

**DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND INNOVATION**

**NATIONAL RADIOACTIVE WASTE  
MANAGEMENT FACILITY**

**COMMUNITY SENTIMENT SURVEY**

**WAVE 2 REPORT OF FINDINGS**

**April 2016**

Melbourne Canberra Sydney  
[www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com)



## Contents

<b>I. Summary of Findings.....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Background .....	1
B. General population community comparison.....	2
Overall support.....	2
Awareness .....	3
Saliency.....	5
Concerns and benefits.....	6
C. Other groups community comparison .....	10
Overall support.....	10
Awareness .....	10
Saliency.....	11
<b>II. Sallys Flat .....</b>	<b>12</b>
A. Support .....	12
B. Benefits/concerns.....	14
General population.....	14
Other groups.....	17
C. Awareness.....	21
D. Saliency .....	22
E. General Population survey outcomes .....	23
F. Sample profiles .....	24
<b>III. Hale .....</b>	<b>27</b>
A. Support .....	27
B. Benefits/concerns.....	29
General population.....	29
Other groups.....	32
C. Awareness.....	36
D. Saliency .....	37
E. General Population survey outcomes .....	38
F. Sample profiles .....	39
<b>IV. Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie.....</b>	<b>42</b>
A. Support .....	42
B. Benefits/concerns.....	44
General population.....	44
Other groups.....	47
C. Awareness.....	51
D. Saliency .....	52
E. General Population survey outcomes .....	53
F. Sample profiles .....	54

<b>V. Barndioota</b> .....	<b>57</b>
A. Support .....	57
B. Benefits/concerns .....	59
General population.....	59
Other groups.....	62
C. Awareness.....	66
D. Saliency .....	67
E. General Population survey outcomes .....	68
F. Sample profiles .....	69
<b>VI. Oman Ama</b> .....	<b>72</b>
A. Support .....	72
B. Benefits/concerns .....	74
General population.....	74
Other groups.....	77
C. Awareness.....	81
D. Saliency .....	82
E. General Population survey outcomes .....	83
F. Sample profiles .....	84
<b>VII. Methodology</b> .....	<b>87</b>
A. Overview .....	87
Six sites in five communities.....	87
The community sentiment surveys .....	88
Area definitions .....	89
B. General population survey .....	92
C. Neighbour survey.....	101
D. Indigenous survey.....	104
E. Business survey.....	106
F. Field issues .....	108
G. Research limitations .....	108

## Appendices

Appendix A: General population questionnaire

Appendix B: Neighbour questionnaire

Appendix C: Indigenous questionnaire

Appendix D: Business questionnaire

Appendix E: Neighbour letters

Appendix F: concerns and benefits across sites for Neighbours, Indigenous and Business surveys

Appendix G: Table of themes from verbatim comments by site and survey

# I. Summary of Findings

## A. Background

Residents of five communities being considered as potential sites for the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility (NRWMF) were surveyed in late February and early March 2016 to ascertain their support for continuing to the next phase of the public consultation process.

The survey covered:

- Awareness of the public consultation and the issue
- Saliency of the issue
- Support for continuing to the next phase of detailed planning
- Perceived **concerns** about locating the site in their community
- Perceived **benefits**
- A number of demographic characteristics including place of residence and distance from site

The surveys included:

1. A telephone survey among a random sample of the general population of residents (n=2,036)
2. A separate mixed telephone / in-person attempted census of all near neighbours to the nominated property (n=228)
3. A separate in-person intercept survey of Indigenous members of two communities (n=179)
4. A telephone survey of local businesses (n=302)


More details about each of the surveys is included in the methodology chapter of this report. Questionnaires are appended.

This report provides results for all four surveys.

## B. General population community comparison

### Overall support

Figure 1: Overall support by community - General Population




Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?


## Awareness

Figure 2: Awareness that site is under consideration by community - General Population



Q9. Did you know that [COMMUNITY] has been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?


Figure 3: Awareness of actual nominated site and consultation period by community - General Population



Q10. And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things: (a) the actual nominated site in your area is [DESCRIPTION] (b) There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites (c) The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.


## Saliency

Figure 4: How much issue matters personally by community - General Population



Q11. [I know you have only just become aware of this, but] how much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

Figure 5: Why have not yet formed an opinion - General Population (all communities combined)



Q13. Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

Base: Those with no opinion (n=336)



## Concerns and benefits

### Concerns

Table 1: Main perceived community concerns by community – comparison across sites and surveys

	Sally's Flat	Hale	Cortlinye / Pinkawillinie	Barndioota	Oman Ama
<b>General Population</b>	Health and safety Water quality Farming land	Water quality Health and safety Road transport risk	Community spirit Produce - quality Farming land	Health and safety Water quality Tourism	Property prices Water quality Health and safety
<b>Neighbours</b>	Water quality Tourism Property prices	Produce - price Produce - quality Water quality	Community spirit Produce - quality Produce – price <b>Pinkawillinie</b> Community spirit Produce - price Property prices	Tourism Produce – quality Water quality Health and safety	Property prices Community spirit Economy Reputation Health and safety
<b>Indigenous</b>	-	Health and safety Water quality Air quality	-	Water quality Health and safety Air quality	-
<b>Business</b>	Health and safety Water quality Farming land	Water quality Health and safety Road transport risk	Community spirit Farming land Health and safety	Tourism Health and safety Earthquake/ tremors	Property prices Community spirit Water quality

Table 2: Main perceived *personal concerns* by community – comparison across sites and surveys

	Sally's Flat	Hale	Cortline / Pinkawillinie	Barridloota	Orman Ama
<b>General Population</b>	Health and safety Water quality Road transport risk	Water quality Health and safety Road transport risk	Community spirit Produce - quality Produce – price	Tourism Property prices Health and safety	Health and safety Property prices Water quality
<b>Neighbours</b>	Property prices Health and safety Traffic Economy	Produce - price Produce - quality Water quality	<b>Cortline</b> Produce - quality Produce - price Health and safety <b>Pinkawillinie</b> Property prices Farming land Produce - price Produce - quality Community spirit	Produce - quality Tourism Health and safety	Property prices Reputation Economy Community spirit
<b>Indigenous</b>	-	Health and safety Water quality Air quality	-	Water quality Health and safety Air quality	-
<b>Business</b>	Economy Water quality Tourism Property prices	Tourism Economy People will leave the area	Farming land Produce – price Produce - quality Property prices	Tourism Health and safety Air quality Accident/ waste leak	Property prices Economy Tourism Community spirit Water quality Health and safety

## Benefits

Table 3: Main perceived community benefits by community – comparison across sites and surveys

	Sally's Flat	Hale	Cortinye / Pinkawillinie	Barridooota	Oman Ama
<b>General Population</b>	Ongoing jobs Construction jobs Financial benefit	Ongoing jobs Construction jobs Economy	Ongoing jobs Financial benefit Construction jobs	Ongoing jobs Construction jobs Financial benefit	Ongoing jobs Construction jobs Financial benefit
<b>Neighbours</b>	Construction jobs Ongoing jobs Awareness of area Financial benefit Upgrade infrastructure Upgrade local facilities	Upgrade infrastructure	<b>Cortinye</b> Construction jobs Upgrade local facilities Ongoing jobs <b>Pinkawillinie</b> Upgrade local facilities Ongoing jobs Upgrade infrastructure	Upgrade infrastructure Economy Upgrade local facilities	Construction jobs Ongoing jobs Upgrade infrastructure Upgrade local facilities Economy
<b>Indigenous</b>	-	Ongoing jobs Construction jobs Upgrade infrastructure	-	Construction jobs Ongoing jobs Upgrade local facilities Economy	-
<b>Business</b>	Ongoing jobs Construction jobs Economy	Ongoing jobs Construction jobs Economy	Construction jobs Upgrade infrastructure Economy Ongoing jobs	Ongoing jobs Construction jobs Economy	Ongoing jobs Construction jobs Economy

Table 4: Main perceived *personal benefits* by community – comparison across sites and surveys

	Sally's Flat	Hale	Cortlinye / Pinkawillinie	Barndioota	Oman Ama
<b>General Population</b>	Ongoing jobs Doctor/ Health	Economy Ongoing jobs Upgrade local facilities	Upgrade local facilities Upgrade infrastructure Ongoing jobs	Construction jobs Ongoing jobs Upgrade infrastructure	Economy Ongoing jobs Construction jobs
<b>Neighbours</b>	Construction jobs Ongoing jobs Upgrade infrastructure Upgrade local facilities	Upgrade infrastructure	Upgrade local facilities Community spirit Upgrade infrastructure Upgrade local facilities Upgrade infrastructure Doctor/ Health	Upgrade infrastructure Upgrade local facilities Economy	Upgrade infrastructure Upgrade local facilities Secure waste storage rather than hospital Property prices Community spirit Construction jobs Ongoing jobs
<b>Indigenous</b>	-	Ongoing jobs Secure waste storage rather than hospital Industry/ local business <i>benefits</i> More people in community Community spirit	-	Construction jobs Ongoing jobs	-
<b>Business</b>	Economy Ongoing jobs Industry/ local business <i>benefits</i>	Economy Ongoing jobs Industry/ local business <i>benefits</i> Construction jobs	Economy More people in community Ongoing jobs	Economy More people in community Ongoing jobs	Construction jobs Ongoing jobs Upgrade infrastructure Economy

## C. Other groups community comparison

### Overall support

Table 5: Overall support by group and community (% not opposed)

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
<b>Sallys Flat</b>	34%	2%		45%
<b>Hale</b>	47%	0%	28%	60%
<b>Cortlinye / Pinkawillinie</b>	51%	17% (C) 40% (P)		57%
<b>Barndioota</b>	65%	35%	3%	93%
<b>Oman Ama</b>	50%	40%		69%

Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

### Awareness

Table 6: Overall awareness by group and community (% fully aware)

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
<b>Sallys Flat</b>	89%	93%		93%
<b>Hale</b>	77%	100%	22%	78%
<b>Cortlinye / Pinkawillinie</b>	97%	99% (C) 100% (P)		97%
<b>Barndioota</b>	90%	100%	78%	89%
<b>Oman Ama</b>	92%	96%		100%

Q9. Did you know that [COMMUNITY] has been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?

## Saliency

Table 7: Saliency by group and community (% a lot)


	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
<b>Sallys Flat</b>	72%	89%		38%
<b>Hale</b>	62%	100%	60%	41%
<b>Cortlinye / Pinkawillinie</b>	77%	98% (C) 90% (P)		74%
<b>Barndioota</b>	70%	82%	96%	43%
<b>Oman Ama</b>	62%	68%		41%

Q11. [I know you have only just become aware of this, but] how much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

## II. Sallys Flat

### A. Support

Figure 6: Overall support by group – Sallys Flat



Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

Table 8: Overall support by neighbour household - Sallys Flat

#### Sally's Flat

Classification of household	Frequency	% of households
Not oppose	1	2%
Mixed	0	0%
Oppose	24	50%
No response	20	42%
Permission denied (by at least one respondent in household)	3	6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*Note: we are unable to display the results for households where permission was denied to link their data with their household identification, as including their results in the pattern of the results in the summary table would indirectly identify the household's opinion.*

Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

Table 9: Support by region and major town – General population, Sallys Flat (% not oppose)

		% not oppose	Base size
<b>Region</b>	<b>Bathurst region</b> (south of site)	33%	556
	<b>Mudgee region</b> (north of site)	40%	178
	<b>Orange region</b> (west of site)	48%	34
	<b>Sallys Flat region</b> (site surrounds)	6%	20
	<b>Other region around Sallys Flat</b>	47%	8
<b>Total</b>		34%	796
<b>Major town</b>	<b>Bathurst</b>	33%	549
	<b>Mudgee</b>	41%	168
	<b>Total</b>	34%	717


*\*Note: results in grey font are based on small sample sizes and should be treated as being indicative only.*



## B. Benefits/concerns


### General population

Figure 7: Top 5 personal **concerns** - General population, Sallys Flat




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

Figure 8: Top 5 personal **benefits** - General population, Sallys Flat




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?

Figure 9: All perceived concerns - General population, Sallys Flat



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any concerns or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?


Figure 10: All perceived **benefits** - General population, Sallys Flat



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?


## Other groups

Figure 11: Top 5 community **concerns** by group - Sallys Flat




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?

Figure 12: Top 5 personal **concerns** by group - Sallys Flat




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

Figure 13: Top 5 community **benefits** by group - Sallys Flat



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?


Figure 14: Top 5 personal **benefits** by group - Sallys Flat



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?


## C. Awareness

Figure 15: Awareness that site is under consideration by group – Sallys Flat



Q9. Did you know that [COMMUNITY] has been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?

Figure 16: Awareness of actual nominated site and consultation period by group – Sallys Flat




Q10. And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things: (a) the actual nominated site in your area is [DESCRIPTION] (b) There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites (c) The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.




## D. Saliency

Figure 17: How much issue matters personally by group – Sallys Flat



Q11. [I know you have only just become aware of this, but] how much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

Figure 18: Why have not yet formed an opinion – General population, Sallys Flat




Q13. Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

Base: Those with no opinion (n=115)

## E. General Population survey outcomes

Please see Section 8 for a glossary of terms and sources used in this table and more methodological information about the Sallys Flat general population survey. For field outcome and methodological information for other surveys, please refer to the same section.

Table 10: Survey outcomes – General population, Sallys Flat



## F. Sample profiles

Table 11: Residency Profile – Sallys Flat

		General population	Neighbours	Business
		(n=796)	(n=54)	(n=100)
Distance from site	0-10km	.5%		
	11-20km	3.0%		
	21-30km	4.3%		
	31-40km	15.7%		
	41km+	76.4%		
Lives	In town	73.5%		80.0%
	On property <5 acres	11.2%		4.0%
	On property 5+ acres	14.8%		15.0%
	Other	0.0%		1.0%
Housing	Owns	75.4%		
	Rents	9.9%		
	Boards	10.2%		
	Other	4.5%		
Tenure in local area	< 11 years	17.3%	26.1%	36.0%
	11-20 years	28.2%	17.4%	26.0%
	21+years	54.6%	56.5%	37.0%
	Refused	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Size of household	Single person household	15.9%		
	2-person household	56.5%		
	3+ person household	27.6%		

Table 12: Demographic Profile – Sallys Flat


		General population	Neighbours	Business
		(n=796)	(n=54)	(n=100)
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	48.9%	59.3%	64.0%
	<b>Female</b>	50.8%	40.7%	36.0%
	<b>Unspecified</b>	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Age</b>	<b>18-34</b>	30.0%	13.0%	
	<b>35-49</b>	26.1%	25.9%	
	<b>50-64</b>	24.1%	37.0%	
	<b>65+</b>	19.7%	24.1%	
	<b>Refused</b>	0.0%	0.0%	
<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Yes</b>	3.7%	0.0%	2.0%
<b>People employed by business in local area</b>	<b>1</b>			23.0%
	<b>2-5</b>			45.0%
	<b>6-10</b>			15.0%
	<b>11-20</b>			9.0%
	<b>21-50</b>			6.0%
	<b>51-100</b>			0.0%
	<b>100+</b>			1.0%
	<b>Can't say</b>			1.0%
<b>Business industry</b>	<b>Tourism</b>			1.0%
	<b>Agriculture, Fishing and Forestry</b>			6.0%
	<b>Construction</b>			23.0%
	<b>Retail trade</b>			17.0%
	<b>Accommodation and food services</b>			7.0%
	<b>Financial or insurance services</b>			2.0%
	<b>Professional, technical and scientific services</b>			2.0%
	<b>Rental, hiring or real estate</b>			3.0%

		General population	Neighbours	Business
		(n=796)	(n=54)	(n=100)
<b>Business industry (continued)</b>	<b>Education and training</b>			4.0%
	<b>Healthcare and social assistance</b>			3.0%
	<b>Arts and recreation services</b>			4.0%
	<b>Transport, postal or warehousing</b>			2.0%
	<b>Property, administrative and support services</b>			1.0%
	<b>Information, media or telecommunications</b>			1.0%
	<b>Wholesale trade</b>			4.0%
	<b>Manufacturing</b>			10.0%
	<b>Public administration or safety</b>			0.0%
	<b>Mining</b>			0.0%
	<b>Electricity, Gas, water and waste services</b>			0.0%
	<b>Personal and other services</b>			10.0%

### III.Hale

#### A. Support

Figure 19: Overall support by group – Hale



Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

Table 13: Overall support by neighbour household – Hale

Hale		
Classification of household	Frequency	% of households
Not oppose	0	0%
Mixed	0	0%
Oppose	2	22%
No response	7	78%
Permission denied (by at least one respondent in household)	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*Note: we are unable to display the results for households where permission was denied to link their data with their household identification, as including their results in the pattern of the results in the summary table would indirectly identify the household's opinion.

Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?




Table 14: Support by region and major town – General population, Hale (% not oppose)

		% not oppose	Base size
<b>Region</b>	<b>Alice Springs region</b>	47%	624
	<b>Other region around Hale</b>	51%	44
	<b>Total</b>	47%	668
<b>Major town</b>	<b>Alice Springs</b>	47%	624
	<b>Total</b>	47%	624

## B. Benefits/concerns


### General population

Figure 20: Top 5 personal **concerns** - General population, Hale



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?


Figure 21: Top 5 personal **benefits** - General population, Hale



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?




Figure 22: All perceived concerns - General population, Hale



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?


Figure 23: All perceived **benefits** - General population, Hale



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?


## Other groups

Figure 24: Top 5 community **concerns** by group - Hale




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?

Figure 25: Top 5 personal **concerns** by group - Hale




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

Figure 26: Top 5 community **benefits** by group - Hale



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?


Figure 27: Top 5 personal **benefits** by group - Hale



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?


## C. Awareness

Figure 28: Awareness that site is under consideration by group – Hale



Q9. Did you know that [COMMUNITY] has been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?


Figure 29: Awareness of actual nominated site and consultation period by group – Hale



Q10. And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things: (a) the actual nominated site in your area is [DESCRIPTION] (b) There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites (c) The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.


## D. Saliency

Figure 30: How much issue matters personally by group – Hale



Q11. [I know you have only just become aware of this, but] how much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

Figure 31: Why have not yet formed an opinion – General population, Hale



Q13. Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...


Base: Those with no opinion (n=135)



## E. General Population survey outcomes

Please see Section 8 for a glossary of terms and sources used in this table and more methodological information about the Hale general population survey. For field outcome and methodological information for other surveys, please refer to the same section.

Table 15: Survey outcomes – General population, Hale



## F. Sample profiles

Table 16: Residency Profile – Hale

		General population (n=668)	Neighbours (n=3)	Indigenous (n=102)	Business (n=100)
Distance from site	0-10km	0.0%			
	11-20km	0.0%			
	21-30km	0.1%			
	31-40km	0.9%			
	41km+	99.0%			
Lives	In town	93.0%		47.1%	84.0%
	On property <5 acres	5.7%		5.9%	4.0%
	On property 5+ acres	1.3%		4.9%	12.0%
	Indigenous community	0.0%		39.2%	0.0%
	Other	0.0%		2.9%	0.0%
Housing	Owens	69.8%		10.8%	
	Rents	16.9%		47.1%	
	Boards	11.8%		27.5%	
	Other	1.5%		14.7%	
Tenure in local area	< 11 years	30.7%	0.0%	35.3%	25.0%
	11-20 years	29.8%	66.7%	18.6%	30.0%
	21+years	38.5%	33.3%	46.1%	44.0%
	Refused	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Size of household	Single person household	21.0%		14.7%	
	2-person household	62.1%		30.4%	
	3+ person household	16.8%		52.0%	

Table 17: Demographic Profile – Hale


		General population (n=669)	Neighbours (n=3)	Indigenous (n=102)	Business (n=100)
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	50.4%	66.7%	52.9%	60.0%
	<b>Female</b>	48.8%	33.3%	47.1%	40.0%
	<b>Unspecified</b>	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Age</b>	<b>18-34</b>	36.1%	0.0%	44.1%	
	<b>35-49</b>	32.2%	66.7%	38.2%	
	<b>50-64</b>	24.1%	0.0%	14.7%	
	<b>65+</b>	7.2%	33.3%	2.9%	
	<b>Refused</b>	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	
<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Yes</b>	3.1%	0.0%	100.0%	2.0%
<b>People employed by business in local area</b>	<b>1</b>				8.0%
	<b>2-5</b>				31.0%
	<b>6-10</b>				31.0%
	<b>11-20</b>				16.0%
	<b>21-50</b>				9.0%
	<b>51-100</b>				2.0%
	<b>100+</b>				2.0%
	<b>Can't say</b>				1.0%
<b>Business industry</b>	<b>Tourism</b>				9.0%
	<b>Agriculture, Fishing and Forestry</b>				3.0%
	<b>Construction</b>				9.0%
	<b>Retail trade</b>				27.0%
	<b>Accommodation and food services</b>				7.0%
	<b>Financial or insurance services</b>				0.0%
	<b>Professional, technical and scientific services</b>				5.0%

		General population (n=669)	Neighbours (n=3)	Indigenous (n=102)	Business (n=100)
Business industry (continued)	Rental, hiring or real estate				2.0%
	Education and training				5.0%
	Healthcare and social assistance				4.0%
	Arts and recreation services				4.0%
	Transport, postal or warehousing				5.0%
	Property, administrative and support services				1.0%
	Information, media or telecommunications				1.0%
	Wholesale trade				2.0%
	Manufacturing				4.0%
	Public administration or safety				0.0%
	Mining				2.0%
	Electricity, Gas, water and waste services				1.0%
	Personal and other services				9.0%

# IV. Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie

## A. Support

Figure 32: Overall support by group – Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie



Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

Table 18: Overall support by neighbour household - Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie

**Cortlinye**

Classification of household	Frequency	% of households
Not oppose	4	15%
Mixed	1	4%
Oppose	15	56%
No response	6	22%
Permission denied (by at least one respondent in household)	1	4%

**Pinkawillinie**

Classification of household	Frequency	% of households
Not oppose	4	22%
Mixed	1	6%
Oppose	10	56%
No response	2	11%
Permission denied (by at least one respondent in household)	1	6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*Note: we are unable to display the results for households where permission was denied to link their data with their household identification, as including their results in the pattern of the results in the summary table would indirectly identify the household's opinion.*

Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

Table 19: Support by region and major town – General population, Cortlinye / Pinkawillinie (% not oppose)


		% not oppose	Base size
<b>Region</b>	<b>Kimba region</b>	54%	166
	<b>Other region around Cortlinye</b>	19%	18
	<b>Total</b>	51%	184
<b>Major town</b>	<b>KIMBA</b>	54%	165
	<b>Total</b>	54%	165

*\*Note: results in grey font are based on small sample sizes and should be treated as being indicative only.*

## B. Benefits/concerns


### General population

Figure 33: Top 5 personal **concerns** - General population, Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

Figure 34: Top 5 personal **benefits** - General population, Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?


Figure 35: All perceived concerns - General population, Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?




Figure 36: All perceived **benefits** - General population, Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?


## Other groups

Figure 37: Top 5 community **concerns** by group - Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?

Figure 38: Top 5 personal **concerns** by group - Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

Figure 39: Top 5 community **benefits** by group - Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?


Figure 40: Top 5 personal **benefits** by group - Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?


## C. Awareness

Figure 41: Awareness that site is under consideration by group – Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie



Q9. Did you know that [COMMUNITY] has been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?


Figure 42: Awareness of actual nominated site and consultation period by group – Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie



Q10. And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things: (a) the actual nominated site in your area is [DESCRIPTION] (b) There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites (c) The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.


## D. Saliency

Figure 43: How much issue matters personally by group – Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie



Q11. [I know you have only just become aware of this, but] how much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

Figure 44: Why have not yet formed an opinion – General population, Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie




Q13. Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

Base: Those with no opinion (n=17)

## E. General Population survey outcomes

Please see Section 8 for a glossary of terms and sources used in this table and more methodological information about the Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie general population survey. For field outcome and methodological information for other surveys, please refer to the same section.

Table 20: Survey outcomes – General population, Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie





## F. Sample profiles

Table 21: Residency Profile – Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie

		General population (n=184)	Neighbours (Cortlinye) (n=3)	Neighbours (Pinkawillinie) (n=3)	Business (n=35)
<b>Distance from site</b>	<b>0-10km</b>	2.6%			
	<b>11-20km</b>	2.7%			
	<b>21-30km</b>	70.3%			
	<b>31-40km</b>	8.8%			
	<b>41km+</b>	15.5%			
<b>Lives</b>	<b>In town</b>	61.7%			60.0%
	<b>On property &lt;5 acres</b>	3.1%			0.0%
	<b>On property 5+ acres</b>	35.2%			40.0%
	<b>Other</b>	0.0%			0.0%
<b>Housing</b>	<b>Owns</b>	88.7%			
	<b>Rents</b>	8.2%			
	<b>Boards</b>	1.0%			
	<b>Other</b>	2.1%			
<b>Tenure in local area</b>	<b>&lt; 11 years</b>	7.0%	9.9%	22.2%	5.7%
	<b>11-20 years</b>	15.9%	12.3%	8.9%	14.3%
	<b>21+years</b>	77.2%	77.8%	68.9%	80.0%
	<b>Refused</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Size of household</b>	<b>Single person household</b>	15.1%			
	<b>2-person household</b>	77.1%			
	<b>3+ person household</b>	7.7%			

Table 22: Demographic Profile – Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie


		General population	Neighbours (Cortlinye)	Neighbours (Pinkawillinie)	Business
		(n=184)	(n=)	(n=)	(n=35)
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	51.1%	50.6%	54.2%	42.9%
	<b>Female</b>	48.9%	49.4%	45.8%	57.1%
	<b>Unspecified</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Age</b>	<b>18-34</b>	23.7%	24.7%	22.9%	
	<b>35-49</b>	22.4%	28.4%	33.3%	
	<b>50-64</b>	28.6%	30.9%	29.2%	
	<b>65+</b>	25.3%	16.0%	14.6%	
	<b>Refused</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Yes</b>	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>People employed by business in local area</b>	<b>1</b>				5.7%
	<b>2-5</b>				80.0%
	<b>6-10</b>				8.6%
	<b>11-20</b>				2.9%
	<b>21-50</b>				0.0%
	<b>51-100</b>				0.0%
	<b>100+</b>				0.0%
	<b>Can't say</b>				2.9%
<b>Business industry</b>	<b>Tourism</b>				0.0%
	<b>Agriculture, Fishing and Forestry</b>				45.7%
	<b>Construction</b>				0.0%
	<b>Retail trade</b>				14.3%
	<b>Accommodation and food services</b>				2.9%
	<b>Financial or insurance services</b>				2.9%
	<b>Professional, technical and scientific services</b>				0.0%

		General population	Neighbours (Cortlinye)	Neighbours (Pinkawillinie)	Business
<b>Business industry (continued)</b>	<b>Rental, hiring or real estate</b>				0.0%
	<b>Education and training</b>				8.6%
	<b>Healthcare and social assistance</b>				5.7%
	<b>Arts and recreation services</b>				2.9%
	<b>Transport, postal or warehousing</b>				5.7%
	<b>Property, administrative and support services</b>				0.0%
	<b>Information, media or telecommunications</b>				0.0%
	<b>Wholesale trade</b>				2.9%
	<b>Manufacturing</b>				0.0%
	<b>Public administration or safety</b>				0.0%
	<b>Mining</b>				0.0%
	<b>Electricity, Gas, water and waste services</b>				0.0%
<b>Personal and other services</b>				8.6%	

# V. Barndioota

## A. Support

Figure 45: Overall support by group – Barndioota



Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

Table 23: Overall support by neighbour household – Barndioota

### Barndioota

Classification of household	Frequency	% of households
Not oppose	3	27%
Mixed	0	0%
Oppose	4	36%
No response	4	36%
Permission denied (by at least one respondent in household)	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*Note: we are unable to display the results for households where permission was denied to link their data with their household identification, as including their results in the pattern of the results in the summary table would indirectly identify the household's opinion.

Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

Table 24: Support by distance, region and major town – General population, Barndioota (% not oppose)


		% not oppose	Base size
<b>Region</b>	<b>Hawker region</b> (north east of site)	84%	38
	<b>Quorn region</b> (south of site)	57%	106
	<b>Other region around Barndioota</b>	100%	2
	<b>Total</b>	65%	146
<b>Major town</b>	<b>Hawker</b>	86%	37
	<b>Quorn</b>	63%	97
	<b>Total</b>	69%	134

*\*Note: results in grey font are based on small sample sizes and should be treated as being indicative only.*

## B. Benefits/concerns


### General population

Figure 46: Top 5 personal **concerns** - General population, Barndioota



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

Figure 47: Top 5 personal **benefits** - General population, Barndioota




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?

Figure 48: All perceived **concerns** - General population, Barndioota



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

Figure 49: All perceived **benefits** - General population, Barndioota




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?




## Other groups

Figure 50: Top 5 community **concerns** by group – Barndioota




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?

Figure 51: Top 5 personal **concerns** by group – Barndioota




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

Figure 52: Top 5 community **benefits** by group – Barndioota



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?


Figure 53: Top 5 personal **benefits** by group – Barndioota



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?


## C. Awareness

Figure 54: Awareness that site is under consideration by group – Barndioota



Q9. Did you know that [COMMUNITY] has been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?


Figure 55: Awareness of actual nominated site and consultation period by group – Barndioota



Q10. And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things: (a) the actual nominated site in your area is [DESCRIPTION] (b) There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites (c) The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.


## D. Saliency

Figure 56: How much issue matters personally by group – Barndioota



Q11. [I know you have only just become aware of this, but] how much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

Figure 57: Why have not yet formed an opinion – General population, Barndioota




Q13. Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

Base: Those with no opinion (n=23)

## E. General Population survey outcomes

Please see Section 8 for a glossary of terms and sources used in this table and more methodological information about the Barndioota general population survey. For field outcome and methodological information for other surveys, please refer to the same section.

Table 25: Survey outcomes – General population, Barndioota



## F. Sample profiles

Table 26: Residency Profile – Barndioota

		General population (n=146)	Neighbours (n=17)	Indigenous (n=77)	Business (n=28)
Distance from site	0-10km	0.0%			
	11-20km	0.0%			
	21-30km	3.1%			
	31-40km	24.4%			
	41km+	72.5%			
Lives	In town	75.8%		47.1%	64.3%
	On property <5 acres	5.5%		5.9%	28.6%
	On property 5+ acres	18.7%		4.9%	7.1%
	Indigenous community	0.0%		39.2%	0.0%
	Other	0.0%		2.9%	0.0%
Housing	Owns	80.0%		9.1%	
	Rents	16.4%		61.0%	
	Boards	2.0%		18.2%	
	Other	1.6%		11.7%	
Tenure in local area	< 11 years	20.1%	50.0%	11.7%	21.4%
	11-20 years	21.7%	14.3%	20.8%	35.7%
	21+years	58.3%	35.7%	67.5%	35.7%
	Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%
Size of household	Single person household	23.3%		20.8%	
	2-person household	68.1%		33.8%	
	3+ person household	8.7%		45.5%	



Table 27: Demographic Profile – Barndioota


		General population	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
		(n=146)	(n=17)	(n=77)	(n=28)
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	50.1%	47.1%	41.6%	67.9%
	<b>Female</b>	49.9%	52.9%	58.4%	32.1%
	<b>Unspecified</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Age</b>	<b>18-34</b>	18.1%	29.4%	42.9%	
	<b>35-49</b>	24.5%	11.8%	27.3%	
	<b>50-64</b>	29.5%	58.8%	24.7%	
	<b>65+</b>	26.4%	0.0%	5.2%	
	<b>Refused</b>	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	
<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Yes</b>	6.2%	23.5%	100.0%	0.0%
<b>People employed by business in local area</b>	<b>1</b>				14.3%
	<b>2-5</b>				60.7%
	<b>6-10</b>				10.7%
	<b>11-20</b>				7.1%
	<b>21-50</b>				7.1%
	<b>51-100</b>				0.0%
	<b>100+</b>				0.0%
	<b>Can't say</b>				0.0%
<b>Business industry</b>	<b>Tourism</b>				7.1%
	<b>Agriculture, Fishing and Forestry</b>				25.0%
	<b>Construction</b>				10.7%
	<b>Retail trade</b>				21.4%
	<b>Accommodation and food services</b>				10.7%
	<b>Financial or insurance services</b>				0.0%
	<b>Professional, technical and scientific services</b>				3.6%

		General population	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
		(n=146)	(n=17)	(n=77)	(n=28)
<b>Business industry (continued)</b>	<b>Rental, hiring or real estate</b>				0.0%
	<b>Education and training</b>				3.6%
	<b>Healthcare and social assistance</b>				0.0%
	<b>Arts and recreation services</b>				3.6%
	<b>Transport, postal or warehousing</b>				3.6%
	<b>Property, administrative and support services</b>				0.0%
	<b>Information, media or telecommunications</b>				0.0%
	<b>Wholesale trade</b>				0.0%
	<b>Manufacturing</b>				0.0%
	<b>Public administration or safety</b>				0.0%
	<b>Mining</b>				3.6%
	<b>Electricity, Gas, water and waste services</b>				0.0%
	<b>Personal and other services</b>				7.1%

## VI. Oman Ama

### A. Support

Figure 58: Overall support by group – Oman Ama



Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

Table 28: Overall support by neighbour household - Oman Ama

#### Oman Ama

Classification of household	Frequency	% of households
Not oppose	8	30%
Mixed	1	4%
Oppose	8	30%
No response	9	33%
Permission denied (by at least one respondent in household)	1	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*Note: we are unable to display the results for households where permission was denied to link their data with their household identification, as including their results in the pattern of the results in the summary table would indirectly identify the household's opinion.

Q11. How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites?

Q12. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

Q14. Would you be willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

Table 29: Support by distance, region and major town – General population, Oman Ama (% not oppose)


		% not oppose	Base size
<b>Region</b>	<b>Inglewood region</b> (west of site)	45%	127
	<b>Leyburn region</b> (northeast of site)	48%	24
	<b>Millmerran Woods region</b> (north of site)	54%	49
	<b>Goldfields region</b> (east of site)	66%	30
	<b>Other region around Oman Ama</b>	48%	12
	<b>Total</b>	50%	242
<b>Major town</b>	<b>Inglewood</b>	38%	112
	<b>Milmerran Woods</b>	57%	39
	<b>Total</b>	43%	151

*\*Note: results in grey font are based on small sample sizes and should be treated as being indicative only.*

## B. Benefits/concerns


### General population

Figure 59: Top 5 personal **concerns** - General population, Oman Ama




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

Figure 60: Top 5 personal **benefits** - General population, Oman Ama




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?

Figure 61: All perceived **concerns** - General population, Oman Ama



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?


Figure 62: All perceived **benefits** - General population, Oman Ama



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

## Other groups


Figure 63: Top 5 community **concerns** by group - Oman Ama



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?




Figure 64: Top 5 personal **concerns** by group - Oman Ama




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

Figure 65: Top 5 community **benefits** by group - Oman Ama



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?


Figure 66: Top 5 personal **benefits** by group - Oman Ama



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?


## C. Awareness

Figure 67: Awareness that site is under consideration by group – Oman Ama



Q9. Did you know that [COMMUNITY] has been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?


Figure 68: Awareness of actual nominated site and consultation period by group – Oman Ama



Q10. And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things: (a) the actual nominated site in your area is [DESCRIPTION] (b) There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites (c) The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.


## D. Saliency

Figure 69: How much issue matters personally by group – Oman Ama



Q11. [I know you have only just become aware of this, but] how much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

Figure 70: Why have not yet formed an opinion – General population, Oman Ama




Q13. Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

Base: Those with no opinion (n=45)

## E. General Population survey outcomes

Please see Section 8 for a glossary of terms and sources used in this table and more methodological information about the Oman Ama general population survey. For field outcome and methodological information for other surveys, please refer to the same section.

Table 30: Survey outcomes – General population, Oman Ama



## F. Sample profiles

Table 31: Residency Profile – Oman Ama

		General population	Neighbours	Business
		(n=242)	(n=25)	(n=39)
Distance from site	0-10km	2.3%		
	11-20km	6.8%		
	21-30km	45.4%		
	31-40km	11.0%		
	41km+	34.5%		
Lives	In town	33.4%		53.8%
	On property <5 acres	5.2%		43.6%
	On property 5+ acres	61.4%		2.6%
Housing	Owns	81.7%		
	Rents	9.6%		
	Boards	3.8%		
	Other	4.8%		
Tenure in local area	< 11 years	27.1%	40.0%	17.9%
	11-20 years	22.7%	16.0%	20.5%
	21+years	50.2%	44.0%	61.5%
	Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Size of household	Single person household	15.1%		
	2-person household	74.6%		
	3+ person household	10.4%		

Table 32: Demographic Profile – Oman Ama

		General population	Neighbours	Business
		(n=241)	(n=25)	(n=39)
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	53.4%	60.0%	51.3%
	<b>Female</b>	46.6%	40.0%	48.7%
	<b>Unspecified</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Age</b>	<b>18-34</b>	16.4%	12.0%	
	<b>35-49</b>	27.4%	16.0%	
	<b>50-64</b>	32.0%	44.0%	
	<b>65+</b>	24.3%	28.0%	
	<b>Refused</b>	0.0%	0.0%	
<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Yes</b>	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>People employed by business in local area</b>	<b>1</b>			10.3%
	<b>2-5</b>			61.5%
	<b>6-10</b>			15.4%
	<b>11-20</b>			7.7%
	<b>21-50</b>			5.1%
	<b>51-100</b>			0.0%
	<b>100+</b>			0.0%
	<b>Can't say</b>			0.0%
<b>Business industry</b>	<b>Tourism</b>			7.7%
	<b>Agriculture, Fishing and Forestry</b>			28.2%
	<b>Construction</b>			2.6%
	<b>Retail trade</b>			12.8%
	<b>Accommodation and food services</b>			12.8%
	<b>Financial or insurance services</b>			0.0%
	<b>Professional, technical and scientific services</b>			0.0%



		General population	Neighbours	Business
		(n=241)	(n=25)	(n=39)
<b>Business industry (continued)</b>	<b>Rental, hiring or real estate</b>			2.6%
	<b>Education and training</b>			7.7%
	<b>Healthcare and social assistance</b>			2.6%
	<b>Arts and recreation services</b>			2.6%
	<b>Transport, postal or warehousing</b>			7.7%
	<b>Property, administrative and support services</b>			0.0%
	<b>Information, media or telecommunications</b>			0.0%
	<b>Wholesale trade</b>			0.0%
	<b>Manufacturing</b>			5.1%
	<b>Public administration or safety</b>			0.0%
	<b>Mining</b>			0.0%
	<b>Electricity, Gas, water and waste services</b>			0.0%
	<b>Personal and other services</b>			7.7%

## VII. Methodology

### A. Overview

The Minister for Resources, Energy and Northern Australia is considering a list of potential sites for the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility (NRWMF) and on 13 November 2015 announced the sites shortlisted for further assessment. Six sites in five communities have been part of a consultation process through to March 2016. Community sentiment surveys will be one consideration in identifying which of the six sites will continue with the consultation process.

#### Six sites in five communities

**Sallys Flat** is 16.5 km to the east of the historic gold mining village Hill End (population 484) in the Central West region of NSW. The postcode of 2850, of which Sallys Flat is part, contains numerous small villages (total population 14,478), and Sallys Flat is included in the Bathurst Regional Council which has a population of 38,521, a population density of 0.10 persons per hectare, and which covers 3,820km<sup>2</sup>. The nearest towns of significant size and potential service centres for a facility at Sallys Flat are Bathurst (64km to the south, population 33,110) and Kandos (population 1,284), 41km to the east. The wider Bathurst District area has a fractionally higher than average proportion of Indigenous people (approximately 4%).

The Hugh district of the Northern Territory, of which **Hale** is part, has a population of just under 1,000 – 84% of which is Indigenous. 140km southeast of Alice Springs (population 36,000, 36% Indigenous), the remote community of Hale is relatively close (60km) to Ltyentye Apurte, also known as Santa Teresa, an Arrernte Indigenous community (population 555). Also relatively nearby is Titjikala, an Aboriginal community with a population of 201 (although there is no direct road between the two communities and access is via Alice Springs). Hale is near the Todd River, which occasionally flows through Alice Springs.

**Cortlinye** and **Pinkawillinie** are both located in the District Council of Kimba within the Eyre and Western Regions of South Australia, and share the same postcode (5641). The total population of the District Council of Kimba was 1,125 in 2009, in a total land area of 3,986 km<sup>2</sup>. The nearest town is Kimba (population 670), which is 45km to the southeast of Pinkawillinie and 17.5km southeast of Cortlinye. The Indigenous population in the immediate region is small

**Barndioota** is located in Flinders Ranges Council of South Australia (postcode 5434). Barndioota is closest to Hawker (area population 492, of which 10% Indigenous), with Quorn (population 1,068, 11% Indigenous) around 70km to the south and Port Augusta (population 13,500, 19% Indigenous) around 100km south.

**Oman Ama** is located in the region of Darling Downs, Queensland (postal code 4352). In the 2006 Census the population of Oman Ama included 133 people and in the wider Coolmunda area, 290 people. It is located approximately midway between Goondiwindi 114km to the west (population 5,629) and Warwick 86 km to the east (population 12,357) on the Cunningham Highway, and is also close to the community of Inglewood (population 1,069, 23km to the west). Inglewood has a higher than average Aboriginal population (7% - about double the state average).

## The community sentiment surveys

Four separate surveys were conducted in order to gauge community sentiment in these five communities:

- (1) A general population survey
- (2) A near neighbours survey
- (3) A separate survey of Indigenous people in two communities where Indigenous people represent a relatively large proportion of the population
- (4) A survey of businesses

The **general population survey** was a random survey of the adult (18+) population within a designated area around the proposed site. People were interviewed by telephone (computer assisted telephone interviewing) following a rigorous random sampling procedure.

The results of the random general population survey were used to determine community sentiment, and were supported by three other supplementary surveys of special populations.

The first of these supplementary surveys was the **near neighbours survey**. Near neighbours were defined as those owning, residing on, or using properties that adjoin the actual proposed site for the NRWMF. The near neighbours survey involved an attempted census of all such properties, but a non-probability method of recruiting and interviewing individuals was undertaken on each property. Non-probability surveys use non-random sampling methods to obtain an approximate representation of the population of interest. They are generally employed where there is a lack of sample frame from which to randomly sample, as in the case of neighbours as defined above. The near neighbours survey was conducted using a combination of on-site face-to-face and telephone interviews.

The second of the supplementary surveys was the **Indigenous survey**. Although people describing themselves as being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin were surveyed through the random general population survey, it was recognised at the design stage that Indigenous peoples are often poorly represented through random telephone surveys. The Indigenous surveys were conducted by ORIMA's specialist Indigenous field force using an in-person non-probability intercept method in two communities with disproportionately large Indigenous populations – Hale (NT) and Barndioota (SA).

The third of the supplementary surveys was the **business survey**. Local business telephone numbers were sourced from the Yellow Pages and True Local searches, and then manually filtered to exclude businesses located outside of a designated radius of the proposed site. Business owner/managers were surveyed by telephone using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI).

It is important to reemphasise that due to sample frame and logistical restrictions, all three supplementary surveys used non-probability sampling methods. The results from these surveys should therefore be considered indicative only. They provide important contextual information from special populations to support the statistically representative general population survey results.


## Area definitions


One of the overarching considerations for the surveys was the definition of the geographic areas to be included for each community. Considerable time and effort was spent to define the areas in ways that were meaningful to the local communities and that also followed several clear principles. The principles applied were:

1. To start with a localised 360° region around each site (a default radius of 50km was used, and only adapted where necessary to conform to principles 2 through 4).
2. To include or exclude population centres in the surrounding area in accordance with the views of the immediate communities as provided to the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science in the initial stages of the consultation period.
3. To include the towns or cities which would be primary “service centres” that would support any facility.
4. To include the remaining areas of any local government area which was predominantly in the circular 50km target area.

Final areas were defined using a combination of distance from the site to generate a starting circular region, and then where necessary local government boundaries were used to apply principle 4 and Australian Bureau of Statistics’ Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) boundaries were used were used to apply principle 3.


The areas were then mapped by Geoscience Australia and exported as images (see below) and as .SHP files which were used for the extraction of within-scope sample for the main community survey.






**Hale (NT)**

Expanded the base radius out to the primary service centre (Alice Springs) and then used SA2s to include all of that service centre.




**Cortlinye / Pinkawillinie (SA)**

Used the overlapping 50km radius around the two nearby sites, plus including the small additional section of the primary local government area included inside the main area.



**Oman Oma (Qld)**

Used a simple 50km radius around the site.



## B. General population survey

### Pilot

The general population survey was piloted by telephone on 9 and 10 February 2016 with 152 respondents (approximately 30 per community). A 50%/50% gender quota was set, as well as non-interlocking target of 50% of sample aged 49 years or less. The purpose of the pilot was to test the survey processes and draft questionnaire.

Generally speaking, the questionnaire worked well during the pilot. The length of the questionnaire, however, was found to be too long (22 minutes on average) and the questionnaire was substantially shortened after the pilot to be closer to the scheduled 15 minutes' duration.

At the conclusion of the pilot interviews, respondents were asked (1) how they felt about the survey they had just completed, and (2) did any questions confuse or concern them.

Overall reaction to the survey was generally positive, with 79% making a favourable comment about the survey. Just under one-in-five made a negative comment, primarily that it was too long and repetitive (5%), or that it was complicated and hard to understand (4%). Only a few pilot respondents felt the survey was biased or a waste of time.

Table 33: General population pilot survey overall reaction

	n=	%
<b>Positive commentary</b>		<b>79%</b>
It was good / acceptable (general)	95	63%
Gave me information I didn't know / it was interesting	8	5%
Good to get local opinion	5	3%
An important survey	5	3%
Comprehensive and thorough	7	5%
<b>Negative commentary</b>		<b>18%</b>
Too long / repetitive	7	5%
It was complicated / hard to understand	6	4%
Would have like more opportunity for open commentary / didn't feel I could adequately express my views	4	3%
Biased, leading survey	3	2%
Didn't like introduction	1	1%
Don't like doing surveys (general)	1	1%
Opposed to the site	3	2%
A waste of time since decision has already been made	2	1%
It was not good (general)	1	1%
<b>No comment</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>

When asked if any questions had concerned or confused them, most (78%) said no. Seventeen percent did have concerns; including a belief that it was difficult to answer the questions given their knowledge levels about the issue (5%), a feeling that questions were complicated and/or confusing (3%), and a view that some questions around concerns and benefits were not relevant for their community (3%).

Table 34: General population pilot survey concerns about questions

	n=	%
<b>No, none</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>78%</b>
Yes, but can't recall which ones	4	3%
Need more information before can answer questions	8	5%
Questions were complicated and hard to understand	4	3%
Specific question wasn't relevant to this community (transport, tourism)	5	3%
Questions didn't fully capture my opinion	2	1%
Some questions had too many components	1	1%
Too many questions	1	1%
Sceptical about some of the information provided	1	1%
Other comment	8	5%
	152	

## Main Survey

A total of 2,036 residents of five communities were surveyed for the main survey. Community sample sizes ranged from 146 in Barndioota to 796 in Sallys Flat. These variations in final sample size reflect the different population sizes and available sample frames in each community.

Table 35: General population sample

	n=
<b>Sallys Flat</b>	796
<b>Hale</b>	668
<b>Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie</b>	184
<b>Barndioota</b>	146
<b>Oman Ama</b>	242
<b>Total</b>	2,036



All respondents were aged 18 years or older, but there were no further qualification criteria. Based on feedback from the pilot, to ensure that no potential respondent was prevented from having their opinions heard, the usual method of applying age and gender quotas at the time of interviewing to match population proportions was not applied. Instead, all contacted individuals were interviewed (including multiple adults in each household), and post-weighting was used to match the samples in each community to the correct population proportions.

## ***Sampling method***

### ***Sample frame***

The sample frame of mobile and landline telephone numbers was provided by SamplePages. SamplePages is the largest provider of telephone numbers for Australian market and social research, and its sampling methodology allows for very accurate geographic targeting of phone numbers.

The geo-targeted sample was primarily composed of landline numbers, as there is very limited availability of mobile numbers that can be geo-targeted. Mobile numbers were used where available, and comprised 11% of the total available sample (from 10% - 20% across the five communities).

### ***Sample method***

A two-stage sampling approach was employed.

First, available telephone numbers were randomly sampled (and in all communities except Sallys Flat, exhausted) for each community. A minimum number of callbacks were made to all households, and in smaller communities where sample was limited the number of callbacks was greater.

Second, once a successful contact was made with the household, all willing adult members of each household were invited to participate in the survey.

There was no sample cap placed on the community surveys. The sample was maximized within each community with the only constraints being the available sample and the fieldwork end date.

## ***Interview method***

Interviews were conducted by telephone using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). The average interview length for the main fieldwork was 11.4 minutes – with some individual interviews considerably longer than this, and some somewhat shorter.

No age or gender quotas were applied in the main fieldwork, to ensure that every contacted person was able to participate if they wanted to. Data were subsequently post-weighted to reflect the age and gender profile of the community.

## ***Interview dates***

Telephone interviews were conducted between 27 February and 11 March 2016.

## ***Call outcomes and response rate***

Table 36 (see next page) presents all interview attempts and a household level response rate is calculated.

### ***Glossary of terms***

**Total Population and 18+ Population:** Population counts based on ABS 2011 census data.

**Estimated 18+ population:** 20+ population plus 40% of the 15-19-year-old population.

**Dwellings:** Based on ABS estimates extracted by Geoscience Australia

**Number of available telephone numbers:** SamplePages contacts within defined areas and pinged as live

**Accessible adults:** Estimated 18+ population divided by number of dwellings multiplied by available phone numbers

**Numbers called:** Telephone numbers where at least one contact attempt was made

**Invalid numbers:** Numbers which rang but were classified as “out of scope” for the survey, including disconnected, fax machines, businesses, where language barriers prevent communication or which redirect outside of the target area

**Valid numbers:** Numbers which rang and could not be considered “out of scope” for interviews

**Households interviewed:** Number of households where at least one interview was completed

**Household refusals:** Where contact was made but the receiver declined to participate in the survey (includes immediate hang-ups and considered refusals after the introduction)

**Household response rate:** % of valid numbers where at least one interview was completed. Response rate is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{Total number of households where at least 1 interview was conducted}}{\text{Total households with an available number – Bad numbers (disconnected or not suitable)}}$$

**People interviewed:** Total number of interviews completed (multiple interviews were permitted in household, with each person aged 18+ invited to participate)

**No contact made:** Numbers which rang but where no personal contact was made throughout the interviewing period (called a minimum of three times in areas where the sample was not fully exhausted, up to daily in areas where no further sample was available)

The overall household response rate across all five communities was 27.3%. This ranged from a low of 23.3% in Hale, to a high of 58.7% in Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie.

Table 36: General population call outcomes and response rate

General Population	Sallys Flat	Hale	Cortlinye Pinkawillinie	Barndioota	Oman Ama	TOTAL
<b>Population</b>						
Total population	49,265	27,014	1,407	1,817	3,185	82,688
Estimated 18+ Population	<b>35,714</b>	<b>19,764</b>	<b>883</b>	<b>1,331</b>	<b>2,845</b>	<b>60,537</b>
Total dwellings	19,407	10,179	327	727	1,422	32,062
Estimated # adults per dwelling <i>18+ pop / dwellings</i>	1.8	1.9	2.7	1.8	2.0	1.9
<b>Sample</b>						
Total Numbers Available	<b>11,586</b>	<b>2,794</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>15,319</b>
Estimated # available adults <i>Numbers x adults/dwelling</i>	21,321	5,425	610	487	894	28,924
Total Numbers Not Dialed	8,683	-	-	-	-	8,683
Total Numbers Dialed	2,903	2,794 <i>Exhausted</i>	226 <i>Exhausted</i>	266 <i>Exhausted</i>	447 <i>Exhausted</i>	6,636
Total Calls Made						17,876
<b>Outcomes (household level):</b>						
Total households interviewed	<b>623</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>1,594</b>
Not suitable (fax machine, no English, does not reside or own property in area, business number)	69	145	11	15	17	257
Disconnected number	229	219	19	23	48	538
No contact made (no answer, answering machine, call back)	1,361	996	33	56	68	2,514
Total household refusals	621	869	48	59	136	1,733

General Population	Sallys Flat	Hale	Cortlinye Pinkawillinie	Barndioota	Oman Ama	TOTAL
<b>Outcomes (individual level):</b>						
<b>Total completed interviews</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>2,036</b>
<b>Effective Sample Size* (post-weighting)</b>	461	292	145	96	165	
<b>Margin of error (18+ pop / Effective Sample Size)</b>	+/-5%	+/-6%	+/-7%	+/-10%	+/-7%	
<b>Total individual refusals</b>	628	870	48	62	140	1,748
<b>Response rates</b>						
<b>Household response rate</b> <i>total households interviewed / (total households interviewed + dialled &amp; reusable + total household refusals)</i>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>58.7%</b>	<b>49.6%</b>	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>
<b>Household refusal rate</b> <i>total household refusals / (total households interviewed + dialled &amp; reusable + total household refusals)</i>	23.8%	35.8%	24.5%	25.9%	35.6%	29.7%

\* See later calculations of Effective Sample Size after allowing for weighing

### Reasons for refusals

All 1,748 refusals were coded and analysed. Approximately one-quarter could be described as “hard refusals” (respondent was abusive, rude, hung up, or asked never to be called back – these are standard codes used for any survey). Among respondents who specified a reason for not participating in the survey, the most common were that they were too busy or too old. A small number stated their opposition / support for the site but refused to continue with the survey, and about 3% said they either don’t know enough about the topic to comment, or didn’t care about the topic.

Table 37: General population reasons for refusals

	n=	%
<b>Immediate Hang-up</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>24.9%</b>
<b>“Hard” refusal</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>3.5%</b>
“Soft” refusal (no reason given)	929	53.1%
<b>Other “soft” refusals – reason given</b>		
Too busy	80	4.6%
Too old / trouble hearing / infirm	55	3.1%
Don't do surveys / give information over phone	37	2.1%
Don't know about topic / don't understand it	27	1.5%
Don't care about issue / live too far away	27	1.5%
Already did a survey / signed a petition about this topic	22	1.3%
Not a good time (death, illness, visitors)	18	1.0%
Going away from area / am away from area	13	0.7%
Opposed to site, but doesn't want to do survey	12	0.7%
At work	10	0.6%
My opinion won't matter - Government has already decided	7	0.4%
Non-resident in area	3	0.2%
Supportive of site, but doesn't want to do survey	3	0.2%
Bad line	2	0.1%
My opinion same as other person in household	2	0.1%
Have a conflict of interest	2	0.1%
Driving	2	0.1%
	<b>1748</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Weighting and sampling error

Data were weighted to reflect the age and gender profiles of each community. Within each community, interlocking age/gender cells were assigned a weight as shown in the table below.

Population numbers upon which weights were based were obtained by Geoscience Australia as an extract from the ABS based on the defined survey areas.

Table 38: General population sample weighting

		Population		Disproportionate raw sample		Proportionate sample target	Final weight
		N=	N%	n=	n%	n=	
<b>Sallys Flat</b>							
Males	18-34	5,546	15.53%	34	4.27%	124	<b>3.6354</b>
	35-49	4,573	12.80%	85	10.68%	102	<b>1.1991</b>
	50-64	4,318	12.09%	143	17.96%	96	<b>0.6730</b>
	65+	3,089	8.65%	103	12.94%	69	<b>0.6684</b>
Females	18-34	5,172	14.48%	28	3.52%	115	<b>4.1166</b>
	35-49	4,758	13.32%	111	13.94%	106	<b>0.9554</b>
	50-64	4,298	12.03%	160	20.10%	96	<b>0.5987</b>
	65+	3,961	11.09%	132	16.58%	88	<b>0.6688</b>
<i>Total</i>		<b>35714</b>		<b>796</b>		<b>796</b>	
<b>Hale</b>							
Males	18-34	3,684	18.64%	21	3.14%	125	<b>5.9286</b>
	35-49	3,177	16.07%	69	10.33%	107	<b>1.5562</b>
	50-64	2,462	12.46%	125	18.71%	83	<b>0.6657</b>
	65+	661	3.34%	70	10.48%	22	<b>0.3192</b>
Females	18-34	3,544	17.93%	35	5.24%	120	<b>3.4228</b>
	35-49	3,180	16.09%	116	17.37%	107	<b>0.9266</b>
	50-64	2,300	11.64%	147	22.01%	78	<b>0.5288</b>
	65+	756	3.83%	85	12.72%	26	<b>0.3006</b>
<i>Total</i>		<b>19764</b>		<b>668</b>		<b>668</b>	
<b>Cortlinye/ Pink'w'nie</b>							
Males	18-34	114	<b>12.87%</b>	8	4.35%	24	<b>2.9603</b>
	35-49	96	<b>10.88%</b>	26	14.13%	20	<b>0.7698</b>
	50-64	147	<b>16.66%</b>	29	15.76%	31	<b>1.0568</b>
	65+	94	<b>10.65%</b>	19	10.33%	20	<b>1.0314</b>
Females	18-34	96	<b>10.88%</b>	10	5.43%	20	<b>2.0014</b>
	35-49	102	<b>11.56%</b>	35	19.02%	21	<b>0.6076</b>
	50-64	105	<b>11.90%</b>	29	15.76%	22	<b>0.7548</b>
	65+	129	<b>14.62%</b>	28	15.22%	27	<b>0.9605</b>
<i>Total</i>		<b>883</b>		<b>184</b>		<b>184</b>	

		Population		Disproportionate raw sample		Proportionate sample target	Final weight
		N=	N%	n=	n%	n=	
<b>Barndioota</b>							
Males	18-34	134	10.04%	5	3.42%	15	<b>2.9310</b>
	35-49	154	11.57%	7	4.79%	17	<b>2.4132</b>
	50-64	196	14.73%	22	15.07%	21	<b>0.9773</b>
	65+	183	13.75%	30	20.55%	20	<b>0.6691</b>
Females	18-34	128	9.65%	6	4.11%	14	<b>2.3474</b>
	35-49	172	12.92%	8	5.48%	19	<b>2.3584</b>
	50-64	196	14.73%	27	18.49%	21	<b>0.7963</b>
	65+	168	12.62%	41	28.08%	18	<b>0.4495</b>
<i>Total</i>		<b>1331</b>		<b>146</b>		<b>146</b>	
<b>Oman Ama</b>							
Males	18-34	242	8.51%	6	2.48%	21	<b>3.4341</b>
	35-49	391	13.75%	27	11.16%	33	<b>1.2320</b>
	50-64	501	17.61%	40	16.53%	43	<b>1.0655</b>
	65+	385	13.53%	35	14.46%	33	<b>0.9358</b>
Females	18-34	224	7.89%	4	1.65%	19	<b>4.7726</b>
	35-49	387	13.60%	27	11.16%	33	<b>1.2194</b>
	50-64	409	14.38%	60	24.79%	35	<b>0.5799</b>
	65+	305	10.72%	43	17.77%	26	<b>0.6034</b>
<i>Total</i>		<b>2845</b>		<b>242</b>		<b>242</b>	

General population data are subject to sampling error as shown in the following table. These margin of error calculations take into account both the finite population correction factor (population N) and the increased sample error associated with weighting (effective n).

Table 39: General population margins of sample error

	Raw Sample n=	Effective n=	Population N=	Margin of error at 95% confidence level
<b>Sallys Flat</b>	796	461	35,714	+/- 5%
<b>Hale</b>	668	292	19,764	+/-6%
<b>Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie</b>	184	145	883	+/-8%
<b>Barndioota</b>	146	104	1,331	+/-9%
<b>Oman Ama</b>	242	165	2,845	+/-7%
	<b>2,036</b>			

## C. Neighbour survey

### *Sample type and size*

The neighbour Survey was highly targeted to just those properties which are direct neighbours of the nominated site, or secondary neighbours which includes at least some land within 5km of the nominated site.

The potential respondent population was defined as all people who own, live on, or use any of these identified properties. For each property, there was no limit on the number of interviews that could be conducted; the minimum number of interviews conducted on any one property was one, while the maximum number was 10 (in Pinkawillinie).

### *Sampling method*

#### *Sample frame*

Geoscience Australia provided detailed maps showing all adjoining properties to the nominated site in each community, and title holders for each property were sourced from publicly available records at local title offices.

#### *Method*

Once properties and title holders were identified, they were sent a letter by ORIMA detailing the reason for the research and asking them to contact ORIMA to schedule an in-person or telephone interview (see Appendix E). The letters asked title holders were asked to provide their contact details to ORIMA by a variety of possible methods, as well as the contacts details of any other people occupying the property and who were willing to take part in the survey. Title holders were also asked to pass on a second letter to any other users of the property, such as a farm manager, tenant or lessee.

Each of these letters carried the ID reference number for the property.

People who contacted ORIMA were able to book a telephone interview or a face-to-face interview during a 7-day window where an interviewer was on the ground in each community. Interviewers travelled to each community in order to conduct pre-booked in-person interviews and also to visit each property where no response to the letter was obtained.

Once an initial contact on the property was made, all additional people living on, working at or regularly visiting the property were approached for an interview. Leaflets and letters were left behind where appropriate (see Appendix E).



### ***Interview method and fieldwork procedures***

Neighbour interviews were conducted using a combination of telephone (CATI) and in-person computer-assisted (CAPI) interviews, depending on the respondent's preference and availability. Across all five communities, 51 CATI and 177 CAPI interviews were conducted. CAPI interviews can be further broken down by whether they were a scheduled interview (75%), an opportunistic interview conducted with another property user after a scheduled interview on the property (2%) or the result of a property drop-in, with no scheduled interview (23%).

### ***Interview dates***

Interviews were conducted between 2 and 22 March 2016.

## Interview outcomes and response rate

Because the total population of all users, residents and owners of adjoining properties is unknown, it is not possible to calculate a response rate at the individual level. Property level response rates are shown in the table below and range from 50% in Hale to 94% in Pinkawillinie.

### Glossary of terms

**Total adjoining properties:** All properties identified on Geoscience Australia maps

**Valid adjoining properties:** Excludes Crown, government and district council land

**Properties where no resident or user identified:** No response to ORIMA letter to titleholder, no physical access to property was located or possible, no mailbox was available for leave-behind flyers and no contact number was found. This was typically commercial land, railway land, or Aboriginal land trust land.

**Suitable adjoining properties:** Balance of properties where a user or resident was identified and / or a connected telephone number was acquired

**Property response rate:**

$$\frac{\text{Total number of properties where at least one person interviewed}}{\text{Suitable adjoining properties}}$$

Table 40: Near neighbours outcomes and response rates

	Sallys Flat	Hale	Cortlyne	Pink'w'nie	Barndioota	Oman Ama
Total adjoining properties	48	11	30	19	12	26
<b>Valid adjoining properties</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>26</b>
Properties where no resident or user identified	2	5	2		2	2
Multiple property ownership – owner already interviewed	4			1		
<b>Suitable adjoining properties</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24</b>
<i>Properties responding to ORIMA letter</i>	2	0	9	9	2	4
No response after multiple attempts to contact in person and /or by telephone	10	1			1	5
Refusal on behalf of whole property	2	1			1	1
Death of respondent						1
Unknown outcome	1		3	1		
<b>Properties where at least one interview completed</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>
Completed individual interviews	54	3	83	48	17	25
<b>Property response rate</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>71%</b>

## Weighting and sampling error

The neighbour survey data was not weighted as the population of neighbours – defined as those who own, reside on, work at or regularly visit an adjoining property – is unknown. As a non-probability sample, sampling error is not measurable.

## D. Indigenous survey

### *Sample type and size*

A total of 179 people of Indigenous origin aged 18 years or older were interviewed in the Hale (n=102) and Barndioota (n=77) regions.

In Barndioota, when the interviewing commenced the interviewers were informed that many relevant respondents did not reside (or reside permanently) in the area, but felt they had a significant attachment to the area. It was decided on the basis of this feedback during the fieldwork process that if a respondent had a significant attachment to the area they were eligible for inclusion in the survey, and interviews were conducted both face-to-face and by telephone as possible with identified respondents.

*Table 41: Indigenous sample profile*

	Hale n=	Barndioota n=
Resided within specified area	102	4
Live outside area, but have attachment to land as owner or traditional owner		61
Live outside area, but have an attachment to land as a non-permanent resident		1
Live outside area, but have an attachment to land because live in a nearby community		3
Live outside area, but have another sort of attachment to the land (e.g. through marriage)		3
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>77</b>

### *Sampling method*

#### *Sample frame*

No sample frame was available for Indigenous interviews.

#### *Method*

Respondents were located via a combination of intercepts in central areas, personal contacts and snowballing / networking techniques. As a non-probability sample survey no specific quotas or structure was applied, with the interviewing teams working towards providing as broad as possible a sample of the local population.

### ***Interview method***

The Indigenous surveys were primarily conducted via Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) using trained Indigenous interviewers. In a few rare instances where follow-up was required, the interview was completed by telephone.

A small incentive in the form of a supermarket voucher was given to all respondents.

### ***Interview dates***

Indigenous interviews were conducted between 27 February and 16 March 2016.

### ***Weighting and sampling error***

The Indigenous survey data was not weighted and as a non-probability sample, sampling error is not measurable.

## E. Business survey

### *Sample type and size*

A total of 302 owner/managers of businesses in five communities were surveyed.

Business sample sizes ranged from 28 in Barndioota to a specified cap of 100 in each of Sallys Flat and Alice Springs (Hale). As with the main community survey, the sample size variations reflect the population and available sample of each designated area.

*Table 42: Business sample*

	n=
<b>Sallys Flat</b>	100
<b>Hale</b>	100
<b>Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie</b>	35
<b>Barndioota</b>	28
<b>Oman Ama</b>	39
<i>Total</i>	<i>302</i>

### *Sampling method*

#### *Sample frame*

Telephone numbers for local businesses were sourced from Yellow Pages and True Local searches using the postcodes from each of the nominated sites. The sample frame was based on best available information, but was not designed to be a comprehensive listing of all relevant businesses.

Initial lists were manually culled based on town name to help ensure that only businesses within the relevant geographic region were included.

#### *Sample method*

In Sallys Flat and Hale, telephone numbers were randomly sampled from lists. In Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie, Barndioota and Oman Ama, all available telephone numbers were called.

## Interview method

Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) was used to conduct the business survey. The average business interview length was 10.7 minutes.

## Interview dates

Business interviews were conducted between 2 and 11 March 2016.

## Call outcomes and response rate

Response rate is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{Total number of businesses interviewed}}{\text{Total businesses with an available telephone number} - \text{Bad numbers (disconnected or not suitable)}}$$

Business response rate ranged from 18.6% in Sallys Flat to 63.6% in Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie.

Table 43: Business call outcomes and response rates

Business	Sallys Flat	Hale	Cortlinye Pinkawillinie	Barndioota	Oman Ama	TOTAL
<b>Sample</b>						
Total Numbers Available	2,162	956	92	91	86	3,387
Total Numbers Not Dialed	1,503	476	-	-	-	1,979
Total Numbers Dialed	659	480	92	91	86	1,408
<b>Outcomes (business level):</b>						
<b>Total businesses interviewed</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>302</b>
Not suitable (fax machine, no English, does not reside or own property in area)	24	25	6	9	6	70
Disconnected number	97	68	31	25	14	235
No contact made (no answer, answering machine, call back, engaged)	305	117	11	15	7	455
Total business refusals	133	170	9	14	20	346
<b>Response rates</b>						
<b>Business response rate</b>						
<i>total business interviewed / (total business interviewed + dialled &amp; reusable + total business refusals)</i>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>25.8%</b>	<b>63.6%</b>	<b>49.1%</b>	<b>59.1%</b>	<b>27.4%</b>
<b>Business refusal rate</b>						
<i>total business refusals / (total business interviewed + dialled &amp; reusable + total business refusals)</i>	24.7%	43.9%	16.4%	24.6%	30.3%	31.4%

## Weighting and sampling error

The business survey data was not weighted as business population parameters for the designated geographic areas is unknown. As a non-probability sample, sampling error is not measurable.

## F. Field issues

Substantive issues encountered during fieldwork related mainly to the in-person CAPI surveys – that is, in the Indigenous and near neighbour surveys.

For the Indigenous survey in Barndioota, significant difficulties were encountered in identifying Indigenous people who met our original criteria as residents of the target area. A great deal of networking and flexibility was required to identify eligible respondents. During the course of fieldwork, it was found that there was a larger pool of Indigenous people who had a connection to the Barndioota area but lived in the wider region or only part-time in the area. An adjustment to the recruitment criteria to accommodate this situation was therefore made.

The near neighbours survey had a poor response to the initial letter explaining the purpose of the survey and asking title holders to contact ORIMA. Response was particularly low in Sallys Flat. This meant that interviewers were required to canvass relevant properties in person without a scheduled appointment. The physical distance between properties made this logistically challenging, particularly in Oman Ama and Hale. Sallys Flat was characterised by a large number of holiday and weekend homes with owners living in Sydney or even overseas. Barndioota was characterised by title holders living in town rather than on the property. In Oman Ama, many locked gates precluded interviewers from approaching residents in person. In all locations except Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie, networking in larger towns and follow-up by telephone (where telephone numbers could be sourced) was therefore required. The Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie near neighbour surveys were the most successful. This reflected the demographic characteristics of the area with many farms and large farming families living on site.

In Sallys Flat, the letters sent to potential respondents contained a database error which led to the misidentification of the specific address of the nominated site. This was brought to the attention of the Department by a member of the public. The letters were corrected and resent, and respondents invited to re-do their survey should the corrected information change their opinion in any way. No near neighbours who had already completed an interview chose to redo their survey.

## G. Research limitations

The research methodologies used for these surveys represent an attempt to deliver the most technically-sound surveys possible within the small and tightly defined geographic areas of interest. Where it could be done without unduly affecting the representativeness of the sample and the results, the surveys sought to allow maximum levels of participation from potential respondents.

All surveys have some limitations, usually due to the practical constraints on how the research can be executed. The existence of limitations in themselves do not invalidate the results of research but should be understood when interpreting the results and extrapolating then to the wider populations of interest.

Limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results of the community sentiment surveys include the following.

## ***Sample frame limitations***

The sample frame is the list of potential survey respondents. Ideally a sample frame encompasses the entire population of interest. People can then be randomly or systematically sampled from this list such that a known margin of sample error can be applied to the results.

In most community surveys, however, sample frames are imperfect and do not include each member of the population. For example, for telephone surveys, telephone listings exclude those with silent numbers, who do not have a landline telephone or who do not have a telephone at all. One way to avoid some of these sample frame limitations when conducting general population telephone surveys is to use random digit dialling (RDD). Where the geographic area of interest is limited, however, RDD is impractical. This was the case for the NRWMF general population survey.

For the NRWMF general population survey, sample was obtained from SamplePages. SamplePages provides Australian residential phone number samples sourced from a directory of seven million residential numbers, which is updated monthly. SamplePages is considered to be the most complete, representative and accurate directory of landline telephone numbers available in Australia at this time. There are currently over 6,000,000 unique landline numbers in the SamplePages database. SamplePages lists differ from RDD in that numbers are geo-coded and can be accurately targeted, right down to very fine areas such as postcode, suburb and even Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1). SamplePages also offers mobile numbers which are geo-coded and these were included where possible. Overall 11% of the total available sample was mobile numbers (between 10% and 20% at each site).

Despite the high quality of SamplePages listings, it is evident that they do not include all households in the target area. The way in which included and excluded households are different, if at all, is unknown. This unknown is one form of potential non-sampling error and is non-measurable. However, this is mitigated in part through verification of the sample against ABS census data on key demographic characteristics (gender and age), and then post-weighting.

The business survey used the Yellow Pages and True Local searches based on postcodes within the target area as a sample frame. Although businesses were randomly selected from this frame, we have less certainty about its quality than the SamplePages frame, which is continually updated and verified. Geographically out-of-scope businesses had to be identified manually and this process was subject to error. Moreover, we do not know the size and characteristics of the business population within the targeted areas in the same way as we know those for the general population through ABS census data. There is no equivalent way in which to verify the business sample.

The Indigenous and near neighbor surveys did not have a sample frame at all. We do not know the size and characteristics of the Indigenous and near neighbor (owners, residents and users) populations of the target areas, and without a sample frame, respondents could not be randomly or systematically selected. This means that the Indigenous and near neighbor surveys are non-probability samples, and results based on these types of samples should be considered indicative only.



## **Sampling error**

The confidence interval, expressed as a margin of error, is a statistical measure of the precision of the data. The margin of error is necessary to know how precisely the sample estimates reflect the “true” population parameters.

Where the survey sample was randomly selected from a sample frame, a margin of sampling error can be applied to the results. This is the case for the general population survey and estimated sample error is shown in Table 35.

Sampling error is a function of the sample size. In general, all other things being equal, the larger the sample, the narrower the margin of error. Where data are weighted to bring a sample into line with known population parameters, as in the case of the general population survey, a consequence of this calibration is that the sample error is also increased as the *effective* sample size is reduced. This has been taken into account when calculating the margins of error for the general population survey weighted estimates.

In some communities - namely, Cortlinye/Pinkawillinie and Barndioota - the margin of error around sample estimates is quite large. This margin of error should be considered when interpreting the findings – particularly, levels of support and opposition for the NRWMF in the community.

Estimates from questions asked of sub-samples will be subject to larger margins of error. Cross-tabulation analysis within demographic sub-groups (e.g. km distance from site bands and sub-regions) will also be subject to larger margins of error. In some cases, where sample sizes for subgroups becomes too small, results cannot be reported on as ‘indicative’ or not at all.

## **Non-response bias**

In addition to the sample frame limitations noted above, every survey which is not mandatory will result in refusals to take part in the survey. An important question is: how do those who took part in the survey (and whose views were measured and recorded) differ from those who refused to take part in the survey? If they differ systematically in terms of the key measures of interest (e.g. support for the NRWMF), this can introduce non-response bias into the results. Non-response bias is another form of non-sampling error, and again is it normally non-measurable.

Where there are concerns about non-response bias, response rates can be an important indicator of sample quality. In the case of all the community sentiment surveys, response rates have been significantly higher than industry norms. Moreover, in several of the communities – Cortlinye, Pinkawillinie, Barndioota and Oman Ama – response rates have been exceptionally high across all the surveys.

These unusually high response rates can probably be attributed to the saliency of the issue in these communities. The rates give us greater confidence that non-response bias has been minimised and mitigate concerns about margins of sampling error.

### ***Non-sampling error***

The margin of error is a statistic expressing the amount of random sampling error in a survey's results, which is only one source of potential error. It does not take into account potential *non-sampling* error. Non-sampling error can occur as a result of imperfect sample frames, non-response bias, social desirability bias, poor questionnaire design, respondent fatigue, interview conditions, interviewer error etc.

Field procedures included a number of measures to control non-sampling error stemming from questionnaire interpretation issues and interviewer error, but these types of errors are unknown and non-measurable.

All of these considerations should be taken into account when reporting and interpreting the sample survey estimates.

## Appendix A: General population questionnaire

Good \_\_\_\_\_. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling from ORIMA Research to do a survey commissioned by the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science in Canberra.

The survey is to understand the full range of views of people in your area about the proposed location of Australia's national radioactive waste management facility. This survey and this process has nothing to do with the Royal Commission process into the nuclear fuel cycle in South Australia.

Your number has been randomly selected from a list of phone numbers in the local community. All responses to this survey are strictly anonymous, and this is protected by Australian privacy legislation. Only the overall results of the survey will be available to the public.

For this survey we would like to interview all people in your household aged 18 or over, and the survey takes about 15 minutes on average. Would you like to do the survey now?

IF YES CONTINUE

IF NOT GOOD TIME MAKE CALLBACK APPOINTMENT

IF REFUSE, ASK TO SPEAK TO ANOTHER PERSON IN THE HOUSEHOLD AGED 18+

### D1 RECORD COMMUNITY FROM SAMPLE.

1. Hill End-Sallys Flat
2. Hale (south east of Alice Springs)
3. Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie
4. Barndioota
5. Oman Ama

### D2 RECORD DISTANCE FROM SITE FROM SAMPLE

1. 0-10km
2. 11-20km
3. 21-30km
4. 31-40km
5. 41-50km
6. 51-60km
7. 61-70km
8. 71-80km
9. 81-90km
10. 91-100km
11. 100km+

### D3 INTERVIEW TYPE

1. First respondent in household
2. Second or further respondent in household

IF D3=2, REPEAT SURVEY INTRODUCTION

Firstly, I just need to ask you a few quick questions about yourself

### 1 Are you aged...

1. Under 18 \_\_\_\_\_ *ASK TO SPEAK TO OTHER RESIDENTS OF THE HOUSEHOLD AGED 18+*
2. 18-34
3. 35 or over

4. Refused *ASK TO SPEAK TO OTHER RESIDENTS OF THE HOUSEHOLD AGED 18+*

2 And which of the following age groups do you fit into?

IF Q1 = 2 SHOW CODES 1-4, IF Q1 = 3 SHOW CODES 5-11

1. 18-19
2. 20-24
3. 25-29
4. 30-34
5. 35-39
6. 40-44
7. 45-49
8. 50-54
9. 55-59
10. 60-64
11. 65+
12. Refused

3 RECORD GENDER / CONFIRM IF NECESSARY

1. Male
2. Female
3. Unspecified
4. Refused

IF D3=1 CONTINUE

IF D3=2 GO TO Q9

4 Including yourself, how many people aged over 18 live in your household?

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. 10+
11. Can't say *TREAT AS 1 ADULT HOUSEHOLD*

IF Q4 = 2 THRU 10 → CONTINUE

IF Q4 = 1 OR 11 → GO TO Q7

6 For the purpose of this interview only, for each person in your household who is aged 18 years or over, starting with yourself, could you please tell me their **first name only**:

RECORD NAME (RESPONDENT) \_\_\_\_\_

RECORD NAME (OTHER HOUSEHOLD ADULT 2) \_\_\_\_\_

RECORD NAME (OTHER HOUSEHOLD ADULT 3) \_\_\_\_\_

RECORD NAME (OTHER HOUSEHOLD ADULT 4) \_\_\_\_\_

RECORD NAME (OTHER HOUSEHOLD ADULT 5) \_\_\_\_\_

RECORD NAME (OTHER HOUSEHOLD ADULT 6) \_\_\_\_\_

RECORD NAME (OTHER HOUSEHOLD ADULT 7) \_\_\_\_\_

RECORD NAME (OTHER HOUSEHOLD ADULT 8) \_\_\_\_\_

RECORD NAME (OTHER HOUSEHOLD ADULT 9) \_\_\_\_\_

RECORD NAME (OTHER HOUSEHOLD ADULT 10) \_\_\_\_\_

7 Which of the following best describes where you live?

1. In a town
2. On a property of under 5 acres outside of a town [IF REQUIRED: Approximately 2 hectares or 20,000m<sup>2</sup>]
3. On a larger property
4. Other: *[Please specify]* \_\_\_\_\_

8 What is the name of [IF Q7 = 1 INSERT “the town where you live?”, IF Q7 = 2-3 INSERT “the town or community that you most closely associate with?”]

D1 = 1 - Hill End Sallys Flat NSW		
	Aarons Pass	1
	Avisford	2
	Bathurst	122
	Billywillinga	3
	Boomey	4
	Capertree	5
	Charbon	6
	Clandulla	7
	Crudine	8
	Dark Corner	9
	Dungeree	10
	Euchareena	11
	Glenroi	12
	Gowan	13
	Green Gully	14
	Guyong	15
	Hargraves	16
	Hill End	17
	Huntley	18
	Ilford	19
	Kandos	20
	Kerrs Creek	21
	Killongbutta	22

	Meroo	23
	Millah Murah	24
	Monivae	25
	Mookerawa	26
	Mount Aquila	27
	Mudgee	28
	Mullion Creek	29
	Ophir	30
	Orange	31
	Palmers Oaky	32
	Peel	33
	Pyramul	34
	Round Swamp	35
	Rylstone	36
	Sallys Flat	37
	Sofala	38
	Spring Flat	39
	Stuart Town	40
	Tambaroora	41
	Triamble	42
	Turondale	43
	Ullamalla	44
	Upper Turon	45
	Wattle Flat	46
	Windeyer	47
	World's End	48
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 2 - Hale NT		
	Alice Springs	49
	Amoonguna	50
	Eridunda	51
	Finke	52
	Hugh	53
	Ilparpa	54
	Santa Teresa	55
	Titjikala	56
	Wallace Rockhole	57
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 3 - Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie		
	Barna	58
	Buckleboo	59
	Campoona	60
	Cootra	61
	Darke Peak	62
	Kelly	63
	Kimba	64
	Kyancutta	65
	Mangalo	66
	Pinkawillinie	67

	Pygery	68
	Solomon	69
	Waddikee	70
	Warrambo	71
	Wudinna	72
	Yalanda	73
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 4 - Barndioota		
	Barndioota	74
	Bruce	75
	Carrieton	76
	Cradock	77
	Hammond	78
	Hawker	123
	Mernmerna	79
	Mooakra	80
	Parachilna	81
	Port Augusta	82
	Quorn	83
	Saltia	84
	Stirling North	85
	Willochra	86
	Yarrah	87
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 5 - Oman Ama QLD		
	Allora	88
	Applethorpe	89
	Bringalily	90
	Clifton	91
	Coolmunda	92
	Cottonvale	93
	Dalveen	94
	Ellangowan	95
	Godfields	96
	Gore	97
	Grays Gate	98
	Greenlands	99
	Greymare	100
	Hendon	101
	Inglewood	102
	Karara	103
	Kooroongarra	104
	Lavelle	105
	Leyburn	106
	Millmerran Woods	107
	Morgan Park	108
	Oman Ama	109
	Pikedale	110
	Pratten	111

	Sandy Camp	112
	Stanthorpe	113
	Terrica	114
	Thane	115
	The Glen	116
	Thulimbah	117
	Warroo	118
	Warwick	119
	Other (please specify)	120
	Refused	121

- 9 Thank you. Firstly, did you know that [INSERT COMMUNITY FROM D1] [IF D1 = 1,2,4,5 INSERT “has”; IF D1 = 3 INSERT “have”] been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?
1. Yes – was aware
  2. Partly aware – had heard something but uncertain exactly what it was
  3. No – had no knowledge or awareness before this survey
  4. Refused

IF Q9 = 1 OR 2 → CONTINUE

IF Q9 = 3 OR 4 → GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11

10 And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things...

PROCESS	Aware	Partly aware	Not aware	Not Sure
A. The actual nominated site in your area is [INSERT DESCRIPTION].	1	2	3	4
B. There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites.	1	2	3	4
IF Q10B= 1 OR 2 CONTINUE. IF Q10B=3 OR 4, GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11	1	2	3	4
C. The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.	1	2	3	4

DESCRIPTIONS OF SITES TO BE INSERTED INTO Q10A:

D1 = 1, DESCRIPTION = “41km North of Bathurst in New South Wales”

D1 = 2, DESCRIPTION = “75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory”

D1 = 3, DESCRIPTION = “Two sites between 22km and 29km North West of Kimba in South Australia”

D1 = 4, DESCRIPTION = “30km North West of Hawker in South Australia”

D1 = 5, DESCRIPTION = “29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland”



SAY IF Q9=3 OR 4: *[INSERT SITE DESCRIPTION BELOW]* been nominated as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility. After an assessment of 28 nominated sites across Australia, *[INSERT COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION BELOW]* is being actively considered.

DESCRIPTIONS OF **SITES** TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:

D1 = 1, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Hill End – Sallys Flat, about 40km North of Bathurst in New South Wales has"

D1 = 2, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Hale, 75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory has"

D1 = 3, DESCRIPTION = "two sites at Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie, which are between 22km and 29km North West of Kimba in South Australia have"

D1 = 4, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Barndioota, 30km North West of Hawker in South Australia has"

D1 = 5, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Oman Ama, 29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland has"

DESCRIPTIONS OF **COMMUNITY** TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:

D1 = 1, DESCRIPTION = "Hill End-Sallys Flat"

D1 = 2, DESCRIPTION = "Hale"

D1 = 3, DESCRIPTION = "Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie"

D1 = 4, DESCRIPTION = "Barndioota"

D1 = 5, DESCRIPTION = "Oman Ama"

**SAY TO ALL:**

This stage of consultation is only to determine if a community is willing to stay in the selection process. If willing, more information will be provided through a formal community consultation process. This will include a more detailed site evaluation to confirm its technical suitability, a construction and operational plan, and developing options for how the community **benefits** fund could be used.

The Government wants 2 or 3 communities to go on to the next stage. Only then would you need to decide whether or not you were willing to host the facility.

- 11 [IF Q9=3, INSERT: "I know you have only just become aware of this, but..."] How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

READ OUT 1-3

1. A lot [GO TO Q12](#)
2. A little [GO TO Q12](#)
3. Not at all [GO TO Q13](#)
4. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
5. Don't know / can't say [GO TO Q13](#)

- 12 And do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

1. Strongly support [GO TO Q15](#)
2. Somewhat support [GO TO Q15](#)
3. Somewhat oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
4. Strongly oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
5. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
6. Haven't decided / Can't say / Don't know [CONTINUE](#)

13 Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

RANDOMISE / READ OUT 1-5 then 7 / MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED

1. You do not have enough information about the issue
2. You have not been able to make sense of the information on the issue
3. There are good arguments both ways
4. You are not really interested in the issue
5. The proposed site is too far away to affect you
6. DON'T KNOW / CAN'T SAY
7. Or something else: *[Please specify]* \_\_\_\_\_

14 Would you be willing or not willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

1. Willing
2. Not willing
3. Don't mind / Not bothered one way or the other
4. Refused
5. Unsure / Don't know **PROBE TO SEE IF REALLY CODE 3 BEFORE USING by reading codes 3 and 5**

PROGRAMMING NOTE: ALTERNATE ORDER OF Q15 AND Q16

15 I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or **negative impacts** you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

- a. First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

- b. And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q15C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15A AND Q15B = 2

- c. Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

	15a – for community	15b - personally	15c – biggest personal concern
None (doesn't have any <b>concerns</b> )	1	1	1
Personal <b>concerns</b> / negative impacts same as for community		2	
Negative impact on economy	3	3	3
Negative impact on tourism	4	4	4
Negative impact on property prices	5	5	5
Negative impact on reputation	6	6	6
Negative impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Negative impact on local job opportunities	8	8	8
Health and safety	9	9	9
Impact on local produce - quality / reputation	10	10	10
Impact on local produce – price / value	11	11	11
Traffic	12	12	12
Noise	13	13	13
Air quality - smell / pollution	14	14	14

Water quality – pollution / contamination	15	15	15
Look ugly / visual effect	16	16	16
Impact on land available for farming / agriculture	17	17	17
Inclusion of intermediate level waste / storage	18	18	18
Possibility of high level or other country's waste	19	19	19
Risk associated with road transport	20	20	20
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i> _____			

16 I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

a. First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

b. And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q16C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16A AND Q16B = 2

c. Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

	16a – for community	16b - personally	16c – Biggest personal benefit
None (doesn't see any <b>benefits</b> )	1	1	1
Personal <b>benefits</b> are same as community <b>benefits</b>		2	
Positive impact on local economy	3	3	3
Positive impact on tourism	4	4	4
Positive impact on property prices	5	5	5
Positive impact on reputation	6	6	6
Positive impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Jobs during construction	8	8	8
Jobs (ongoing)	9	9	9
Investment / upgrade to local facilities	10	10	10
Investment / upgrade to local infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc)	11	11	11
Awareness / profile of the area	12	12	12
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i> _____			

17 Thank you, that is the end of the main part of the survey. I just have a few more questions about you to make sure we have a good cross section of your community and to be able to see if there are different opinions amongst different groups of people. Before we do those questions, did you have any other comments you would like to make?

---



---

**FINAL DEMOGRAPHICS SECTION**

18 Which of the following best describes your housing situation?

1. You are an owner occupier
2. You are renting or leasing from a landlord
3. You pay rent or board to other people in your household
4. Something else: *[Please specify]* \_\_\_\_\_

19 How long have you lived in this local area?

1. Less than one year  
RECORD YEARS
98. Can't say / don't know
99. Refused

20 Do you identify as being Aboriginal or a Torres Strait Islander?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't say / don't know
4. Refused

Thank you for completing the survey.

For quality control purposes we may contact you again to ask you a couple of questions, verifying some of the information we have just collected. We will remove your contact details and de-identify your survey responses when all interviewing and validations are completed.

21 Can I just confirm your name and phone number?

- a. Respondent's Name: .....
- b. Respondent's Phone: (.....) .....

We will not disclose any identifiable research information for a purpose other than conducting our research or to overseas recipients unless we have your express prior consent or are required to do so by an Australian law. If you would like details of our privacy policy, I can give you those now.

**READ OUT IF RESPONDENT REQUESTS DETAILS**

Our Privacy Policy is available at [www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com) and contains further details regarding how you can access or correct information we hold about you, how you can make a privacy related complaint and how that complaint will be dealt with. Should you have any questions about our privacy policy or how we will treat your information, you may contact our Privacy Officer, Liesel van Straaten on (03) 9526 9000. Until we de-identify our research records, you have the right to access the information that we hold about you as a result of this interview. You may request at any time to have this information de-identified or destroyed.

**CLOSE:** That's the end of the interview. Thanks so much for your help. Just in case you missed it my name is (...) and this survey was conducted for ORIMA Research and the Australian Department of Industry, Innovation and Science.

**IF NECESSARY:** If you have any queries about this survey, or would like any further information, you can call ORIMA on 1800 654 585.

ASK Q22 IF Q4=2 THRU 10 AND NOT ALL HOUSEHOLD ADULTS INTERVIEWED.

22 I now need to speak with [INSERT NON-INTERVIEWED NAMES FROM Q6]. Are any of these people available to speak now?

IF NECESSARY MAKE CALLBACK

## Appendix B: Neighbour questionnaire

### Neighbour's CATI Questionnaire

Good \_\_\_\_\_. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling from ORIMA Research to do a survey commissioned by the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science in Canberra. Can I please speak to NAME.

#### REINTRODUCE IF NECESSARY

You recently provided your contact details to us in response to a letter mailed to you.

This survey is to understand the range of views of people who are in close proximity to one of the nominated sites of Australia's national radioactive waste management facility. in the area. This survey and this process has nothing to do with the Royal Commission process into the nuclear fuel cycle in South Australia.

All responses to this survey are strictly anonymous, and this is protected by Australian privacy legislation. Only the overall results of the survey will be available to the public.

The survey takes about 15 minutes on average. Would you like to do the survey now?

#### IF YES CONTINUE

#### IF NOT GOOD TIME MAKE CALLBACK APPOINTMENT

D0 RECORD REFERENCE NUMBER FROM SAMPLE

-----

D0a IF NO REFERENCE NUMBER PROVIDED IN SAMPLE: In the letter you received advising you about the survey, in the top right hand corner there should have been a 5 or 6 character reference number – are you able to give me that number?

-----

1. Unable to locate number / don't know
2. Refused

D1 AUTOCALCULATE COMMUNITY FROM REFERENCE **[WILL BE READ OUT IN Q9]**

- |  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. Hill End-Sallys Flat IF REFERENCE = 16000-16999               |                                |
| 2. Hale (south east of Alice Springs) IF REFERENCE = 11000-11999 |                                |
| 3. Cortlinye IF REFERENCE = 13000-13999                          | PRONUNCIATION: Cort-Liney      |
| 4. Barndioota IF REFERENCE = 12000-12999                         | PRONUNCIATION: Barndy-oota     |
| 5. Oman Ama IF REFERENCE = 15000-15999                           | PRONUNCIATION: Omanama         |
| 6. Pinkawillinie IF REFERENCE – 14000-14999                      | PRONUNCIATION: Pinka-willi-nee |

D1a IF NO REFERENCE AVAILABLE (D0a = 8 OR 9) As you aren't able to give me the reference number, can you please tell me which one of the following sites would be near where you live, work, regularly spend time or own property? READ OUT. SINGLE RESPONSE.

- |  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. Hill End-Sallys Flat near Bathurst in NSW                       |                                |
| 2. Hale, which is south east of Alice Springs                      |                                |
| 3. Cortlinye near Kimba in South Australia                         | PRONUNCIATION: Cort-Liney      |
| 4. Barndioota which is north-west of Pt Augusta in South Australia | PRONUNCIATION: Barndy-oota     |
| 5. Oman Ama in the Darling Downs region of Queensland              | PRONUNCIATION: Omanama         |
| 6. Pinkawillinie near Kimba in South Australia                     | PRONUNCIATION: Pinka-willi-nee |

Firstly I just need to ask you a few quick questions about yourself

- 1 Are you aged...
1. Under 18 \_\_\_\_\_ *ASK TO SPEAK TO OTHER RESIDENTS OF THE HOUSEHOLD AGED 18+*
  2. 18-34
  3. 35 or over
  4. Refused *ASK TO SPEAK TO OTHER RESIDENTS OF THE HOUSEHOLD AGED 18+*

2 And which of the following age groups do you fit into?

IF Q1 = 2 SHOW CODES 1-4, IF Q1 = 3 SHOW CODES 5-11

1. 18-19
2. 20-24
3. 25-29
4. 30-34
5. 35-39
6. 40-44
7. 45-49
8. 50-54
9. 55-59
10. 60-64
11. 65+
12. Refused

3 RECORD GENDER / CONFIRM IF NECESSARY

1. Male
2. Female
3. Unspecified
4. Refused

4 What is the name of the town or community that you most closely associate with?"

D1 = 1 - Hill End Sallys Flat NSW		
	Aarons Pass	1
	Avisford	2
	Bathurst	122
	Billywillinga	3
	Boomey	4
	Capertree	5
	Charbon	6
	Clandulla	7
	Crudine	8
	Dark Corner	9
	Dungeree	10
	Euchareena	11
	Glenroi	12
	Gowan	13
	Green Gully	14
	Guyong	15
	Hargraves	16
	Hill End	17

	Huntley	18
	Ilford	19
	Kandos	20
	Kerrs Creek	21
	Killongbutta	22
	Meroo	23
	Millah Murah	24
	Monivae	25
	Mookerawa	26
	Mount Aquila	27
	Mudgee	28
	Mullion Creek	29
	Ophir	30
	Orange	31
	Palmers Oaky	32
	Peel	33
	Pyramul	34
	Round Swamp	35
	Rylstone	36
	Sallys Flat	37
	Sofala	38
	Spring Flat	39
	Stuart Town	40
	Tambaroora	41
	Triamble	42
	Turondale	43
	Ullamalla	44
	Upper Turon	45
	Wattle Flat	46
	Windeyer	47
	World's End	48
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 2 - Hale NT		
	Alice Springs	49
	Amoonguna	50
	Eridunda	51
	Finke	52
	Hugh	53
	Ilparpa	54
	Santa Teresa	55
	Titjikala	56
	Wallace Rockhole	57
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 3 OR 6 - Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie		6
	Barna	58
	Buckleboo	59
	Campoona	60
	Cootra	61
	Darke Peak	62

	Kelly	63
	Kimba	64
	Kyancutta	65
	Mangalo	66
	Pinkawillinie	67
	Pygery	68
	Solomon	69
	Waddikee	70
	Warramboo	71
	Wudinna	72
	Yalanda	73
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 4 - Barndioota		
	Barndioota	74
	Bruce	75
	Carrieton	76
	Cradock	77
	Hammond	78
	Hawker	123
	Mernmerna	79
	Mooakra	80
	Parachilna	81
	Port Augusta	82
	Quorn	83
	Saltia	84
	Stirling North	85
	Willochra	86
	Yarrah	87
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 5 - Oman Ama QLD		
	Allora	88
	Applethorpe	89
	Bringalily	90
	Clifton	91
	Coolmunda	92
	Cottonvale	93
	Dalveen	94
	Ellangowan	95
	Godfields	96
	Gore	97
	Grays Gate	98
	Greenlands	99
	Greymare	100
	Hendon	101
	Inglewood	102
	Karara	103
	Kooroongarra	104
	Lavelle	105
	Leyburn	106



	Millmerran Woods	107
	Morgan Park	108
	Oman Ama	109
	Pikedale	110
	Pratten	111
	Sandy Camp	112
	Stanthorpe	113
	Terrica	114
	Thane	115
	The Glen	116
	Thulimbah	117
	Warroo	118
	Warwick	119
	Other (please specify)	120
	Refused	121

5 Thank you. Firstly, did you know that [INSERT COMMUNITY FROM D1/D1a] has been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?

DO NOT READ OUT / PROBE TO CLARIFY CODE 1 AND 2 IF NECESSARY

1. Yes – was aware
2. Partly aware – had heard something but uncertain exactly what it was
3. No – had no knowledge or awareness before this survey
4. Refused

IF Q9 = 1 OR 2 → CONTINUE

IF Q9 = 3 OR 4 → GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11a

6 And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things...

PROCESS	Aware	Partly aware	Not aware	Not Sure
a. The actual nominated site in your area is [INSERT DESCRIPTION].	1	2	3	4
b. There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites.	1	2	3	4
IF Q10B= 1 OR 2 CONTINUE. IF Q10B=3 OR 4, GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11	1	2	3	4
c. The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.				

DESCRIPTIONS OF SITES TO BE INSERTED INTO Q10A:

D1/D1a = 1, DESCRIPTION = "41km North of Bathurst in New South Wales"

D1/D1a = 2, DESCRIPTION = "75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory"

D1/D1a = 3, DESCRIPTION = "22km North West of Kimba in South Australia"

D1/D1a = 4, DESCRIPTION = "30km North West of Hawker in South Australia"

D1/D1a = 5, DESCRIPTION = "29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland"

D1/D1a = 6, DESCRIPTION = "29km North West of Kimba in South Australia"

**PREAMBLE TO Q11A**

SAY IF Q9=3 OR 4: [INSERT **SITE DESCRIPTION** BELOW] been nominated as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility. After an assessment of 28 nominated sites across Australia, [INSERT **COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION** BELOW] is being actively considered.

**DESCRIPTIONS OF SITES TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:**

D1/D1a = 1, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Hill End – Sallys Flat, about 40km North of Bathurst in New South Wales has"

D1/D1a = 2, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Hale, 75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory has"

D1/D1a = 3, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Cortlinye, which is 22km North West of Kimba in South Australia has"

D1/D1a = 4, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Barndioota, 30km North West of Hawker in South Australia has"

D1/D1a = 5, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Oman Ama, 29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland has"

D1/D1a = 6, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Pinkawillinie, which is 29km North West of Kimba in South Australia has"

**DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:**

D1/D1a = 1, DESCRIPTION = "Hill End-Sallys Flat"

D1/D1a = 2, DESCRIPTION = "Hale"

D1/D1a = 3, DESCRIPTION = "Cortlinye"

D1 /D1a = 4, DESCRIPTION = "Barndioota"

D1/D1a = 5, DESCRIPTION = "Oman Ama"

D1/D1a = 6, DESCRIPTION = "Pinkawillinie"

**ASK ALL**

11a. This is a survey of people who live, work, regularly spend time or own property very near to the location being considered. Do you...?

READ OUT 1-3 / ONLY READ OUT CODES 4 THRU 6 IF NO TO ALL OF CODES 1-3 / MULTIPLE RESPONSE

1. Own property near the location being considered
2. Live on a property near the location being considered
3. Work on a property near the location being considered
4. Regularly visit a property near the location being considered
5. Lease a property near the location being considered?
6. Classify as a renter on a property near the location being considered?
7. None of these

SAY TO ALL:

This stage of consultation is only to determine if a community is willing to stay in the selection process. If willing, more information will be provided through a formal community consultation process. This will include a more detailed site evaluation to confirm its technical suitability, a construction and operational plan, and developing options for how the community **benefits** fund could be used.

The Government wants 2 or 3 communities to go on to the next stage. Only then would you need to decide whether or not you were willing to host the facility.

- 7 [IF Q9=3, INSERT: "I know you have only just become aware of this, but..."] How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

READ OUT 1-3

1. A lot [GO TO Q12](#)
2. A little [GO TO Q12](#)
3. Not at all [GO TO Q13](#)
4. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
5. Don't know / can't say [GO TO Q13](#)

- 8 And do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

READ OUT 1-4 ONLY IF REQUIRED / SINGLE RESPONSE

1. Strongly support [GO TO Q15](#)
2. Somewhat support [GO TO Q15](#)
3. Somewhat oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
4. Strongly oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
5. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
6. Haven't decided / Can't say / Don't know [CONTINUE](#)

- 9 Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

RANDOMISE / READ OUT 1-5 then 7 / MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED

1. You do not have enough information about the issue
2. You have not been able to make sense of the information on the issue
3. There are good arguments both ways
4. You are not really interested in the issue
5. The proposed site is too far away to affect you
6. DON'T KNOW / CAN'T SAY
7. Or something else: [\[Please specify\]](#) \_\_\_\_\_

- 10 Would you be willing or not willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

READ OUT CODES 1-3 ONLY IF REQUIRED

1. Willing
2. Not willing
3. Don't mind / Not bothered one way or the other
4. Refused
5. Unsure / Don't know **PROBE TO SEE IF REALLY CODE 3 BEFORE USING by reading codes 3 and 5**

PROGRAMMING NOTE: ALTERNATE ORDER OF Q15 AND Q16

11 I would like to now ask you about any, **concerns** or **negative impacts** you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

a First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

b And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q15C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15A AND Q15B = 2

c Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

	15a – for community	15b - personally	15c – biggest personal concern
None (doesn't have any <b>concerns</b> )	1	1	1
Personal <b>concerns</b> / negative impacts same as for community		2	
Negative impact on economy	3	3	3
Negative impact on tourism	4	4	4
Negative impact on property prices	5	5	5
Negative impact on reputation	6	6	6
Negative impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Negative impact on local job opportunities	8	8	8
Health and safety	9	9	9
Impact on local produce - quality / reputation	10	10	10
Impact on local produce – price / value	11	11	11
Traffic	12	12	12
Noise	13	13	13
Air quality - smell / pollution	14	14	14
Water quality – pollution / contamination	15	15	15
Look ugly / visual effect	16	16	16
Impact on land available for farming / agriculture	17	17	17
Inclusion of intermediate level waste / storage	18	18	18
Possibility of high level or other country's waste	19	19	19
Risk associated with road transport	20	20	20
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i>			

12 I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

a First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

b And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q16C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16A AND Q16B = 2

c Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

	16a – for community	16b - personally	16c – Biggest personal benefit
None (doesn't see any <b>benefits</b> )	1	1	1
Personal <b>benefits</b> are same as community <b>benefits</b>		2	
Positive impact on local economy	3	3	3
Positive impact on tourism	4	4	4
Positive impact on property prices	5	5	5
Positive impact on reputation	6	6	6
Positive impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Jobs during construction	8	8	8
Jobs (ongoing)	9	9	9
Investment / upgrade to local facilities	10	10	10
Investment / upgrade to local infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc)	11	11	11
Awareness / profile of the area	12	12	12
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i> _____			

13 Thank you, that is the end of the main part of the survey. I just have a few more questions about you to make sure we have a good cross section of your community and to be able to see if there are different opinions amongst different groups of people. Before we do those questions, did you have any other comments you would like to make?

---



---

**FINAL DEMOGRAPHICS SECTION**

18a. ASK IF DO NOT LIVE ON REFERENCE PROPERTY [NOT CODE 2 AT Q11a] Do you live in the local area – say within 40-50km of the site being considered for the facility?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't say / don't know
4. Refused

ASK Q19 IF Q11a = 2 OR Q18a = 1

14 How long have you lived in this local area?

0. Less than one year  
RECORD YEARS
98. Can't say / don't know
99. Refused

ASK Q19a IF Q11a = 1

19a. How long have you owned the property that is near the site being considered for the facility?

0. Less than one year  
RECORD YEARS
98. Can't say / don't know
99. Refused

15 Do you identify as being Aboriginal or a Torres Strait Islander?

2. Yes
5. No
6. Can't say / don't know
7. Refused

Thank you for completing the survey.

P1 This is a targeted survey of neighbours of the sites being considered. The Department of Industry, Innovation and Science and the Minister considering the locations would like to be able to associate your views with the specific property your reference number identifies. Under Australian Privacy Legislation this can only be done if you specifically give permission. If you do so, only the Department, the Minister and their representatives will ever have access to this information.

Do you give permission to ORIMA to link your answers to your reference number and that specific property in the results we provide to the Department and the Minister?

3. Yes
8. No

For quality control purposes we may contact you again to ask you a couple of questions, verifying some of the information we have just collected. We will remove your contact details and de-identify your survey responses when all interviewing and validations are completed.

16 Can I just confirm your name and phone number?

a Respondent's Name: .....

b Respondent's Phone: (.....) .....

We will not disclose any identifiable research information for a purpose other than conducting our research or to overseas recipients unless we have your express prior consent or are required to do so by an Australian law. If you would like details of our privacy policy, I can give you those now.

**READ OUT IF RESPONDENT REQUESTS DETAILS**

Our Privacy Policy is available at [www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com) and contains further details regarding how you can access or correct information we hold about you, how you can make a privacy related complaint and how that complaint will be dealt with. Should you have any questions about our privacy policy or how we will treat your information, you may contact our Privacy Officer, Liesel van Straaten on (03) 9526 9000. Until we de-identify our research records, you have the right to access the information that we hold about you as a result of this interview. You may request at any time to have this information de-identified or destroyed.

**CLOSE:** That's the end of the interview. Thanks so much for your help. Just in case you missed it my name is (...) and this survey was conducted for ORIMA Research and the Australian Department of Industry, Innovation and Science.

**IF NECESSARY:** If you have any queries about this survey, or would like any further information, you can call ORIMA on 1800 654 585.

## Neighbour's CAPI Questionnaire

### D00: INTERVIEWER TO RECORD INTERVIEW TYPE:

1. Scheduled interview
2. Opportunistic interview conducted with another property user after scheduled interview on property
3. Property drop-in (no scheduled interview for property)

### INTRODUCTION IF D00=1

Good \_\_\_\_\_. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm from ORIMA Research. NAME arranged for us to come at this time to do a survey commissioned by the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science in Canberra.

### REINTRODUCE IF NECESSARY

You recently provided your contact details to us in response to a letter mailed to you, and you arranged for an interview to take place at this time.

### INTRODUCTION IF D00=2 or 3

Good \_\_\_\_\_. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm from ORIMA Research. We are doing a survey commissioned by the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science in Canberra. We recently sent a letter to this property saying we need to speak to all owners, lessees and users of this property.

### INTRODUCTION FOR ALL

This survey is to understand the range of views of people who are in close proximity to one of the nominated sites of Australia's national radioactive waste management facility. in the area. This survey and this process has nothing to do with the Royal Commission process into the nuclear fuel cycle in South Australia.

All responses to this survey are strictly anonymous, and this is protected by Australian privacy legislation. Only the overall results of the survey will be available to the public.

The survey takes about 15 minutes on average.

### D0 RECORD REFERENCE NUMBER FOR PROPERTY FROM SAMPLE

-----

### D1 AUTOCALCULATE COMMUNITY FROM REFERENCE [WILL BE READ OUT IN Q9]

- |  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. Hill End-Sallys Flat IF REFERENCE = 16000-16999               |                                |
| 2. Hale (south east of Alice Springs) IF REFERENCE = 11000-11999 |                                |
| 3. Cortlinye IF REFERENCE = 13000-13999                          | PRONUNCIATION: Cort-Liney      |
| 4. Barndioota IF REFERENCE = 12000-12999                         | PRONUNCIATION: Barndy-oota     |
| 5. Oman Ama IF REFERENCE = 15000-15999                           | PRONUNCIATION: Omanama         |
| 6. Pinkawillinie IF REFERENCE – 14000-14999                      | PRONUNCIATION: Pinka-willi-nee |

Firstly I just need to ask you a few quick questions about yourself

1. Are you aged...
  1. Under 18 \_\_\_\_\_ *TERMINATE INTERVIEW AND CONDUCT INTERVIEWS WITH OTHER PROPERTY OWNERS OR USERS AS AVAILABLE*
  2. 18-34
  3. 35 or over
  4. Refused *TERMINATE INTERVIEW AND CONDUCT INTERVIEWS WITH OTHER PROPERTY OWNERS OR USERS AS AVAILABLE*



2 And which of the following age groups do you fit into?

IF Q1 = 2 SHOW CODES 1-4, IF Q1 = 3 SHOW CODES 5-11

1. 18-19
2. 20-24
3. 25-29
4. 30-34
5. 35-39
6. 40-44
7. 45-49
8. 50-54
9. 55-59
10. 60-64
11. 65+
12. Refused

3 RECORD GENDER / CONFIRM IF NECESSARY

1. Male
2. Female
3. Unspecified
4. Refused

8 What is the name of the town or community that you most closely associate with?"

D1 = 1 - Hill End Sallys Flat NSW		
	Aarons Pass	1
	Avisford	2
	Bathurst	118
	Billywillinga	3
	Boomey	4
	Capertree	5
	Charbon	6
	Clandulla	7
	Crudine	8
	Dark Corner	9
	Dungereee	10
	Euchareena	11
	Glenroi	12
	Gowan	13
	Green Gully	14
	Guyong	15
	Hargraves	16
	Hill End	17
	Huntley	18
	Ilford	19
	Kandos	20
	Kerrs Creek	21
	Killongbutta	22
	Meroo	23

	Millah Murah	24
	Monivae	25
	Mookerawa	26
	Mount Aquila	27
	Mudgee	28
	Mullion Creek	29
	Ophir	30
	Orange	31
	Palmers Oaky	32
	Peel	33
	Pyramul	34
	Round Swamp	35
	Rylstone	36
	Sallys Flat	37
	Sofala	38
	Spring Flat	39
	Stuart Town	40
	Tambaroora	41
	Triamble	42
	Turondale	43
	Ullamalla	44
	Upper Turon	45
	Wattle Flat	46
	Windeyer	47
	World's End	48
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 2 - Hale NT		
	Alice Springs	49
	Amoonguna	50
	Eridunda	56
	Finke	57
	Hugh	54
	Ilparpa	51
	Santa Teresa	52
	Titjikala	53
	Wallace Rockhole	55
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 3 or D1=6- Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie		
	Barna	56
	Buckleboo	57
	Campoona	58
	Cootra	59
	Darke Peak	60
	Kelly	61
	Kimba	62
	Kyancutta	63
	Mangalo	64
	Pinkawillinie	65
	Pygery	66

	Solomon	67
	Waddikee	68
	Warrambo	69
	Wudinna	70
	Yalanda	71
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 4 - Barndioota		
	Barndioota	72
	Bruce	73
	Carrieton	74
	Cradock	75
	Hammond	76
	Hawker	119
	Mernmerna	77
	Moockra	78
	Parachilna	79
	Port Augusta	80
	Quorn	81
	Saltia	82
	Stirling North	83
	Willochra	84
	Yarrah	85
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 5 - Oman Ama QLD		
	Allora	86
	Applethorpe	87
	Bringalily	88
	Clifton	89
	Coolmunda	90
	Cottonvale	91
	Dalveen	92
	Ellangowan	93
	Godfields	94
	Gore	95
	Grays Gate	96
	Greenlands	97
	Greymare	98
	Hendon	99
	Inglewood	100
	Karara	101
	Kooroongarra	102
	Lavelle	103
	Leyburn	104
	Millmerran Woods	105
	Morgan Park	106
	Oman Ama	107
	Pikedale	108
	Pratten	109
	Sandy Camp	110

	Stanthorpe	111
	Terrica	112
	Thane	113
	The Glen	114
	Thulimbah	115
	Warroo	116
	Warwick	117
	Other (please specify)	_____
	Refused	999

9 Thank you. Firstly, did you know that [INSERT COMMUNITY FROM D1] has been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?

DO NOT READ OUT / PROBE TO CLARIFY CODE 1 AND 2 IF NECESSARY

1. Yes – was aware
2. Partly aware – had heard something but uncertain exactly what it was
3. No – had no knowledge or awareness before this survey
4. Refused

IF Q9 = 1 OR 2 → CONTINUE

IF Q9 = 3 OR 4 → GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11a

10 And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things...

PROCESS	Aware	Partly aware	Not aware	Not Sure
d. The actual nominated site in your area is [INSERT DESCRIPTION].	1	2	3	4
e. There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites.	1	2	3	4
IF Q10B= 1 OR 2 CONTINUE. IF Q10B=3 OR 4, GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11	1	2	3	4
f. The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.	1	2	3	4

DESCRIPTIONS OF SITES TO BE INSERTED INTO Q10A:

D1/ = 1, DESCRIPTION = "41km North of Bathurst in New South Wales"

D1/ = 2, DESCRIPTION = "75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory"

D1/ = 3, DESCRIPTION = "22km North West of Kimba in South Australia"

D1/ = 4, DESCRIPTION = "30km North West of Hawker in South Australia"

D1/ = 5, DESCRIPTION = "29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland"

D1/ = 6, DESCRIPTION = "29km North West of Kimba in South Australia"

**PREAMBLE TO Q11A**

SAY IF Q9=3 OR 4: [INSERT SITE DESCRIPTION BELOW] been nominated as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility. After an assessment of 28 nominated sites across Australia, [INSERT COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION BELOW] is being actively considered.

DESCRIPTIONS OF SITES TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:

D1/ = 1, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Hill End – Sallys Flat, about 40km North of Bathurst in New South Wales has"

D1/ = 2, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Hale, 75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory has"

D1/ = 3, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Cortlinye, which is 22km North West of Kimba in South Australia has"

D1/ = 4, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Barndioota, 30km North West of Hawker in South Australia has"

D1/ = 5, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Oman Ama, 29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland has"

D1/ = 6, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Pinkawillinie, which is 29km North West of Kimba in South Australia has"

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:

D1/ = 1, DESCRIPTION = "Hill End-Sallys Flat"

D1/ = 2, DESCRIPTION = "Hale"

D1/ = 3, DESCRIPTION = "Cortlinye"

D1 / = 4, DESCRIPTION = "Barndioota"

D1/ = 5, DESCRIPTION = "Oman Ama"

D1/ = 6, DESCRIPTION = "Pinkawillinie"

**ASK ALL**

11a. This is a survey of people who live, work, regularly spend time or own property very near to the location being considered. Do you...?

READ OUT 1-3 / ONLY READ OUT CODES 4 THRU 6 IF NO TO ALL OF CODES 1-3 / MULTIPLE RESPONSE

1. Own property near the location being considered
2. Live on a property near the location being considered
3. Work on a property near the location being considered
4. Regularly visit a property near the location being considered
5. Lease a property near the location being considered?
6. Classify as a renter on a property near the location being considered?
7. None of these

SAY TO ALL:

This stage of consultation is only to determine if a community is willing to stay in the selection process. If willing, more information will be provided through a formal community consultation process. This will include a more detailed site evaluation to confirm its technical suitability, a construction and operational plan, and developing options for how the community **benefits** fund could be used.

The Government wants 2 or 3 communities to go on to the next stage. Only then would you need to decide whether or not you were willing to host the facility.

- 11 [IF Q9=3, INSERT: "I know you have only just become aware of this, but..."] How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

READ OUT 1-3

1. A lot [GO TO Q12](#)
2. A little [GO TO Q12](#)
3. Not at all [GO TO Q13](#)
4. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
5. Don't know / can't say [GO TO Q13](#)

- 12 And do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

READ OUT 1-4 ONLY IF REQUIRED / SINGLE RESPONSE

1. Strongly support [GO TO Q15](#)
2. Somewhat support [GO TO Q15](#)
3. Somewhat oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
4. Strongly oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
5. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
6. Haven't decided / Can't say / Don't know [CONTINUE](#)

- 13 Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

RANDOMISE / READ OUT 1-5 then 7 / MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED

1. You do not have enough information about the issue
2. You have not been able to make sense of the information on the issue
3. There are good arguments both ways
4. You are not really interested in the issue
5. The proposed site is too far away to affect you
6. DON'T KNOW / CAN'T SAY
7. Or something else: [\[Please specify\]](#) \_\_\_\_\_

- 14 Would you be willing or not willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

READ OUT CODES 1-3 ONLY IF REQUIRED

1. Willing
2. Not willing
3. Don't mind / Not bothered one way or the other
4. Refused
5. Unsure / Don't know **PROBE TO SEE IF REALLY CODE 3 BEFORE USING by reading codes 3 and 5**

PROGRAMMING NOTE: ALTERNATE ORDER OF Q15 AND Q16

15 I would like to now ask you about any, **concerns** or **negative impacts** you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

a First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

b And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q15C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15A AND Q15B = 2

c Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

	15a – for community	15b - personally	15c – biggest personal concern
None (doesn't have any <b>concerns</b> )	1	1	1
Personal <b>concerns</b> / negative impacts same as for community		2	
Negative impact on economy	3	3	3
Negative impact on tourism	4	4	4
Negative impact on property prices	5	5	5
Negative impact on reputation	6	6	6
Negative impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Negative impact on local job opportunities	8	8	8
Health and safety	9	9	9
Impact on local produce - quality / reputation	10	10	10
Impact on local produce – price / value	11	11	11
Traffic	12	12	12
Noise	13	13	13
Air quality - smell / pollution	14	14	14
Water quality – pollution / contamination	15	15	15
Look ugly / visual effect	16	16	16
Impact on land available for farming / agriculture	17	17	17
Inclusion of intermediate level waste / storage	18	18	18
Possibility of high level or other country's waste	19	19	19
Risk associated with road transport	20	20	20
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i>			

16 I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

a First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

b And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q16C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16A AND Q16B = 2

c Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

	16a – for community	16b - personally	16c – Biggest personal benefit
None (doesn't see any <b>benefits</b> )	1	1	1
Personal <b>benefits</b> are same as community <b>benefits</b>		2	
Positive impact on local economy	3	3	3
Positive impact on tourism	4	4	4
Positive impact on property prices	5	5	5
Positive impact on reputation	6	6	6
Positive impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Jobs during construction	8	8	8
Jobs (ongoing)	9	9	9
Investment / upgrade to local facilities	10	10	10
Investment / upgrade to local infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc)	11	11	11
Awareness / profile of the area	12	12	12
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i> _____			

17 Thank you, that is the end of the main part of the survey. I just have a few more questions about you to make sure we have a good cross section of your community and to be able to see if there are different opinions amongst different groups of people. Before we do those questions, did you have any other comments you would like to make?

---



---



**FINAL DEMOGRAPHICS SECTION**

18a. ASK IF DO NOT LIVE ON REFERENCE PROPERTY [NOT CODE 2 AT Q11a] Do you live in the local area – say within 40-50km of the site being considered for the facility?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't say / don't know
4. Refused

ASK Q19 IF Q11a = 2 OR Q18a = 1

19 How long have you lived in this local area?

0. Less than one year  
RECORD YEARS
98. Can't say / don't know
99. Refused

ASK Q19a IF Q11a = 1

19a. How long have you owned the property that is near the site being considered for the facility?

0. Less than one year  
RECORD YEARS
98. Can't say / don't know
99. Refused

20 Do you identify as being Aboriginal or a Torres Strait Islander?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't say / don't know
4. Refused

Thank you for completing the survey.

P1 This is a targeted survey of neighbours of the sites being considered. The Department of Industry, Innovation and Science and the Minister considering the locations would like to be able to associate your views with the specific property your reference number identifies. Under Australian Privacy Legislation this can only be done if you specifically give permission. If you do so, only the Department, the Minister and their representatives will ever have access to this information.

Do you give permission to ORIMA to link your answers to your reference number and that specific property in the results we provide to the Department and the Minister?

- 5. Yes
- 6. No

For quality control purposes we may contact you again to ask you a couple of questions, verifying some of the information we have just collected. IF CODE 2 "NO" TO P1 ONLY: We will remove your contact details and de-identify your survey responses when all interviewing and validations are completed.

21 Can I just confirm your name and phone number?

a Respondent's Name: .....

Respondent's Phone: (.....) .....

We will not disclose any identifiable research information for a purpose other than conducting our research or to overseas recipients unless we have your express prior consent or are required to do so by an Australian law. If you would like details of our privacy policy, I can give you those now.

**READ OUT IF RESPONDENT REQUESTS DETAILS**

Our Privacy Policy is available at [www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com) and contains further details regarding how you can access or correct information we hold about you, how you can make a privacy related complaint and how that complaint will be dealt with. Should you have any questions about our privacy policy or how we will treat your information, you may contact our Privacy Officer, Liesel van Straaten on (03) 9526 9000. Until we de-identify our research records, you have the right to access the information that we hold about you as a result of this interview. You may request at any time to have this information de-identified or destroyed.

**CLOSE:** That's the end of the interview. Thanks so much for your help. Just in case you missed it my name is (...) and this survey was conducted for ORIMA Research and the Australian Department of Industry, Innovation and Science.

**IF NECESSARY:** If you have any queries about this survey, or would like any further information, you can call ORIMA on 1800 654 585.

**CLOSING**

***I need to speak with all adult users of this property, including owners, residents, and lessees. Who should I speak with next?***



## Appendix C: Indigenous questionnaire

Good \_\_\_\_\_. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm from ORIMA Research. We are conducting a survey commissioned by the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science in Canberra.

The survey is to understand the full range of views of people in your area about the proposed location of Australia's national radioactive waste management facility. This survey and this process has nothing to do with the Royal Commission process into the nuclear fuel cycle in South Australia.

We are talking to as many people as possible in the local community. All responses to this survey are strictly anonymous, and this is protected by Australian privacy legislation. Only the overall results of the survey will be available to the public.

The survey takes about 15 minutes on average. Would you like to do the survey now?

IF YES CONTINUE

IF NOT GOOD TIME MAKE CALLBACK APPOINTMENT

IF REFUSE, ASK TO SPEAK TO ANOTHER PERSON IN THE HOUSEHOLD AGED 18+

D1 RECORD COMMUNITY FROM SAMPLE [WILL BE READ OUT IN Q10]

1. Hill End-Sallys Flat
2. Hale (south east of Alice Springs)
3. Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie PRONUNCIATION: Cort-Liney / Pinka-willi-nee
4. Barndioota PRONUNCIATION: Barndy-oota
5. Oman Ama PRONUNCIATION: Omanama

SHOW D4 IF D1=4

D4 RECORD TYPE OF RESPONDENT FROM PRE-INTERVIEW INFORMATION

MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED FOR CODES 2-5

1. Interviewed within specified area
2. Outside area, but has attachment to land in the area – as OWNER or TRADITIONAL OWNER
3. Outside area, but has attachment to land in the area – as NON-PERMANENT RESIDENT
4. Outside area, but has attachment to land in the area – as NEARBY COMMUNITY
5. Outside area, but has attachment to land in the area – OTHER, Specify:
6. Outside area, and do not have any definite attachment to the land in the area **DO NOT CONTINUE**

ASK D5 IF D4 = 2 - 5

D5 Can you please describe for me your attachment to the land this survey is about?

RECORD VERBATIM / PROBE FOR DETAIL

IF NO ATTACHMENT - **DO NOT CONTINUE INTERVIEW**

Firstly I just need to ask you a few quick questions about yourself

- 1 Are you aged...
1. Under 18 \_\_\_\_\_ *ASK TO SPEAK TO OTHER RESIDENTS OF THE HOUSEHOLD AGED 18+*
  2. 18-34
  3. 35 or over
  4. Refused *ASK TO SPEAK TO OTHER RESIDENTS OF THE HOUSEHOLD AGED 18+*

- 2 And which of the following age groups do you fit into?

IF Q1 = 2 SHOW CODES 1-4, IF Q1 = 3 SHOW CODES 5-11 (INTERVIEWER READ OUT)

1. 18-19
2. 20-24
3. 25-29
4. 30-34
5. 35-39
6. 40-44
7. 45-49
8. 50-54
9. 55-59
10. 60-64
11. 65+
12. Refused (DO NOT READ OUT)

- 3 RECORD GENDER / INTERVIEWER TO CODE / CONFIRM IF NECESSARY

1. Male
2. Female
3. Unspecified
4. Refused

- 4 Including yourself, how many people aged over 18 live in your household?

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. 10+
11. Can't say *TREAT AS 1 ADULT HOUSEHOLD*

7 Which of the following best describes where you live?

READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE

1. In a town
2. On a property of under 5 acres outside of a town [IF REQUIRED: Approximately 2 hectares or 20,000m<sup>2</sup>]
3. On a larger property
4. Other: *[Please specify]* \_\_\_\_\_

8 What is the name of [IF Q7 = 1 INSERT “the town where you live?”, IF Q7 = 2-3 INSERT “the town or community that you most closely associate with?”]

D1 = 1 - Hill End Sallys Flat NSW		
	Aarons Pass	1
	Avisford	2
	Bathurst	118
	Billywillinga	3
	Boomey	4
	Capertree	5
	Charbon	6
	Clandulla	7
	Crudine	8
	Dark Corner	9
	Dungeree	10
	Euchareena	11
	Glenroi	12
	Gowan	13
	Green Gully	14
	Guyong	15
	Hargraves	16
	Hill End	17
	Huntley	18
	Ilford	19
	Kandos	20
	Kerrs Creek	21
	Killongbutta	22
	Meroo	23
	Millah Murah	24
	Monivae	25
	Mookerawa	26
	Mount Aquila	27
	Mudgee	28
	Mullion Creek	29
	Ophir	30
	Orange	31
	Palmers Oaky	32
	Peel	33
	Pyramul	34
	Round Swamp	35
	Rylstone	36
	Sallys Flat	37

	Sofala	38
	Spring Flat	39
	Stuart Town	40
	Tambaroora	41
	Triamble	42
	Turondale	43
	Ullamalla	44
	Upper Turon	45
	Wattle Flat	46
	Windeyer	47
	World's End	48
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 2 - Hale NT		
	Alice Springs	49
	Amoonguna	50
	Eridunda	56
	Finke	57
	Hugh	54
	Ilparpa	51
	Santa Teresa	52
	Titjikala	53
	Wallace Rockhole	55
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 3 - Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie		
	Barna	56
	Buckleboo	57
	Campoona	58
	Cootra	59
	Darke Peak	60
	Kelly	61
	Kimba	62
	Kyancutta	63
	Mangalo	64
	Pinkawillinie	65
	Pygery	66
	Solomon	67
	Waddikee	68
	Warrambo	69
	Wudinna	70
	Yalanda	71
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 4 - Barndioota		
	Barndioota	72
	Bruce	73
	Carrieton	74
	Cradock	75
	Hammond	76
	Hawker	119
	Mernmerna	77

	Moockra	78
	Parachilna	79
	Port Augusta	80
	Quorn	81
	Saltia	82
	Stirling North	83
	Willochra	84
	Yarrah	85
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 5 - Oman Ama QLD		
	Allora	86
	Applethorpe	87
	Bringalily	88
	Clifton	89
	Coolmunda	90
	Cottonvale	91
	Dalveen	92
	Ellangowan	93
	Godfields	94
	Gore	95
	Grays Gate	96
	Greenlands	97
	Greymare	98
	Hendon	99
	Inglewood	100
	Karara	101
	Kooroongarra	102
	Lavelle	103
	Leyburn	104
	Millmerran Woods	105
	Morgan Park	106
	Oman Ama	107
	Pikedale	108
	Pratten	109
	Sandy Camp	110
	Stanthorpe	111
	Terrica	112
	Thane	113
	The Glen	114
	Thulimbah	115
	Warroo	116
	Warwick	117
	Other (please specify)	_____
	Refused	999

9 Thank you. Firstly, did you know that [INSERT COMMUNITY FROM D1] [IF D1 = 1,2,4,5 INSERT “has”; IF D1 = 3 INSERT “have”] been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?

DO NOT READ OUT / IF THEY SAY ‘AWARE’ PROBE TO CLARIFY CODE 1 (AWARE) OR 2 (PARTLY AWARE) IF NECESSARY

1. Yes – was aware
2. Partly aware – had heard something but uncertain exactly what it was
3. No – had no knowledge or awareness before this survey
4. Refused

IF Q9 = 1 OR 2 → CONTINUE

IF Q9 = 3 OR 4 → GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11

10 And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things...

PROCESS	Aware	Partly aware	Not aware	Not Sure
g. The actual nominated site in your area is [INSERT DESCRIPTION].	1	2	3	4
h. There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites.	1	2	3	4
IF Q10B= 1 OR 2 CONTINUE. IF Q10B=3 OR 4, GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11	1	2	3	4
i. The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.	1	2	3	4

DESCRIPTIONS OF SITES TO BE INSERTED INTO Q10A:

D1 = 1, DESCRIPTION = “41km North of Bathurst in New South Wales”

D1 = 2, DESCRIPTION = “75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory”

D1 = 3, DESCRIPTION = “Two sites between 22km and 29km North West of Kimba in South Australia”

D1 = 4, DESCRIPTION = “30km North West of Hawker in South Australia”

D1 = 5, DESCRIPTION = “29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland”

SAY IF Q9=3 OR 4: [INSERT SITE DESCRIPTION BELOW] been nominated as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility. After an assessment of 28 nominated sites across Australia, [INSERT COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION BELOW] is being actively considered.

DESCRIPTIONS OF SITES TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:

D1 = 1, DESCRIPTION = “a site at Hill End – Sallys Flat, about 40km North of Bathurst in New South Wales has”

D1 = 2, DESCRIPTION = “a site at Hale, 75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory has”

D1 = 3, DESCRIPTION = “two sites at Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie, which are between 22km and 29km North West of Kimba in South Australia have”

D1 = 4, DESCRIPTION = “a site at Barndioota, 30km North West of Hawker in South Australia has”

D1 = 5, DESCRIPTION = “a site at Oman Ama, 29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland has”

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:

D1 = 1, DESCRIPTION = “Hill End-Sallys Flat”

D1 = 2, DESCRIPTION = “Hale”

D1 = 3, DESCRIPTION = “Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie”

D1 = 4, DESCRIPTION = “Barndioota”

D1 = 5, DESCRIPTION = “Oman Ama”



SAY TO ALL:

This stage of consultation is only to determine if a community is willing to stay in the selection process. If willing, more information will be provided through a formal community consultation process. This will include a more detailed site evaluation to confirm its technical suitability, a construction and operational plan, and developing options for how the community **benefits** fund could be used.

The Government wants 2 or 3 communities to go on to the next stage. Only then would you need to decide whether or not you were willing to host the facility.

- 11 [IF Q9=3, INSERT: "I know you have only just become aware of this, but..."] How much does it matter to you personally which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

READ OUT 1-3

1. A lot [GO TO Q12](#)
2. A little [GO TO Q12](#)
3. Not at all [GO TO Q13](#)
4. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
5. Don't know / can't say [GO TO Q13](#)

- 12 And do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

READ OUT 1-4 ONLY IF REQUIRED / SINGLE RESPONSE

1. Strongly support [GO TO Q15](#)
2. Somewhat support [GO TO Q15](#)
3. Somewhat oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
4. Strongly oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
5. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
6. Haven't decided / Can't say / Don't know [CONTINUE](#)

- 13 Why have you not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

RANDOMISE / READ OUT 1-5 ONE AT A TIME AND ASK THE RESPONDENT 'YES' OR 'NO' TO EACH, then 7 / MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED

1. You do not have enough information about the issue
2. You have not been able to make sense of the information on the issue
3. There are good arguments both ways
4. You are not really interested in the issue
5. The proposed site is too far away to affect you
6. DON'T KNOW / CAN'T SAY (DO NOT READ OUT)
7. Or something else: [\[Please specify\]](#) \_\_\_\_\_

- 14 Would you be willing or not willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

READ OUT CODES 1-3 ONLY IF REQUIRED

1. Willing
2. Not willing
3. Don't mind / Not bothered one way or the other
4. Refused
5. Unsure / Don't know **PROBE TO SEE IF REALLY CODE 3 BEFORE USING by reading codes 3 and 5**

PROGRAMMING NOTE: ALTERNATE ORDER OF Q15 AND Q16

15 I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or **negative impacts** you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

a First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

b And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q15C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15A AND Q15B = 2

c Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

	15a – for community	15b - personally	15c – biggest personal concern
None (doesn't have any <b>concerns</b> )	1	1	1
Personal <b>concerns</b> / negative impacts same as for community		2	
Negative impact on economy	3	3	3
Negative impact on tourism	4	4	4
Negative impact on property prices	5	5	5
Negative impact on reputation	6	6	6
Negative impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Negative impact on local job opportunities	8	8	8
Health and safety	9	9	9
Impact on local produce - quality / reputation	10	10	10
Impact on local produce – price / value	11	11	11
Traffic	12	12	12
Noise	13	13	13
Air quality - smell / pollution	14	14	14
Water quality – pollution / contamination	15	15	15
Look ugly / visual effect	16	16	16
Impact on land available for farming / agriculture	17	17	17
Inclusion of intermediate level waste / storage	18	18	18
Possibility of high level or other country's waste	19	19	19
Risk associated with road transport	20	20	20
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i>			

16 I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

a First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

b And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q16C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16A AND Q16B = 2

c Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

DO NOT READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

	16a – for community	16b - personally	16c – Biggest personal benefit
None (doesn't see any <b>benefits</b> )	1	1	1
Personal <b>benefits</b> are same as community <b>benefits</b>		2	
Positive impact on local economy	3	3	3
Positive impact on tourism	4	4	4
Positive impact on property prices	5	5	5
Positive impact on reputation	6	6	6
Positive impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Jobs during construction	8	8	8
Jobs (ongoing)	9	9	9
Investment / upgrade to local facilities	10	10	10
Investment / upgrade to local infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc)	11	11	11
Awareness / profile of the area	12	12	12
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i> _____			

17 Thank you, that is the end of the main part of the survey. I just have a few more questions about you to make sure we have a good cross section of your community and to be able to see if there are different opinions amongst different groups of people. Before we do those questions, did you have any other comments you would like to make?

---



---

**FINAL DEMOGRAPHICS SECTION**

18 Which of the following best describes your housing situation?

1. You are an owner occupier
2. You are renting or leasing from a landlord
3. You pay rent or board to other people in your household
4. Something else: *[Please specify]* \_\_\_\_\_

19 How long have you lived in this local area?

0. Less than one year  
RECORD YEARS
98. Can't say / don't know
99. Refused

20 Do you identify as being Aboriginal or a Torres Strait Islander?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't say / don't know
4. Refused

Thank you for completing the survey.

For quality control purposes we may contact you again to ask you a couple of questions, verifying some of the information we have just collected. We will remove your contact details and de-identify your survey responses when all interviewing and validations are completed.

21 Can I just confirm your name and phone number?

- a Respondent's Name: .....
- b Respondent's Phone: (.....) .....

We will not disclose any identifiable research information for a purpose other than conducting our research or to overseas recipients unless we have your express prior consent or are required to do so by an Australian law. If you would like details of our privacy policy, I can give you those now.

**READ OUT IF RESPONDENT REQUESTS DETAILS**

Our Privacy Policy is available at [www.orida.com](http://www.orida.com) and contains further details regarding how you can access or correct information we hold about you, how you can make a privacy related complaint and how that complaint will be dealt with. Should you have any questions about our privacy policy or how we will treat your information, you may contact our Privacy Officer, Liesel van Straaten on (03) 9526 9000. Until we de-identify our research records, you have the right to access the information that we hold about you as a result of this interview. You may request at any time to have this information de-identified or destroyed.

**CLOSE:** That's the end of the interview. Thanks so much for your help. Just in case you missed it my name is (...) and this survey was conducted for ORIMA Research and the Australian Department of Industry, Innovation and Science.

**IF NECESSARY:** If you have any queries about this survey, or would like any further information, you can call ORIMA on 1800 654 585.



## Appendix D: Business questionnaire

Good \_\_\_\_\_. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling from ORIMA Research to do a survey commissioned by the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science in Canberra.

The survey is to understand the full range of views of businesses in your area about the proposed location of Australia's national radioactive waste management facility. This survey and this process has nothing to do with the Royal Commission process into the nuclear fuel cycle in South Australia.

Your number has been randomly selected from a list of businesses in the local community.

S1. For this survey we would like to interview a person who is the business **owner**, or a **manager** who can speak on behalf of the business, is that you?

1. Yes *CONTINUE*
2. No *ASK WHETHER AN OWNER OR MANAGER IS AVAILABLE*

REINTRODUCE IF NECESSARY

S2. What is your role or position in the business?

1. Owner
2. General Manager / Managing Director / Partner
3. Manager / Director
4. Other *Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_*

All responses to this survey are strictly anonymous, and this is protected by Australian privacy legislation. Only the overall results of the survey will be available to the public.

The survey takes about 15 minutes on average. Would you like to do the survey now?

IF YES CONTINUE

IF NOT GOOD TIME MAKE CALLBACK APPOINTMENT

IF REFUSE, ASK TO SPEAK TO ANOTHER OWNER OR MANAGER IN THE BUSINESS

D1 RECORD COMMUNITY FROM SAMPLE **[WILL BE READ OUT IN Q10]**

1. Hill End-Sallys Flat
2. Hale (south east of Alice Springs)
3. Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie PRONUNCIATION: Cort-Liney / Pinka-willi-nee
4. Barndioota PRONUNCIATION: Barndy-oota
5. Oman Ama PRONUNCIATION: Omanama

Firstly I just need to ask you a few quick questions about your business

3 RECORD GENDER / CONFIRM IF NECESSARY

1. Male
2. Female
3. Unspecified
4. Refused

4A Including yourself, how many people are employed by the business in your local area?

1. 1
2. 2-5
3. 6-10
4. 11-20
5. 21-50
6. 51-100
7. 100+
8. Can't say

4B Which of the following best describes the industry your business operates in? [ANZSIC CODES, PLUS TOURISM]

READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE

1. Tourism
2. Agriculture, Fishing and Forestry
3. Construction
4. Retail trade
5. Accommodation and food services
6. Financial or insurance services
7. Professional, technical and scientific services
8. Rental, hiring or real estate
9. Education and training
10. Healthcare and social assistance
11. Arts and recreation services
12. Transport, postal or warehousing
13. Property, administrative and support services
14. Information, media or telecommunications
15. Wholesale trade
16. Manufacturing
17. Public administration or safety
18. Mining
19. Electricity, Gas, water and waste services
20. Personal and other services

7 Which of the following best describes where your business **primarily** operates in this area?

READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE

21. In a town
22. On a property of under 5 acres outside of a town [IF REQUIRED: Approximately 2 hectares or 20,000m<sup>2</sup>]
23. On a larger property
24. Other: *[Please specify]* \_\_\_\_\_

8 What is the name of [IF Q7 = 1 INSERT “the town where your business primarily operates?”, IF Q7 = 2-3 INSERT “the town or community that you most closely associate your business with?”]

D1 = 1 - Hill End Sallys Flat NSW		
	Aarons Pass	1
	Avisford	2
	Bathurst	122
	Billywillinga	3
	Boomey	4
	Capertree	5
	Charbon	6
	Clandulla	7
	Crudine	8
	Dark Corner	9
	Dungeree	10
	Euchareena	11
	Glenroi	12
	Gowan	13
	Green Gully	14
	Guyong	15
	Hargraves	16
	Hill End	17
	Huntley	18
	Ilford	19
	Kandos	20
	Kerrs Creek	21
	Killongbutta	22
	Meroo	23
	Millah Murah	24
	Monivae	25
	Mookerawa	26
	Mount Aquila	27
	Mudgee	28
	Mullion Creek	29
	Ophir	30
	Orange	31
	Palmers Oaky	32
	Peel	33
	Pyramul	34
	Round Swamp	35
	Rylstone	36
	Sallys Flat	37
	Sofala	38
	Spring Flat	39
	Stuart Town	40
	Tambaroora	41
	Triamble	42
	Turondale	43
	Ullamalla	44
	Upper Turon	45
	Wattle Flat	46

	Windeyer	47
	World's End	48
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 2 - Hale NT		
	Alice Springs	49
	Amoonguna	50
	Eridunda	51
	Finke	52
	Hugh	53
	Ilparpa	54
	Santa Teresa	55
	Titjikala	56
	Wallace Rockhole	57
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 3 - Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie		
	Barna	58
	Buckleboo	59
	Campoona	60
	Cootra	61
	Darke Peak	62
	Kelly	63
	Kimba	64
	Kyancutta	65
	Mangalo	66
	Pinkawillinie	67
	Pygery	68
	Solomon	69
	Waddikee	70
	Warrambo	71
	Wudinna	72
	Yalanda	73
	Other (please specify)	_____
D1 = 4 - Barndioota		
	Barndioota	74
	Bruce	75
	Carrieton	76
	Cradock	77
	Hammond	78
	Hawker	123
	Mernmerna	79
	Mooakra	80
	Parachilna	81
	Port Augusta	82
	Quorn	83
	Saltia	84
	Stirling North	85
	Willochra	86
	Yarrah	87
	Other (please specify)	_____



D1 = 5 - Oman Ama QLD		
	Allora	88
	Applethorpe	89
	Bringalily	90
	Clifton	91
	Coolmunda	92
	Cottonvale	93
	Dalveen	94
	Ellangowan	95
	Godfields	96
	Gore	97
	Grays Gate	98
	Greenlands	99
	Greymare	100
	Hendon	101
	Inglewood	102
	Karara	103
	Koroongarra	104
	Lavelle	105
	Leyburn	106
	Millmerran Woods	107
	Morgan Park	108
	Oman Ama	109
	Pikedale	110
	Pratten	111
	Sandy Camp	112
	Stanthorpe	113
	Terrica	114
	Thane	115
	The Glen	116
	Thulimbah	117
	Warroo	118
	Warwick	119
	Other (please specify)	120
	Refused	121

9 Thank you. Firstly, did you know that [INSERT COMMUNITY FROM D1] [IF D1 = 1,2,4,5 INSERT “has”; IF D1 = 3 INSERT “have”] been under active consideration as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility from 28 nominated sites in Australia?

DO NOT READ OUT / PROBE TO CLARIFY CODE 1 AND 2 IF NECESSARY

- 25. Yes – was aware
- 26. Partly aware – had heard something but uncertain exactly what it was
- 27. No – had no knowledge or awareness before this survey
- 28. Refused

IF Q9 = 1 OR 2 → CONTINUE

IF Q9 = 3 OR 4 → GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11

10 And before this interview were you aware, partly aware or not aware of the following things...

PROCESS	Aware	Partly aware	Not aware	Not Sure
j. The actual nominated site in your area is [INSERT DESCRIPTION].	1	2	3	4
k. There has been a consultation period underway with the community around each of the shortlisted sites.	1	2	3	4
IF Q10B= 1 OR 2 CONTINUE. IF Q10B=3 OR 4, GO TO PREAMBLE TO Q11	1	2	3	4
l. The public comment period finishes on 11 March 2016.				

DESCRIPTIONS OF SITES TO BE INSERTED INTO Q10A:

D1 = 1, DESCRIPTION = "41km North of Bathurst in New South Wales"

D1 = 2, DESCRIPTION = "75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory"

D1 = 3, DESCRIPTION = "Two sites between 22km and 29km North West of Kimba in South Australia"

D1 = 4, DESCRIPTION = "30km North West of Hawker in South Australia"

D1 = 5, DESCRIPTION = "29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland"

SAY IF Q9=3 OR 4: [INSERT SITE DESCRIPTION BELOW] been nominated as a possible location for the national radioactive waste management facility. After an assessment of 28 nominated sites across Australia, [INSERT COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION BELOW] is being actively considered.

DESCRIPTIONS OF SITES TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:

D1 = 1, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Hill End – Sallys Flat, about 40km North of Bathurst in New South Wales has"

D1 = 2, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Hale, 75km South South East of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory has"

D1 = 3, DESCRIPTION = "two sites at Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie, which are between 22km and 29km North West of Kimba in South Australia have"

D1 = 4, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Barndioota, 30km North West of Hawker in South Australia has"

D1 = 5, DESCRIPTION = "a site at Oman Ama, 29km East North East of Inglewood in Queensland has"

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY TO BE INSERTED INTO PREAMBLE:

D1 = 1, DESCRIPTION = "Hill End-Sallys Flat"

D1 = 2, DESCRIPTION = "Hale"

D1 = 3, DESCRIPTION = "Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie"

D1 = 4, DESCRIPTION = "Barndioota"

D1 = 5, DESCRIPTION = "Oman Ama"

SAY TO ALL:

This stage of consultation is only to determine if a community is willing to stay in the selection process. If willing, more information will be provided through a formal community consultation process. This will include a more detailed site evaluation to confirm its technical suitability, a construction and operational plan, and developing options for how the community **benefits** fund could be used.

The Government wants 2 or 3 communities to go on to the next stage. Only then would you need to decide whether or not you were willing to host the facility.

- 11 [IF Q9=3, INSERT: "I know you have only just become aware of this, but..."] How much does it matter to your business which way your community decides to go at the end of this first consultation period with the shortlisted sites? Does it matter...

READ OUT 1-3

1. A lot [GO TO Q12](#)
2. A little [GO TO Q12](#)
3. Not at all [GO TO Q13](#)
4. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
5. Don't know / can't say [GO TO Q13](#)

- 12 And does your business strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose your community continuing with the process to the detailed plan stage?

READ OUT 1-4 ONLY IF REQUIRED / SINGLE RESPONSE

1. Strongly support [GO TO Q15](#)
2. Somewhat support [GO TO Q15](#)
3. Somewhat oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
4. Strongly oppose [GO TO Q15](#)
5. Refused [GO TO Q14](#)
6. Haven't decided / Can't say / Don't know [CONTINUE](#)

- 13 Why has your business not formed an opinion on this topic? Is it because...

RANDOMISE / READ OUT 1-5 then 7 / MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED

1. You do not have enough information about the issue
2. You have not been able to make sense of the information on the issue
3. There are good arguments both ways
4. You are not really interested in the issue
5. The proposed site is too far away to affect you
6. DON'T KNOW / CAN'T SAY
7. Or something else: [\[Please specify\]](#) \_\_\_\_\_

- 14 Would your business be willing or not willing to see your community continue to the next stage of the process, or do you not mind either way?

READ OUT CODES 1-3 ONLY IF REQUIRED

1. Willing
2. Not willing
3. Don't mind / Not bothered one way or the other
4. Refused
5. Unsure / Don't know **PROBE TO SEE IF REALLY CODE 3 BEFORE USING by reading codes 3 and 5**

PROGRAMMING NOTE: ALTERNATE ORDER OF Q15 AND Q16

15 I would like to now ask you about any, **concerns** or **negative impacts** you think there might be for your business or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

a First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

b And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect your business?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q15C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q15A AND Q15B = 2

c Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for your business?

DO NOT READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

	15a – for community	15b – for business	15c – biggest business concern
None (doesn't have any <b>concerns</b> )	1	1	1
Business <b>concerns</b> / negative impacts same as for community		2	
Negative impact on economy	3	3	3
Negative impact on tourism	4	4	4
Negative impact on property prices	5	5	5
Negative impact on reputation	6	6	6
Negative impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Negative impact on local job opportunities	8	8	8
Health and safety	9	9	9
Impact on local produce - quality / reputation	10	10	10
Impact on local produce – price / value	11	11	11
Traffic	12	12	12
Noise	13	13	13
Air quality - smell / pollution	14	14	14
Water quality – pollution / contamination	15	15	15
Look ugly / visual effect	16	16	16
Impact on land available for farming / agriculture	17	17	17
Inclusion of intermediate level waste / storage	18	18	18
Possibility of high level or other country's waste	19	19	19
Risk associated with road transport	20	20	20
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i>			

16 I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for your business or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility?

a First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

b And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for your business?

DO NOT READ OUT / MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

ASK Q16C IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16B OR

IF 2 OR MORE CODES >=3 IN Q16A AND Q16B = 2

c Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for your business?

DO NOT READ OUT / SINGLE RESPONSE / PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE

	16a – for community	16b – for business	16c – Biggest business benefit
None (doesn't see any <b>benefits</b> )	1	1	1
Business <b>benefits</b> are same as community <b>benefits</b>		2	
Positive impact on local economy	3	3	3
Positive impact on tourism	4	4	4
Positive impact on property prices	5	5	5
Positive impact on reputation	6	6	6
Positive impact on community spirit / cohesion	7	7	7
Jobs during construction	8	8	8
Jobs (ongoing)	9	9	9
Investment / upgrade to local facilities	10	10	10
Investment / upgrade to local infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc)	11	11	11
Awareness / profile of the area	12	12	12
Anything else: <i>[Please specify]</i> _____			

17 Thank you, that is the end of the main part of the survey. I just have a few more questions about you to make sure we have a good cross section of your community and to be able to see if there are different opinions amongst different groups of people. Before we do those questions, did you have any other comments you would like to make?

---



---

**FINAL DEMOGRAPHICS SECTION**

19 How long has your business operated in this local area?

- 1. Less than one year
- RECORD YEARS

98. Can't say / don't know

99. Refused

20 Do you identify as being Aboriginal or a Torres Strait Islander?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Can't say / don't know
- 4. Refused

Thank you for completing the survey.

For quality control purposes we may contact you again to ask you a couple of questions, verifying some of the information we have just collected. We will remove your contact details and de-identify your survey responses when all interviewing and validations are completed.

21 Can I just confirm your name and phone number?

a Respondent's Name: .....

b Respondent's Phone: (.....) .....

We will not disclose any identifiable research information for a purpose other than conducting our research or to overseas recipients unless we have your express prior consent or are required to do so by an Australian law. If you would like details of our privacy policy, I can give you those now.

**READ OUT IF RESPONDENT REQUESTS DETAILS**

Our Privacy Policy is available at [www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com) and contains further details regarding how you can access or correct information we hold about you, how you can make a privacy related complaint and how that complaint will be dealt with. Should you have any questions about our privacy policy or how we will treat your information, you may contact our Privacy Officer, Liesel van Straaten on (03) 9526 9000. Until we de-identify our research records, you have the right to access the information that we hold about you as a result of this interview. You may request at any time to have this information de-identified or destroyed.

**CLOSE:** That's the end of the interview. Thanks so much for your help. Just in case you missed it my name is (...) and this survey was conducted for ORIMA Research and the Australian Department of Industry, Innovation and Science.

**IF NECESSARY:** If you have any queries about this survey, or would like any further information, you can call ORIMA on 1800 654 585.



## Appendix E: Neighbour letters



Reference Number:  
«Reference»

**Melbourne**  
Level 6, 479 St Kilda Road  
Melbourne VIC 3004  
PO Box 7543  
Melbourne VIC 3004  
Australia  
T 03 9526 9000  
F 03 9820 0766

15 April 2016

«Proprietor»  
«Address1»  
«Locality1» «State» «Postcode»

**Canberra**  
Ground Floor,  
2 Brindabella Circuit  
Brindabella Business Park  
Canberra Airport ACT 2609  
GPO Box 2093  
Canberra ACT 2601  
Australia  
T 02 6109 6300

### National Radioactive Waste Management Facility Neighbour Survey

Dear Sir or Madam,

A site was voluntarily nominated within your area to host the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility. The site nominated is «Site\_Name» and is one of six potential sites under consideration.

**Sydney**  
Level 9, 132 Arthur Street  
North Sydney NSW 2060  
PO Box 1439  
North Sydney NSW 2059  
Australia  
T 02 9929 6000

Your details were obtained from publically available records from «Title\_Office» as a title holder of a property that is a near neighbour of the nominated site.

E info@orima.com  
www.orima.com

The Australian Government, through the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science have engaged ORIMA Research to undertake research relating to community sentiment on the proposal.

As well as a general community survey the Department is interested in understanding the views of owners, residents and users of properties in the immediate vicinity of the site. The Department will provide these views to the Minister so they are taken into account in determining if the site moves to the next phase.

To do this we would like to speak to all owners, and adult occupants of your property to conduct a voluntary survey. To enable participation in the survey we require your contact details and the contact details of other people who occupy the property who are willing to undertake this survey. Due to privacy laws these contact details must be provided by you and the other occupants and should include names, phone numbers and the reference number at the top of this letter.

Surveys can be completed by phone, and you will be able to make an appointment for a convenient time to do this between 27 February and 18 March.



Alternatively, ORIMA will be present within the community and will undertake door-to-door surveys between 9<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> March. During these times ORIMA will be able to complete surveys by appointment and will attempt to visit any property which has not responded to this letter.

This information can be provided either by:

Calling 0448 133 838  
Emailing [ingrid.curtis@orima.com](mailto:ingrid.curtis@orima.com)  
Mailing ORIMA Research  
Reply Paid 7543  
Melbourne VIC 3004

or  
Faxing 03 9820 0766

Details should be provided to ORIMA no later than 16<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

In addition, if the property is occupied by other users, for instance a farm manager, tenant or lessee, we would ask that you provide the attached letter to them so that they may provide their own details should they wish to participate in the survey.

We would appreciate it if you could pass this information on as soon as possible.

#### Privacy

The research will be conducted in accordance with the Australian Market and Social Research Society's Code of Professional Conduct and the Australian Privacy Legislation.

As this is a targeted survey of neighbours, you will be asked if you consent to allowing your individual view to be associated with your property. If you consent, only the Department, the Minister and their representatives will have access to this information.

Individuals' survey responses will be treated as confidential and only aggregated findings from the surveys will be published at the end of the consultation period.

#### Further Information

Further information on the project is available at [www.radioactivewaste.gov.au](http://www.radioactivewaste.gov.au).

You can also submit inquiries or feedback via email to [radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au](mailto:radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au)  
or  
call the Radioactive Waste Hotline on 1800 682 704.



Melbourne Canberra Sydney

[www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com)







Reference Number:  
«Reference»

**Melbourne**  
Level 6, 479 St Kilda Road  
Melbourne VIC 3004  
PO Box 7543  
Melbourne VIC 3004  
Australia  
T 03 9526 9000  
F 03 9820 0766

**Canberra**  
Ground Floor,  
2 Brindabella Circuit  
Brindabella Business Park  
Canberra Airport ACT 2609  
GPO Box 2093  
Canberra ACT 2601  
Australia  
T 02 6109 6300

**Sydney**  
Level 9, 132 Arthur Street  
North Sydney NSW 2060  
PO Box 1439  
North Sydney NSW 2059  
Australia  
T 02 9929 6000

E [info@orima.com](mailto:info@orima.com)  
[www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com)

15 April 2016

**National Radioactive Waste Management Facility Neighbour Survey**

Dear Sir or Madam,

A site was voluntarily nominated within your area to host the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility. The site nominated is «Site\_Name» and is one of six potential sites under consideration.

You have been identified by the title holder of a property that is a near neighbour of the nominated site as a resident, user or lessee.

The Australian Government, through the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science have engaged ORIMA Research to undertake research relating to community sentiment on the proposal.

As well as a general community survey the Department is interested in understanding the views of owners, residents and users of properties in the immediate vicinity of the site. The Department will provide these views to the Minister so they are taken into account in determining if the site moves to the next phase.

To do this we would like to speak to all adult occupants of the property to conduct a voluntary survey. To enable participation in the survey we require your contact details and the contact details of other people who occupy the property who are willing to undertake this survey. Due to privacy laws these contact details must be provided by you and the other occupants and should include names, phone numbers and the reference number at the top of this letter.

Surveys can be completed by phone, and you will be able to make an appointment for a convenient time to do this between 27 February and 18 March.

ORIMA will also be present within the community and will undertake door-to-door surveys between 9<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> March. During these times ORIMA will be able to complete surveys by appointment and will attempt to visit any property which has not responded to this letter.

This information can be provided either by:

Calling 0448 133 838  
Emailing [ingrid.curtis@orima.com](mailto:ingrid.curtis@orima.com)  
Mailing ORIMA Research  
Reply Paid 7543  
Melbourne VIC 3004

or  
Faxing 03 9820 0766

Details should be provided to ORIMA no later than 16<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

#### **Privacy**

The research will be conducted in accordance with the Australian Market and Social Research Society's Code of Professional Conduct and the Australian Privacy Legislation.

As this is a targeted survey of neighbours, you will be asked if you consent to allowing your individual view to be associated with your property. If you consent, only the Department, the Minister and their representatives will have access to this information.

Individuals' survey responses will be treated as confidential and only aggregated findings from the surveys will be published at the end of the consultation period.

#### **Further Information**

Further information on the project is available at  
[www.radioactivewaste.gov.au](http://www.radioactivewaste.gov.au).

You can also submit inquiries or feedback via email to  
[radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au](mailto:radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au)  
or  
call the Radioactive Waste Hotline on 1800 682 704.



Melbourne Canberra Sydney [www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com)



Reference Number:

---

Melbourne  
Level 6, 479 St Kilda Road  
Melbourne VIC 3004  
PO Box 7545  
Melbourne VIC 3004  
Australia  
T 03 9526 9000  
F 03 9820 0766

Canberra  
Ground Floor,  
2 Brindabella Circuit  
Brindabella Business Park  
Canberra Airport ACT 2609  
GPO Box 2093  
Canberra ACT 2601  
Australia  
T 02 6009 6300

Sydney  
Level 9, 132 Arthur Street  
North Sydney NSW 2060  
PO Box 1439  
North Sydney NSW 2059  
Australia  
T 02 9929 6000

E [info@orima.com](mailto:info@orima.com)  
[www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com)

### **National Radioactive Waste Management Facility Neighbour Survey**

**Dear Sir or Madam,**

A site was voluntarily nominated within your area to host the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility. The site nominated is «Site\_Name» and is one of six potential sites under consideration.

The Australian Government, through the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science, have engaged ORIMA Research to undertake a survey relating to community sentiment on the proposal, and we are currently visiting properties in your area.

As well as a general community survey, the Department is interested in understanding the views of owners, residents, users and lessees of adjacent properties to the site. The Department will provide these views to the Minister so they are taken into account in determining if the site moves to the next phase.

Today a representative of ORIMA Research visited your property but was unable to speak to all owners, residents or users to undertake the voluntary survey.

Surveys can be completed by phone, and you will be able to make an appointment for a convenient time to do this before 18<sup>th</sup> March.

Alternatively, ORIMA will remain in your community and will undertake door-to-door surveys between 9<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> March. During these times ORIMA will be able to complete surveys by appointment.

To make an appointment for an in-person or telephone survey, please call, email, or fax us on the details below. We will need your contact details and the contact details of other people who occupy the property who are willing to undertake this survey. Due to privacy laws these contact details must be provided by you and the other occupants and should include names, phone numbers and the reference number at the top of this letter.

Yours  
Sincerely,



This information can be provided either by:

Calling        0448 133 838  
Emailing      ingrid.curtis@orima.com  
Mailing        ORIMA Research  
                  Reply Paid 7543  
                  Melbourne VIC 3004

or  
Faxing        03 9820 0766

Details should be provided to ORIMA no later than 16<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

#### Privacy

The research will be conducted in accordance with the Australian Market and Social Research Society's Code of Professional Conduct and the Australian Privacy Legislation.

As this is a targeted survey of neighbours, you will be asked if you consent to allowing your individual view to be associated with your property. If you consent, only the Department, the Minister and their representatives will have access to this information.

Individuals' survey responses will be treated as confidential and only aggregated findings from the surveys will be published at the end of the consultation period.

#### Further Information

Further information on the project is available at  
[www.radioactivewaste.gov.au](http://www.radioactivewaste.gov.au).

You can also submit inquiries or feedback via email to  
[radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au](mailto:radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au)  
or  
call the Radioactive Waste Hotline on 1800 682 704.




Melbourne Canberra Sydney      [www.orima.com](http://www.orima.com)




## Appendix F: concerns and benefits across sites for Neighbours, Indigenous and Business surveys

Figure 71: All perceived concerns – Neighbours survey, Sallys Flat



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any concerns or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

Figure 72: All perceived **benefits** – Neighbours survey, Sallys Flat




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

Figure 73: All perceived concerns – Business survey, Sallys Flat



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any concerns or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?


Figure 74: All perceived **benefits** – Business survey, *Sallys Flat*



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?




Figure 75: All perceived concerns – Neighbours survey, Hale




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any concerns or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

Figure 76: All perceived **benefits** – Neighbours survey, Hale




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

Figure 77: All perceived concerns – Indigenous survey, Hale



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any concerns or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

Figure 78: All perceived **benefits** – Indigenous survey, *Hale*



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?


Figure 79: All perceived concerns – Business survey, Hale



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?




Figure 80: All perceived **benefits** – Business survey, **Hale**




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

Figure 81: All perceived **concerns** – Neighbours survey, *Cortliffe*



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?


Figure 82: All perceived **benefits** – Neighbours survey, **Cortlinye**



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?




Figure 83: All perceived **concerns**– Neighbours survey, *Pinkawillinie*




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

Figure 84: All perceived **benefits** – Neighbours survey, Pinkawillinie




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

Figure 85: All perceived **concerns** – Business survey, *Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie*




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

Figure 86: All perceived **benefits** – Business survey, *Cortlinye and Pinkawillinie*




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

Figure 87: All perceived **concerns**– Neighbours survey, **Barndioota**




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

Figure 88: All perceived **benefits** – Neighbours survey, **Barndioota**




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

Figure 89: All perceived concerns – Indigenous survey, Barndioota



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?


Figure 90: All perceived **benefits** – Indigenous survey, **Barndioota**



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?




Figure 91: All perceived concerns – Business survey, Barndioota




Q15. I would like to now ask you about any concerns or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

Figure 92: All perceived **benefits** – Business survey, **Barndioota**




Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

Figure 93: All perceived concerns – Neighbours survey, Oman Ama



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any concerns or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, concerns or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?

Figure 94: All perceived **benefits** – Neighbours survey, **Oman Ama**



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?


Figure 95: All perceived concerns – Business survey, Oman Ama



Q15. I would like to now ask you about any **concerns** or negative impacts you think there might be for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility? (a) First, what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **concerns** or negative impacts do you think could directly affect you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest concern or possible negative impact for you personally?



Figure 96: All perceived **benefits** – Business survey, **Oman Ama**



Q16. I would like to now ask you about any **benefits** you think there are for you or your community from hosting the national radioactive waste management facility. (a) First, what, if any, **benefits** do you think there might be for your community? (b) And what, if any, **benefits** do you think there are for you personally? (c) Which of these is the single biggest possible benefit for you personally?

## Appendix G: Table of themes from verbatim comments by site and survey

### *Sally's Flat*

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
No comment	51%	11%		60%
Feels negatively towards initiative	2%	2%		
Environmental concerns	2%	4%		1%
Health concerns		2%		
Safety concerns	1%	2%		
Fear of a Fukushima-type disaster		2%		
Risks outweigh the benefits				
Concerns about effect on community	1%			
General community consensus is against the facility	1%			2%
Issue has caused divisions and problems within the community				
Concerns about the impact in the future				
Concern that there might be a shift to storing high level waste in future	1%			
Should not accept waste from overseas	1%			
Location needs infrastructure upgrade to be appropriate	1%	4%		
Lack of trust (of government and politicians)	1%			1%
Lack of information/communication from government	3%	4%		3%
Dissatisfied by government's management of situation	1%			3%
Inform the community/ keep community informed	1%			1%
Greater Transparency				
Lack of consideration of the Indigenous people of the area				
Concerned about effects on Tourism				1%
Concerned about land/ property prices		5%		
Facility should not be forced on a community		7%		
Process too long/drawn out		2%		
Feels like waste should be stored elsewhere	6%			5%
Waste should be stored in remote/unpopulated parts of Australia	9%	2%		7%
Feels as if waste should remain in capital cities				
Waste should stay close to where it is created				

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
Unsure why it has to be so remote		5%		
Should be stored at already contaminated sites (e.g. Maralinga)	1%			5%
Feels positively towards initiative	1%	2%		
Believes facility will be beneficial to community and economy				2%
Responsibility to take our own nuclear waste				
Sees value of nuclear industry/ nuclear medicine	1%			
Disagrees with anti-nuclear lobby	1%			
Fear mongering by media and those opposed to facility		2%		
Views risk as being low	1%	2%		
Waste has to be stored somewhere/somehow	2%			
Undecided/ Want more information before making a judgement				2%
Unsure/ Want more information about the process of choosing the sites				1%
Questions about how the facility will operate				
Concerned that commodity prices will be affected				
Concerns regarding connection with their land				
Concerns about the effects on traditions/language/stories				
Concerns about the effects on sacred/Dreaming sites				
Concerns about the effects on traditional hunting grounds/ bush tucker				
Other	8%	44%		7%



**Hale**

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
No comment	53%		56%	67%
Feels negatively towards initiative	1%			
Environmental concerns	2%		6%	1%
Health concerns			4%	
Safety concerns	2%		2%	
Fear of a Fukushima-type disaster				
Risks outweigh the benefits				
Concerns about effect on community	1%			
General community consensus is against the facility	1%		2%	
Issue has caused divisions and problems within the community				
Concerns about the impact in the future	1%		5%	
Concern that there might be a shift to storing high level waste in future	1%			
Should not accept waste from overseas	1%			1%
Location needs infrastructure upgrade to be appropriate	1%			
Lack of trust (of government and politicians)	1%			
Lack of information/communication from government	1%			
Dissatisfied by government's management of situation	1%			
Inform the community/ keep community informed	1%	33%		
Greater Transparency	1%			
Lack of consideration of the Indigenous people of the area	1%			2%
Concerned about effects on Tourism				1%
Concerned about land/ property prices		17%		
Facility should not be forced on a community				
Process too long/drawn out				
Feels like waste should be stored elsewhere	3%		3%	4%
Waste should be stored in remote/unpopulated parts of Australia	3%		1%	4%
Feels as if waste should remain in capital cities	1%			2%
Waste should stay close to where it is created	2%			1%
Unsure why it has to be so remote	1%			
Should be stored at already contaminated sites (e.g. Maralinga)	2%			3%

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
Feels positively towards initiative	1%			
Believes facility will be beneficial to community and economy	1%			
Responsibility to take our own nuclear waste				
Sees value of nuclear industry/ nuclear medicine	1%			
Disagrees with anti-nuclear lobby	1%			
Fear mongering by media and those opposed to facility				
Views risk as being low	1%			
Waste has to be stored somewhere/somehow	3%			
Undecided/ Want more information before making a judgement			1%	
Unsure/ Want more information about the process of choosing the sites			1%	
Questions about how the facility will operate				
Concerned that commodity prices will be affected				
Concerns regarding connection with their land			6%	
Concerns about the effects on traditions/language/stories			2%	
Concerns about the effects on sacred/Dreaming sites			2%	
Concerns about the effects on traditional hunting grounds/ bush tucker			4%	
Other	10%	50%	7%	14%

### Cortlinye / Pinkawillinie

	General public	Neighbours Cortlinye	Neighbours Pinkawillinie	Business
No comment	43%			39%
Feels negatively towards initiative		7%	4%	
Environmental concerns		3%		6%
Health concerns		4%	4%	3%
Safety concerns		9%	7%	
Fear of a Fukushima-type disaster		1%	3%	
Risks outweigh the benefits				
Concerns about effect on community	3%			
General community consensus is against the facility	1%			3%
Issue has caused divisions and problems within the community	8%			6%
Concerns about the impact in the future		1%		
Concern that there might be a shift to storing high level waste in future				
Should not accept waste from overseas	1%			
Location needs infrastructure upgrade to be appropriate		4%	3%	
Lack of trust (of government and politicians)	3%			
Lack of information/communication from government	1%	4%	5%	
Dissatisfied by government's management of situation	3%			3%
Inform the community/ keep community informed			3%	
Greater Transparency		1%		
Lack of consideration of the Indigenous people of the area		10%	9%	
Concerned about effects on Tourism		1%		
Concerned about land/ property prices		3%	7%	
Facility should not be forced on a community			3%	
Process too long/drawn out	1%			
Feels like waste should be stored elsewhere	5%		3%	
Waste should be stored in remote/unpopulated parts of Australia				6%
Feels as if waste should remain in capital cities		13%	12%	

	General public	Neighbours Cortlinye	Neighbours Pinkawillinie	Business
Waste should stay close to where it is created	1%	2%	7%	
Unsure why it has to be so remote				
Should be stored at already contaminated sites (e.g. Maralinga)	2%			
Feels positively towards initiative	2%			
Believes facility will be beneficial to community and economy	1%			11%
Responsibility to take our own nuclear waste		1%	1%	
Sees value of nuclear industry/ nuclear medicine				3%
Disagrees with anti-nuclear lobby	1%			
Fear mongering by media and those opposed to facility	1%	3%	1%	
Views risk as being low				
Waste has to be stored somewhere/somehow				
Undecided/ Want more information before making a judgement				
Unsure/ Want more information about the process of choosing the sites				
Questions about how the facility will operate		4%	1%	
Concerned that commodity prices will be affected				
Concerns regarding connection with their land				
Concerns about the effects on traditions/language/stories				
Concerns about the effects on sacred/Dreaming sites				
Concerns about the effects on traditional hunting grounds/ bush tucker				
Other	15%	24%	27%	22%

## Barndioota

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
No comment	47%	14%	5%	30%
Feels negatively towards initiative				
Environmental concerns	3%		5%	
Health concerns		7%	4%	
Safety concerns	2%		2%	
Fear of a Fukushima-type disaster			1%	
Risks outweigh the benefits				
Concerns about effect on community	1%			
General community consensus is against the facility			1%	
Issue has caused divisions and problems within the community	1%		2%	
Concerns about the impact in the future	1%		6%	
Concern that there might be a shift to storing high level waste in future				3%
Should not accept waste from overseas	1%			
Location needs infrastructure upgrade to be appropriate		7%		
Lack of trust (of government and politicians)	3%	7%	2%	
Lack of information/communication from government	2%		17%	3%
Dissatisfied by government's management of situation			2%	
Inform the community/ keep community informed	2%		4%	
Greater Transparency			1%	
Lack of consideration of the Indigenous people of the area	1%	7%	1%	3%
Concerned about effects on Tourism	1%			
Concerned about land/ property prices		7%		
Facility should not be forced on a community				
Process too long/drawn out	1%		1%	3%
Feels like waste should be stored elsewhere	4%		2%	3%
Waste should be stored in remote/unpopulated parts of Australia	1%			3%
Feels as if waste should remain in capital cities			2%	
Waste should stay close to where it is created	1%		1%	3%
Unsure why it has to be so remote		7%		
Should be stored at already contaminated sites (e.g. Maralinga)				

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
Feels positively towards initiative	8%			3%
Believes facility will be beneficial to community and economy	2%			12%
Responsibility to take our own nuclear waste	1%			
Sees value of nuclear industry/ nuclear medicine	2%			
Disagrees with anti-nuclear lobby	1%			
Fear mongering by media and those opposed to facility	1%			
Views risk as being low	3%			
Waste has to be stored somewhere/somehow	3%			
Undecided/ Want more information before making a judgement			5%	
Unsure/ Want more information about the process of choosing the sites		7%		
Questions about how the facility will operate				
Concerned that commodity prices will be affected				
Concerns regarding connection with their land			6%	
Concerns about the effects on traditions/language/stories			10%	
Concerns about the effects on sacred/Dreaming sites			4%	
Concerns about the effects on traditional hunting grounds/ bush tucker			1%	
Other	9%	36%	12%	33%

**Oman Ama**

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
No comment	45%	3%		46%
Feels negatively towards initiative	2%			
Environmental concerns	3%	3%		2%
Health concerns	1%			
Safety concerns	1%	9%		
Fear of a Fukushima-type disaster				
Risks outweigh the benefits				
Concerns about effect on community	2%			2%
General community consensus is against the facility				
Issue has caused divisions and problems within the community	2%			4%
Concerns about the impact in the future	1%			2%
Concern that there might be a shift to storing high level waste in future	1%			2%
Should not accept waste from overseas				
Location needs infrastructure upgrade to be appropriate		3%		
Lack of trust (of government and politicians)	1%			2%
Lack of information/communication from government	3%	6%		8%
Dissatisfied by government's management of situation	1%			
Inform the community/ keep community informed	2%			
Greater Transparency				
Lack of consideration of the Indigenous people of the area		12%		
Concerned about effects on Tourism		3%		2%
Concerned about land/ property prices		6%		4%
Facility should not be forced on a community				
Process too long/drawn out	1%			
Feels like waste should be stored elsewhere	4%			4%
Waste should be stored in remote/unpopulated parts of Australia	5%			
Feels as if waste should remain in capital cities	1%	6%		2%
Waste should stay close to where it is created				
Unsure why it has to be so remote				
Should be stored at already contaminated sites (e.g. Maralinga)	1%			2%

	General public	Neighbours	Indigenous	Business
Feels positively towards initiative	3%			
Believes facility will be beneficial to community and economy				4%
Responsibility to take our own nuclear waste		9%		
Sees value of nuclear industry/ nuclear medicine				
Disagrees with anti-nuclear lobby	2%			6%
Fear mongering by media and those opposed to facility	1%	9%		
Views risk as being low	1%			2%
Waste has to be stored somewhere/somehow				
Undecided/ Want more information before making a judgement				
Unsure/ Want more information about the process of choosing the sites				
Questions about how the facility will operate				
Concerned that commodity prices will be affected				
Concerns regarding connection with their land				
Concerns about the effects on traditions/language/stories				
Concerns about the effects on sacred/Dreaming sites				
Concerns about the effects on traditional hunting grounds/ bush tucker				
Other	15%	32%		8%