Working title: Fuel cycle impacts of deploying High Assay Low Enriched Uranium (HALEU)-fueled reactors

I. Introduction

A. Purpose of the work: investigate the effect of deploying HALEU-fueled advanced reactors on the nuclear fuel cycle in the US

B. Scope:

1. US facilities
2. select advanced reactors: USNC MMR, X-energy Xe-100, NuScale VOYGR
3. Front-end and back-end of the fuel cycle

C. Motivations

1. Benefits of using HALEU for reactors
2. Changing the fuel form affects fuel cycle dynamics

D. Goals

1. understand how deploying HALEU reactors affects resource demand
2. understand which components of the fuel cycle are most sensitive to HALEU deployments
3. understand how implementing recycling with HALEU reactors affects the fuel cycle
4. understand how possible avenues to obtain fuel for HAELU reactors can affect reactor performance

II. Lit Review

A. The nuclear fuel cycle

1. Once-through vs recycle [1]
2. Enrichment facility/SWU calculations [1]
   a. classifications of uranium, LEU vs HEU vs HALEU
3. Recycling processes [1]
   a. overview of aqueous reprocessing
   b. Known changes to LWR fuel cycle by recycling
   c.

B. Fuel Cycle simulators

1. Why we use them, their benefits
2. why multiples have been created
3. ideal functionalities and capcbilities [2, 3]
4. uses of fuel cycle simulators
   a. Department of Energy (DOE) Evaluation & screening [4]
      (1) Differences in EG 01 and EG 02
   b. Effects of changing from 5% to 7% for PWR [5]
   c. EG29 analysis [6]
   d. verification [7]
5. sensitivity studies
6. Cyclus [8]
   a. basic fundamentals
   b. Cycamore [9]
   c. addresses many of the things brought up by [2]
   d. comparison to other codes [10]
   e. verification [11]

C. Reactors

1. USNC MMR [12]
2. X-energy Xe-100 [13]
3. NuScale VOYGR

III. Material requirements – Once through fuel cycles

A. Methodology

B. Scenario Definitions

C. Results

1. Reactor deployment
   a. No growth scenarios
   b. 1% growth scenarios
2. Uranium resources
   a. No growth scenarios
   b. 1% growth scenarios
3. SWU capacity
   a. No growth scenarios
   b. 1% growth scenarios

IV. Sensitivity analysis and optimization

A. Methodology

B. Results

V. Model fuel cycle with recycle

A. Methodology

B. Scenario Definitions

C. Results

VI. Downblending effects on neutronics

VII. Conclusions

Bibliography

[1] N. Tsoulfanidis, *The Nuclear Fuel Cycle*. La Grange Park, Illinois, USA: American Nuclear Society, 2013. 00177.

[2] K. Huff and B. Dixon, "Next Generation Fuel Cycle Simulator Functions and Requirements Document," Tech. Rep. fcrd-sysa-2010-000110, Idaho National Laboratory, July 2010.

[3] N. R. Brown, B. W. Carlsen, B. W. Dixon, B. Feng, H. R. Greenberg, R. D. Hays, S. Passerini, M. Todosow, and A. Worrall, "Identification of fuel cycle simulator functionalities for analysis of transition to a new fuel cycle," *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, vol. 96, pp. 88–95, Oct. 2016.

[4] R. Wigeland, T. Taiwo, H. Ludewig, M. Todosow, W. Halsey, J. Gehin, R. Jubin, J. Buelt, S. Stockinger, and K. Jenni, "Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation and Screening Final Report," *Final Report*, p. 51, 2014.

[5] J. R. Burns, R. Hernandez, K. A. Terrani, A. T. Nelson, and N. R. Brown, "Reactor and fuel cycle performance of light water reactor fuel with 235U enrichments above 5%," *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, vol. 142, p. 107423, July 2020. JC0008.

[6] E. Sunny, A. Worrall, J. Peterson, J. Powers, J. Gehin, and R. Gregg, "Transition Analysis of Promising U.S. Future Fuel Cycles Using ORION," p. 10, 2015.

[7] B. Feng, B. Dixon, E. Sunny, A. Cuadra, J. Jacobson, N. R. Brown, J. Powers, A. Worrall, S. Passerini, and R. Gregg, "Standardized verification of fuel cycle modeling," *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, vol. 94, pp. 300–312, Aug. 2016.

[8] K. D. Huff, M. J. Gidden, R. W. Carlsen, R. R. Flanagan, M. B. McGarry, A. C. Opotowsky, E. A. Schneider, A. M. Scopatz, and P. P. H. Wilson, "Fundamental concepts in the Cyclus nuclear fuel cycle simulation framework," *Advances in Engineering Software*, vol. 94, pp. 46–59, Apr. 2016. arXiv: 1509.03604.

[9] A. M. Scopatz, K. D. Huff, M. J. Gidden, R. W. Carlsen, R. R. Flanagan, M. B. McGarry, A. C. Opotowsky, E. A. Schneider, and P. P. Wilson, "Cyclus Archetypes," *Submitted*, 2015.

[10] D. Djokic, A. M. Scopatz, H. R. Greenberg, K. D. Huff, R. P. Nibbelink, and M. Fratoni, "The Application of CYCLUS to Fuel Cycle Transition Analysis," in *Proceedings of Global 2015*, LLNL-CONF-669315, (Paris, France), p. 5061, Sept. 2015.

[11] J. W. Bae, J. L. Peterson-Droogh, and K. D. Huff, "Standardized verification of the Cyclus fuel cycle simulator," *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, vol. 128, pp. 288–291, June 2019.

[12] M. Hussain, F. Reitsma, M. Subki, and H. Kiuchi, "Advances in Small Modular Reactor Technology Developments," a Supplement to: IAEA Advanced Reactors Information System (ARIS), Nuclear Power Technology Development Section, Division of Nuclear Power of the IAEA Department of Nuclear Energy, Vienna, Austria, Sept. 2018.

[13] B. Harlan, "X-energy Xe-100 Reactor initial NRC meeting," Sept. 2018.