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: I wonder if there's something that the jury notes the importance of this to specific communities, or something?

JUROR: Can we change the knows to believes?

5

MS JENKE: Yes. Okay. So read it out, craft sentence – no, you're the juror.

JUROR: The jury - - -

10 MS JENKE: We believe, or the jury believes.

JUROR: The jury believes - - -

15 MS JENKE: The jury believes – the jury believes full stop. The jury believes that – what did I say?

JUROR: I changed the word to believe. The local or the indigenous - - -

MS JENKE: In the importance - - -

20

JUROR: Believes in the importance of - - -

JUROR: The local indigenous community's consent.

25 MS JENKE: In Aboriginal - - -

JUROR: Aboriginal.

MS JENKE: - - - believes in the importance of Aboriginal - - -

30

JUROR: Consent.

MS JENKE: Do you want to do Aboriginal and local community?

35 JUROR: Yes.

JUROR: Yes.

40 MS JENKE: And local community consent. How's that? Is that strong enough?

JUROR: (indistinct)

45 MS JENKE: The jury believes in the importance of Aboriginal and local community consultation and consent.

JUROR: I think we might be confusing if we're going back to consultation when the title says consent.

5 MS JENKE: That's all right. If it helps, just think about how's it going to help other people.

JUROR: Okay.

10 MS JENKE: Local community engagement and consent. Okay, so take out consultation and put engagement because engagement is a bit stronger.

JUROR: It's consult – when you talk to Aboriginal people and we get consulted, they say this is what we're doing and then they'll say yes, we consulted and that's all we had to do. Thanks for coming.

MS JENKE: So engagement is richer than consult.

JUROR: Yes, I prefer it.

20

MS JENKE: Yes. Okay.

JUROR: Sorry, with regards to the Aboriginal rights, there's an interesting section here in page 128, in particular sections 105, 106. So to the extent that any project would be proposed on land in which there are Aboriginal rights and interests, including Native Title rights, the interests – sorry, and interests, they must be respected and then, the deep connection that Aboriginal people have with the land and their responsibility for its care must be understood and respected by any nuclear project.

30

MS JENKE: Okay. So if we just reference that page number. Page 128.

JUROR: Wasn't there a mention of (indistinct) section - - -

35 MS JENKE: Okay, page 128, section 105 to 6. Okay. How are we going? Can we live with that? Next paragraph? You need to be aware - - -

JUROR: (indistinct)

40 MS JENKE: Yes, okay.

JUROR: (indistinct)

45 MS JENKE: Okay, it's recognised that the law needs to change. Are you happy with that? The report recognises that the law needs to change.

JUROR: Can I just say that we very deliberately directed this to the reader - - -

MS JENKE: To the reader.

5

JUROR: - - - by saying that. You know that - - -

JUROR: (indistinct) so if you write, you need to be aware, as a reader I look at that and I go, “you” whoa, I need to be aware of this, so we actually wrote it this way to have people involved in the consent process, whereas if you’re writing the jury believes, I’m reading a story, it’s like a – you know the jury believes the report says but if I – this is why we worded it, your challenge is to be informed and educated, so - - -

15 MS JENKE: So maybe we say something like - - -

JUROR: - - - speaking to them but it’s a style thing, so if the jury isn’t happy - - -

20 MS JENKE: Maybe we say something – maybe a balance is, it’s important that the community - - -

JUROR: Yes, sure.

25 MS JENKE: - - - are aware.

JUROR: I just felt like (indistinct)

MS JENKE: The community is aware.

30

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: You must be aware. Okay. It’s important that the community is aware that the law needs to change for any new nuclear activity to be developed in SA. You need to ensure the government is accountable and transparent in this process.

35

JUROR: Do you want me to put “and” in there?

40 MS JENKE: And we need – yes, and we need. Yes? We? Okay, and we need to ensure the government is – that government is accountable and transparent in this process, or the government?

JUROR: (indistinct)

45

MS JENKE: Are they? Sorry. All right. Lack of community consent, inevitably leads to failure of these projects, full stop, end of story. Can you live with that?

5 JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: Okay. I'm going to take one more question before we do our vote, maybe two. And then we're devoting - - -

10 JUROR: Mine's on a different section so - - -

MS JENKE: It's not on consent?

JUROR: It is on consent but it goes back to - - -
15

MS JENKE: I'm wrapping up consent, so - - -

JUROR: Yes. So okay, so we go back to the statement where the report recognises - - -
20

MS JENKE: Yes, that's it.

JUROR: So it's the sentence, the second sentence "In the report states that social consent is ongoing, public support that is necessary for the activity to be undertaken in a society." Right. The second is actually two – it's an abbreviation – that's not it actually. No, that's not it. Okay. So the next sentence is actually abbreviation of two sentences. So I'm going to give it to juror to read those two sentences, so we can make it clear because that's not clear.
25

JUROR: So it's social consent is something that is commonly taken in to account as part of a political process. It is not given once for the life of an activity. Is it necessary to include that?
30

35 MS JENKE: You don't need to do it (indistinct)

JUROR: I don't actually understand. I have to say, I don't actually understand. Once for the life, or once - - -

40 MS JENKE: Is not given once but instead is something that's ongoing. Maybe you just – so you're not writing the original statement because you're referencing back to it on the page 121. So make it make sense here, social consent is not given once but is ongoing for the life of the activity. Right. Can we live with this chapter? Stand up if you can? Look have we got a full complement?
45 complement? Look, yay. So last one. No, we've got trust – so we need to

move quickly guys because we're really running out of time. And we've got to get ready to present this to the premier. Are you taking us in to trust?

JUROR: Yes.

5

MS JENKE: So no more changes. We'll do it in a minute. We'll do it in a minute. Okay. No more changes. All right. So trust, accountability and transparency are vital.

10 JUROR: The Royal Commission's report states we have a choice in South Australia as to whether or not we want to further engage with the nuclear fuel cycle, see reference. Factors that promote trust and transparency need to be built in to the design of any regulatory systems. Our decision will affect both
15 future generations of South Australians and options for other nations for the management of their high level radioactive waste. You need to consider that moral and ethical responsibilities are central to the ownership and integrity of our decision. Do we think these actions are good? Do we think they are the right decisions? It is an international principle of radioactive waste
20 management, with a reference, that the society that generates the waste is responsible for managing it. Those nations that are unable to manage their own waste within their borders are permitted, reference, to contract the radioactive waste management to another country, or we do this. Our challenge is to build and maintain trust by avoiding repeating past mistakes such as Maralinga. The Royal Commission report recommends that clauses from SA legislation,
25 reference, be removed which currently prohibits public money being used to encourage or finance the construction and operation of a nuclear - - -

MS JENKE: No, you've done right. Finance construction or operation - - -

30 JUROR: Of a nuclear waste storage facility. Further investigation cannot proceed without changing this legislation, reference. The Royal Commission report recommends removal at the state level and or federal level existing prohibitions in law on the licensing of processing activities to enable commercial developments such as nuclear fuel leasing and existing
35 prohibitions on nuclear power generation. We as a community need to ensure that any measures put in place are what we want. And then this is a question, will the public have an opportunity to review any proposed changes to legislation? Which is again, with that consent process.

40 MS JENKE: Okay. All right. Are there anything – is there anything burning, burning, burning that you will never happy with if you don't talk about it now?

JUROR: For me leaving Maralinga in there.

45 MS JENKE: Why?

JUROR: Because it confuses the issue in terms of the nuclear fuel process and it has nothing to do with Maralinga or anything else. I have a real concern with leaving something in there that has a lack of relevance.

5

MS JENKE: Okay. So it's in the report and it's actually about – if you look at the sentence, it's actually about maintaining trust by avoiding repeating past mistakes.

10 JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: So it's the concept about mistakes?

JUROR: Leave out Maralinga.

15 MS JENKE: Okay.

JUROR: It's not a - - -

20 MS JENKE: It's on.

JUROR: The reason we left Maralinga in there is because it was a mistake and mistakes happen and we need to be aware of that.

25 JUROR: Yes. But my concern is people link – sorry, my concern is if people then link a nuclear explosion with what we're talking about, it's completely different. That's why I'm concerned about using Maralinga as the reference point.

30 MS JENKE: Yes. Okay. So get that, it's the past; it's this tension between this notion of past mistakes.

JUROR: It's a different matter if we look at a past mistake with respect to a repository site.

35 MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: Not a nuclear explosion.

40 JUROR: It is. Sorry, we – it is related with trust and based on what happened in the past, the indigenous community doesn't trust and then it's related with trust, that's the reason why we need to incorporate Maralinga.

JUROR: (indistinct)

45

JUROR: It is mentioned in the report.

5 JUROR: As part of this actual discussion group, we are strictly appointed to giving the information that is actually in the report, not any other outside information. And the only references to accidents are Maralinga, Radium Hill and something else that I don't remember. So therefore, given the guidelines and the parameters we were given, that is the only reference we can make because we can't actually make a reference, even though there has been accidents in storage, below ground storage facilities in the world - - -

10

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Okay, page 125.

15 JUROR: You can't reference that because it's not in the report.

MS JENKE: Okay. So maybe at the end of that sentence, as referenced on page 125. You had to didn't you?

20 JUROR: I just wanted to say the lesson from Maralinga is not just about radioactive contamination of the earth, although that is obviously a major concern and lesson for us and the world. The other lesson to learn from the Maralinga experience, and there's a whole Royal Commission on it, and there's a chapter in this Royal Commission about that engagement process and what happens when communities aren't actually engaged and understanding 25 what the ramifications are. And obviously – well, we all know that the effects on Aboriginal people's health and well-being and land and connection to country and culture, were affected. We also know that British soldiers experienced the same health and well-being effects but a lot of Aboriginal 30 people also were – what's the word, killed, blown up in the whole thing because they weren't engaged with. They didn't know – they didn't know where to go. Some people lost their eyesight because they couldn't speak English, they – that engagement, that ability to access health in the wake of a – in the wake of a disaster, or the wake of something going wrong, whether it's a 35 big disaster or a little disaster, or a little accident, the things we can learn from that are more – are not just about the effects on the earth and the environment, it's also about the human element and how we address that.

40 MS JENKE: Yes, okay. All right. So there's now a reference in there, so pointing back to the report. Can you live with that?

JUROR: Can I just – I agree with what you've said but I think we just maybe need to elaborate what some of those lessons were because the fear factor that comes with just the word Maralinga - - -

45

MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: Do you know what I mean? So I think that it's - - -

5 MS JENKE: So how would we do that?

JUROR: So maybe it's about the lack of consultation, education, communication, engagement with the communities to prevent such an incident like Maralinga.

10

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: So potentially our challenge is to build and maintain trust by avoiding repeating past mistakes such as Maralinga where there was a lack of engagement and communication. There was other things. Can you help us out of this pickle Juror? So I mean what we need to find is what are we – how do we do this well? How do we pick this up and round it out?

15

JUROR: So people know the difference of what Maralinga was, should it be the atomic weapons testing at Maralinga. Because just – because I am younger and maybe ignorant, Maralinga, I had no idea what that was. And people start – and people say Maralinga and I'm like where's Maralinga, what's Maralinga? What happened there? But actually say atomic weapons testing - - -

20

25

MS JENKE: Weapons testing - - -

JUROR: - - - and people go, that was from bombs and then they'll – won't know – they know it's different to storage facility; they were from a weapons testing site. Then they know the difference of those two.

30

MS JENKE: I think that's – don't keep typing that bit because it wasn't well received as a suggestion.

35 JUROR: (indistinct) atomic weapons testing at Maralinga.

MS JENKE: Such mistakes – mistakes such as the atomic weapons testing - - -

JUROR: Weapons testing at Maralinga.

40

MS JENKE: - - - in Maralinga.

JUROR: In the 1950s and 60s if you want to have a time - - -

45 JUROR: Can I – I don't necessarily say here that we're suggesting that –

obviously we know how bad that was and that was a mistake itself but the point that we're making here in trust is that the lack of consultation and community engagement was the mistake that we're focussing on.

5 JUROR: And the report mentioned to use interpreters, they need to receive information in their own language. The report mentioned to use face to face consultation, that's to make it better for next time.

JUROR: I don't think we want to muddy the waters by saying atomic
10 weapons. That's just - - -

JUROR: (indistinct)

JUROR: Yes, that's right. But if - - -
15

JUROR: (indistinct)

JUROR: I understand that you don't want to muddy the waters by bringing it
in but I think having it in and saying the mistake at Maralinga was to do with
20 atomic – there was atomic weapons testing at Maralinga, we see mistakes in
that process, we want to avoid those same mistakes which are da, da, da, da,
da. It doesn't – I think it actually helps clarify the difference rather than
confuse it.

25 MS JENKE: Okay. Can we live with that? Can we live with that? There's
some no's. Who's a no? Hang on you need a microphone. Where are all the
microphones?

JUROR: Can we have just after the – can we just add about the atomic
30 weapons testing at Maralinga which is different from the storage facility
proposed now. So we can make in the same sentence make it a difference
between both of them.

MS JENKE: Okay. So idea to – our challenge is to build and maintain trust by
35 avoiding repeating past mistakes such as the lack of consultation and
information about the atomic weapons testing at Maralinga.

JUROR: I just thought we said consultation – it really isn't consultation - - -

40 MS JENKE: Lack of involvement - - -

JUROR: - - - it's engagement.

MS JENKE: - - - engagement.
45

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Yes, it was engagement and communication.

5 JUROR: You want that word changed?

MS JENKE: Engagement and communication, I think was the language we just had. Okay. Are we comfortable with that?

10 JUROR: Engagement and communication?

MS JENKE: Engagement and communication.

JUROR: And I delete this bit?

15

MS JENKE: You're deleting the yellow bit. Our challenge is to build and maintain trust by avoiding repeating past mistakes, such as the lack of engagement and communication about the atomic weapons testing at Maralinga.

20

JUROR: I understand that you're clarifying it but I'm just thinking of that associated fear factor of atomic weapons. Is that going to - - -

JUROR: (indistinct)

25

JUROR: Yes, I realise that but the nuclear fuel cycle that we're dealing with has got nothing to do with atomic weapons testing. I recognise that - - -

MS JENKE: Do we need to say – do we need to say that?

30

JUROR: (indistinct)

JUROR: I don't know. That's my thought.

35 MS JENKE: Yes.

JUROR: (indistinct)

40 MS JENKE: All right. Can we live with it? Imperfect, there's lots of this that are imperfect. Lots of this. It's actually quite strong I think, it's actually really strong and honest, which is what you should be producing. Who can live with it? Who can live with it? Come on, look who's up. Come on. They're slowly get up, look at that. You can live with it? Beautiful. Okay, well done. Good job. Okay. So economics. Next one, economics. Quick change over because
45 this is the last one. Hopefully there hasn't been many changes was the

question. Okay. So yesterday we were generally happy with this one, this is why I saved it for last, so that's good. Who's reading?

JUROR: Yes.

5

MS JENKE: Righto.

JUROR: It's a bit longer now, so - - -

10 MS JENKE: It's a bit longer.

JUROR: Yes. Okay. Recommendations one, two, three, four, five and 11 should be referenced for the economic benefits in the nuclear fuel cycle. The Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission report recommends that we pursue the opportunity to establish used nuclear fuel and intermediate level waste storage and disposal facilities in South Australia. Recommendation 11. This facility has the potential to provide a significant income for South Australia. There are risks and uncertainties with this endeavour that still require more research. This research requires further financial commitment by South Australia which is needed in order to make a better informed decision if this project is to go ahead to precommitment negotiation with client nations. There is the possibility that further research may determine that this project is not viable, however there is a strong possibility that this project will be viable in the future and provide a significant income for South Australia. Should this project go ahead, the report recommends the project to be funded by a client nation with a precommitment payment that will cover all expenditure costs. This is to ensure that there is no possibility of client nations withdrawing from the project. "Through precommitment from the client countries, the state would not need to assume significant commercial risks in incurring capital costs to develop the project." Refer to page 102 for estimated revenue and precommitment. Given the inter-generational nature of this project it is important to ensure any economic benefits are ongoing. Refer to chapter 5. There were - - -

25 MS JENKE: Yes, keep going.

35

JUROR: There were varying views between expert witnesses on the economic viability of this project and therefore some of the jury felt that there was insufficient detail in the conservative economic modelling by the Royal Commission report to feel comfortable progressing to further involvement. Refer to page 1 and 2. Whilst this is a first step, there are many more questions that must be answered before we will be comfortable progressing to the next phase.

40 There are many questions still unanswered by the Royal Commission report.
45 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 Australian brand or external reputation be affected and how will this have an effect on tourism and trade, what reliance is there on other countries to pre-commit to storing high-level nuclear waste at a fixed price, and how will the benefits be realised, and how will the wealth be distributed?

A call to action for South Australia. There is a real opportunity for South Australians to increase the knowledge and participation in the nuclear fuel cycle, including South Australia's current participation and to better understand the potential benefits and risks. Refer to page 292. The jury suggests reading the appendix, which is basically the analysis of the whole viability of the economic impacts, and then if there is any further interest read chapter 5, page 73.

MS JENKE: Okay. Let's start from the very end. Who can live with that because we'd gone a far way yesterday. If you can live with it, if you like it, you think it nails it, pick it up. Yes, so stand up Juror. I'm getting the code. Okay. So stand up Juror. Viv's got one with you. I'm going to actually come over. There's cautious standing up going on. Did you get a mike? No. Okay. You can sit if you want to sit.

JUROR: Sorry, it's only very small. There was a section there where it refers to some of the jury. I'm just concerned that maybe that will give the impression that some people have formed an opinion on particular objects.

MR: (indistinct) discussion about whether (indistinct) leave it out.

MS JENKE: There we go. There were varying views between expert witnesses on the economic viability of this project, and therefore some of the jury felt there was insufficient detail in the conservative economic modelling.

JUROR: Yes, we did have discussion on that point and we thought it was better for this forum to decide whether it should be in or be out. So in - - -

JUROR: I'm happy to leave something like that in, but maybe if we could just reword it so it doesn't sound like there's a - because it almost gives the impression that then there's a proportion of the jury that agree that the financial estimates are accurate.

MS JENKE: So the suggestion is do we leave "some of the jury", or just "the jury". Is that what you're suggesting?

MR: (indistinct)

MS: (indistinct)

5 MS JENKE: Okay, and therefore there is a question. There is some - there remain questions about the conservative - and therefore questions remain relating to insufficient detail - relating to insufficient detail. There we go. Relating to the economic modelling. Okay. Relating to the economic modelling. So we're taking "conservative" out. "To feel comfortable progressing to further involvement." You know what, I think that's what it was yesterday.

10

JUROR: Yes.

MS JENKE: Yes. Good one. Okay. So what else? What else is problematic? Juror?

15

JUROR: Just that another point is how do we incorporate rapid change in future technologies such as nuclear fuel recycling in next generation reactors is another economic query.

20 MS JENKE: Okay. So it's another question. Down - there's some questions down the bottom.

JUROR: Yes.

25 MS JENKE: So what is the question? How?

JUROR: How do we incorporate rapid change in future technologies such as nuclear fuel recycling in next generation nuclear reactors?

30 MS JENKE: Such as nuclear recycling, was it? Nuclear fuel recycling. Nuclear fuel recycling.

JUROR: Recycling in the next generation of nuclear fuel reactors.

35 MS JENKE: Okay. Are you comfortable to have that question in there? Questions are good because they to get people thinking about things. So Dulcie, and there's Ilke.

40 JUROR: That question about the South Australian brand, I agree I would like yes to have that question, but also at the same time the report mentioned there are cases like at the French one the cheese company on page 232. What I mean - - -

45 MS JENKE: Okay. So maybe put in brackets - - -

JUROR: But what I mean is yes we need to think about that maybe there is an effect in our reputation in our food, but also there are positive cases.

MS JENKE: There are positives, yes. So page 222.

5

JUROR: Page 232 mention about the French cheese.

MS JENKE: Okay, good.

10 JUROR: And they've got a facility in that area.

MS JENKE: Okay, good. All right. Juror, you've got a question. Who else? Just raise - - -

15 JUROR: Just on that same point in the report itself, so that's from an appendix. In the report itself finding 145 on page 163 looks at impacts on other sectors, and it says, "There are no compelling evidence that the development of nuclear facilities in South Australia would adversely affect other economic sectors provided these facilities operated safely and securely.

20

MS JENKE: Finding 145 on page 163. Tam, I'm going - working away. Go.

JUROR: There's just a slight confusion in regards to the facility being near the cheese factory. Is that something that should have been included in the safety, or are we trying to refer that economically it's not affecting other businesses by having these cheese factories near the - - -

25

MS JENKE: I actually think - - -

30 JUROR: Is that what we're trying to - - -

MS JENKE: I think the champagne reference might actually be a stronger one there. Yes. So this was impact on the brand, so it probably has crossover. But this was specifically - and where this came from, this economic thing, was about economics, future technologies and reputation. So that's why it's landed there. Comfortable?

35

JUROR: Comfortable.

40 MS JENKE: Juror, go.

JUROR: I have a little question about the commitment of other countries for the disposal of their high-level waste. I think we should have something in that which also includes them being responsible for transport costs to the country, because it's very expensive, transport of high-level waste, and the other thing is

45

does that commitment - it is envisaged that commitment covers the continuing management of the waste when those countries may have changed their technology to a new form of reactor, and therefore not have any more waste at all?

5

MS JENKE: It does say all expenditure costs, which I think is quite broad.

JUROR: Okay.

10 MS JENKE: Okay. Good. Resolved that. Bang. Juror? Someone else is going.

JUROR: I just had one. It's sort of going back now to the tourism, but there is a potential that having the - I mean the waste facility no, but maybe the industry around it could potentially have a great effect on the economy because the underground testing lab in - is it in Finland, correct me if I'm wrong - is the number 1 tourist site. So it could actually positively - I don't know that anyone is going to want to go to the dump, but in terms of nuclear education programs and facilities, there may be a positive effect on tourism.

20

MS JENKE: But basically it's not called the dump. Okay. So, all right, we're not opening this back up again. We're just refining to ask the questions. So there's nothing specific. You can live with it as it's framed. Just whip back up, Em, about what - how will the South Australian brand or external reputation be affected, and how will this have an effect on tourism and trade? Might be it could be positive or negative, or an impact. Okay, so an effect positive or negative. Okay, leave it as an effect. All right. Goodo. Let us go. Juror?

25

JUROR: At the start in the first paragraph there it mentions there is a strong possibility. Is that according to the jury or to the report? Maybe - I wonder if the word "strong" could be removed?

30

MS V. LAMBERT: Okay. "There is the possibility that further research may determine that this project is not viable. However, there is a strong possibility that this project will be viable in the future and provide a significant" - so take out the word strong?

35

MS JENKE: Yes. To keep it quite neutral.

40 MS V. LAMBERT: Okay. Well, that's nice and balanced. However, there is a possibility, or likewise, "There's a possibility that this project will be viable."

MS JENKE: Okay. Juror?

45 JUROR: You're getting sick of my voice, aren't you?

MS JENKE: No, I'm getting sick of turning around.

5 JUROR: I think that's kind of really misrepresenting what's in the report. The report basically says that there is a very good likelihood that there will be a good economic case for it. I think it's fair to acknowledge that that might not pan out, but kind of saying that it's fifty-fifty with this wording, which I think is just not fair.

10 MS JENKE: Can we then write that in the report?

JUROR: Can we include that the report - yes. Outlines there is a strong - that sort of - yeah.

15 JUROR: Yeah.

MS JENKE: The report suggests - - -

20 JUROR: From the report? Yeah.

MS JENKE: Okay. That there is a strong possibility - let's go back to the language you have. Let's go back to the language, because it was yours. Okay? "However the report suggests" - look at all these school teachers. Were you a school teacher? No. Okay. Good. Juror? Question? Get your mic.

25 JUROR: When I was in the economics group we discussed a few things in relation to what was the project about. Is it about creating jobs? Is it about money? A lot of the witnesses said it is about money, because of the fact that it is a high risk, I guess, workforce that would be repetitive, and automated, so the initial states - I think construction it's fine, but if it's all about money and it's going into a wealth fund or a sovereign fund, have we mentioned that so the public knows we're doing this for money, and this is where the money is going?

30 MS V. LAMBERT: There's a question. One of the questions I recall. Is it in there, Emily?

MS JENKE: There is. So on this page, given the intergenerational nature of this project, it's important to ensure any economic benefits are ongoing. The reference there is to the sovereign wealth fund, and then there is a question about the ongoing economic benefits to the state. "How will the benefits be realised, and how will the wealth be distributed?" Is that okay?

45 FRANCESCA: Yes.

MS JENKE: Satisfied? Okay. Who else? I have two microphones, so I'll bring one. A question for the jurors via you, is there some questions here that a Royal Commission staff member feels are addressed, and there's some references jurors might want to consider? So Ashok has just raised some - a
5 point that some of these questions are addressed in the report. You might still want to - I'm just flagging this before you start. You might still want to leave them there, but say there are many things we still need to discuss some more, which might be these. So over to you, Ashok.

10 MR KANIYAL: Thank you. So I want to refer to two specific questions. Question number 1 is in relation to how we incorporate rapid change in future technologies related to the next generation of nuclear fuel reactors. Now, the commission has incorporated that already into its determination of the size of the market of use fuel that would be available to South Australia. This
15 assumption is conservative, because in a sense it assume that all nuclear power reactors that will be developed beyond 2030 are reactors that will consume all of the waste. There is no such reactor under development currently.

So to suggest that in the space of 13 years that will happen is, I would suggest, very conservative. Now, you can find that on page 291, and I suggest that that
20 reference be incorporated. Notwithstanding that, it's something - it's a question that needs to be addressed. Point (2) is in relation to Juror's question about the costs of transport. Now, I agree with you that customers should pay for transport, but to be conservative we have assumed that that comes off the
25 revenue.

So we assume that it costs \$200,000 per tonne to transport it from wherever. We haven't identified wherever because the size of the market is geographically diverse, comes off the revenue. So you will also find that in
30 appendix J on page 295.

MS V. LAMBERT: That's not a question up here. It was a question in the room, but thanks, Ashok. Great. So what we've - what Emily has done is just change that header. There are many things we still need to discuss. Okay? So
35 some of them are flagged in the report, some not, some to satisfactory measure and some not.

JUROR: Emily, just very quickly, we also did discuss - we haven't put it down here because it would make it too long, but the robustness of the
40 economic model hasn't been proven, because we're not currently allowed by legislation to go and talk to Japan or Taiwan about whether they would send their fuel to us, what would they pay, et cetera. So that's what we talk about, the ability to endeavour or to further research is really because, as of today, we talked about it yesterday, we can't actually do that.
45

MS JENKE: Yes. So that's flagged up in this thing about we need to do further research, there are further costs, and so it's sort of recognising that work was done yesterday.

5 JUROR: We recognise in the trust document when we talked about the need to pass legislation before anything could progress.

JUROR: Okay. I would like to put on the discussion, because the premier said if we have this nuclear waste, more jobs would be available.

10

MS JENKE: Okay. So what are the workforce opportunities? What is the - yes. That did come up. Is that enough? What are the workforce opportunities?

15 JUROR: So if the - sort of saying if the potential of the nuclear waste is going to decline in virtually - what was it, 13 years time or something like that. So we're not going to actually - - -

20 MS JENKE: Let's not go into the topic. Let's grab the question. So what's the question? Does that nail the question for you? What's the realistic picture about the workforce opportunities?

JUROR: Can I suggest that we put in skills, training, and research, which is part of the workforce. It's not just - - -

25

MS JENKE: So it could be jobs, skills, training, and research? Okay. Skills, training, and research. Do you want jobs in there?

JUROR: I take opportunities as jobs.

30

MS JENKE: Okay. Workforce opportunities, skills, training and research. Okay.

JUROR: (indistinct) so many questions. There are thousands (indistinct)

35

MS JENKE: Yes, there are thousands. So let's think of conversations starting. So there's lots of things that need to happen. I would be encouraging you to just leave a few more questions than not. Because you want these conversations to happen.

40

JUROR: I have been asked who will own this nuclear waste facility, and can it ever be sold of if South Australia were to come upon bad times again.

45 MS JENKE: We had that conversation in the trust group, and I think it's better answered in the trust section, but there was a suggestion that there could be

kind of failsafes, I guess, built into the legislation. So potentially that could be answered elsewhere.

5 MS V. LAMBERT: I think it was picked up in a general way up in that, that said the right arrangements need to be put in place. Do you want to check it, and have a look at it?

JUROR: Yes, we did discuss in the trust and consent in relation to gateways, or phases, and that the entity remains in public hands with, you know, as what
10 Emily said, trigger points to stop that being transferred or sold off.

MS JENKE: So there's a sentence in there which is quite a simple one. Is that enough. Okay. All right - - -

15 MS V. LAMBERT: Emily, I've been asked to pose a question to the jury, if people are happy for me to do that, which is when - in that section, when you talk about "we", who is the we? Is that "we, the jury"? Or "we the South Australian community" that will have impacts on people reading it. I hope I've characterised that correctly.

20

MS JENKE: So it's we as South Australia? So we, our state? It's a royal we?

JUROR: (indistinct) about engaging people as people.

25 MS JENKE: There are many things that South Australians need to discuss. We've kind of done a bit of South Australians. Last one. Can you live with it? can you live with it? Look, you're amazing. Juror. Well done. Thanks for getting up. Good job, guys. So grab a seat. So we - I just need to check timing. Someone that knows something about timing. Premier is here at 4.30,
30 so it's 20 past 3. Is afternoon tea there by any chance? We could potentially do with a little break. No afternoon tea yet? 4 o'clock is afternoon tea. So bad luck.

35 Okay. So the last little piece of work - I'll just comment about this document which I need to get on - someone to take the stick because we're going to hit the print button for now, which is for - yes, I've been saving it all the time. Can you imagine that? Yes, there's one here. Okay. So I'm going to put this ceremoniously onto the memory stick. Jury report finalised Sunday. That is there. That was easy. Was that the easiest report ever? So there's our report.

40

45 So what we're going to - well done. The ceremonial chucking of the report. So obviously there's a little bit of work to do to get this report shipshape and in two ways styled that you like. There's - throughout the day I've heard, you know, there's a bit of typos and spelling. What we're going to propose is that we have a look at that for you. So I can have a look at it for you (indistinct)

can have a look at it for you to just not change anything, just make sure the apostrophes - you should do that.

5 Make sure the apostrophes are where they should be, that the reference, you know, they're consistent. We're talking about the Royal Commission report. So just so that we have that level of consistency. Are you comfortable with that? There will be no changes. Okay. So then there's another level (indistinct) so then there's another level of - - -

10 JUROR: Emily?

MS JENKE: Yes, Juror?

15 JUROR: Are we able to get a marked up copy so we can see what you've actually changed?

MS JENKE: Absolutely.

20 JUROR: Good.

MS JENKE: So the other thing that I'm going to suggest is that we have an opportunity to make this a bit more (indistinct) so that it actually looks really interesting to read. It's not - I don't even look at how many pages it is. It's a lot of pages. It's 13 pages. But get it into something that's a six or eight page
25 brochure, which requires a bit of formatting. What we're proposing to do is work with our designer, democracyCo Designer, not government, to put it into a design, and get it to you to have a look at tomorrow. Is that okay?

30 It's going to be on base camp though, or emailed. We need to try and find a way to get you guys that haven't got IT a look at it. We can come to your end of the world if we need to. Are you comfortable if we do that?

JUROR: What's the time frame?

35 MS JENKE: Well, my designer is spending all day - they're spending all day on it tomorrow. By tomorrow afternoon, and then keen to turn it around pretty quickly by Tuesday lunchtime. So the cartoons, there are a range of cartoons around the room. Simon was here, and I totally forgot yesterday to introduce you to Simon. So he was just listening, and he was sketching up some
40 cartoons. I hadn't had a really close look at them, and maybe you guys have. Up to you. Up to you what we do with them.

45 They can just be a library that we can give to you as a, you know, reflection of what you've talked about. Some of them are real issues based, some of them are dealing with the challenges and the - you know, the questions that you've

got. You could use some of them. I'm relaxed. It's up to you. Completely up to you.

JUROR: (indistinct)

5

MS JENKE: Get them electronically for you? We can get them electronically for you.

JUROR: (indistinct)

10

MS JENKE: Really? I'm trying to make it be entertaining. Juror, did you have - - -

JUROR: (indistinct)

15

MS JENKE: Want to take one home? Okay. What we'll do is we'll get them put them electronically for you. If there's some that you really like, or if you want one commissioned, you know, Simon can knock one up pretty quickly. Did you have something to add Juror?

20

JUROR: I'm just going to ask, are we having someone independent read this for us, just for some clarification that it reads okay as all one document? Only because, like, we've just put pieces together, and we're so close to it. I just say this because I write so many documents, and it always takes a clean, fresh pair of eyes or mind - - -

25

MS JENKE: So an idea that I've got for you is that my co CEO Emma, who I think is coming, could have a look at it for us tonight. She hasn't been in the room, and she's - okay. So it might be good if she sort of had a look at that and just made sure that that was - - -

30

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: All right. Well, again, we can do a marked up - I can send that to her and give you a marked up version. So if she's made any suggestions, what they are in order to make it readable.

35

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: Yes. I sent through - John is - John had the stick, and he's gone. It's - the printing is happening. Okay. So we'll get Emma to have a run over it tonight, and she's just had a baby, so she'll be up late. Her brain is in tact. No, she's good. She can - will provide a marked up - I'll put this version up on Basecamp this afternoon, we'll provide you with a marked up one with tracked changes to see where we've made any apostrophes or definitions. Then

45

tomorrow night and option or two for graphics. Comfortable? Okay. All right. So I feel like I'm just turning around in circles, so I'm going to come and sit down.

5 The next thing we need to talk about is the premier. So he's coming, and your job is to give him a briefing on what you've come up with. So how we do that, he'll hopefully join our circle. He will join our circle, but what I was looking for is, you know, three or four jurors to kind of take him through some sections of the report. We've got four or five sections, I can't even remember now. I'm
10 just wondering how you want to approach that.

JUROR: (indistinct) would it not be appropriate for the people who actually did the reading of each section to be the people who talk to him about that particular section that we've written?
15

MS JENKE: That's a potential. Who read? Who were the readers? Do you want to just stand up? Are we comfortable with that? Yes? Supportive? So what I might do is have a huddle with that little group, and we'll just get ourselves a bit organised about how we do that.
20

JUROR: (indistinct)

MS JENKE: So you don't have to read it through. So we can just talk about how we tell that story to him. But we've got some time, I think. He's here for -
25 I think he's here for an hour. Iain is nodding. So we have got some time with him, and I think he'd really value understanding where we've come from. So what we are going to do is do a reflection. In order to do this part of the day, what I'm going to do is invite the rest of the team to come and join us in the circle.
30

I'm keen to move that table out, because we need to get rid of it anyway, and get the team, sort of expand the circle, bring a few more chairs, bring the advisory board members in, the agency team in, and to be part of this reflection, because we've been on quite a journey over four days, and just want
35 to stop and pause before afternoon tea and reflect on that. So what we might do, we need to make a little break in the circle to get rid of this table, and lets breathe out, bring a few more chairs in, and get yourselves relaxed. We'll be back in a couple of minutes.

40 **ADJOURNED** [3.31 PM]

RESUMED [4.48 PM]

MS JENKE: Okay. So welcome back, everybody, and hopefully you had a
45 nice little break. We're waiting on our reports, which are being printed upstairs

and coming down, but we're just going to try and get the report put up on the screen so we can start taking the Premier through the main chunks of it. So this is opportunity is your formal handover as a jury and it's the moment where you start to release to the public, I suppose, the work that you're really proud of
5 and also some of the Kickstart conversation piece that you've been talking about for the last four days. So it's a moment to really just take some time. We're hoping that it's quite casual how this might roll and there will be the opportunity for the Premier to answer any questions.

10 So I would like to formally welcome the Premier to our handover. Lovely to have you here as part of this process. We've been really excited to welcome you today. And there are a number of other guests who have joined us to see the handover from the Citizens' Jury. So we've got jurors lined up and ready to start taking us through. Adam, have you still got the document to pop up on
15 the screen? Okay. We've got a little mechanical problem, but we might start - Juror, are you ready to start by just giving a sense of the conversation that we've had around the principles for decision making, the call to action to the community, and - yes. So I'll hand over to you. Thanks, Juror.

20 JUROR: So one of the common feelings amongst the jury was that with such a complex issue, we wanted people to consider it in a really thoughtful and structured way. So we came up with some principles for decision making that we wanted everyone to keep in mind. So the principles that we felt were most important and needed to be in people's minds when they were discussing South
25 Australia's involvement in the nuclear fuel cycle were:

Legitimacy: a legitimate decision must include all people;
Inclusivity: there must be continual community consultation;
Transparency: all sources of information must be freely available;
30 *Accountability: decision makers are accountable to the community;*
Consider the future: further consideration and more debate of other options. We also must consider future generations of South Australians through all stages.
Distribution: potential economic benefits must be shared and
35 *accessible to everyone;*
Ethical: all decisions should be ethically and morally sound: what's good, what's right, what matters.

40 So we wanted people to keep these principles in mind when they're thinking about our involvement in the nuclear fuel cycle, and the main thing is we really want everyone to be involved. We all feel really passionately about this and we want the wider community to as well. We wanted to put out a call to action to our fellow South Australians.

45 *We, the Citizens' Jury, call on you, our fellow South Australians, to*

5 *join us and be a part of the process in shaping our state's future. This is a unique opportunity to be involved in the decision-making process in shaping the future for South Australia. Any future decision about the nuclear industry in our state will have long long-term commitment and consequences. The decision will affect not just us but future generations. We encourage you to get involved and participate with an open and inquiring mind. Your voice will shape the future of our state and our descendants have #@YourSAyNuclear. Everyone's choice. Everyone matters.*

10

PREMIER WEATHERILL: Thank you.

15 MS JENKE: So I'm not sure how you want to go through this, Premier. We might start taking you through a bit more content and as we go through, feel free to ask questions. So the next chunk that we worked on as a jury was the section around safety, which was a really, really important part of our deliberations over the last four day. Who's talking to safety? Juror, there you are. Okay.

20 JUROR: Yes. We looked considerably at the safety issue and based on information that was provided to us from the various speakers who we had, people from the Royal Commission who had actually attended a lot of the facilities around the world, for example, the head of geology in South Australia. As we were presenting basically a précis of the report, we had to sort of put in it the main things that they said, much of which was based on the process being a fairly safe one.

25
30 There were of course within the group some, I suppose, arguments for and against that, but in general, when we are simply reporting on the report, the report did suggest there was considerable safety involved in having such a process developed here in South Australia, which of course led into things like the health situation. Obviously the effect of long-term exposure to radiation is a concern, but when we look at levels of radiation that people are exposed to on a day-by-day basis, much of the information that was provided would suggest that the effect of possible leakage of radiation with such a facility would fall within the realms of what a person is exposed to a daily basis with respect to even flying on a plane, or whatever the case may be.

35
40 From the geological point of view, it was suggested that there are potentially a number of good sites around the state which would have the appropriate safety issues involve, I suppose, of storing the waste without the likely possibility of hydrological problems and also seismic problems. However, obviously there would have to be considerably more investigation into what sites would be the most appropriate for that to go ahead.

45

The theme that I think needs to be certainly spread to the local community is the fact that we are considering a site some 500 metres underground, which in itself creates certain safeguards and yet there are also areas where the initial capsules, et cetera, and the radioactive waste that comes in will be
5 aboveground for some period of time, maybe 10, 20, 30 years. Again, the particular ways that particular waste will be stored, according to the report, does suggest that there are considerably safe aspects with respect to the capsules that the waste will be stored in and where those capsules themselves will be stored in an aboveground initially.

10

We obviously do not have a facility operating fully around other parts of the world for us to base a lot of our information on, but certainly Finland in particular, France and Sweden, are in the process of developing such facilities which does give us, I think, some hope in the future for providing a fairly safe
15 facility. I think that's all. Is there anything else on the - - -

MS JENKE: Is there anything about transport?

JUROR: Transport. Yes, the transport aspects. There is a lovely little cartoon
20 that we may well include, which indicates potential - well, so the level of safety involved with, first of all, shipping the particular material from a country to, say, somewhere here in South Australia, and then of course the transport of that material from that aboveground storage facility after, say, 10, 20, 30 years, to the actual belowground facility.

25

Again, there is a suggestion that particular procedures are considerably safe, based on what the material will be stored in, and the particular storage facilities for that waste at that particular time has been subjected to considerable stress from a point of view firing rockets at it, dropping it from great heights,
30 et cetera, does suggest that they do provided a fairly safe place for that particular material to be stored in that particular time. And I think that's probably pretty close to what I have there. I mean, there have been some accidents around the world with respect to some of the storage, but from what we have gleaned from the report that there, as it says there, there's no breach of
35 the packages or release of harmful radiation as a result of that. We do obviously have to separate this from the disasters of Fukushima, Chernobyl and even Maralinga from that point of view because we're not talking about a nuclear explosion, we are talking about simply the safe storage of this particular material.

40

MS JENKE: Okay, great.

PREMIER WEATHERILL: Can I just ask a question about the earlier page?
45 There was a reference to flora and fauna so there is some uncertainty around the impacts of flora and fauna which warrant further study as it done in

Finland. Can you just explain that a little better?

JUROR: To be honest, I'm not fully aware of what that Finland study is. I mean, from a personal point of view when we are looking at something
5 500 metres below the ground I would think there would be certainly minimal impact in that regard. Again, maybe the above ground storage might be a slightly different situation with respect to some of the, you know, smaller fauna et cetera that are around.

10 JUROR: Yes, I can give you a specific response as well in respect to one of the witnesses provided us, the woman that works for Golding, was it Golding? Golder. Yes, so one of the expert witnesses, she told us that in Finland when she went over and did a study, the tour with the Royal Commission, in Finland
15 they've started 20 years ago they started a study of the leaf structure so then they can compare the reaction of the flora and fauna over, you know, in a longitudinal sense as well. That was a real eye opener. A lot of people hadn't thought about what the long term impacts of radiation would be in flora and fauna in the region because, and then another one of the experts, Dr Lowe, said
20 that for us humans that level of radiation may be safe but for smaller animals like little marsupial mice, we don't know what the effects are on their gorgeous little bodies.

PREMIER WEATHERILL: So the idea is that that's a further study that should accompany any expert - - -
25

JUROR: Particularly in relationship to the site that may be chosen more so than in general.

PREMIER WEATHERILL: Now, in relation to the sites, the next point there
30 about geological and seismic stability, was there a view that that work needed to occur before people would be comfortable taking a next step?

JUROR: I think probably that's the case. I mean, the interesting thing is there are three possible geological aspects that could be considered. First of all,
35 there's obviously a hard rock situation. There's also a clay situation and even a salt situation that the geological, here in South Australia the group said and probably I dare say research would have to be carried out as to which one of those was probably better than the other.

40 JUROR: Sorry, just to add to that. I can't remember his name but the chief geologist was saying that we've got fairly incomplete data about the geology of South Australia and most of the data that's been gathered has been in relation to mining or searching for water sources which is kind of the opposite of the sorts of data that we're looking for for this kind of facility.
45

PREMIER WEATHERILL: The absence of results.

JUROR: Exactly, so we wouldn't want to site something like this near an aquifer or, you know, in the middle of a gold deposit or whatever. He did highlight that there's, while we do have world class record keeping for our geological data that there are still significant gaps in the quantity of data across the state.

PREMIER WEATHERILL: Excellent.

10

MS JENKE: Thanks juror. Okay, so the next section of the report was about consent and trust so the jury, this was something that has been really complex for us or for them to unpack but really some fundamental concepts so I'll hand over to juror who is right next to me.

15

JUROR: Thank you. Thank you, premier, for us taking part in this process. It was mentioned earlier in the principles that consent and engagement was paramount in any further progress of the nuclear fuel cycle so while this section may not be as long verbally or in words it is knitted in and interwoven throughout the whole document. What we're saying is that there needs to be both broad social informed consent and specific community consent. Notably, for those sites that may be or site that may host such a facility so that has to be there.

25

Also that the social consent is not given once but it is ongoing for the life of that activity. So we got some references and that we are also calling as a call to arms under the principles is that all South Australian's opinions are valued so you have to be informed or educated so that you can make such a decision. Also, there's the opportunity to gain expert witnesses or view facilities in order to gain that information or education. We also believe in the importance of the Aboriginal and local community engagement and consent. We did talk about, quite a bit strongly on the word engagement as versus consultation. Engagement was a more appropriate word so we're quite strong on that.

30

35

We're also aware for the community that the laws need to be changed for any new nuclear activity to be developed in South Australia and we've referenced that. We've also noted that there is history of lack of community consent and I guess engagement invariably leads to failure. So we also had some questions to put to the rest of the community, how the community's consent is measured and made and how those individuals and as a society can be involved. We also recommend that they look at the recommendations in chapter 10, look at some of the report summary and some of the basic information on radiation risks and the disposal of nuclear waste.

40

45

So that was about it. The area isn't large in words but it's strongly interwoven

that the community has to be informed, educated and drive this process along with the government because if that doesn't happen, it won't occur at whatever level that goes.

5 MS JENKE: Do you want to take us through into (indistinct) trust.

JUROR: Okay.

MS JENKE: Juror, while you're going.

10

JUROR: All right. We've highlighted again that, you know, there was a need as the title says, this is vital for trust, accountability and transparency. We as a state and as citizens we've got a choice as to whether or not we want to further engage so that's referenced in the report. We need to promote trust and
15 transparency needs to be built on the design of any regulatory system moving forward if we do. Again, as part of the principles the decision affects both future generations here in South Australia and the options for other nations for the management of their high level used fuel waste.

20

We need to consider as mentioned under the principles again moral and ethical responsibilities are central to the ownership and the integrity of our decision. You know, do we think these actions are good, do we think they are the right ones and that was again referenced in the principles. We also noted in the report the international principle of radioactive waste management is that
25 society that generates it is responsible for it but there is also those that are unable to manage their own waste, that they can contract that radioactive waste management process to another country and again a question just to start those conversations.

30

So we need to, the challenge is to build and maintain trust by avoiding repeating mistakes from the past through the lack of engagement and communications such as Maralinga. So we report that the legislation and the specific item of legislation needs to be removed in order to encourage or finance construction or operation of a nuclear waste storage facility and that
35 further investigation cannot proceed without changing this legislation. I think that is about it. No, there's a bit more? We also went, I'm not on the economics part, that's another section. We also recommend that the removal of state level and/or federal level legislation which currently prohibits the licensing of uranium process and activities needs to change to enable the
40 commercial development of such items such as nuclear fuel leasing and nuclear power generation.

45

We need to, as a community, need to ensure that any measures put in place are what we want and that we have the opportunity as the public to review any proposed changes to legislation similar to this process. Strong, active

community engagement.

5 MS JENKE: Great, good job. Well done. The last big section of the report was around economics and the benefits and risks for the state to juror is going to take us through that.

10 JUROR: Thank you. So we looked at the economics of specifically establishing a used nuclear fuel and intermediate level waste storage and disposal facility and so we looked through the Royal Commission report and also heard from various economic experts. Basically the gist of it is we found that the Royal Commission found that it's a very viable option and that there's a highly probable chance of good profits. However, the experts have missed reviews. Some were saying it wasn't as viable and some saying it was too many assumption and variables which still need to be researched into.

15 Basically, we all thought that this area requires more research and in particular there's legislation which restricts us from doing further research and talking with other countries to find out exactly how much of what and for how much we can actually get. There was also other factors such as uncertainty for the future because we recognise that this is a long-term project and we don't know how many years before we start or if we start doing something like that and that obviously poses challenges such as changes in technology or alternate solutions popping up.

20 Basically we were left with more questions at the very end and even though the Royal Commission report said that, you know, it's definitely highly profitable there are definitely more questions that need to be asked and definitely further research that needs to be done into this area.

25 PREMIER WEATHERILL: Do I understand you to say that the way that you tried to resolve the difference in the experts is to try and reduce this uncertainty about the assumptions that the experts have actually based their expert opinion on and the key one is what essentially another country would be prepared to pay for this and that would involve us having to have a more detailed discussion about that and actually get that commitment so that we could evaluate the real benefit, not the assumed benefit if you like?

JUROR: That's correct.

30 PREMIER WEATHERILL: Okay, that's interesting. At the moment the legislation on one view of it it's not entirely clear, prevents us from spending money to do that. Okay.

35 JUROR: Some of the questions we were left with was then also what are we going to do with the, if we were to set up this waste facility, what would we do

with the funds that were generated from it. We also talked about would this sort of facility effect the reputation of the area, both in tourism and trade. We also looked at what kind of reliance there was on countries to pre-commit because obviously this is about upfront payments from countries to start
5 building a facility like this. Those are some of the questions and also such as work force opportunities, skills and training so all these questions still need answering. It's a lot of questions still to answer.

10 PREMIER WEATHERILL: Is it fair to say that a much clearer idea of the benefits was, you think, would be necessary as we go into this next phase to assist people to have a look at it?

JUROR: Yes, I think just basically just the assumptions that were in the Royal Commission just need to be just made definite so we know exactly what
15 figures we're working with and what time frames we're working with more precisely. It would give us a better figure of what sort of profits we're looking at.

20 PREMIER WEATHERILL: Was there also a discussion about the costs that might, the state might have to commit to or the commonwealth for that matter in the lead up to, because I think it's pretty clear and nobody would build one of these things unless you had a pre-commitment so assuming that you didn't start building it until you had a pre-commitment, so was there a discussion about how much South Australia would have to spend to get to the point where
25 we'd sign a deal with someone?

JUROR: Yes, there was. These were figures somewhere between \$300 and \$600 million. There were figures that were lower than that, other economists were not sure exactly so this is something which obviously has to be
30 considered whether these sort of funds are, those sorts of figures are used. It's not a question again how much - - -

PREMIER WEATHERILL: So having some clarity about getting up to the point where you would potentially enter into a contract with a country, how
35 much would South Australia have to spend.

JUROR: That's correct.

40 PREMIER WEATHERILL: Okay.

MS JENKE: I just wondered before we hand over to the premier whether there were any other jurors that wanted to make any other comments about the report or about you work. What have we missed? We missed the intro. Are you taking us through that? No. Juror. Sorry juror. I knew you were doing
45 something. We will just start from the end. Let's end with the start.

JUROR: So we just went through, yes, so we started with letting the rest of South Australia know what our purpose here, what the Citizens' Jury is and what we're doing here. How we were chosen, how it was a random selection
5 and we have some figures there on the table that show the distribution of, you know like it was, all the people here represent the South Australian community. We then went into the nuclear fuel cycle and just explaining and kind of like an overall what is the nuclear fuel cycle. So we talked about the four main stages so there's the mining and the milling, the enrichment and fuel fabrication,
10 electricity generation and then the used fuel management and storage.

We wanted to make quite clear that the Royal Commission report recommended that the main key issue that South Australia should look to is the storage of fuel, used fuel. That is the main focus of our Citizens' Jury. That
15 was the main focus of the four days that we were here so the Royal Commission report doesn't recommend that we produce nuclear energy or anything like that. We are just talking about the storage of waste. I think that's it. Yes, so then we just talked about the decision making process, the different stages. It's important for South Australian community to know that there are
20 many, what we're doing here isn't saying yes or no, what we're doing is starting the conversation and putting forth the discussion that needs to be made.

MS JENKE: Great, good job. Thanks juror.

25 PREMIER WEATHERILL: Excellent.

JUROR: So with that I just will open up just if there are any jurors that have any final comments and then hand over to the premier for his reflections. Assessment of our work.

30

JUROR: I just wanted to say thank you for being brave enough to participate in a process which is very unique and involves the community in a really special and engaging way so, yes, thank you.

35 PREMIER WEATHERILL: Thank you for that presentation. Before I start, I might just ask a few more questions about the report, because I just - is there any - are there any sort of things, facts or drafts or pictures that leapt out at you as a bit of an ah-ha moment, where you sort of thought, "That really helped my understanding of this"?

40

The reason I ask that question is that now after four days you're actually much more informed than you were at the start, but the next phase is actually going out to the community, and they're going to start where you started. So we're - what I want to try and get you to do is to go back and think about what you
45 were like on day one, and what was the thing that was the - you know, the

thing that jumped into your mind as being helpful? because that's something we want to capture through this.

5 JUROR: You are correct, and I believe in our introduction piece and it will come through in the formatting and the styling of the document, we actually took the four stages pictures from the summary of the Royal Commission report, and then we're building a table which is colour coordinated back to each of those stages. Then each of the questions that we had will be documented, or should I say highlighted in each of those boxes. So it makes it very clear for
10 the individual that this is stage 1 is green, stage 2 is - et cetera. Because we felt that a picture says 1000 words.

JUROR: Personally I think one of the things that the general public would like to see would be (1) a representation of what a storage facility would look
15 like, showing the fact that we are 500 metres below the surface of the earth. Secondly, what the spent fuel rods are actually stored in, the capsules, their make-up to sort of present a more realistic picture of the safety aspects of the process.

20 JUROR: In other parts there was other grafts from the report in relation to transport and the odds of accidents to date in relation to the transport of these steel canisters. So that was a graft that was to go in. There was also another table or graft in relation to the stages of radioactivity, and as it reduces down. So that's to be included as well. It's not in this document, but we've referenced
25 that there are to be, you know, as Juror said, pictures say 1000 words.

JUROR: My one that I would think would be important to include, there's a lot of misconception about the danger here. We talked a lot and thoroughly about putting risks in context. So I'd like to include at the table that shows the
30 relative radiotoxicity versus what we're exposed to every day.

PREMIER WEATHERILL: Those dangerous bananas?

35 MS JENKE: And the Lindt chocolates. The Lindt chocolates that we enjoyed.

JUROR: We didn't have information about the route the transport might take through the state. I think that would be very important to the people living in the communities where such transport was passing.

40 PREMIER WEATHERILL: Excellent. Thank you.

JUROR: Another one too, just so maybe a diagram too of the proposed economic benefits of what we think it might be, comparative to the money that the state already draws in from everything else.
45

PREMIER WEATHERILL: So comparing the - I see. So giving people a relative picture on the relative size of this compared with what our existing revenue base is? Because most people wouldn't know how much money comes into the state through revenue. I see. Okay. Well, if there are no other
5 contributions there, the first thing I want to say is thank you. I mean, it's an extraordinary thing to give up two weekends of your life, and understand it also became quite demanding, especially as you were trying to grapple with turning this into writing.

10 So thank you so much for all the energy, the brain power, the physical energy, the emotional energy that you put into this exercise. I really think this is important. I think - we've just had an election where nobody knows who won. I think they've worked it out today, but I think in a real sense this - if this
15 election spoke to anything, it's a bit of doubts about our democracy, and so what we're trying to do, I think, is to reform our democracy, and - so this is a big experiment. You're part of it.

I think from what I've seen today, it's a fantastic start. We're taking a big, complicated issue that is very important, and what you seem to have done is
20 you've come to a set of conclusions about the way forward, using two really important tools. One is you've put yourself in the shoes of everyone else, rather than just you've stepped outside yourself, which I think is - that's being a citizen rather than just being an individual with your own perspectives, which I think is magnificent.

25 The second thing is you've done it constructively, and there's been no fist fights, I understand, which is tremendous. And conducted in a way which is quite in contrast to the general political discourse we see, which is a bit of a Punch and Judy act. So all of those things, I think, just bode really well for the
30 future. So thank you so much for the work you've done. I suppose I'll play back what I've heard a bit here, and that is that it seems that it's important for people to take the next step for them to have the risk - the safety risks explained to them in detail, so they can make an assessment of that important question.

35 It's important that they have a much clearer and settled idea of the benefits, and the potential costs for South Australia, so they can make an evaluation of that. It appears that you seem to be saying that you want to stay - you want citizens somehow to stay involved in this process at every step of the way. It seems
40 what you've designed is a series of steps which are sort of go, no go, and then proceed with caution. Go, no go, proceed with caution. At any stage the community can retrieve the decision-making process.

45 So that sounds like an intelligent way of going forward. One thing I did hear in the conversation before I sat down was that somebody said that you wanted to

continue to be part of the conversation. You don't want to be excluded from the conversation, just when it goes over to the politicians to make a decision, you don't want that to be the end of it. You want to be able to have - it's conditional. You're conditionally handing the decision over to the politicians, not absolutely handing the decision over. So you have to keep checking in, which I think is a powerful observation.

So I suppose from my perspective what you've done is the very thing we asked you to do. That is produce a guide to allow the rest of the citizens to look at this report. One big thing it seems you've done is you've taken sort of - of the four areas to look at, you've taken three of them off the table which will make the report easier to read because you're now just talking about waste, which the rest are sort of for another day, and they're not really part of the present consideration for the community. So that's a good thing, that will reduce the size of people's consideration by about 75 per cent, which is a good thing.

There seems like there's some further investigations that we need to undertake, and that we might have to change the legislation to give ourselves permission to do that. So that's the next bit of work that we will involve ourselves in. We'll - obviously this will now be published. I'll present this to the parliament, and we'll use this to guide the next steps that we take, in particular going out to the community between now and the end of the year, when I hope as many of you as possible will be able to participate in the 350 person jury, which will be quite a thing to behold.

So I think you've given us a wonderful start. So thank you so much for participating in this big experiment in reforming our democracy, and if we're able to be successful I think South Australia will be leading the nation, in some respects leading the world in this way of resolving difficult questions. So thank you so much.

MS JENKE: Okay. That wraps up our time together. We'd like to recognise the jury, and thank the jury for all of their very hard work. Thank you again, premier, for coming along this afternoon and dipping into what we've done, and I wish everyone safe travels home.

PREMIER WEATHERILL: I think before we go we should - there's a few people that want to say some other words, I think, but can I on behalf of the jury and the government thank you, Emily, and your team for the wonderful work you've done. There's lots of people here that have really played an important role in making this a success, not the least the technical elements, as well as the people that are just providing food and provisions, and making sure this all goes smoothly, and New Democracy, thank you so much for the wonderful work that you do. It's just so much great work. Also the advisory panel who have been here to supervise the work. Thank you so much for

giving up your weekends as well.

5 MS JENKE: Before you go, I'm just going to - the premier has actually got a card for all the jurors. So I'll get those. They're just near where you are, Viv, there somewhere. So we might just hand those around.

10 JUROR: I actually want to echo what you just said, Premier, about democracyCo. This whole process has been a reflection of democracy. We've all felt safe, included, and have been extremely respectful in the whole process. It's been an amazing result. There are a bunch of amazing people. It was brilliantly done. I can't recommend it highly enough. Democracy in its truest self run by a great group. I think I reflect everyone's sentiment.

15 MS JENKE: Thank you.

**MATTER ADJOURNED AT 5.31 PM UNTIL
SATURDAY, 22 OCTOBER 2016**