<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>Welcome &amp; Meeting Logistics</td>
<td>Dennis Andrukat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 pm</td>
<td>Opening Remarks</td>
<td>Theresa Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 pm</td>
<td>NRC Presentation – Rulemaking Overview</td>
<td>Duncan White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 pm</td>
<td>Stakeholder Perspectives</td>
<td>Laila El-Guebaly, Andrew Holland, Sachin Desai, Tyler Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 pm</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:55 pm</td>
<td>Questions &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55 pm</td>
<td>Wrap-up &amp; Adjourn</td>
<td>Dennis Andrukat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RULEMAKING
OVERVIEW

Duncan White
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Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
US NRC
Background

• The Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (NEIMA; Public Law 115-439) requires NRC to establish a technology inclusive regulatory framework for fusion energy systems by December 31, 2027
  o Definition of advanced reactor includes “fusion reactor”

  o Three options
    o Proposed rulemaking would be limited in scope to include definitions, content-of-application requirements, and other targeted augmentations
Commercial power reactors, research and test reactors and new reactor designs

Radioactive materials for medical, industrial and academic use

Transportation, storage and disposal of nuclear material and waste, and decommissioning of nuclear facilities

Physical security, source security and cyber security

Nuclear Reactors

Radioactive Waste

Nuclear Security

Nuclear Materials
Information on Agreement State Program: https://www.nrc.gov/agreement-states.html

Note: Data are current as of February 2023. For the most recent information, go to the Agreement State page at https://www.nrc.gov/agreement-states.html. In February 2023, the State of West Virginia submitted a letter of intent to the NRC to become an agreement state.

Source: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission - As of February 2023
Commission Direction
for Fusion Energy Systems

On April 13, 2023, the Commission issued SRM-SECY-23-0001 “Options for Licensing and Regulating Fusion Energy Systems” (ML23103A449) directing the staff to implement a byproduct material approach to fusion energy system regulation (Option 2)

Byproduct Material Framework

NUREG-1556 Guidance

10 CFR Part 30 - Rules of General Applicability To Domestic Licensing of Byproduct Material

NUREG-1556, “Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses”
Specific Considerations from the SRM

• Scope limited to currently known fusion energy system designs
• The staff should consider existing fusion energy systems already licensed or under review by Agreement States
• The staff should evaluate whether controls-by-design approaches, export controls, or other controls are necessary for near-term fusion energy systems
• If a design presents hazards sufficiently beyond near-term technologies, staff should notify the Commission and make recommendations for appropriate action
NRC Rulemaking Process
NRC Rulemaking Process

WE ARE HERE

Staff develops the draft proposed rule
- Stakeholder input
- Cost and benefits analysis
- Environmental analysis

Commission review and approval of the draft proposed rule
- Commission issues staff requirements memorandum
- Staff resolves Commission comments

Public involvement/stakeholder input
- Advance notice of proposed rulemaking
- Regulatory basis
- Preliminary proposed rule language
- Public meeting

Rulemaking triggers
- Congress/Executive order
- Commission/EDO direction
- Staff-identified need
- Petition for rulemaking

PRE-rulemaking

Pre-

U.S. NRC
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Protecting People and the Environment
SCOPE OF FUSION RULEMAKING ACTIVITIES

Rulemaking:

- Based on 11e.(3) definition in AEA of byproduct material
  - Radioactive material for research, commercial or medical purposes
  - Accelerator-produced

- Limited-scope rulemaking in 10 CFR Part 30 to cover only near-term, known fusion energy system designs:
  - Definitions
  - Content-of-application requirements specific to fusion - Use standard Part 30 processes where applicable
  - Other fusion-specific requirements, as needed, to address specialized topics
  - Compatibility determinations part of rulemaking process
SCOPE OF FUSION RULEMAKING ACTIVITIES

Licensing Guidance:
- New NUREG-1556 licensing volume
  o Well established structure
- Focus on topics that distinguish fusion from other uses of radioactive materials
- Address range of fusion technologies – technology inclusive
- Use standard content from guidance documents to the extent possible
  o NRC, State, and DOE
  o No other licensing guidance development anticipated

Other Related Activities (Non-Rulemaking):
- Technology-specific implementation advice
- Inspection guidance
- Training for NRC and Agreement State staff
Licensing with NUREG-1556 Guidance Documents

• Wide range of materials uses under Part 30 - regulations would be complex and burdensome to maintain without licensing guidance documents

• Provides specific instructions to applicants and reviewers on what requirements are expected to be addressed in an application and information to be provided for a radioactive material license

• Applicant/Licensee submittals to regulatory agency based on licensing guidance documents can be used as legally binding requirements (LBRs) when incorporated into license as a tie-down condition
  o LBRs can be enforced the same as regulations
  o Provides the licensee flexibility
Fusion-Specific Issues

• Radioactive material inventory challenges due to activation products and tritium production
  o Possession Limits
  o Financial Assurance
  o Potential offsite consequences
• Facility design requirements and shielding
• Tritium form and dosimetry
• Tritium handling systems
• Security
• Offsite emergency preparedness evaluation
• Environmental review
Fusion Rulemaking Activities Since the SRM...

• Program and Technical Lead shifted to NMSS
• Proposed rulemaking efforts underway
  • Identified NRC and Agreement State staff
  • Developing outreach schedule
  • Started work on specific topics
• Start of public meetings and engagement with stakeholders
• Commission receives proposed rule and draft guidance by Fall 2024
NRC Outreach

Leverage Existing Communication Avenues
- State-Tribal Communication letters
- Government-to-Government meetings
- Public Meetings
- User Group(s)

Build Capabilities and Knowledge
- Workshops
- Seminars
- Training
- Staff rotations/details

Engagement Timeframe
- Start of official rulemaking
- Middle of draft development (before concurrence)
- After publication of proposed rule (during public comment period)
  Additional meetings as needed

Leverage Existing Regulatory Experience
- Agreement States
- DOE
- ARPA-E
- SDOs (ASME, ANS)
- International
- Staff rotations/details

Diverse Stakeholder Engagement
- Agreement States
- Tribal Nations
- Federal Agencies
- Fusion Industry
- Professional Associations
- Utilities
- Universities
- International community
- Non-Government Organizations
Radiological Hazards
- Potential Accident Scenarios
- Activation Products
- Neutrons

Fusion Reactions (Fuel)
- Deuterium – Tritium (DT)
- Proton – Boron 11
- Deuterium – Helium 3

Fusion Technologies
- Magnetic
- Inertial
- Magneto-Inertial

Design Elements
- Shielding
- Systems
- Access Control, etc.

Programmatic Elements
- Radiation Protection
- Security & Emergency Preparedness
- Waste Management
- Control & Accountability, etc.

Challenge – Diversity of Designs and Hazards under One Framework
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Inquiry to Develop Fusion-Specific Standards to Regulate Radioactive Waste of Fusion Energy System

Laila El-Guebaly
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Consultant to CATF

Sehila Gonzalez and Joe Chaisson
Clean Air Task Force
(https://www.catf.us)

NRC Virtual Public Meeting:
Commencing of NRC Rulemaking for Fusion Energy System

July 12, 2023
Fusion Generates Large Amount of Mildly Radioactive Materials That Needs Serious Effort to Manage

What to do with the sizable fusion waste?
We recommend returning all radioactive materials (mainly steels and concrete) to nuclear and public industries through recycling and clearance.

For more details, refer to:

Presented at June 7, 2022
NRC Virtual Public Meeting:
Developing Options for a Regulatory Framework for Fusion Energy System. Available at: https://uwmadison.box.com/s/b5l4y36gj2gi2ukmu7wtojstjhhe3x1a
To recap...
Fusion Generates Low-Level Waste, but in Large Quantity Compared to Fission

**Fusion experts** (in U.S., Japan, Europe, China, and RF) have been addressing fusion environmental concerns for decades.

Actual volume of fusion power components in ITER, JA, EU, China, and US ARIES designs; not compacted, no replacements; no plasma chamber; no cryostat/bioshield. EU-DEMO values are only preliminary and will be refined in the next phase of the design.
Radioactivity Level Varies Widely with Fusion Designs

**High Radioactivity** (Power Plant):
- High radwaste inventory
- High fusion power (2-3 GW)
- High NWL ($\geq 1$ MW/m²)
- High availability (85%)
- > 50 y lifetime
- High n fluence ($\geq 20$ MWy/m²)

**Low Radioactivity** (ITER):
- Relatively low radwaste inventory
- 500 MW fusion power
- Low NWL (0.5 MW/m²)
- 20 y lifetime
- Low availability
- Low n fluence (0.3 MWy/m²)

This leads to RWM* challenges that require serious effort to manage radwaste.

Building eight 1-GWe fusion plants annually, fleet of 1,000 D-T fusion power plants could provide ~10% of world electricity demand by ~2200.

Resources will Eventually be Limited


* Radioactive waste (radwaste) management
Fusion Offers Advantages Over Most Other Energy Types

**Fusion advantages:**

- Not weather dependent (like solar and wind)
- Large amounts of 24/7 energy in small land footprints
- No long-lived byproducts
- Low radiotoxicity* compared to fission.

However, environmental concerns could influence public acceptance to fusion energy, if remains unaddressed.

* The radiotoxicity is calculated by multiplying a dose factor by the ingested activity. The dose factor varies in large proportions; from 1 in the case of beta low energy emitters, such as tritium, to 10,000 in the case of alpha emitters, such as plutonium and uranium isotopes.

What we Suggest

• **Focus on:**
  – Minimizing the waste by clever design
  – Limiting radwaste requiring disposal
  – Emphasizing recycling and clearance to minimize waste requiring disposal
  – Develop fusion-specific disposal class and regulations for remaining fusion radwaste after recycling.

• **Why?**
  – Fusion generates large quantity of LLW (mostly steel and concrete)
  – Limited capacity of existing LLW repositories
  – Political difficulty of building new repositories (for both LLW and HLW)
  – Stricter regulations and tighter environmental controls
  – Uncertain geological conditions over long time
  – Minimize radwaste burden for future generations
  – **Reclaim resources** by recycling and clearance
  – Promote fusion as energy source with minimal environmental impact
  – **Gain public acceptance for GREEN fusion** (The fusion design stages, commercialization procedures, and use of processes and products that minimize pollution, promote sustainability, and protect the environment and human health without sacrificing economic viability and efficiency)
  – **Support decommissioning goal of U.S., IAEA and international nuclear programs in 21st century.**

Main goal of following organizations is to **minimize waste volumes, recycle, and clear as much of materials as practical.**

**Reasons:**

- **Reclaim the use of metal resources** (through less mining of materials, and maintaining a sustainable environment)
- **Reduce volume of waste requiring disposal** (free ample space in repositories, and save millions of dollars for high disposal cost).

- **ARIES** national project for GW-power plant designs.
- **NAS** 2013 report for Inertial Fusion Energy.
- **IAEA** 2019 Workshop on Novel Trends in Decommissioning.
- **UK** Atomic Energy Authority on Safety Aspects for Fusion Power Plants.
- **JET** fusion experiment at UK.
- **EU** Fusion DEMO (under development).
- **Japan** Fusion DEMO (under development).
- **China** CFETR design (under development).
Applications of Recycling/Clearance to Fusion Power Plants

(Typical Fusion Radial Build – ARIES-ACT2)

- Recycle power core materials and return back to nuclear industry
- Clear slightly radioactive materials and release to commercial market

Recyclable 35% of radioactive inventory
Clearable 65% of radioactive inventory

Mostly Steel
Mostly Concrete
Beside Steel and Concrete, Fusion Employs Other Structural and Functional Materials

**Structural Materials:**
- Steel alloys
- Tungsten alloys
- Vanadium alloys
- Copper alloys
- SiC/SiC composites

**Recyclable Functional Materials:**
- Liquid metal breeders
- Ceramic breeders
- Molten salt breeders
- Neutron multipliers (Be and Pb)

**Others:**
- Magnets (largest inventory in FPC)
- Bioshield (largest inventory of entire plant, but its concrete is clearable).
Recycling & Clearance Flow Diagram for Fusion Decommissioning

Original Components
1 or 2 Sets of Replaceable Components

Final Inspection and Testing

Permanent Components @ End of Life

Replaceable Components

Component Fabrication and Assembly

Fresh Supply (if needed)

Recycling Facility

Nuclear Industry

Remaining waste after recycling: LLW and GTCC waste

Free Release to Commercial Market

Detritiation System

Materials Segregation

CI > 1

Clearable Materials (CI < 1)

Temporary Storage

Ore Mines & Mills

During Operation

After Decommissioning
Recognizing the relatively early stages of commercial fusion maturity, lessons learned, worldwide knowledge and recycling/clearance experiences from other nuclear and non-nuclear fields are invaluable resources for fusion.

During decades-long fusion efforts, designers faced problems evaluating designs due to lack of fusion-specific regulations.
Inquiries:

1. Expand the list of radioisotopes that define Class A and Class C waste categories in 10CFR61 (and for newly developed GTCC) to include all radionuclides of importance to fusion.

2. Expand the list of clearable radioisotopes in 2003 NRC clearance standards to cover fusion-relevant alloys and functional materials.
First Inquiry

Expand the list of radioisotopes that define Class A and Class C waste categories in 10CFR61 (and for newly developed GTCC) to include all radionuclides of importance to fusion

• Remaining waste after recycling will require land-based disposal as Class A or Class C low-level waste, and/or GTCC waste.

• The most recent “NRC plans on possible changes to GTCC, low-level waste regulation” is of interest.

• Fusion community should be engaged in such RWM effort to outline problems that we faced when applying current 10CFR61 disposal limits to fusion.
NRC Classifications of Radwaste

- **Radwaste sources:** nuclear industries, utilities (from 104 US commercial fission reactors), university research laboratories, manufacturing and food irradiation facilities, hospitals, healthcare companies, and Department of Energy (DOE) facilities.
- **NRC 10CFR61 document** has specific disposal requirement for each type of waste so that LLW and HLW are disposed of properly and safely.
- There are several types of radioactive waste defined by NRC:
  - **HLW** is defined as spent nuclear fission fuel and any reprocessing liquids or residues. It is typically very radioactive and can have high heat generation and requires robust shielding (i.e., such as deep geologic storage) to provide for safety. This HLW class applies only to the fission-fusion hybrid concept. This system meets the definition of a Utilization Facility.
  - **LLW** can be safely disposed of in a near-surface repository. It is classified into three classes:
    - **Class A** is the least hazardous type of waste. Waste trenches placed 5-8 m below ground surface.
    - **Class B** is more radioactive than Class A
    - **Class C** waste must meet more rigorous requirements. Intrusion barrier, such as thick concrete slab, is added to waste trenches placed > 8 m deep in ground.
  - **GTCC** (greater-than-class C) waste is LLW that contains radionuclide concentrations exceeding Class C limits. NRC is currently preparing the regulatory basis for disposal of GTCC waste. On May 17, 2023, the NRC had a meeting on possible changes to GTCC, low-level waste regulation – this long-awaited proposed rulemaking will cover both LLW and GTCC waste. [https://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment.html](https://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment.html)

---

Waste Disposal Rating
(Metric for Waste Classification)

NRC classifies the waste at 100 years after shutdown according to its waste disposal rating (WDR), which is the ratio of specific activity (in \( \text{Ci/m}^3 \)) to allowable limit, summed over only \(~10\) radioisotopes relevant to fusion:

- **WDR < 1** means Class C LLW (using Class C limits)
- **WDR < 0.1** means waste may qualify as Class A LLW (to be re-evaluated using Class A limits)
- LLW with **WDR > 1** means GTCC waste.
NRC Defined Specific Activity Limits for Class A and C LLW for 9/11 Elements/Radionuclides

**NRC 10CFR61 limits** for waste classification is based largely on radionuclides that are produced in fission reactors, hospitals, research laboratories, and food irradiation facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radionuclides</th>
<th>Half-life (y)</th>
<th>Class A Limits (Ci/m³)</th>
<th>Class C Limits (Ci/m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-14</td>
<td>5.7e3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-60</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7e3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni-59</td>
<td>7.5e4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni-63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7e3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr-90</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7e4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb-94</td>
<td>2e4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tc-99</td>
<td>2.13e5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-129</td>
<td>1.57e7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs-135</td>
<td>3e6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8.4e3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs-137</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6e4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excluding actinides and fission products. Assuming waste form is activated metal.

Many radionuclides of interest to fusion are not in the NRC table

**Reason:** at the time of original rulemaking in 1980s, no fusion waste was going to commercial sites.
Fusion Generates Numerous Radionuclides

>> 9/11 Elements/Radionuclides in NRC 10CFR61 Tables

@ shutdown:
56/367 elements/radioisotopes with wide range of activities and half-lives

@ 100 y after shutdown:
38/71 elements/radioisotopes with various activities and half-lives
In early 1990s, Fetter Developed Specific Activity Limits for Radionuclides of Interest to Fusion

NRC 10CFR61 provides specific activity limits for 9/11 elements/radioisotopes*


Fetter expanded list of NRC 10CFR61 radionuclides and determined specific activity limits for fusion-relevant isotopes 39/53 elements/radioisotopes*

with \( 5y < t_{1/2} < 10^{12}y \), assuming waste form is metal.


* Excluding actinides and fission products.
Commonalities and Differences between NRC and Fetter’s Limits for Class C LLW

In the absence of fusion-specific regulations, ARIES designs satisfied both NRC and Fetter's limits until NRC develops official guidelines for fusion radwaste.
To generate Class C (or better) LLW as recommended by National and International Materials Programs:

- Limit Nb impurity to < 1 wppm in F82H and EUROFER97.
- Avoid using two steels: SS316 (of ITER) and Inconel-718 (of MIT ARC design).

Questions:

- Could a component with WDR > 10,000 qualify as LLW?
- What is the upper limit for GTCC waste?
Existing NRC LLW disposal limits
(for 11 radioisotopes, excluding actinides and fission products)

**present weak basis for evaluating fusion WDR,**
calling for fusion-specific limits that cover all radionuclides encountered in fusion
(> 70 radioisotopes for steel at 100 y after shutdown).

Class A and C disposal limits will need to be expanded considerably to include all radionuclides of importance to all fusion devices that employ different materials and vary greatly in power production level, ranging from 100s of MW to GW of electric power.
Second Inquiry

Expand the list of clearable radioisotopes in 2003 NRC clearance standards to cover fusion-relevant alloys and functional materials

• Clearance fusion campaign could develop clearance standards/guidelines beyond fission*/accelerator fields.
• Expand the list of clearable radioisotopes to cover fusion-relevant alloys and functional materials.
• Options for consideration:
  – NRC could generate clearance limits for individual alloys employed by fusion designs, or
  – Provide a single list of clearance limits for all radioisotopes generated by fusion designs (> 300).

Main Concerns

- The 2003 NRC Clearance document* provides limits for 115 radioisotopes for 3 alloys and concrete:
  - Steel alloy
  - Copper alloy
  - Aluminum alloy
  - Concrete.

- Only 77 radioisotopes (out of 115) are fusion-relevant.

- Many fusion alloys and functional materials cannot be examined with 2003 NRC clearance standards. Examples include:
  - Vanadium alloys
  - SiC/SiC composites
  - Tungsten alloys
  - Tritium breeders
  - Be and Pb neutron multipliers
  - Conductors
  - Electric insulators
  - Thermal insulators
  - Others.

- Large discrepancies exist between NRC* & IAEA# clearance standards.

- Many radioisotopes are missing from ALL clearance evaluations (such as $^{10}$Be, $^{26}$Al, $^{32}$Si, $^{91,92}$Nb, $^{98}$Tc, $^{113m}$Cd, $^{121m}$Sn, $^{150}$Eu, $^{157,158}$Tb, $^{163,166m}$Ho, $^{178m}$Hf, $^{186m,187}$Re, $^{193}$Pt, $^{208,210m,212}$Bi, and $^{209}$Po).

- Lack of fusion-specific clearance limits introduces uncertainties in clearance index prediction for fusion materials.


Discrepancies Between NRC & IAEA Clearance Standards

Such discrepancies impact:
- CI evaluation of components
- Storage period.
Fusion-specific standards are required to build confidence in fusion radwaste classification and clearance of slightly activated materials

Recent publications:
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Andrew Holland
Chief Executive Officer
Fusion Industry Association
The FIA: Building the Global Fusion Energy Industry

FIA Mission

The Fusion Industry Association is the voice of the growing fusion industry. It is a membership organization that supports efforts to accelerate commercial fusion energy through advocacy and education.

The FIA is an IRS-registered 501(c)6 Membership Association. Its members are the investor-backed fusion developers, and its affiliate members are the companies and organizations that will build the global fusion energy economy.

The FIA’s goals are to accelerate commercially viable fusion energy by advocating for policies, partnerships, regulations, and industry incentives that support our member companies as they develop commercial fusion power.
The Private Fusion Industry Today

- 43 verified private fusion companies
- $6.2 billion in investment
- 13 new fusion companies
- Increasing optimism on timescales
- Growing interest from governments in Public Private Partnerships
- Growing geographical diversity
- But – many challenges remain
FIA Membership

Commonwealth Fusion Systems
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The Commission’s decision was clear

• The 5-0 vote by the Commissioners to initiate a rulemaking under the byproduct materials regulatory regime (10 CFR Part 30), and separate the regulatory oversight of fusion from the utilization facilities regime (10 CFR Parts 50 & 52) that regulate nuclear fission energy was appropriate for the technology and the risk.

• This decision will give fusion developers the regulatory certainty they need to innovate as they grow fusion energy into a viable new energy source, while also most effectively protecting the safety, security, and health of the public.
Limited Scope Rulemaking

Commission vote approving Option 2 explicitly called for a “limited-scope rulemaking” to establish a regulatory framework for fusion energy systems that augments the NRC's byproduct material framework in 10 CFR Part 30.

A limited rulemaking should not include a new fusion-specific part at this time. The Commission’s decision emphasized the need to near-term regulatory certainty.
"Possible Affected Sections of the Code"

SECY-23-0001, Enclosure 1 stated the primarily affected sections of 10 C.F.R. could be the following:

- 30.4, “Definitions”
- 30.32, “Application for specific licenses”
- 30.33, “General requirements for issuance of specific licenses”
- 30.34, “Terms and conditions of licenses”

FIA agrees that 30.4 should be updated to include new definitions.

However, it is unclear why §§ 30.32-.34 need updating. These sections are generic and already apply to a wide range of facilities.

A Limited Scope Rulemaking should remain solely focused on § 30.4 definitions for Fusion Energy Systems and particle accelerators.
Specific definitions NRC identifies to address

SECY-23-0001, Enclosure 1 proposed the following definitions for rulemaking:

- Define “Fusion”

- Define “Fusion Energy System”

- Update the definition of “Particle Accelerator”
FIA Principles for Definitions

• Define “Fusion”
  • Fusion is widely understood and a scientific concept. There is no need for a separate definition for fusion. (NRC regulations do not contain a definition for “fission”)

• Define “Fusion Energy System”
  • The NRC has requested a definition of a “fusion energy system” but “system” could be defined too broadly to include auxiliary and subsystems that are separate from the fusion reaction or are not affected by byproduct materials

• Define “Fusion Energy Machine”
  • The definition should be limited to those systems that directly use byproduct materials for fusion, and should invoke the commercial purpose of the system, because fusion research facilities are already regulated.

• Update the definition of “Particle Accelerator”
  • A definition of a “fusion energy machine” should acknowledge that they are particle accelerators. Although it is therefore not necessary for the NRC to also change the definition of particle accelerator to include fusion, it would add completeness.
Particle Accelerator

“Particle accelerator means any machine capable of accelerating electrons, protons, deuterons, or other charged particles in a vacuum and of discharging the resultant particulate or other radiation into a medium at energies usually in excess of 1 megaelectron volt, including fusion energy machines. For purposes of this definition, accelerator is an equivalent term.”

RED = proposed amendment

*10 C.F.R. § 30.4
SRM: “The staff should evaluate whether controls-by-design approaches, export controls, or other controls are necessary for near-term fusion energy systems.”
Export Controls

“Nuclear fusion reactors per se” are exempt from NRC Export Controls (10 CFR 810.2(c)(4))

Supporting systems involving hydrogen isotope separation technologies already fall under NRC Export Controls. Tritium is also export controlled.

The Department of Commerce Bureau of Industry and Security has jurisdiction and has reviewed fusion energy systems and subsystems for dual use export controls.

A “limited rulemaking” on export controls should recognize that NRC controls are for Nuclear Suppliers Group Trigger List items, for which fusion is not included.*

*(43 Fed. Reg. 21,641, and 21,642)
SRM directs staff to “develop a new volume of NUREG-1556, ‘Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses,’ dedicated to fusion energy systems, so as to provide consistent guidance across the National Materials Program.”

Currently, to the extent that fusion energy machines use or create byproduct materials and therefore fall under NRC jurisdiction, licensing is guided by NUREG-1556, Vol 21, “Program-Specific Guidance About Possession Licenses for Production of Radioactive Material Using an Accelerator.”

FIA supports the creation of a new fusion-specific volume.

FIA proposes to develop guidance which could be endorsed by the NRC.

FIA will engage with other stakeholders to solicit feedback as guidance is developed.
Thank you

• FIA thanks NRC staff for their dedicated engagement over more than 3 years leading to today’s meeting

• FIA looks forward to continuing productive engagement
Introduction to Helion

Rulemaking for Fusion Energy Systems

Sachin Desai
General Counsel
July 12, 2023
About Helion

- Fusion power company founded in 2013
- Based in Everett, WA
- 170+ team members
- First private company to reach 100 M°C
- Raised a total of $570M
Helion’s technology: How it works

1. Formation
Deuterium and helium-3 are heated to plasma conditions and confined in an FRC.

2. Acceleration
Magnets accelerate the FRCs until they collide in the center of the device.

3. Compression
The merged plasma is compressed by a magnetic field to fusion conditions.

4. Energy recovery
The plasma expands and releases energy, which is directly recaptured as electricity.
More About Helion

- See the video about Helion in Real Engineering

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_bDXXWQxy66
Polaris: Helion’s 7th fusion prototype

- Machine is currently under construction
- Expected completion: Early 2024
- Regulated by the WA Department of Health
- Goal: Demonstrate electricity from fusion
Ongoing progress: Preparing Polaris

Optimizing fuel injection technology

Scaling in-house capacitor manufacturing

Installing our 7th fusion prototype, Polaris
Commercial system: 50 MW

- Fits in 30,000 sq. ft. building
- Borated concrete and BPE shielding
- No secondary steam cycle

- First customer: Microsoft with power marketing support from Constellation
NRC Rulemaking Considerations

• **How can we continue strong and open engagement?**
  – Workshops on key topics
    – *Definitions*
    – *Key technical areas (see also March 2022 presentations)*
    – *Export controls (see also June 2022 presentations & Helion August 2022 letter)*
  – Public meetings
  – Site tours

• **How can fusion developers assist?**
  – Technology overviews
  – Supporting on guidance
Building the world’s first fusion power plant, enabling a future with unlimited clean electricity.
Construction of SPARC and magnet factory in Devens, MA
10 CFR 30 is an effective pathway for regulating fusion

- CFS supports the unanimous vote by the NRC Commission to regulate fusion energy under a byproduct materials approach (10 CFR 30) which will provide appropriate protection for the environment as well as public health and safety.

- This pathway provides the necessary regulatory certainty to fusion companies to continue developing their next generation facilities towards the goal of putting fusion electricity on the grid by the early 2030s.

- CFS looks forward to engaging with all stakeholders to support NRC’s limited-scope rulemaking effort to establish regulatory treatment for fusion energy in 10 CFR 30 as well as provide regulatory guidance for the preparation of a license application.
Limited Rulemaking Proposal

• In SECY-23-0001, Enclosure 1 “Rulemaking Plan” references several potential parts of 10 CFR that could be modified in this rulemaking including:
  • Part 30, “Rules of General Applicability to Domestic Licensing of Byproduct Material”
    • 30.4, “Definitions”
    • 30.32, “Application for specific licenses”
    • 30.33, “General requirements for issuance of specific licenses”
    • 30.34, “Terms and conditions of licenses”
  • Part 51, “Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions”

• In line with the Commission’s desire for a limited rulemaking and previous CFS submissions to the NRC\(^1\), we believe that **minor updates to the definitions in 10 CFR 30.4 are the only changes to the CFR necessary to implement the mandate of the SRM.**

\(^1\) Ellis, T. (August 16, 2022). Letter from Commonwealth Fusion Systems to NRC Chairman Christopher Hanson. ML22230D055
In principle, a new definition for “Fusion Energy Machine” should include these aspects:

- It is a type of particle accelerator,
- It is capable of transforming atomic nuclei via fusion processes into other elements, and
- It directly captures and uses the resultant products, including particles, heat, or other electromagnetic radiation, for a commercial or industrial purpose.

This approach is technology inclusive for all proposed fusion design concepts and fuel cycles.

“Fusion Energy Machine” is used instead of “Fusion Energy System” because it appropriately focuses on the portions of the plant impacted by byproduct materials, rather than encompassing the entire plant which contains systems that have no impact on radiological public health and safety while avoiding an overbroad change that could create unintended impacts on the segments of the materials licensing framework.
Second proposed update to 10 CFR 30.4

• Edit the current definition of particle accelerator to include the bolded text:

  [Particle accelerator – means any machine capable of accelerating electrons, protons, deuterons, or other charged particle in a vacuum and of discharging the resultant particulate or other radiation into a medium at energies usually in excess of 1 megaelectron volt, including fusion energy machines. For purposes of this definition, accelerator is an equivalent term.]

• The first update could be the only one since it does establish “Fusion Energy Machines” as particle accelerators, but the second update does strengthen this point.

• CFS does not think it is necessary to define “fusion” as the concept is widely understood, and “fission” is not similarly defined in 10 CFR 50.2.
In the Staff Requirements Memo on SECY-23-0001 it states:

“The staff should develop a new volume of NUREG-1556, “Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses,” dedicated to fusion energy systems, so as to provide consistent guidance across the National Materials Program.”

CFS agrees with this pathway and NUREG-1556 Volume 21 provides a solid basis for the development of this new fusion specific volume.¹

CFS is ready to work with the FIA on developing a draft volume for the NRC to consider.

¹ Ellis, T. (August 16, 2022). Letter from Commonwealth Fusion Systems to NRC Chairman Christopher Hanson. ML22230D055
Following extensive conversations with NRC and Agreement state partners, NUREG-1556 Volume 21 is currently being used as guidance for the preparation of the SPARC materials license application and it has been effective so far.

Given our existing work assembling the SPARC license application and the similarity of subsystems between SPARC and ARC, we believe that volume 21 guidance should be largely applicable for all future fusion energy machines.

CFS looks forward to sharing lessons learned through the SPARC licensing process to inform the development of this new volume for fusion.
Export Controls

In the Staff Requirements Memo on SECY-23-0001 it states:

“The staff should evaluate whether controls-by-design approaches, export controls, or other controls are necessary for near-term fusion energy systems.”

As per 10 CFR 810.2(c)(4), export controls do not apply to “Nuclear fusion reactors per se, except for supporting systems involving hydrogen isotope separation technologies...”.

NRC export controls are focused on the Nuclear Suppliers Group Trigger List which does not include fusion energy systems.

Export controls already exist for both the tritium material itself and associated handling systems, so additional export controls are not needed.
Summary

• Minor modifications to 10 CFR 30.4, adding a definition of "fusion energy machine" and updating the current definition of "particle accelerator," are fully consistent with the Commission's direction to implement a limited rulemaking to bring fusion energy machines into the Part 30 framework more explicitly.

• For writing fusion specific regulatory guidance, NUREG-1556 Volume 21 provides a solid basis and CFS looks forward to working with all stakeholders to support NRC’s efforts to develop a new volume of NUREG-1556, including sharing our recent experience in licensing SPARC.

• Sufficient export controls already exist for fusion and new regulations are not needed.
The fastest path to limitless, clean energy
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</tr>
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</tr>
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Questions & Feedback

Please Note: the NRC is not accepting official comments during this meeting and will not provide any official responses to any feedback provided during this meeting.
Thank You!

Contacts
- Dennis Andrukat
  Rulemaking Project Manager
  Dennis.Andrukat@nrc.gov
- Duncan White
  Technical Lead
  Duncan.White@nrc.gov

Public Information
- NRC Public Website:
  https://www.nrc.gov/materials/fusion-energy-systems.html
- Docket ID: NRC-2023-0071 (www.regulations.gov)
Fission vs. Fusion

Fission

\[ ^{235}\text{U} \rightarrow ^{236}\text{U} \rightarrow \text{Fission} \]

Fusion

\[ \text{D} + \text{T} \rightarrow \text{He} + \text{Neutron} + \text{Energy} \]
Radioactive Material Considerations

The neutronicity of the fuel is the fraction of the fusion reaction energy that is contained in the neutrons. It has important implications for fusion reactor designs. Less neutrons mean less radiation damage and activation products. Fuels with a small neutronicity are referred to as aneutronic fusion. The downside of less neutrons is that you need to develop a direct power conversion system instead of just running a thermal cycle from a neutron heated blanket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fuel</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>$E_{\text{fus}}$ [MeV]</th>
<th>$E_{\text{ch}}$ [MeV]</th>
<th>neutronicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^2\text{H}^3\text{T}^*$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2\text{D}^2\text{D}^*$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2\text{D}^2\text{He}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>≈0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^5\text{B}^7\text{B}^+$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>≈0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*reaction results in radioactive material

Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_fusion
Path to Fusion

To initiate a fusion reaction, you must confine the energy long enough in a fuel that is dense enough at a temperature that is high enough. The relationship that quantifies this is called the Lawson criterion.

Sources:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lawson_criterion
Fusion Approaches

**Magnetic Confinement Fusion (steady state)**
- Creates “magnetic bottles” to confine the plasma using the Lorentz force.
- Low density and long energy confinement times.
- External heating, fueling, and current drive to sustain the plasma.

**Magneto-Inertial Confinement (pulsed)**
- Forms a magnetically confined plasma and then heats it using magnetic or conducting shell compression.
- Medium density and medium energy confinement times.

**Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) (pulsed)**
- Uses directed energy in the form of lasers, particle beams or projectiles to heat and compress a plasma to high densities and temperatures.
- Very high density and short energy confinement times.
Magnetic Confinement Concepts

Tokamak

Field Reversed Configuration (FRC)

Spheromak

Stellarator

Axial-field bias coils

Flux Conserver

Spheromak plasma with magnetic field lines
Magneto-Inertial Confinement

**Magnetic Compression**

1. Deuterium fuel extracted from water and helium from the engine’s exhaust is injected and heated until it becomes a plasma.

2. A strong magnetic field compresses the merged plasma to fusion pressure and temperature, over 100 million degrees.

3. At high temperature the deuterium and helium nuclei fuse, releasing charged particles that push back on the compressing magnetic field.

The resulting electricity is sent to the grid for safe, baseload power. The Fusion Engine produces 8 times as much energy as what’s put in, and at a 50-megawatt scale can power 40,000 homes for less than $0.06/kWh.

**Liquid Wall Compression**

Pulsed magnetic fields accelerate the plasma into the burn chamber at over 1 million mph.
Inertial Confinement

Laser Driver

Projectile Driver