

## Submission to the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission, Tentative Findings

I think there are some conflicts between the Royal Commission's Feb 2016 'tentative' findings and other statements, e.g. in an Advertiser article of 17<sup>th</sup> Feb 2016. There are conflicts between the cautious tone and wording of the tentative findings and the "advanced" planning, investigation, design and consultations already made by other parties. This gives an impression that the assurances given by the Commission (and the SA Premier) that no decisions have yet been made cannot be entirely relied on due to the inertia of those ready and willing to build a high level waste facility. It feels as though they have been given tacit approval. Hence a community which opposes the facility will be disadvantaged.

Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission Tentative Findings.	Personal notes and statements from an Advertiser article 17 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2016.
(103) Social and Community consent is essential to the development.	We still have nuclear waste in Port Pirie from the 1950's (Pt Pirie mayor indicating a poor attitude to clean up). At the Whyalla session there was no answer given to the question "what percentage for or against will qualify for consent?" This still needs a decision/answer.
(111.g) Community is supported to make its own decision free from lobby groups.	The community is already subject to the "advanced" planning by 'SA Nuclear Energy Systems' which is already lobbying (eg having discussions with governments and aboriginal groups).
(?) Detailed investigation is required for site selection	SA Nuclear Energy Systems has "advanced plans" for a site at Maralinga.
The SA government is yet to take a position (Wetherill)	If so why are SA Nuclear Energy Systems pushing "advanced" plans to ship waste from a port south of Whyalla and already consulted Governments and Aboriginal groups. SANES will have a jump start on community discussions

The Royal Commission's tentative findings do not have a risk assessment for transporting the high level waste across the world then through the coastal, industrial and farming areas of Eyre Peninsula. The transport and numerous handling transfers will be where an accident is guaranteed to happen somewhere, sometime. That additional risk will make disposal of high level waste more dangerous if undertaken in Australia than in the country where the waste is produced. **The Australian community needs assessment of that additional risk.**

The language of the Commission such as 'adequate robustness', rigorously tested' or 'mature international regulatory regime' means nothing when the inevitable accident occurs.

There is no place which is 'not in MY backyard' for high level nuclear waste. Anywhere in Australia is in SOMEONE's backyard. There is no 'past the black stump', 'back of beyond' or 'no man's land'.

Even if Australia has some 'responsibility' to help the people of a country who choose to produce high level nuclear waste Australia's primary responsibility is to protect the people of Australia from the increased risk of transporting it across the world, half way into our country through populated and food growing areas and then keep it safe for thousands of years when we have no idea what it will be like then.

**Once we accept any high level waste for disposal in Australia there will be no reversing that decision or the ill reputation it may cause. If the facility is such a bonanza once established, there seems to be no reason that another country will not offer their own disposal facility at a competitive reduced cost just as is common in our present world.**

Allan Nield