

Nuclear-powered Shipping

Louis Kissinger, Brad Ellis, and Adam Pichman

Course: NPRE 458; Advisor: Magdi Ragheb

February 22, 2019

Abstract

Nuclear power was analyzed as an alternative to fossil fuel combustion for propulsion of large boats. In particular, ...

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Background and State of the Art	3
3	Conceptual Design	4
3.1	Naval concept	4
3.1.1	Oceanic tug boat	4
3.1.2	Offshore power plant and coastal tug boat	4
3.2	Reactor concept	4
3.2.1	Core concept	4
3.2.2	Neutronics analysis	4
3.2.3	Thermal analysis	6
3.2.4	Materials analysis	6
3.2.5	Alternatives	6
4	Conclusions	6
5	Acknowledgements	7

1 Introduction

Introduction

If you wanna cite Alekseev put [1]
If you wanna cite Carlton put [2]
[3]
[4]
[5]
If you wanna cite Hirdaris put [6]
If you wanna cite Jacobs put [7]
If you wanna cite Holtec put [8]

2 Background and State of the Art

Background and state of the art

3 Conceptual Design

3.1 Naval concept

3.1.1 Oceanic tug boat

3.1.2 Offshore power plant and coastal tug boat

3.2 Reactor concept

3.2.1 Core concept

3.2.2 Neutronics analysis

The following analysis determines the enrichment required to reach $k_\infty = 1$:

$$k_\infty = \eta f = 1 \quad (1)$$

$$= \nu \frac{\sigma_f^F \Sigma_a^F}{\sigma_a^F \Sigma_a} \quad (2)$$

Approximate values of these parameters are given in table 1.

Table 1: Approximate values of nuclear properties germaine to equation 2, [9]

Parameter	Value	Unit
ν	2.4	-
$\sigma_f, 235$	1.2	barns
$\sigma_a, 238$	0.1	barns

The macroscopic cross section is by definition $\Sigma = N\sigma = \frac{\rho N_{av}}{A}\omega$. Equation 2 then reduces to:

$$1 = \nu \frac{{}^{235}\sigma_f \frac{\omega}{235} {}^{235}\sigma_a}{{}^{235}\sigma_a \frac{1-\omega}{238} {}^{238}\sigma_a} \quad (3)$$

$$= \nu \frac{{}^{235}\sigma_f}{{}^{238}\sigma_a} \frac{238\omega}{235(1-\omega)} \quad (4)$$

Upon defining a new variable $\xi = \nu \frac{^{235}\sigma_f}{^{238}\sigma_a}$, we find:

$$\frac{1}{\xi} = \frac{238\omega}{235(1-\omega)} \quad (5)$$

$$\omega = \frac{235}{238\xi + 235} < 1 \quad (6)$$

Upon inserting the tabulated values for these cross sections, we find $\xi = 4.2$ and $\omega = 0.0336 = 3.4\%$. The bulk of the reactor can thus be fueled without HEU.

If the fuel is UO_2 , then the mass of Uranium per mass of fuel is:

$$\frac{m_U}{m_{UO_2}} = \frac{238(1-\omega) + 235\omega}{238(1-\omega) + 235\omega + 32} \quad (7)$$

$$= 0.8817 \frac{\text{grams}}{\text{gram}} \quad (8)$$

It is now easy to find the number of U_{235} atoms per gram of fuel:

$$n_{235} = \omega \frac{m_u}{m_{UO_2}} \frac{N_{av}}{235} \quad (9)$$

$$= 7.906 \times 10^{21} \quad (10)$$

If we **assume that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the fissions occur in U_{235}** , then the total fissile atoms per gram of fuel is 1.05×10^{21} .

We can now determine the required mass of Uranium to produce a certain amount of energy. The core's power is related to the fission rate by a factor of 200 MeV per fission. We will **assume a core power of 1.75 GWth** for this analysis. This value roughly corresponds to 500 MWe for typical values of efficiency, which is close to the power output of the reactors we seek to imitate. The fission rate in our reactor is then $1.75 \times 10^9 \frac{\text{Joules}}{\text{sec}} \times \frac{1 \text{MeV}}{1.6 \times 10^{-13} \text{Joules}} \times \frac{1 \text{Fission}}{200 \text{MeV}} = 5.5 \times 10^{19} \frac{\text{fissions}}{\text{second}}$.

In an **assumed 2-year refueling cycle** we would then need $5.5 \times 10^{19} \frac{\text{fissions}}{\text{second}} \times \frac{3.15 \times 10^7 \text{s}}{\text{y}} = 1.723 \times 10^{27}$ fissile atoms.

Returning to our value of fissile atoms per gram of UO_2 , we can find the mass of Uranium required to power our core for two years. This number is $5.5 \times 10^{19} \frac{\text{fissions}}{\text{second}} \times \frac{6.3 \times 10^7 \text{s}}{2 \text{years}} = 3.5 \times 10^{27} \frac{\text{fissions}}{\text{cycle}}$, which can be used to find the mass of fuel, and ultimately the volume of the reactor. Recall that we

anticipate 1.05×10^{21} fissile nuclei per gram of fuel. The mass of fuel needed is then $\frac{3.05 \times 10^{27}}{1.05 \times 10^{21}} = 2.90 \times 10^6 g = 2900 kg$. However, we do not expect to burn every fissile isotope, **so this value should be adjusted by a factor of 1.7**, so that our first estimate of the mass of fuel is 4930 kg.

The density of UO_2 is $10970 \frac{kg}{m^3}$. The Volume of this much fuel is therefore $V = \frac{4930 kg}{10970 \frac{kg}{m^3}} = 4.50 m^3$

We will assume that the volume of our cylindrical core is equal to the volume of a cylinder of the same radius, which is to say $H = \frac{4}{3}\pi R$. Under this assumption, the radius of our core is $(\frac{3}{4}\pi V)^{1/3} = 2.20 meters$, giving a height of $2.93 meters$. This first estimate of the height (which will most likely be shorter than the final value) will be very useful in the thermal analysis.

3.2.3 Thermal analysis

Let us begin by estimating the mass flow rate required to remove the fission heat at steady state. With a simple energy balance, it becomes apparent that heat flux is related to the heat capacity and mass flow rate of the coolant and the temperature change across the length of the channel as follows:

$$q'' = \dot{m} c_p \Delta T \quad (11)$$

$$\dot{m} = \frac{q''}{c_p \Delta T} \quad (12)$$

We can estimate q'' by dividing the thermal power by the surface area of the fuel, which gives us $q'' = \frac{1.5 \times 10^9}{2\pi N 2.93 \times 10^{-2}}$ if there are N fuel rods, each with 1-cm radius 2.93 meters tall

3.2.4 Materials analysis

3.2.5 Alternatives

Conceptual design

4 Conclusions

Conclusions

5 Acknowledgements

Thanks to the Illinois NPPE department for their tireless work educating us. In particular, we would like to thank Professor Ragheb for his guidance and mentorship and Professor Stubbins for instructing the Senior Design course.

References

- [1] P. ALEKSEEV, N. E. KUKHARKIN, Y. N. UDYANSKII, T. D. SHCHEPETINA, I. A. BELOV, S. A. SUBBOTIN, A. A. D. A. A. SEDOV, M. M. KASHKA, and V. V. BASHAEV, “ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS WITH MICROPELLETED FUEL FOR NUCLEAR-POWERED SHIPS,” *Atomic Energy Voll 99 No. 1* (2005).
- [2] J. CARLTON, R. SMART, and V. JENKINS, “The nuclear propulsion of merchant ships: Aspects of engineering, science and technology,” *Journal of Marine Engineering and Technology* (2011).
- [3] J. GRAVINA, J. BLAKE, A. SHENOI, S. TURNOCK, and S. HIRDARIS, “CONCEPTS FOR A MODULAR NUCLEAR POWERED CONTAINERSHIP,” (2013).
- [4] W. SHI HAN and T. LIU, “A new marine propulsion system,” (2003).
- [5] M. HUSSAIN, F. REITSMA, M. H. SUBKI, and H. KIUCHI, “Advances in Small Modular Reactor Technology Developments,” (2018).
- [6] S. HIRDARIS, Y. CHENG, P. SHALLCROSS, J. BONAFOUX, D. CARLSON, B. PRINCE, and G. SARRIS, “Considerations on the potential use of Nuclear Small Modular Reactor (SMR) technology for merchant marine propulsion,” (2013).
- [7] J. JACOBS, “Nuclear Short Sea Shipping: The integration of a Helium cooled reactor in a 800 TEU Container Feeder,” (2007).
- [8] J. R. RUSSELL, “Holtec International Response to the DOE RFI,” (2017).
- [9] JAEA, “Japan Atomic Energy Agency Nuclear Data Center,” (2018).