

Interaction of U.S. Social, Technological, and Nuclear Regulatory History

By Brian K. Grimes

Prepared for Argonne/IAEA
Research Reactor Workshop
September 2004

Sequence of Presentations

- History of U.S. regulatory process in the context of social and technological development
- Desirable attributes of the regulatory process as applied to research reactors
- Standard Format and Content for the Safety Analysis Report for research reactors
- Standard Review Plan for research reactors
- Inspection and Enforcement
- Selected Topics

The Changing Context of US Nuclear Regulation

- Presentation originally developed for power reactor audience
- The same social and technological factors have affected U.S. research reactors
- How both research and power reactors are regulated is affected by the dynamic of social inputs, industry initiatives, and regulatory body concerns

USNRC Mission

- Adequate protection of public health and safety
- Promote common defense and security
- Protect the environment
- (Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended)
- Implemented by regulations, decisions and practices

Evolution of U.S. Reactor Regulatory Oversight

- Social context has changed
 - ◆ Culture
 - ◆ Economic
- Industry has changed
- USAEC/NRC oversight has changed

Oversight - 1950s

- Industry
 - ◆ AEC power and research reactor prototypes
- Social
 - ◆ Technology optimism
 - ◆ Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Congressional Oversight
- USAEC Oversight
 - ◆ Internal to AEC
 - ◆ Little independent technical oversight
 - ◆ Effluent limits

Oversight - Early 1960s

- Industry
 - ◆ First commercial reactors
 - ◆ Heavy NSSS vendor involvement
 - ◆ Little owner expertise
 - ◆ University research reactors
- Social
 - ◆ Public neutral
 - ◆ Economic regulation by States
- USAEC Oversight
 - ◆ Separate regulatory staff within AEC
 - ◆ Regulations
 - ◆ Siting Criteria
 - ◆ Design Basis Accidents
 - ◆ Issues resolved on successive CP reviews

Oversight - Late 1960s, Early 1970s

■ Industry

- ◆ Large number of reactors ordered
- ◆ Higher power
- ◆ Large number of NSSS/A&E/Owner combinations

■ Social

- ◆ Distrust of Government and large business
- ◆ Environmental concerns

■ USAEC Oversight

- ◆ Stronger technical staff
- ◆ General Design Criteria, T.S.
- ◆ Industry Standards
- ◆ NRC Guides, Standard Review Plans
- ◆ ECCS, QA rules
- ◆ Inspections begun

Oversight - Late 1970s

■ Industry

- ◆ Electrical demand slows after oil crisis
- ◆ Reactor orders cancelled
- ◆ Some instances of poor quality/construction
- ◆ 75 Power Units Operating by 1979
- ◆ About 80 research reactors
- ◆ TMI accident

■ Social

- ◆ Breakup of JCAE
- ◆ Fear of nuclear

■ USNRC Oversight

- ◆ NRC separated from AEC in 1975
- ◆ Fire Protection, Equipment Qualification regulations
- ◆ Compliance inspections
- ◆ Cost/Benefits considered for improvements
- ◆ PRA studies

Oversight - Early 1980s

■ Industry

- ◆ Additional reactors, started before TMI, completed
- ◆ More reactors cancelled
- ◆ INPO formed
- ◆ Industry event experience
- ◆ Site-specific simulators
- ◆ Decline in Research Reactors and NE programs

■ Social

- ◆ Public hearing intervention intensifies
- ◆ Anti-nuclear globalization

■ USNRC Oversight

- ◆ TMI Orders issued
- ◆ Emergency Preparedness rules and exercises
- ◆ Human Factors emphasized
- ◆ Performance based engineering inspections in response to design problems

Oversight - Late 1980s, Early 1990s

■ Industry

- ◆ More reactors under construction completed
- ◆ 112 Power Units in 1992
- ◆ Performance shutdowns
- ◆ Some improve capacity factors

■ Social

- ◆ Economic deregulation starts - disincentive for large capital investment
- ◆ Reaction to Chernobyl

■ USNRC Oversight

- ◆ Performance concept extended to all aspects of inspection program
- ◆ U.S. industry shifted audit focus to areas NRC was inspecting
- ◆ Safety conscious environment emphasized
- ◆ Risk significance emphasized, some testing requirements relaxed

Oversight - Late 1990s

■ Industry

- ◆ Millstone problem
- ◆ Improved performance in rest of industry
- ◆ Deregulation of electricity industry results in mergers
- ◆ Some reactors decommissioned
- ◆ Requests to recognize better performance

■ Social

- ◆ Concerns shift to waste disposal
- ◆ CO2 concerns favor nuclear
- ◆ University NE programs decline

■ USNRC Oversight

- ◆ Emphasis on FSAR accuracy and design bases
- ◆ Effectiveness initiatives
 - ◆ Digital I&C
 - ◆ License renewal
- ◆ Performance Indicators used in pilot plant inspections

Oversight - early 2000s

■ Industry

- ◆ Investment in security upgrades
- ◆ Continued high performance
- ◆ Davis Besse, grid events
- ◆ Discussion of new plants

■ Social

- ◆ 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks
- ◆ Nuclear power more accepted as an important energy source

■ USNRC Oversight

- ◆ Emphasis on security
- ◆ Focus on control of materials
- ◆ Discussion of worst-case scenarios
- ◆ Integration of response with defense forces
- ◆ Introduction of realism in consequence projections

Reasons for Improvement?

- Maturing industry
- No major additional NRC rules
- INPO
- Competition
- NRC and industry use of performance based inspections, audits and self-evaluations

Current USNRC Regulatory Approach

- Defense in Depth
- Licensee responsibility for safety
- Safety-conscious environment (safety culture)
- Regulatory Effectiveness
- Accountability to the public
 - ◆ Citizens
 - ◆ Congress
 - ◆ Industry
 - ◆ Interest groups

What is the Goal?

- NRC/Industry Relationship
 - ◆ Industry self-regulation
 - ◆ NRC oversight to assure that self-regulation is working
- Develop understanding of how social (culture and economic) context interacts

Summary

- Regulatory approaches used have varied with the activity regulated (design, construction, operation), with the social context, with NRC expertise, and with industry performance
- The impetus for changes of approach has come from the dynamic of social inputs, industry initiatives, and NRC concerns