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. U.S. wants to develop a supply chain of HALEU
    2. HALEU has broad uses outside of reactors [1]
    3. Benefits of using HALEU in reactors
      a. higher burnups
      b. reduced LCOE
    4. 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 neutronics
      a. neutron flux
      b. k-eff
      c. β-eff
      d. feedback coefficients,
      e. lifetimes
      f. uranium utilization in general
      g. breeding ratio

II. Lit Review

  A. The nuclear fuel cycle
    1. Once-through vs recycle [2]
    2. Enrichment facility/SWU calculations [2]
    3. Recycling processes [2]
      a. overview of aqueous reprocessing
      b. Known changes to LWR fuel cycle by recycling
  B. Fuel Cycle simulators
    1. Why we use them, their benefits
    2. why multiples have been created
    3. ideal functionalities and capcbilities [3, 4]
    4. uses of fuel cycle simulators
      a. Department of Energy (DOE) Evaluation & screening [5]
        (1) Differences in EG 01 and EG 02
      b. EG29 analysis [6]
      c. verification [7]
    5. CYCLUS [8]

a. basic fundamentals
b. Cycamore [9]
c. addresses many of the things brought up by [3]
d. comparison to other codes [10]
e. verification [11]

6. sensitivity analysis

C. Reactors with HALEU

1. fuel forms (ceramic vs metallic vs TRISO)
2. Effects of changing from 5% to 7% for PWR [12]
   a. no effects on reactivity coefficients
   b. more mining and enrichment per energy unit generated
   c. reduced energy normalized quantity of waste
   d. slight decrease in radioactivity of waste
3. Effects on NuScale SMR [13]
   a. increases fast to thermal flux ratio
   b. more burnable poisons
   c. larger concentration of fission product poisons
4. Effects of impurities [14]

III. Transition modeling methodology

A. Reactors, inculuding serpent models

1. USNC MMR [15]
2. X-energy Xe-100 [16]
3. NuScale VOYGR [**?**, 17]

B. material flow in fuel cycles

1. Once-through
   a. once-through flow figure
   b. scenario definitions
2. recycle
   a. recycle-flow figure
   b. scenario definitions

IV. Material requirements – Once through fuel cycles

A. Results

1. Scenario 1 – current fleet
   a. reactor deployment – compare to actual data??
   b. uranium resources
   c. SWU capacity
   d. Waste
2. Reactor deployment
   a. No growth scenarios
   b. 1% growth scenarios
3. Uranium resources
   a. No growth scenarios
   b. 1% growth scenarios
4. SWU capacity

a. No growth scenarios
b. 1% growth scenarios

5. Waste
   a. No growth scenarios
   b. 1% growth scenarios

V. Model fuel cycle with recycle

A. 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
4. Waste
   a. No growth scenarios
   b. 1% growth scenarios

VI. Sensitivity analysis and optimization

A. Methdology

B. Results

VII. Effects on neutronics

A. Methodology

B. Models

C. Results

VIII. Conclusions

Bibliography

[1] S. Nagley, “HA-LEU Supply (Enrichment, De-conversion, Fuel Fab & Transportation),” Apr. 2020.

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

[3] 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.

[4] 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.

[5] 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.

[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] 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.

[13] L. Carlson, J. Miller, and Z. Wu, “Implications of HALEU fuel on the design of SMRs and micro-reactors,” *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, vol. 389, p. 111648, Apr. 2022.

[14] O. S. Celikten and D. Sahin, “The Effects of Impurities in Down-Blending Highly Enriched Uranium on the Reactor Neutronics and Cycle Length,” in *Transactions of the American Nuclear Soceity Winter Meeting*, vol. 125, (Washington D.C.), pp. 165–167, Dec. 2021.

[15] 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.

[16] B. Harlan, “X-energy Xe-100 Reactor initial NRC meeting,” Sept. 2018.

[17] P. Suk, O. Chvla, G. I. Maldonado, and J. Frbort, “Simulation of a NuScale core design with the CASL VERA code,” *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, vol. 371, p. 110956, Jan. 2021.