

**From:** Katrina Bohr  
**Sent:** Friday, 18 March 2016 4:04 PM  
**To:** NFCRC:Enquiries  
**Subject:** Public Response to Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission T.F.

My Response to the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commissions' Tentative Findings is based on my knowledge of South Australia, and the insights I have gained through this Consultative process.

1. I am aware that the long term safe storage of Intermediate and High level Nuclear Waste is paramount. The question is where and what is the safest long term solution?
2. Professor Barry Brook, Professor of Environmental Sustainability has accrued significant expertise in the Nuclear Fuel Cycle debate. He goes so far as to say that 'Australia is Politically and Geologically secure' (ABC radio interview, posted on public media 11/3/16)
3. I now refer you to a statement that was made by retired Associate Professor of Geology Victor Gostin, where he confidently declares: 'There are a number of unstable areas in South Australia, and the Royal Commission hasn't done enough' (ABC radio interview)  
Victor Gostin has outstanding credentials and many years of experience in Geology, as well as the overall physical environment of South Australia. I am inclined to adhere to the facts that come from an expert in this field.
4. In reference to the financial risks involved in establishing a Nuclear Waste Facility of this kind, the views of Professor Richard Blandy must not be ignored.  
Adjunct Professor of Economics in the Business School, University of South Australia. Professor Blandy has many concerns in regard to the long term financial stability of this proposed Facility. He anticipates that there will only be a 30 year lifespan for the forecast \$5 billion per year income, and then we will be looking at a future of long term debt.  
His rationale is determined by the proposed income of the Facility against its extremely long term financial requirements.  
'Future generations will end up with the interest debt and repayment bills.' he states.  
Article to substantiate this debate can be referred to in (IN DAILY, Adelaide Independent News, Tuesday February 23rd 2016)
5. Craig Wilkins, Chief Executive for the Conservation Council of South Australia is decided on the Nuclear Waste debate.  
(ABC radio interview)  
Craig Wilkins strongly believes that we will be Consigning or Bequeathing future generations with the financial burden of this proposed Facility.  
He also questions their meaning of Social Consent, in regards to the Consultative process.
6. Dr Jim Green, National Nuclear Campaigner for Friends of the Earth.  
(ABC radio interview)  
Dr Jim Green highlights overseas incidents where there has been radiation exposure to workers. These incidents in Germany, France and the UK were covered up for some time.  
He emphasises the poor history South Australia has. 'There is lack of disclosure' he says.  
Dr Green concurs with Craig Wilkins and Professor Blandy in regards to the burden we would be leaving future generations. He is also convinced that complacency will set it.  
'South Australia doesn't have a good track record for clean ups either.' 'Maralinga and Radium Hill are prime examples of this.' declares Dr Green.

7. Professor Ian Lowe, Order of Australia for Services to Sciences, Technology and the Environment determines that there must be Geological, Political and Financial Stability in the future.

(ABC radio interview)

My question here is: 'How can we forecast 100,000 years ahead?' There are too many unknown factors.

8. Even with the up to date information that we have, people will always be reluctant to accept that the Nuclear Waste disposal industry is a safe and viable option.

I believe that \$32 billion will become available in 100 years of the Facilities lifespan. This amount is classed as 'maintenance'

Have your projected amounts taken into account the costs involved if there was a major incident, where billions would be required for a site clean up?

I am not convinced of the Geological, Political or Financial stability in the future, for a Nuclear Waste Facility in South Australia. I have taken on board a number of views, in order to enable myself to present you with an informed opinion.

The footprint I want to leave behind, is the one where I have tried to make a difference for future generations.

An Intermediate to High level Nuclear Waste Facility is not the memory I want to leave my children.

Thank you for your attention to my submission.

My name is Katrina Bohr