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Multiple new reactor designs will require High Assay Low Enriched Uranium (HALEU) fuel, which allows for

- Longer cycle times
- Higher burnups

To meet the HALEU demand, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has proposed two methods [2]:

- Recovery and downblending of High Enriched Uranium (HEU)
- Enrichment of natural uranium

Determining which method to use, or how to combine them, will be based on the material requirements of the reactor(s) deployed.
This work simulates multiple transition scenarios to HALEU-fueled reactors and aims to:

- Quantify material requirements of the transition to reactors fueled by HALEU
  - Number of reactors deployed
  - Ability to meet energy demand
  - Mass of uranium supplied to reactors
  - Separative Work Unit (SWU) capacity to enrich uranium

- Compare the material requirements of a small reactor with a long cycle time and a medium-sized reactor with on-line refueling

- Identify how each HALEU production method can be used to meet the material requirements
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Simulated 5 fuel cycle scenarios in *Cyclus* [3]

- **Scenario 1**: Current fleet of Light Water Reactors (LWRs)
- **Scenario 2**: No growth transition to Ultra Safe Nuclear Company (USNC) Micro Modular Reactor (MMR)™
- **Scenario 3**: No growth transition to X-energy Xe-100
- **Scenario 4**: 1% growth transition to USNC MMR™
- **Scenario 5**: 1% growth transition to X-energy Xe-100

### Table 1: Advanced reactor design specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Criteria</th>
<th>USNC MMR™</th>
<th>X-Energy Xe-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactor Type</td>
<td>Modular HTGR</td>
<td>Modular HTGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Output (MWe)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment (% ²³⁵U)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Length (yr)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Online Refuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Form</td>
<td>TRISO Compacts</td>
<td>TRISO Pebbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactor Lifetime</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>60 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnup ((\text{MWd/kgU}))</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Simulation Details

- Simulations model reactor deployment from 1965-2090
- LWR commission dates are obtained from the IAEA Power Reactor Information System (PRIS) database [1]
- LWRs are assumed to operate for 60 years, unless they were decommissioned by December 2020
- Transitions begin in 2025
- Timestep of one month

Figure 1: Fuel cycle facilities and material flow between facilities.
Figure 2: Organization of agents in the simulations, green shows the region, red shows institutions, and blue shows the facilities.
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• The last LWR is decommissioned in 2076

• In the no growth scenarios (Scenarios 2 and 3) the advanced reactors are deployed starting in October 2031

• In the 1% growth scenarios (Scenarios 4 and 5) the advanced reactors are deployed starting in March 2029

• The maximum number of advanced reactors deployed at one time in Scenarios 2-5 are 9182, 1225, 17656, and 2361 reactors, respectively

Figure 3: Reactor deployment schedule for LWRs and advanced reactors.
Energy

- Energy produced by LWRs in Scenario 1 in 2025 is 91.818 GWe-y
- Scenarios 2 and 3 do not meet demand between 2030-2050
- Scenarios 4 and 5 do not meet demand between 2026-2048
- Noticable deviations from demand in Scenarios 2, 4 when new reactors are deployed
- Initial gap between demand and energy produced is due to how the ManagerInst responds to the demand of the GrowthRegion

Figure 4: Energy produced per year by all reactors in Scenarios 1-3 (top) and Scenarios 1, 4, 5 (bottom)
Uranium Mass Supply

- All scenarios have the same uranium demands until advanced reactors are deployed.
- Large peaks in Scenarios 2 and 4 correspond to the deployment of new reactors.
- Less variation with time in the uranium supplied to reactors for Scenarios 3 and 5 than Scenarios 2 and 4.

Figure 5: Uranium mass sent to all reactors (top) and only advanced reactors (bottom).
SWU Requirements

- Follows similar pattern to uranium mass
- Scenarios 2 and 4 require the most SWU because of the large mass of uranium, despite a lower enrichment level for the advanced reactors Scenarios 3 and 5

Figure 6: SWU required to produce enriched uranium for all reactors (top) and only advanced reactors (bottom)
Conclusions

- Simulated 5 fuel cycle scenarios to investigate the material requirements of deploying HALEU-fueled reactors
- Transitions to the X-energy Xe-100 reactor are better able to meet the energy demand of the scenarios due to longer lifetimes
- Transitions to the USNC MMR™ have significantly more material requirements than transitions to the X-energy Xe-100
- Changing to a 1% growth demand model requires advanced reactors to be deployed 2.5 years earlier

Ongoing Work

- Incorporate LWR license expiration dates
- Increase the amount of time in the scenario, change end date to 2125
- Determine how much HALEU can be produced by downblending HEU
Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported under an Integrated University Program Graduate Fellowship. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Energy Office of Nuclear Energy.
Prof. Huff is supported by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Faculty Development Program (award NRC-HQ-84-14-G-0054 Program B), the Blue Waters sustained-petascale computing project supported by the National Science Foundation (awards OCI-0725070 and ACI-1238993) and the state of Illinois, the DOE ARPA-E MEITNER Program (award DE-AR0000983), and the DOE H2@Scale Program (Award Number: DE-EE0008832)
References I

Number 507 in TECDOC Series. INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, Vienna, 1989.

Overview of NEs High-Assay Low Enriched Uranium (HALEU) Program, April 2020.

Fundamental concepts in the Cyclus nuclear fuel cycle simulation framework.