

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. HALEU has broad uses outside of reactors [1]
 - 2. Benefits of using HALEU in reactors (e.g higher burnups)
 - 3. 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 HALEU reactors can affect neutronics

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 capabilities [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]
 - 3. Effects on SMRs [13]

4. Effects of impurities [14]

III. Methodology

A. Collecting information

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

B. material flow in fuel cycles

1. Once-through – once-through-flow figure
2. recycle – recycle-flow figure

C. sensitivity analysis and optimization

D. downblending/re-enriching effects

IV. Material requirements – Once through fuel cycles

A. Scenario Definitions

B. 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

V. Sensitivity analysis and optimization

A. Results

VI. Model fuel cycle with recycle

A. Scenario Definitions

B. Results

VII. Effects on neutronics

A. 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. Fraton, “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 Society 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.