

From: Robyn Stewart



I have lived in Kimba all my life and have no problems with the site selection process and its transparency. I give my permission for my submission to be published on the internet.

- I feel the financial compensation offered to the landowner is fair and adequate for the 100 hectares required by the department to build the waste facility.
- I firmly believe “broad community support” should take into account majority percentage of the vote, as well as percentage of total eligible voters who chose not to vote, as it could be argued that these community members don’t care if the facility is built in the district (if they were strongly opposed they would surely have voted no). The support of direct neighbours to the proposed sites should also be taken into account, as well as the economic benefits to businesses within the community hosting the facility.
- Even though there was majority 51% for the facility in the first phone poll, I feel the process was flawed, as not all community members had the opportunity to vote. The second AEC vote was by far a fairer and more inclusive poll of the district, returning 57.4% of the 88% who voted. These results clearly show an increase in community support within the district.
- My understanding is that the Barngala people have been contacted by the department about any heritage issues regarding the sites and have viewed both the proposed sites at the end of February/early March 2018.
- Whilst the community benefit program is welcomed by various clubs and organisations, as a way of achieving progress to the betterment of our community, I don’t believe this will sway people’s opinions in any way.
- I firmly believe that the Stage 3 vote and beyond, should remain with the same boundary as the previous Stage 2 vote. If boundaries were to change, how can you determine if there has been increased/diminished percentage of community support in the district. Taking it to the wider community, who have not had the same level of education and opportunity to garner information as we have, by way of community meetings, visiting experts onsite at the department office, etc. I feel that it would result in an emotive vote rather than an informed choice.
- Our district has had ample opportunity to avail ourselves of information about the facility, since the initial meeting with Rowan Ramsey in April 2015, through various avenues ie. Community meetings, by visiting the department office and conversing with the many experts in their fields etc. Recently, some community members have had the opportunity to visit Lucas Heights, myself included, and got first hand information about the facility and waste management process. Members from both sides, for and against, have had and will have (with future trips planned) the opportunity to see for themselves, enabling them to make informed decisions.
- There have been various newsletters by way of letter box drop, as well as ARPANZA conducting meetings with concerned community members/groups.

- Whenever I have spoken to people elsewhere, I have found that most people get the low level repository confused with the high level facility that the State Government held a citizen's jury on. Therefore, I feel the wider community beyond our council boundary would not have the knowledge to make an informed decision.

Robyn Stewart
3/3/2018