

# List of conclusions and recommendations

## The Need

Committee's Conclusions	Paragraph
HIFAR is obsolete and will need to be permanently decommissioned in 2005.	2.63
The estimated cost of refurbishing HIFAR to comply with safety requirements alone would be half of the cost of providing a new research reactor. This would not provide an enhancement of its research and operational capabilities which are considered by the scientific community to be limited. Such limitations have led to a reduction in national research and development opportunities.	2.64
A need exists to replace HIFAR with a modern research reactor. The new national research reactor must be operational some time before HIFAR is decommissioned.	2.65
The need for the replacement of HIFAR arises as a consequence of national interest considerations, research and development requirements and the need to sustain the local production of radiopharmaceuticals.	2.66
There has been substantial investment in infrastructure at Lucas Heights Science and Technology Centre.	2.67
Construction of a replacement research reactor at a greenfields site and decommissioning of HIFAR would require the provision of much of the infrastructure which already exists at Lucas Heights.	2.68
The comparative costs of locating the replacement research reactor at Lucas Heights or a greenfields site favour the former by a considerable margin.	2.69
On financial grounds there is merit in locating the replacement research reactor at Lucas Heights, subject to the suitability of the	2.70

site on operational and public safety grounds.

## **The Proposal**

<b>Committee's Conclusions</b>	<b>Paragraph</b>
The capabilities of the proposed research reactor and auxiliary facilities result from study and assessment by representatives of potential users and provides scope for later enhancement.	3.79
<b>Committee's Recommendation</b>	
During the licensing, construction and commissioning phases ANSTO should provide the Committee with six-monthly reports on progress.	3.80

## **Codes, waste and hazards**

<b>Committee's Conclusion</b>	<b>Paragraph</b>
The storage of radioactive waste at Lucas Heights is of major concern to the local community.	4.142
<b>Committee's Recommendations</b>	
When moving the expediency motion for the work to proceed, the Minister should provide a guarantee to the House that all recommendations in the Environment Assessment Report will be implemented. This guarantee should include existing commitments and new commitments listed in Appendix A of the Environment Assessment Report.	4.143
Provided all recommendations and commitments contained in the Environment Assessment Report are implemented during construction and commissioning and for the expected life of the research reactor, the Committee believes, based on the evidence, that all known risks have been identified and their impact on public safety will be as low as technically possible.	4.144
Removal of all radioactive waste from Lucas Heights for disposal or storage at a National Repository must be a high priority and is dependent on the timely provision of the Repository and Store.	4.145
In its quarterly and annual reports to Parliament, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency should report on the implementation of all recommendations in the Environment Assessment Report falling within its direct responsibility.	4.146
In future, in its Annual Report to Parliament ANSTO should	4.147

report on compliance and implementation of all recommendations in the Environment Assessment Report, including the commitments listed in Appendix A of the report.

As a matter of urgency, the Minister for Health and ARPANSA should appoint members to positions on committees identified in the Act.

4.148

## **Consultation**

### **Committee's Recommendation**

**Paragraph**

There is an urgent need for an agreement on the Community Right to Know Charter. Steps toward its development identified in the Environment Assessment Report should be undertaken as soon as possible to enable the public to be better informed about the further development of the project.

5.27

## **Project management and cost**

### **Committee's Conclusions**

**Paragraph**

The estimated cost is based on international precedents and national construction. There will be no scope for design variations during construction which could lead to cost increases.

8.52

A high level management structure will be established to oversight the project with representation from key departments—including the Department of Finance and Administration.

8.53

### **Committee's Recommendation**

The Committee recommends provision of the reactor should not be at the expense of other Government science funding.

8.54

The Committee recommends the construction of a replacement research reactor at Lucas Heights at an estimated cost of \$286.4 million at 1997 prices.

8.55