






AIM

Association for Information and Image Management




1100 Wayne Avenue, Suite 1100
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
301/587-8202



Centimeter



Inches



MANUFACTURED TO AIM STANDARDS
BY APPLIED IMAGE, INC.

1 of 1

Evaluating the Efficacy of a Minor Actinide Burner

K. D. Dobbin
S. F. Kessler
J. V. Nelson
R. P. Omberg
D. W. Wootan

Date Published
June 1993

To Be Presented at
American Nuclear Society
Global '93--Future Nuclear Systems: Emerging Fuel
Cycles and Waste Disposal Options Conference
Seattle, Washington
September 12-17, 1993

To Be Published in
Proceedings

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy
Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy



Westinghouse
Hanford Company

P.O. Box 1970
Richland, Washington 99352

Hanford Operations and Engineering Contractor for the
U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC06-87RL10930


Copyright License By acceptance of this article, the publisher and/or recipient acknowledges the U.S. Government's right to retain a nonexclusive, royalty-free license in and to any copyright covering this paper.

Approved for Public Release

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

g75

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| Date Received: 5/20/93 | | INFORMATION RELEASE REQUEST ORIGINAL | | Reference: WHC-CM-3-4 |
| Complete for all Types of Release | | | | |
| Purpose | | | ID Number (include revision, volume, etc.) | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Speech or Presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Reference | WHC-SA-1775-FP | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full Paper (Check only one suffix) | <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Report | List attachments. | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Summary | <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis or Dissertation | Date Release Required | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Abstract | <input type="checkbox"/> Manual | 06/10/93 | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Visual Aid | <input type="checkbox"/> Brochure/Flier | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Speakers Bureau | <input type="checkbox"/> Software/Database | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Poster Session | <input type="checkbox"/> Controlled Document | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Videotape | <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | | |
| Title Evaluating the Efficacy of a Minor Actinide Burner | | Unclassified Category UC- | Impact Level 4 | |
| New or novel (patentable) subject matter? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If "Yes", has disclosure been submitted by WHC or other company? | | Information received from others in confidence, such as proprietary data, trade secrets, and/or inventions? | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Disclosure No(s). | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Identify) | | |
| Copyrights? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If "Yes", has written permission been granted? | | Trademarks? | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Attach Permission) | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Identify) | | |
| Complete for Speech or Presentation | | | | |
| Title of Conference or Meeting Global '93 International Conference and Technology Exhibition | | Group or Society Sponsoring American Nuclear Society | | |
| Date(s) of Conference or Meeting September 12-17, 1993 | City/State Seattle, WN | Will proceedings be published? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | Will material be handed out? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Title of Journal | | | | |
| CHECKLIST FOR SIGNATORIES | | | | |
| Review Required per WHC-CM-3-4 | Yes | No | Reviewer - Signature Indicates Approval | |
| | | | Name (printed) | Signature Date |
| Classification/Unclassified Controlled Nuclear Information | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | J.E. TRUAX | <i>J. E. Truax</i> 5-20-93 |
| Patent - General Counsel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | S.W. Berglin | <i>S. W. Berglin</i> 5/25/93 |
| Legal - General Counsel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Applied Technology/Export Controlled Information or International Program | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | J.D. Watrous | <i>J. D. Watrous</i> 5/24/93 |
| WHC Program/Project | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | J.D. Watrous | <i>J. D. Watrous</i> 5/24/93 |
| Communications | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | W.P. Whiting | <i>W. P. Whiting</i> 5-26-93 |
| RL Program/Project | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | R.A. Almquist | <i>R. A. Almquist</i> 5/28/93 |
| Publication Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | K.M. Liikala by M. Boston per telecon | <i>M. Boston</i> 6/9/93 |
| Other Program/Project | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Information conforms to all applicable requirements. The above information is certified to be correct. | | | | |
| References Available to Intended Audience Transmit to DOE-HQ/Office of Scientific and Technical Information | | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | INFORMATION RELEASE ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL STAMP Stamp is required before release. Release is contingent upon resolution of mandatory comments.  |
| Author/Requestor (Printed/Signature) | | <i>KD</i> | Date | |
| K. D. Dobbin <i>KD Dobbin</i> | | 5-13-93 | | |
| Intended Audience | | <input type="checkbox"/> Internal <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> External | | |
| Responsible Manager (Printed/Signature) | | Date | | |
| J. W. Daughtry <i>J. W. Daughtry</i> | | 5/19/93 | | |
| Date Cancelled | | | Date Disapproved | |

CONTENTS

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| ABSTRACT | 1 |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. CORE LOADING | 2 |
| IV. WORKSCOPE | 5 |
| V. RESULTS | 5 |
| VI. CONCLUSIONS | 7 |
| VII. REFERENCES | 11 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|--|---|
| 1 Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor Core | 4 |
| 2 Sodium Void Worth for Heterogeneous Core | 6 |
| 3 Sodium Void Worth for Homogeneous Core | 8 |
| 4 Minor Actinide Loading Effect on NA Void | 9 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| 1 Minor Actinide Isotopics | 3 |
| 2 Sodium Void Worth and Support Ratios for Selected LMR Core Arrangements | 10 |

**EVALUATING THE EFFICACY
OF A MINOR ACTINIDE BURNER**

K. D. Dobbin
S. F. Kessler
J. V. Nelson
D. W. Wootan
R. P. Omberg

Westinghouse Hanford Company
P. O. Box 1970
Richland, Washington 99352
(509) 376-9415

ABSTRACT

The efficacy of a minor actinide burner can be evaluated by comparing safety and economic parameters to the support ratio. Minor actinide mass produced per unit time in this number of Light Water Reactors (LWRs) can be burned during the same time period in one burner system. The larger the support ratio for a given set of safety and economic parameters, the better. To illustrate this concept, the support ratio for selected Liquid Metal Reactor (LMR) burner core designs was compared with corresponding coolant void worths, a fundamental safety concern following the Chernobyl accident. Results can be used to evaluate the cost in reduced burning of minor actinides caused by LMR sodium void reduction efforts or to compare with other minor actinide burner systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Numerous physics studies have shown that actinide waste discharged from Light Water Reactors (LWRs) could be burned in Liquid Metal Reactors (LMRs) as well as other systems. Relationships between safety and economic parameters and minor actinide burn rates are usually established. However, it is difficult to determine from these trade-off studies how effective one burner system is relative to others. In fact, within any one design, optimizing these relationships is a multi-dimensional problem. It would seem logical, within the systems design approach to this problem, to relate all parameters to one that is an indicator of how good the system is. That measure of quality should be how much of the high-level waste from LWRs the burner system can eliminate.

Therefore, safety and economic parameters should be related to a parameter called the support ratio. Minor actinide mass produced per unit time from this number of LWR plants can be burned during the same period of time in one burner system. As a measure of efficacy, the larger the support ratio for a given set of safety and economic parameters, the better the burner system. Different systems could use the same relationships and quantitative comparisons could be drawn.

Unfortunately, good safety, economics, and waste burning do not generally co-exist. As a result, many parameters are required to evaluate a system. However, random selection of parametric relationships may lead to considerable time studying concepts that will not work. Following the Chernobyl accident, one disqualifying parameter is a significant positive coolant void reactivity coefficient. Therefore, for any system where coolant void can be a problem, this feedback should be examined early in the design.

To illustrate this concept, sodium void worth and minor actinide burn rate were analyzed for an LMR and intercompared using the support ratio definition, above. Minor actinide loading and core height were varied as a means to establish relationships between void worth and minor actinide burn rate for study purposes. Obviously, many other parameters are involved in a burner design, but they are beyond the scope of this paper.

II. CORE LOADING

This study of the sodium void reactivity worth versus support ratio was performed for a selection of core designs based on one 471 MW module of an LMR similar to the one described in Reference 1. Multiple modules would be identical and add together to form a plant equivalent in power to an LWR. The LMR fuel assemblies contained a combination of plutonium and uranium with the fuel pin and assembly dimensions of Reference 1. A nitride fuel matrix was selected for performance reasons discussed later. However, with slight adjustments, the results and conclusions drawn for nitride fuel would be applicable for other fuel types. Certainly the parametric concept illustrated here would be applicable for all fuel types.

Plutonium enrichment in the fuel assemblies was varied to handle the particular minor actinide target load. Minor actinides were loaded into separate assemblies for reprocessing ease. These target assemblies had the same pin and assembly dimensions as the fuel assemblies. Relative abundances of neptunium, americium, and curium changed during the process of transmutation. Table 1 shows their mass fractions as discharged from LWRs² and the mass fractions after several passes through an LMR where fission products are replaced with LWR discharge material representing recycling of the minor actinides³. Minor quantities of uranium and other isotopes of neptunium, plutonium, americium, and curium that build-in during the irradiation do not significantly contribute to the problem and were thus ignored. No higher actinide mass isotopes are included because analyses show virtually no buildup of higher actinides in this neutron spectrum. This work included sodium void worth and support ratio calculations using minor actinide isotopics representing LWR discharge and LMR recycle waste streams.

Table 1. Minor Actinide Isotopics.


| Nuclide | LWR Discharge Mass Fraction | LMR Recycle Mass Fraction |
|---------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Np-237 | 0.41780 | 0.34694 |
| Pu-238 | | 0.13886 |
| Pu-239 | | 0.00807 |
| Pu-240 | | 0.00637 |
| Pu-241 | | 0.00016 |
| Pu-242 | | 0.01866 |
| Am-241 | 0.47762 | 0.34951 |
| Am-242m | 0.00063 | 0.02258 |
| Am-243 | 0.08603 | 0.06597 |
| Cm-242 | | 0.00655 |
| Cm-243 | 0.00032 | 0.00049 |
| Cm-244 | 0.01671 | 0.03200 |
| Cm-245 | 0.00089 | 0.00374 |

Both homogeneous and heterogeneous LMR reactors were studied. The heterogeneous core consisted of fuel, internal blankets, radial blankets, and minor actinide assemblies in various core arrangements. Fuel was located as shown in Figure 1, but the number of minor actinide target assemblies was varied. The homogeneous core consisted of internal fuel occupying the fuel and internal blanket locations of Figure 1, surrounded by either minor actinide assemblies and/or blanket assemblies.

III. ANALYSIS METHODS

Sodium void worths were computed with three-dimensional diffusion theory code 3DB⁴. Neutron cross sections from ENDF/B-V⁵ were prepared using the shielding factor method⁶ for both sodium voided and sodium flooded cases. Sodium was voided only from the fuel, blanket, and minor actinide burner assemblies. Resultant reactivity changes were computed using the k_{eff} -difference method. Void worths were computed for cores containing LWR discharge minor actinide densities and for cores containing minor actinides recycled through an LMR.

Figure 1. Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor Core.



39107077.2

The support ratio was computed from the comparison of the mass of minor actinides burned in each case to the mass generated in equivalent sized LWRs. The capacity factor was assumed to be the same between an LMR burner and the LWRs. Minor actinides produced by the burner system were included in what must be burned.

IV. WORKSCOPE

Design of a burner system requires many trade-off studies. The main objective of this work was to suggest a systems-related concept of comparing trade-off parameters against the support ratio. For illustration, the sodium void worth and the minor actinide mass change with burnup were studied and reported here.


Reduction of the sodium void in an LMR system may involve both geometry changes to affect neutron leakage, as well as, material changes to alter the neutron spectrum. Because time allotted to this study was limited, only leakage effects were included and only the height-to-diameter ratio was altered to achieve an effect. Analyses were performed for a tall 135-cm-high core as well as a shorter 76-cm-high alternative core that still exhibited satisfactory linear heat rates, at least for the nitride core studied.

V. RESULTS

Heterogeneous core arrangements of plutonium/uranium fuel, blankets, and minor actinide target assemblies were used to study how the sodium void reactivity and support ratio varied with actinide target assemblies scattered throughout the core. Case 1 was the reference LMR core with 42 fuel, 24 internal blanket, and 33 radial blanket assemblies as shown in Figure 1. In Case 2, the 42 fuel assemblies were replaced with minor actinide target assemblies containing LMR recycle-type material of Table 1. For Case 3, 6 internal blankets and 12 radial blankets from the reference core were replaced with minor actinide target assemblies. For Case 4, 18 fuel assemblies from the reference core were replaced with minor actinide assemblies. Figure 2 shows the sodium void worth for each of these cases examining both 76-cm and 135-cm-high variations of these core loadings. Reactivities are reported in units of dollars based upon a delayed neutron fraction (Beta) of 0.0037 representing the reference case. Actually, the quantity and position of minor actinides loaded into the core changes the value of Beta. It is beyond the scope of this work to calculate that value for each loading. The purpose of this work is to show how the concept of support ratio can aid in feasibility studies of burner systems. Also included in Figure 2 are calculations where all the blanket assemblies throughout the core are replaced with minor actinide targets. These results are almost identical to those of the full-core minor actinide for fuel replacement.

In an alternative core arrangement, minor actinide assemblies were substituted for radial blankets around the periphery of a homogeneously fueled core without internal blankets or targets. Case 5 is the reference

Figure 2. Sodium Void Worth for Heterogeneous Core.



homogeneous case that consisted of 66 driver fuel assemblies surrounded by 33 radial blankets. In Case 6, the 33 blankets were replaced with minor actinide target assemblies containing LMR recycle type material of Table 1. For Case 7, only 18 of the blankets of Case 5 were replaced with minor actinide targets. Case 8 is a repetition of Case 6 except that the target assemblies contained LWR discharge type material of Table 1. Case 9 is a repetition of Case 7 with the LWR discharge type material. Cases 5 through 9 sodium void worth results are found in Figure 3.

Results from Cases 5 through 9 were recast in Figure 4, where the sodium void worth is plotted against the quantity of minor actinides loaded into the core. These data illustrate how the sodium void worth becomes more positive as the minor actinides are burned.

To establish the support ratio, the burnout rates of the minor actinides in each of these cases were computed accounting for only fission of these nuclides. Capture to another minor actinide does not eliminate it from the minor actinide inventory. Table 2 summarizes the results of all nine cases.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

From the summary of results in Table 2, the following conclusions can be drawn from this study of burning actinides in conventional LMR systems.

1. With the proper selection of location for minor actinides, an LMR burner with a support ratio of 10 and sodium void coefficient no larger than for present conventional LMR designs is feasible.
2. The core would consist of approximately 23% minor actinides.
3. Minor actinides must be recycled through the LMR, otherwise the support ratio drops by a factor of 3.
4. Generally, the greater the transmutation rate, the higher the sodium void worth.
5. Reducing the height-to-diameter ratio of the core reduced the positive void coefficient in every case.
6. To obtain near-zero sodium void reactivity coefficient, a void worth reduction scheme more dramatic than the reduction in core height shown here is required.

Figure 3. Sodium Void Worth for Homogeneous Core.




Figure 4. Minor Actinide Loading Effect on NA Void.




Table 2. Sodium Void Worth and Support Ratios for Selected LMR Core Arrangements.

| Case | No. of Fuel Assemblies | No. of Internal Blanket Assemblies | No. of Internal Minor Actinide Assemblies | No. of Radial Blanket Assemblies | No. of Radial Minor Actinide Assemblies | Support Ratio(c) | Sodium Void Worth (\$) ^(d) | |
|------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|
| | | | | | | | 53" Core | 30" Core |
| 1 | 42 | 24 | 0 | 33 | 0 | ---- | 2.4 | 0.6 |
| 2 | 0 | 24 | 42 | 33 | 0 | 24.3 | 6.8 | 5.5 |
| 3 | 42 | 18 | 6 | 21 | 12 | 13.3 | 3.1 | 1.4 |
| 4 | 24 | 24 | 18 | 33 | 0 | 10.6 | 4.3 | 2.9 |
| 5 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | ---- | 2.0 | 0.1 |
| 6 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 ^(a) | 17.7 | 5.7 | 4.1 |
| 7 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 18 ^(a) | 5.9 | 3.5 | 1.9 |
| 8 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 ^(b) | 5.1 | 3.2 | 1.4 |
| 9 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 18 ^(b) | 2.2 | 2.7 | 1.0 |

- (a) LMR Recycled Minor Actinide Target Composition
- (b) LWR Discharge Minor Actinide Target Composition
- (c) Minor actinide mass produced per unit time from this number of LWR plants, plus the burner system itself, can be burned during the same time by one burner system.
- (d) The effective delayed neutron fraction was assumed to equal 0.0037; calculation of Beta for each minor actinide loading was beyond the scope of this work.

VII. REFERENCES

1. M. L. Thompson, "The Modular ALMR (PRISM) Fuel Cycle," Proceedings of the American Nuclear Society Special Cluster Session--LMR: A Decade of LMR Progress and Promise, Washington D.C., November 8, 1990.
2. J. A. Rawlins, "CURE: Clean Use of Reactor Energy," WHC-EP-0268, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
3. K. D. Dobbin et. al "Transmutation of LWR High-Level Waste in LMRs," Transactions of the American Nuclear Society 1991 Winter Meeting, San Francisco, November 10-14, 1991.
4. R. W. Hardie, W. W. Little, Jr., "3DB, A Three-Dimensional Diffusion Theory Burnup Code," BNWL-1264, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington (March 1970).
5. F. M. Mann, "FTR Set 500, A Multigroup Cross-Section Set for FTR Analysis," HEDL-TME 81-31, Hanford Engineering Development Laboratory, Richland, Washington (February 1982).
6. F. M. Mann, "MIDX, A One-Dimensional Diffusion Code for Generating Effective Nuclear Cross Sections," HEDL-TML 82-12, Hanford Engineering Development Laboratory, Richland, Washington (September 1982).

DISTRIBUTION

Number of copies

ONSITE

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 1 | <u>U.S. Department of Energy - Richland Operations Office</u> | |
| | R. A. Almquist | N1-39 |
| 20 | <u>Westinghouse Hanford Company</u> | |
| | F. E. Bard | L5-01 |
| | R. B. Baker | L5-01 |
| | J. W. Daughtry | N2-32 |
| | K. D. Dobbin (5) | N2-32 |
| | R. A. Karnesky | H0-39 |
| | S. F. Kessler | N2-32 |
| | K. L. Liikala | A2-25 |
| | J. V. Nelson | N2-32 |
| | R. P. Omberg | H0-40 |
| | R. F. Richard | N2-32 |
| | E. L. Tang | N2-32 |
| | A. E. Waltar | H0-32 |
| | D. W. Wootan | H0-40 |
| | Document Clearance Administration (3) | A3-36 |
| | Document Processing and Distribution | L8-15 |
| | Central Files | L8-04 |

DATE

FILMED

9/8/93

END

