Topics for today:

• Nuclear Energy Production
  – History
  – Reactor Technology
  – Waste

• Hydrogen Economy
  – Overview
  – Source?
  – An Interesting Unintended Consequence
Course Logistics

Only assigned to students in 433:

4. Plan for The U.S. To Meet Its Future Energy and Needs (60 points)

Ross & Pam will read each reply carefully and make an assessment based on our view of how well material presented throughout the class, or perhaps gleaned from other sources, is integrated into a coherent, thoughtful reply. We look forward to learning from your replies 😊.

You are the Energy Advisor of a candidate for preparing for the 2020 election for President of the United States. The candidate has asked you to present a plan for the nation to meet its future energy needs, taking into account climate change, air quality, and the candidate’s long-term vision for a high quality of life for US citizens. Specifically, the candidate has asked you to address the Nation’s future electricity supply and energy needs in a manner that is both environmentally friendly and cost effective over the long-term, even if the plan requires significant initial investment.

The candidate’s parting words when describing this request were “when dealing with energy, it is hard to separate the charlatan from the prophet”.

As part of your plan to gain advocacy for your vision of America’s energy future, you have decided to produce a “one page” briefing paper for the candidate that highlights the plan.

Please share your one-page plan for America’s energy future. Your reply can take whatever format you’d like: i.e., paragraphs, bullet statements, etc are all fine. Your reply can be produced using Word, Powerpoint, etc. The only requirement is that your plan fit onto a single piece of paper (one side) 😊.

Please write your name on the back, so that we can read your response without knowing by whom it was written (use a pencil if you think your name will show through the paper).
Course Logistics

Only assigned to students in 633:

- **Student Papers and Projects**: project grade will count towards final grade in an amount equal to each exam
- Due Wednesday, **10 May 2017**… you’re welcome to complete sooner
- ~8 pages single spaced (not including reference list or figures) on a topic related to class (your choice …we’re happy to discuss potential topics)
- Must be **new work for this class** but can be related to your dissertation or some other topic in which you’ve had prior interest
- ~10 min, AGU / ACS style presentations

10 May: 7:00 pm, CSS 3400: everyone encouraged to attend

We’ll conduct a ~45 min review of P Set #4 staring 6:15 pm, CSS 3400, on the same date
Course Logistics

Chemistry in Context : Applying Chemistry to Society, 7/e

American Chemical Society (ACS)
Catherine H. Middlecamp, University of Wisconsin--Madison
Steven W. Keller, University of Missouri--Columbia
Karen L. Anderson, Madison Area Technical College
Anne K. Bentley, Lewis & Clark College
Michael C. Cann, University of Scranton
Jamie P. Ellis, The Scripps Research Institute

The author team truly benefitted from the expertise of a wider community. We extend our thanks to the following individuals for the technical expertise they provided to us in preparing the manuscript:

Mark E. Anderson, University of Wisconsin–Madison
David Argentar, Sun Edge, LLC
Marion O’Leary, Carnegie Institution for Science
Ross Salawitch, University of Maryland
Kenneth A. Walz, Madison Area Technical College

• If you have rented, please bring with you to final exam, on Wed 17 May, 10:30 am (this room)
Nomenclature

Power (energy/time):
- TW : Terra Watt; $10^{12}$ W
- GW : Giga Watt; $10^9$ W
- MW : Mega Watt; $10^6$ W
- kW : Kilo Watt; $10^3$ W

$W = 1$ joule /sec

Solar arrays are “sized” in terms of kW

Energy (Power $\times$ time):
- kW hr : $10^3$ W delivered continuously over an hour
- mW hr : $10^6$ W delivered continuously over an hour

Output of solar arrays are metered in terms of kW hr
Nuclear Power History

• Use of nuclear power developed by military; currently around 150 ships, globally
  – allowed submarines to stay underwater for extended periods of time
  – 1954: U.S.S. Nautilus, first nuclear powered submarine
• 1956: first commercial nuclear power plant, U.K.
• 1957: first U.S. commercial nuclear power plant, Shippingport, Pa

Operational 18 Dec 1957 to 1 Oct 1982 for 80,324 hours

It took more than 8 hours to lower the 58 reactor core into the pressure vessel in October 1957. There was a clearance of only six-hundredths of an inch between the core and the steel wall of the pressure vessel.

http://www.phmc.state.pa.us/portal/communities/pa-heritage/atoms-for-peace-pennsylvania.html
Pros and Cons of Nuclear Energy

Discussions about nuclear energy evoke strong emotions. Climate change concerns have led some to reassess their views regarding this power source.


To those influencing environmental policy but opposed to nuclear power:

As climate and energy scientists concerned with global climate change, we are writing to urge you to advocate the development and deployment of safer nuclear energy systems. We appreciate your organization’s concern about global warming, and your advocacy of renewable energy. But continued opposition to nuclear power threatens humanity’s ability to avoid dangerous climate change.

We call on your organization to support the development and deployment of safer nuclear power systems as a practical means of addressing the climate change problem. Global demand for energy is growing rapidly and must continue to grow to provide the needs of developing economies. At the same time, the need to sharply reduce greenhouse gas emissions is becoming ever clearer. We can only increase energy supply while simultaneously reducing greenhouse gas emissions if new power plants turn away from using the atmosphere as a waste dump.

Renewables like wind and solar and biomass will certainly play roles in a future energy economy, but those energy sources cannot scale up fast enough to deliver cheap and reliable power at the scale the global economy requires. While it may be theoretically possible to stabilize the climate without nuclear power, in the real world there is no credible path to climate stabilization that does not include a substantial role for nuclear power.

We understand that today’s nuclear plants are far from perfect. Fortunately, passive safety systems and other advances can make new plants much safer. And modern nuclear technology can reduce proliferation risks and solve the waste disposal problem by burning current waste and using fuel more efficiently. Innovation and economies of scale can make new power plants even cheaper than existing plants. Regardless of these advantages, nuclear needs to be encouraged based on its societal benefits.
Pros and Cons of Nuclear Energy

Discussions about nuclear energy evoke strong emotions. Climate change concerns have led some to reassess their views regarding this power source.

Quantitative analyses show that the risks associated with the expanded use of nuclear energy are orders of magnitude smaller than the risks associated with fossil fuels. No energy system is without downsides. We ask only that energy system decisions be based on facts, and not on emotions and biases that do not apply to 21st century nuclear technology.

While there will be no single technological silver bullet, the time has come for those who take the threat of global warming seriously to embrace the development and deployment of safer nuclear power systems as one among several technologies that will be essential to any credible effort to develop an energy system that does not rely on using the atmosphere as a waste dump.

With the planet warming and carbon dioxide emissions rising faster than ever, we cannot afford to turn away from any technology that has the potential to displace a large fraction of our carbon emissions. Much has changed since the 1970s. The time has come for a fresh approach to nuclear power in the 21st century.

We ask you and your organization to demonstrate its real concern about risks from climate damage by calling for the development and deployment of advanced nuclear energy.

Sincerely,

Dr. Ken Caldeira, Senior Scientist, Department of Global Ecology, Carnegie Institution
Dr. Kerry Emanuel, Atmospheric Scientist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Dr. James Hansen, Climate Scientist, Columbia University Earth Institute
Dr. Tom Wigley, Climate Scientist, University of East Anglia and the National Center for Atmospheric Research

World Production: Nuclear

Electricity Generation Production via nuclear = 10.8%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Source</th>
<th>GW (year 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>1,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>1,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro-electric</td>
<td>1114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid Fossil Fuel</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Renewable (Biomass)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/ieo/ieo_tables.cfm
Sustained Reliability and Productivity

U.S. Nuclear Capacity Factor, Percent


92.1% in 2016*
92.2% in 2015
91.7% in 2014
89.9% in 2013
86.1% in 2012
World Production: Nuclear

Electricity Generation Production via nuclear peaked 2006 to 2010 and has declined since

World Production: Nuclear

CC states roughly 440 nuclear power plants
European Nuclear Society states 450 as of Nov 2016

Figure 7.2, Chemistry in Context
Figure 7.3, Chemistry in Context

World Production: Nuclear

Copyright © The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. Permission required for reproduction or display.

Percent

France 76
Belgium 54
Sweden 42
Switzerland 39
Hungary 37
Rep. of Korea 36
Japan 25
United States 20
Spain 18
Russia 17
Canada 15
United Kingdom 14
Argentina 6
Netherlands 4
Brazil 3
China 2

Copyright © 2017 University of Maryland
This material may not be reproduced or redistributed, in whole or in part, without written permission from Ross Salawitch.
World Production: Nuclear

Nuclear Generation by Country, TWh, Year 2015

Source: IAEA PRIS Database

World Production: Nuclear

Total Number of Nuclear Reactors: 450

As of Nov 2016

[Bar chart showing the number of nuclear reactors in different countries]

Country Name
- United States of America
- France
- Japan
- China
- Russia
- Korea, Republic of
- India
- Canada
- Ukraine
- United Kingdom
- Sweden
- Germany
- Belgium
- Spain
- Czech Republic
- Switzerland
- Finland
- Hungary
- Pakistan
- Slovakia
- Argentina
- Brazil
- Bulgaria
- Mexico
- Romania
- South Africa
- Armenia
- Iran, Islamic Republic of
- Netherlands
- Slovenia

Number of Reactors
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https://www.euronuclear.org/info/encyclopedia/images/npp-ww-1116.jpg

Copyright © 2017 University of Maryland
This material may not be reproduced or redistributed, in whole or in part, without written permission from Ross Salawitch.
World Production: Nuclear

Total Number of Nuclear Reactors
Under Construction: 60

As of Nov 2016

https://www.euronuclear.org/info/encyclopedia/images/npp-ww-uc-1116.gif
# Calvert Cliffs

## Start Size & Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calvert Cliffs</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Size &amp; Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>866 MW, Gen II (PWR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>850 MW, Gen II (PWR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity Factor = 95.6%
Cost = $766 million
Output has been 41 years × 1706 MW × 8760 hrs/yr × 0.956 = 5.86 × 10^8 MW hrs
Cost per KWh is $766 × 10^6 / 5.86 × 10^8 W hrs = $1.30 / MWh = 0.13 cents/ kWhr

# Four Reactors Under Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Origin</th>
<th>Size &amp; Type</th>
<th>Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Vogtle 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>$2 \times 1250$ MW, Gen III Westinghouse AP 1000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>V.C. Summer 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>$2 \times 1250$ MW, Gen III Westinghouse AP 1000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This Gen III design will debut in Sanmen, China later this year*

Vogtle 3 & 4 under construction. Source: Southern Company

http://www.lynceans.org/tag/generation-iii-reactors/
http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-t-z/usa-nuclear-power.aspx

Copyright © 2017 University of Maryland
This material may not be reproduced or redistributed, in whole or in part, without written permission from Ross Salawitch.
US has 99 reactors, with a capacity factor of 92% 
Also, 1000 MW = 0.001 TW 
99 x 0.001 TW x 8760 hrs x 0.92 = 800 TWh
Nuclear Power:

- Generates ~11% of world's electricity
- 435 commercial reactors in 31 countries; 70 presently under construction
- 56 countries operate a total of about 240 research reactors and a further 180 nuclear reactors power some 140 ships and submarines

http://breakingenergy.com/2013/11/19/nuclears-prospects-glass-half-full-or-half-empty
• Producing electricity at U.S. nuclear power plants, including fuel, operation and maintenance, declined from 3 ¢ kWh\(^{-1}\) in 1990 to 2.3 ¢ kWh\(^{-1}\) in 2013
• US nuclear plant capacity factor: 58% in 1980, 70% in 1990, 92% in 2014

*increased plant capacity equivalent to 20 new nuclear reactors*

---

**U.S. Electricity Production Costs, 1995-2012**

*Production costs = operation & maintenance + fuel. (excludes indirect costs and capital)*

*Source: Ventyx Velocity Suite / NEI, May 2013*

• Producing electricity at U.S. nuclear power plants, including fuel, operation and maintenance, declined from 3 ¢ kWh$^{-1}$ in 1990 to 2.3 ¢ kWh$^{-1}$ in 2013
• US nuclear plant capacity factor: 58% in 1980, 70% in 1990, 92% in 2014

*increased plant capacity equivalent to 20 new nuclear reactors*

[Graph showing electricity costs from 2000 to 2014 for coal, gas, nuclear, and petroleum.]

Costs in cents per kWh

- **2014**
  - Coal: 3.29
  - Gas: 4.58
  - Nuclear: 2.4
  - Petroleum: 22.49

Electricity Costs: Nuclear

- Why is it relatively inexpensive to generate electricity using nuclear reactions?

Olah et al., Beyond Oil and Gas: The Methanol Economy, 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Average energy content in 1 g [kcal]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNG</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uranium (LWR, once through)</td>
<td>150 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LWR: Light Water Reactor; Regular water, H$_2$O, used to cool (80% of commercial plants worldwide)

Once Through: Present “Generation II” technology **not** recycling fuel
(most countries, except France, Japan, Russia, and U.K. who recycle fuel)

Note: “recycled fuel” is more expensive than newly mined fuel
the recycling of fuel reduces waste, but typically involves plutonium
We’ll return to recycling soon!
Nuclear Power:

- $^{235}\text{U}$ (about 0.7% of natural uranium) is fissile; $^{238}\text{U}$ (dominant form) not fissile
- For reactor, uranium enriched to 3 to 5% using either gas diffusion (1 plant in U.S.) or gas centrifuge (two new plants being developed)
- Bomb grade uranium enriched to 90% $^{235}\text{U}$
  - critical mass for uncontrolled explosion not present in conventional nuclear reactor
- Enriched UF$_6$ (gas at 56°C) converted to solid UO$_2$ pellets “size of a dime”
- Pellets stacked to form “fuel rods”
Nuclear Fission:

- $^{235}\text{U}$ hit by “slow neutron” $\rightarrow$ splits into two smaller atoms, generating heat, more neutrons
  - slow neutrons: cause $^{235}\text{U}$ to split
  - fast neutrons: can be absorbed by $^{238}\text{U}$, transmuting this element to $^{239}\text{Pu}$
  - $^{239}\text{Pu}$: int’l security concern; half life of 24,110 yr
- Released neutrons lead to chain reaction (positive feedback) that releases lots of energy
- Today’s reactors (Generation II)
  - Moderators, either deuterium, helium, or carbon (graphite), quench fast neutrons and maintain “delicate balance” of sustained chain reaction (which ceases with too few neutrons) and regulation of temperature (which gets too high with too many electrons)

http://www.doccasagrande.net
Today's reactors (Generation II):

- Regular $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ used as coolant, transfers heat to another system of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$
  - generates steam which turns turbines
- Operates at $\sim 300^\circ\text{C}$ (not too hot) but at very high pressure ($\sim 150$ times atmospheric)
- Water used for turbines drawn from nearby water source (river, lake, ocean, etc), returned to environment once cooled:
  - intake system not pleasant for local fish
  - concern over output raising temperature of nearby body of water
Today’s reactors (Generation II):

• Regular $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ used as coolant, transfers heat to another system of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$
  – generates steam which turns turbines

• Operates at $\sim300^\circ\text{C}$ (not too hot) but at very high pressure ($\sim$150 times atmospheric)

• Water used for turbines drawn from nearby water source (river, lake, ocean, etc), returned to environment once cooled:
  • intake system not pleasant for local fish
  • concern over output raising temperature of nearby body of water
Nuclear Power: Waste

- HLW: High Level Waste (i.e., spent fuel)
  - 20 tons per plant per year → 2000 tons per year in the U.S.
  - contains $^{235}$Uranium, $^{238}$Uranium, $^{239}$Plutonium, $^{131}$Iodine, $^{137}$Cesium, $^{90}$Strontium
  - About 70,000 tons of spent fuel generated in U.S. (as of 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radioisotope</th>
<th>Half-life ($t_{1/2}$)</th>
<th>Found in the spent fuel rods of nuclear reactors?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uranium-238</td>
<td>$4.5 \times 10^9$ years</td>
<td>Yes. Present originally in fuel pellet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potassium-40</td>
<td>$1.3 \times 10^9$ years</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uranium-235</td>
<td>$7.0 \times 10^8$ years</td>
<td>Yes. Present originally in fuel pellet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plutonium-239</td>
<td>24,110 years</td>
<td>Yes. See equation 7.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carbon-14</td>
<td>5715 years</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cesium-137</td>
<td>30.2 years</td>
<td>Yes. Fission product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strontium-90</td>
<td>29.1 years</td>
<td>Yes. Fission product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thorium-234</td>
<td>24.1 days</td>
<td>Yes. Small amount generated in natural decay series of U-238.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iodine-131</td>
<td>8.04 days</td>
<td>Yes. Fission product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radon-222</td>
<td>3.82 days</td>
<td>Yes. Small amount generated in natural decay series of U-238.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plutonium-231</td>
<td>8.5 minutes</td>
<td>No. Half-life is too short.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polonium-214</td>
<td>0.000016 seconds</td>
<td>No. Half-life is too short.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Spent fuel from plants encased in ceramic or glass (vitrification)
  - radioactivity remains, but glass isolates waste from water supply
  - In U.S., presently stored “on site” at reactors with design capacity for ~25 yrs of waste
Nuclear Power: Waste

• U.S.
  • 1997: Federal Government Designated Yucca Mountain, Nevada (not far from Las Vegas) as sole site for long-term, high level nuclear waste storage
  • Nevada opposed
  • 2002: Senate gave final approval for Yucca Mountain Site based on EPA 10,000 year radiation compliance assessment
  • 2004: U.S. Appellate Court ruled compliance must address N.A.S. study that peak radiation could be experienced 300,000 yrs after site had been filled and sealed
  • 2009: EPA published in Federal Register a final rule, increasing compliance period to 1,000,000 years
  • 2011: Obama administration stopped financial support for Yucca, after $54 billion has been invested for capacity of 70,000 tons of spent fuel plus 8000 tons of military waste

• Rest of World
  • many countries recycle waste, considerably reducing mass of waste
  • Japan considering storing waste at Fukushima reactor site
  • United Kingdom, Canada, and U.S. considering burial of waste in ~2 to 5 km boreholes:
### Nuclear Power: Waste

- United Kingdom, Canada, and U.S. considering burial of waste in ~2 to 5 km boreholes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near-surface disposal at ground level, or in caverns below ground level (at depths of tens of metres)</td>
<td>• Implemented for LLW in many countries, including Czech Republic, Finland, France, Japan, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, UK and USA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implemented in Finland and Sweden for LLW and short-lived ILW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep geological disposal (at depths between 250m and 1000m for mined repositories, or 2000m to 5000m for boreholes)</td>
<td>• Most countries with high-level and long-lived radioactive waste have investigated deep geological disposal and it is official policy in various countries (variations also include multinational facilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implemented in USA for defence-related ILW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preferred sites for HLW/spent fuel selected in France, Sweden, Finland and USA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Geological repository site selection process commenced in UK and Canada.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nuclear Power: Waste

• United Kingdom, Canada, and U.S. considering burial of waste in ~2 to 5 km boreholes:

Deep boreholes

As well as mined repositories which have been the focus of international efforts so far, deep borehole disposal of high-level radioactive waste has been considered as an option for geological isolation for many years, including original evaluations by the US National Academy of Sciences in 1957 and more recent conceptual evaluations. In contrast to recent thinking on mined repositories, the contents would not be retrievable.

The concept consists of drilling a boreholes into crystalline basement rock to a depth of about 5000 metres, emplacing waste canisters containing used nuclear fuel or vitrified radioactive waste from reprocessing in the lower 2000 metres of the borehole, and sealing the upper 3000 metres of the borehole with materials such as bentonite, asphalt or concrete. The disposal zone of a single borehole could thus contain 400 steel canisters each 5 metres long and one-third to half a metre diameter. These might be emplaced in strings of 40 canisters. The waste containers would be separated from each other by a layer of bentonite or cement.

Boreholes can be readily drilled offshore (as described in the section below on sub seabed disposal) as well as onshore in host rocks both crystalline and sedimentary. This capability significantly expands the range of locations that can be considered for the disposal of radioactive waste.

Deep borehole concepts have been developed (but not implemented) in several countries, including Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland and USA for HLW and spent fuel. Compared with deep geological disposal in a mined underground repository, placement in deep boreholes is considered to be more expensive for large volumes of waste. This option was abandoned in countries such as Sweden, Finland and the USA. The borehole concept remains an attractive proposition for the disposal of smaller waste forms including sealed radioactive sources from medical and industrial applications.⁹

An October 2014 US Department of Energy report said: “Preliminary evaluations of deep borehole disposal indicate a high potential for robust isolation of the waste, and the concept could offer a pathway for earlier disposal of some wastes than might be possible in a mined repository.”

Nuclear Power: Safety

- **U.S.**
  - 1979: Three Mile Island near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
  - Loss of coolant and partial meltdown
  - Release of radioactive gases: no fatalities, normal cancer rates in area
    The accident began about 4:00 a.m. on March 28, 1979, when the plant experienced a failure in the secondary, non-nuclear section of the plant. The main feedwater pumps stopped running, caused by either a mechanical or electrical failure, which prevented the steam generators from removing heat. First the turbine, then the reactor automatically shut down. Immediately, the pressure in the primary system (the nuclear portion of the plant) began to increase. In order to prevent that pressure from becoming excessive, the pilot-operated relief valve (a valve located at the top of the pressurizer) opened. The valve should have closed when the pressure decreased by a certain amount, but it did not. Signals available to the operator failed to show that the valve was still open. As a result, cooling water poured out of the stuck-open valve and caused the core of the reactor to overheat.
    For more info, see [http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/3mile-isle.html](http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/3mile-isle.html)

- **Russia**
  - 1986: Chernobyl
    - During a test, operators interrupted flow of cooling water to core
    - Insufficient control rods were in reactor
    - Heat surge resulted, leading to chemical explosion
    - Water was sprayed; water reacted with graphite producing \( H_2 \) (\( 2H_2O + C \rightarrow 2H_2 + CO_2 \)), which caused additional chemical explosion
    - 31 firefighters and several people in plant died from acute radiation sickness; an estimated 250 million people were exposed to elevated radiation that may shorten their lives
    - Nuclear engineers state that no U.S. commercial reactors have Chernobyl design defects
Nuclear Power: Safety

- Japan (Reactors 1-3)
  - 11 March 2011, Earthquake off the coast. Reactors undamaged – go into containment isolation
  - Diesel generators power emergency cooling systems
  - Reactors designed to withstand 6.5m tsunami – reactor complex hit by 14m tsunami
  - Cooling system powered by batteries
  - Loss of battery power led to pressure build up, coolant turned to steam, fuel rods exposed - begin to burn

http://cisac.stanford.edu/events/the_nuclear_crisis_in_japan
Fukushima: Could this have been avoided?

- Diesel generators were located in basement
- Fuel located in above ground, external fuel tanks
- Tsunami flooded generators, wiped out fuel tanks

If generators had been on upper level of the building and fuel buried or kept at a higher elevation, we wouldn’t be having this discussion!!!

Could another Fukushima happen?

National Geographic, 23 March 2011

For a world on the brink of a major expansion in nuclear power, a key question raised by the Fukushima disaster is would new reactors have fared better in the power outage that triggered dangerous overheating?

The answer seems to be: Not necessarily.

The nuclear industry has developed reactors that rely on so-called "passive safety" systems that could address the events that occurred in Japan: loss of power to pump water crucial to cooling radioactive fuel and spent fuel.

But these so-called Generation III designs are being deployed in only four of the 65 plants under construction worldwide. (Four reactors that are in the site-preparation phase and still awaiting regulatory approval in Georgia and South Carolina in the United States would make that eight of 69 plants.)

The vast majority of plants under construction around the world, 47 in all, are considered Generation II reactor designs—the same 1970s vintage as Fukushima Daiichi, and without integrated passive safety systems.

At the San Onofre Nuclear Station on the Southern California coast, modifications have been made that allow the operators to use a gravity-driven system to circulate the water to cool the plant for a period of time upon loss of power. … But there are limits to such retrofits. "This is a huge volume of water," says Adrian Heymer, executive director of strategic programs for the NEI. "What happens to that tank in an earthquake?"

That's why there's been an effort to integrate a fully passive system from the get-go of the design process, he said. There is no ready reference list of which plants around the world have been modified with gravity-driven or other safety features. And as for new nuclear plants with integrated passive safety systems, deployment is slow.

Newer reactors (Generation III):

- Standard design – cheaper and quicker to build and license
- Simpler, rugged design easier to operate and less prone to accidents
- Longer operational lifetime
- Includes many **passive safety features** that decrease likelihood of meltdown

[http://editors.eol.org/eoearth/wiki/Nuclear_power_(About_the_EoE)](http://editors.eol.org/eoearth/wiki/Nuclear_power_(About_the_EoE))
Generation IV

- Initiated by DOE in 1999
- Focusing on "fast spectrum" reactors that cool using sodium
- Fast spectrum refers to use of "fast neutrons", which convert $^{238}\text{U}$ to $^{239}\text{Pu}$
- Operate at atmospheric pressure but $\sim 1000^\circ C$
- Lower pressure reduces risk of explosion

  **But**: sodium + water would generate lots of energy (fire!!!) → safety concerns focused on prevention of this chemical reaction!

- Can recover more than 99% of energy from spent nuclear fuel
- Supported by members of both political parties, leading scientists
- Plutonium would be separated in process:
  
  **Good News**: resulting waste would only have to be managed for ~500 years! (for sufficient decay of 90-strontium to occur)
  
  **Bad News**: presently, plutonium is mixed with nasty, shorter lived radionuclides. If plutonium is isolated, it literally can be handled using gloves:

Generation IV

- Initiated by DOE in 1999
- Focusing on “fast spectrum” reactors that cool using sodium
- Fast spectrum refers to use of “fast neutrons”, which convert $^{238}\text{U}$ to $^{239}\text{Pu}$
- Operate at atmospheric pressure but $\sim 1000^\circ\text{C}$
- Lower pressure reduces risk of explosion
- **But**: sodium + water would generate lots of energy (fire!!!) $\rightarrow$ safety concerns focused on prevention of this chemical reaction!
- Can recover more than 99% of energy from spent nuclear fuel
- Supported by members of both political parties, leading scientists
- Plutonium would be separated in process:
  - Good News: resulting waste would only have to be managed for $\sim 500$ years!
    (for sufficient decay of 90-strontium to occur)
  - Bad News: presently, plutonium is mixed with nasty, shorter lived radionuclides.
    If plutonium is isolated, it literally can be handled using gloves

For more info, see:
- “Power to Save the World, the Truth about Nuclear Energy”, Gwyneth Cravens, 2008.

**Operating conditions of Generation IV reactors attractive for “high temperature hydrolysis of steam for hydrogen production”**

*(Olah et al., Section 9.3.5)*
The Hydrogen Economy*

Hydrogen as a fuel source:

\[ 2H_2(g) + O_2(g) \rightarrow 2H_2O(l) + 286 \text{ kJ} \]

1 gram of hydrogen can yield 143 kJ

Much higher energy yield than fossil fuels and no harmful emissions !!!!!

How does this compare to gasoline?

1 gallon of gasoline ≈ 2800 g ⇒ 2800g × 47.8 kJ/g = 1.34×10^5 kJ

1 kg of hydrogen = 1000g ⇒ 1.43×10^5 kJ

In terms of energy available, 1 kg of hydrogen ≈ 1 gallon of gasoline

Fuel cell cars are more efficient than internal combustion engines
so, in theory, not as much hydrogen is needed

* Not a registered trademark
The Hydrogen Economy*

Majority of world hydrogen produced using fossil fuels
used to create ammonia for fertilizer and to refine petroleum products

* Not a registered trademark
The Hydrogen Economy: Sources

Steam Reformation:

CH₄ is reacted with high temperature steam (700-1000° C) to create H₂

\[ \text{CH}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{CO} + 3\text{H}_2 \]

CO can further react with water (water-gas shift reaction)

\[ \text{CO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2 \]

accounts for most of hydrogen produced in the US
The Hydrogen Economy: Sources

Water electrolysis:

286 kJ are released when hydrogen reacts with oxygen to create water. This reaction can be run in reverse to create hydrogen.

\[ \text{H}_2\text{O} + 286 \text{ kJ} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \frac{1}{2} \text{O}_2 \]

but 286 kJ are needed!

While this uses a lot of energy, it is potentially the cleanest way to make hydrogen.

No emission of GHGs if the electricity needed for electrolysis comes from either nuclear or renewable energy.
The Hydrogen Economy: Storage

Compressed gas:

Need high pressure cylinders to hold enough hydrogen to power a vehicle

Assuming a normal car (10 gallon tank) is 25% efficient

\[ 10 \text{ gallon} \times 1.34 \times 10^5 \text{ kJ/gal.} \times 0.25 = 3.35 \times 10^5 \text{ kJ} \]

Newer hydrogen vehicles are supposedly ~60% efficient,

\[ 3.35 \times 10^5 \text{ kJ} / (1.43 \times 10^5 \text{ kJ/kg} \times 0.6) = \sim 4\text{kg} \]

Hydrogen tanks for vehicle use are rated at 5500 PSI (~375 atm)

From the ideal gas law,

\[ V = 2000 \text{ mol} \times 0.0821 \text{ L atm mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \times 295K / 375 \text{ atm} \]
\[ = 129 \text{ L} \]
\[ = 34 \text{ gallons} \ldots 3.4 \text{ times bigger than a standard liquid tank} \]

- Gas tanks are heavy
- Hard to monitor how much fuel remaining
Hydrogen Fuel Cells

- Hydrogen comes in contact with platinum anode, converts $\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{H}^+$
- $2e^-$ pass through circuit to power car
- Protons pass through proton exchange membrane (PEM) and come in contact with oxygen and $e^-$ to form $\text{H}_2\text{O}$
- Process generates $< 1$ volt, so need stack of fuel cells to power vehicle

Two hurdles to widespread use of hydrogen fuel cell cars:
- source of $\text{H}_2$ that does not involve release of GHGs
- “chicken & egg” dilemma of re-fueling infrastructure

This hurdle seems to have been solved:
✓ past prototype cars have been prohibitively expensive

Hydrogen Fuel Cell Cars

Is that really water that comes out of the exhaust?

Believe it or not, yes. Out of the exhaust comes water so pure you could drink it (but shouldn’t).

The fuel you pump into these cars is hydrogen gas. The energy is created in the fuel cell by reacting the hydrogen in the tanks with oxygen from the air over what is called a “proton exchange membrane” and the end result is electricity and water. Water is made up of two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom (hence H2O) and is the only remnant from this fuel-air interaction.

For the record I would have taken a drink of this water, but Toyota’s people didn’t allow me to for legal reasons. The exhaust pipes can pick up dirt and pollutants while driving around, so it was hard to trust what else besides water could be in that glass.

http://america.aljazeera.com/watch/shows/techknow/articles/2014/10/8/6-questions-abouthydrogenfuelcellcarsyouweretooembarrassedtoask.html
Hydrogen Fuel Cell Cars

Honda has been selling -- or, rather, leasing -- the Clarity hydrogen fuel cell car in California for years. But lately it's been offering a new, roomier five-seat version.

A hydrogen fuel cell car is essentially an electric car. It's driven by electric motors, but it doesn't store energy in a big battery pack. Instead, it gets power by running hydrogen gas through a "fuel cell stack" in which the hydrogen combines with oxygen from the air. That process generates electricity. It also results in the car's only emission, water.

Hydrogen fuel cell cars have two big advantages over electric cars. First, they generally have a longer driving range before needing to refuel. (The Clarity can travel for an EPA-estimated 366 miles on a fill-up.) Second, when they do need to fill up, it only takes a few minutes, not the hours it can take to charge an electric car.

But there are downsides. Foremost, hydrogen fueling stations aren't easy to find. Even in California, which has enough of them that it's the only state in which these cars are currently available, there are still only a relative handful.

Second, there's the space required inside the car to store the gas. Electric car battery packs can be made in a variety of shapes so they can be squeezed into floors of cars and other out-of-the-way places.

Storing a compressed gas means dealing with thick-walled, barrel-shaped tanks that are hard to "squeeze in" anywhere. In the case of the Clarity, while it's roomy enough for people, luggage space is hampered by a big tank behind the back seats. (A second, smaller tank rides beneath the seats.)

The Hydrogen Economy: Problems

Hydrogen Leaks:

- Not a problem if occurring outside
- If inside (parking garage, house garage, etc.) hydrogen will quickly fill space
  - easily ignited
  - explosive in air at concentrations between 18 and 59%
  - burns with a colorless flame
- Pressurized tank explosion
- Containment during car accident

These problems assume that the hydrogen is pressurized or liquefied. If metal hydrides are used, these problems aren't as much of an issue.

Infrastructure:

US has:
- 114,000 gas stations
- 15,703 public electric charging stations
- 34 public hydrogen refueling stations

Energy and Climate

Need to produce, store, and distribute H in a manner that is energy efficient and approaches carbon neutrality
The Hydrogen Economy:
Problems

The Hydrogen Economy: Solar thermochemical

Thermochemical water splitting uses high temperatures—from concentrated solar power or from the waste heat of nuclear power reactions—and chemical reactions to produce hydrogen and oxygen from water. This is a long-term technology pathway, with potentially low or no greenhouse gas emissions.

HOW DOES IT WORK?

Thermochemical water splitting processes use high-temperature heat (500°–2,000°C) to drive a series of chemical reactions that produce hydrogen. The chemicals used in the process are reused within each cycle, creating a closed loop that consumes only water and produces hydrogen and oxygen. The necessary high temperatures can be generated in the following ways:

• Concentrating sunlight onto a reactor tower using a field of mirror "heliostats," as illustrated in Figure 1. For more information, see Chapter 5 of the SunShot Vision Study.
• Using waste heat from advanced nuclear reactors. For more information, see the U.S. Department of Energy’s Nuclear Hydrogen R&D Plan.

http://energy.gov/eere/fuelcells/hydrogen-production-thermochemical-water-splitting
The Hydrogen Economy: Solar thermochemical

Thermochemical water splitting uses high temperatures—from concentrated solar power or from the waste heat of nuclear power reactions—and chemical reactions to produce hydrogen and oxygen from water. This is a long-term technology pathway, with potentially low or no greenhouse gas emissions.

HOW DOES IT WORK?

Thermochemical water splitting processes use high-temperature heat (~500°C to ~2,000°C) to drive a series of chemical reactions that produce hydrogen. The chemicals used in the process are reused within each cycle, creating a closed loop that consumes only water and produces hydrogen and oxygen. The necessary high temperatures can be generated in the following ways:

- Concentrating sunlight onto a reactor tower using a field of mirror “heliostats,” as illustrated in Figure 1. For more information, see Chapter 5 of the SunShot Vision Study.
- Using waste heat from advanced nuclear reactors. For more information, see the U.S. Department of Energy’s Nuclear Hydrogen R&D Plan.

**cerium oxide two step cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentrated sunlight</th>
<th>~2000°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Ce(IV)O₂</td>
<td>Ce(III)₂O₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~400°C</td>
<td>H₂ gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>H₂ gas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduction: 2Ce(IV)O₂ → Ce(III)₂O₃ + ½O₂
Oxidation: Ce(III)₂O₃ + H₂O → 2Ce(IV)O₂ + H₂
net reaction: H₂O → ½O₂ + H₂

**copper chloride hybrid cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentrated sunlight</th>
<th>~500°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Cu₂OCl₂</td>
<td>2CuCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~400°C</td>
<td>H₂ gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>H₂ gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2HCl</td>
<td>H₂ gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrolysis: 2CuCl + 2HCl → 2CuCl₂ + H₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dissociation: 2Cu₂OCl₂ → 2CuCl + ½O₂
Hydrolysis: 2CuCl₂ + H₂O → 2Cu₂OCl₂ + 2HCl

http://energy.gov/eere/fuelcells/hydrogen-production-thermochemical-water-splitting
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Effects of Hydrogen Economy on Atmospheric Composition

If the world moved to a hydrogen economy, what would happen to atmospheric levels of $\text{H}_2$?

Presently, $\text{H}_2$ is about 0.5 ppm and is *long lived in the troposphere.*

$\text{H}_2$ is not a greenhouse gas.

If future levels of atmospheric $\text{H}_2$ happen to rise, this may have an important effect on atmospheric composition.

What effect could occur?

Hints: what happens to $\text{H}_2$ in an oxidizing atmosphere? where will this transition occur?
Increases in stratospheric H$_2$O will lead to chemical loss of O$_3$, cooling the lower stratosphere. Decreasing temp. will promote the formation of PSC's, further decreasing O$_3$ (Tromp et al., *Science*, 2003)

Some believe this study is flawed:
- unrealistic H$_2$ leakage rates
- recovery of ozone layer not considered in model (mentioned by authors, though)
- questioned validity of citations used in study

http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/reprint/300/5626/1740.pdf