



## NUCLEAR SAFETY COMMITTEE

### Summary of the meeting held on 10 November 2000

#### ATTENDANCE

All members, with the exception of Dr. Lee and Mr McAneny, were in attendance.

#### CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 14 JULY 2000

The draft minutes were confirmed with minor amendments.

#### BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Seismic Modelling: A report on details of the study into safety parameters to be set for the replacement reactor was tabled. ARPANSA would refine and extend the study using parameters that are more realistic for the Australian situation. The Committee would be kept informed of the process.

Dose Limits: The CEO advised of the Radiation Health Committee (RHC) discussion in relation to dose limits in RHS39 and the ARPANS legislation, relating to the "exceptional circumstances" clause and the public limit. The RHC had considered that the clause was no longer required and a rebadged Radiation Health Series 39 should incorporate a note to the effect that the "exceptional circumstances" clause is no longer recommended.

Site-wide airborne discharge authorisation: The current authorisation applied to HIFAR only, and the rest of the ANSTO site was operating under an old NSW EPA agreement that no longer exists. An authorisation for the whole site was required.

ANSTO visit: The proposed ANSTO visit would be planned for the day before the next NSC meeting.

#### MAJOR ISSUES

##### **Safety Assessment Principles — discussion of issues arising from Working Group (WG) consideration**

An update on the current progress of the review of the Safety Assessment Principles for Controlled Facilities (SAP) was provided and a summary document titled **Progress on Drafting Safety Assessment Principles and Design Guidelines** was tabled. At the time of the meeting the ARPANSA Regulatory Branch was in discussion with a technical editor for the technical review of the SAP. ARPANSA would provide a document responding to the WG comments, there would be an opportunity for the WG to discuss, and then it would go to public comment. NSC members would receive copies of the document for approval before public comment. The CEO indicated that he would like the public comment period to take place in time for the final document to be presented at the March 2001 NSC meeting.

The Committee agreed that it would be useful in the public comment process to direct attention to areas in the document that may be contentious or may require comment.

## **Report From Working Group Review of the Regulatory Assessment Criteria for the Design of Controlled Facilities and Modification to Existing Facilities (RAC)**

Dr Jezukaitis summarised the Working Group meeting of 14 August 2000 reiterating the Working Group opinion that the RAC was an essential document in the ARPANSA hierarchy. He advised that recommendations on remaining comments could be finalised by teleconference. ARPANSA considered that the RAC was nearing completion despite some remaining comments. Similar to the SAP review, the public comment period should take place in time for the final document to be presented at the March 2001 NSC meeting.

As the SAP and the RAC were internal ARPANSA Regulatory Branch documents, a Regulatory Impact Statement would not be needed.

## **Replacement Research Reactor Project — ARPANSA relationship with INVAP, peer review of Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (PSAR), timing of licensing process**

The Committee had reviewed the document titled **Select Committee for an Inquiry Into the Contract for a New Reactor at Lucas Heights – Submission by CEO of ARPANSA**. This document was a submission in relation to ANSTO licence applications and the Committee advised that the document adequately covered their current concerns and issues relating to the ANSTO appointment of the contractor to build the replacement reactor.

## **ARPANSA Consideration of Construction Licence for Replacement Reactor — timetable, public involvement, role of the NSC**

ARPANSA expected that ANSTO would apply for a construction licence by May 2001 and that a licence decision would be finalised by the end of February 2002. Under the Act, there would be a public consultation process before the final decision was made. A comprehensive PSAR would be undertaken and the results of the PSAR would make up part of the application. An independent peer review of the PSAR would also be undertaken and made public.

ARPANSA may require ANSTO to provide additional information if ARPANSA considered the information essential to the application process.

Overall, the Committee felt that the process was to be commended but that consideration should be given to a public hearing process. ARPANSA would advise the NSC of the timetable regarding involvement with seismic issues, reactor fuels and disposition of spent fuel, and “reference accident” assumptions.

## **Spent Fuel Reprocessing**

The CEO advised that in making a licence decision for the replacement reactor, ARPANSA needs to be satisfied of the process of handling spent fuel and any alternate process of disposal.

## **Maralinga Licence**

The CEO advised of the licence that had been issued to the Department of Industry, Science and Resources to cover the Maralinga site two weeks prior to the meeting. The licence included conditions related to the ongoing management of the site.

## **Progress With ARPANSA Licensing of Existing ANSTO Facilities — progress report**

ANSTO had applied for licences for seventeen separate facilities on the site and ARPANSA was well into the review of the applications and the public comment period. The closing date for public comment on each of the General Safety Plans and Arrangements, HIFAR Nuclear research Reactor, Waste Operators, Fuel Operations, Radiopharmaceutical Operations and Moata Nuclear Research Reactor

licence applications was 17 November 2000. The first of the licensing decisions was expected to take place next month.

## **REPORTS**

### **ARPANSA Public Information Session — 9 November 2000**

The CEO gave a summary of the public information meeting, held the previous evening, which was attended by 45-50 people. The consensus of those Members that had attended was that such information meetings were a valuable exercise and that there should be more in future.

### **Report on Council — Meeting of 24 July 2000 and agenda for meeting of 1 December 2000**

The **Summary of the meeting** was tabled for Members reference. The Council document on the **Protocol for Public Consultation** was also tabled for the Members' information. The Committee noted that Working Groups had been formed on the issues of radioactive waste and the precautionary principle.

### **Report on RHC — Meetings of 19-20 July and 1-2 November 2000**

Aspects of the November 2000 RHC meeting were brought to the attention of the NSC. Of particular interest was that some Codes of Practice were nearing completion, including the Transport Code (see later item), the fixed radiation gauges code, the portable moisture/density gauges code and the occupational UV standard.

The possible rebadging or review of RHS 39 was an important issue discussed by the RHC and the Committee noted that an RHC Business Working Group had been formed.

## **ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

### **Committee Forward Planning — Further discussion following ARPANSA planning day meeting**

Ms Kidziak briefly discussed the summary paper of the planning meeting, highlighting proposed NSC work on the replacement reactor. The issue was to be further discussed at the 1 December 2000 Council meeting.

### **Draft Transport Code — progress report**

The Committee was advised that the draft **Code of Practice for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material** was nearing completion and it was expected to go to public comment along with its associated regulatory impact statement early in 2001. The Code of Practice was intended to be adopted by regulators by 1 July 2001.

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

Details of Dr Smith's contact details, as the person representing a local government area on the NSC, were to be placed on the Web site out of session.

## **CLOSURE AND NEXT MEETING**

The Committee discussed meeting dates for 2001. The Committee agreed that 16 March 2001 was the preferred date for the first meeting. The second meeting of 2001 would be either 6 July or 13 July (6 July preferred) and the third meeting would be either 9 November or 16 November (9 November preferred).

The meeting closed at 3:10 pm.