

Efficiency Upgrade in PWRs

Morteza Gharib¹; Abdolazim Yaghooti²; Majid Oloomi Buygi³

Amirkabir University of Technology, Tehran, Iran^{1,2}

*Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran*³

E-mail¹: mgharib@aut.ac.ir

E-mail²: ayaghooti@aut.ac.ir

Abstract

Most of the light water reactor power plants now operating or under construction use pressurized-water reactor (PWR). They are suffering of relatively low thermal efficiency which is around 33%. This would not only have a negative impact economically but also incurs environmental burden in terms of thermal pollution. In this paper, nuclear steam supply system of a typical PWR has been taken into consideration using 1000 MW_e Bushehr nuclear power plant (BNPP) data. It is shown thermal efficiency could conceivably be increased by superheating live steam with natural gas up to around 40%, competing with similar fossil-fueled power plants. It is further shown that fuel cost (natural gas) as low as 0.12 Cent/MW_e, extra power generated is feasible.

Keywords: Upgrade efficiency, Nuclear Power Plant, PWR

1. Introduction

Basic human needs can be met only through industrial growth, which depends to a great extent on energy supply. The large increase in population during the last few decades and the spurt in industrial growth have placed tremendous burden on the electrical utility industry and process plants producing chemicals, petrochemicals, and other essential commodities, resulting in the need for additional capacity in the areas of power and steam generation throughout the world. Steam is used in nearly every industry, and it is well known that steam generators and heat recovery boilers are vital to power and process plants. It is no wonder that with rising fuel and energy costs engineers in these fields are working on innovative methods to generate electricity, improve energy utilization in these plants, recover energy efficiently from various waste gas sources, and simultaneously minimize the impact these processes have on environmental pollution and the emission of harmful gases to the atmosphere.

It is a common practice in fossil-fueled power plants to boost live steam entering turbine by superheating it. This would not only increase its thermal efficiency but also this reduces the problem of blade erosion and increases the turbine efficiency in actual cycles. Moreo-

ver, this means that less heat would be injected to an already thermally polluted environment [1,2]. Nuclear power plants (NPP), in contrast with fossil-fueled power plant, contribute their power to the working fluid through a solid substance known as nuclear fuel. This obviously prevents approach to high temperatures and thus high thermal efficiencies. Therefore approaching to a higher thermal efficiency for NPPs is very attractive. There are several approaches to accomplish this. One approach to achieve high temperatures, using gas cooled reactors which employing ceramic, but still solid, nuclear fuels such as dispersed UC fuels within graphite bed [3]. Therefore high operating temperatures is possible thanks to ceramic and graphite high melting points. Currently, light water reactors (LWR) are the most common type of operational reactors in nuclear industry worldwide, among them pressurized water reactors (PWR) are most prominent [3]. Thus, for the time being, the easiest approach is to improve existing reactors. Since fuel and other structural materials in these reactors are pushed at their extreme working conditions, therefore attention may only be restricted to the working fluid in PWRs. A chronic problem with PWRs, as well as with boiling water reactors (BWR), is that steam production is in saturated state. Thus, the very first step on improving thermodynamical cycle of such reactors is to boost live steam

3. Calculation

Starting with conditions similar to BNPP, heat is added step by step at point 8 and observation is made as to what happens to thermal efficiency of the whole plant. It is assumed that a natural gas burner is employed for heat addition to saturated steam at steam generator's exit. For each step, enthalpy is increased by 100 units. **Table 2** shows a brief result on new improved efficiencies. As observed, efficiency would raise from nominal 34% in standard design to improved values up to 38.5% in proposed model.

Table 2. Efficiency improvement as a result of superheating steam in BNPP

step	Steam condition upon exit of heater	Entrance enthalpy to turbine h (kJ/kg)	Entrance steam temperature at turbine T (°C)	Efficiency η (%)
1	saturated steam	2791	275.6	34.2
2	super heat steam	2900	304.5	34.73
3	super heat steam	3000	334.9	35.04
4	super heat steam	3100	370	35.45
5	super heat steam	3200	408.4	35.96
6	super heat steam	3300	449	36.54
7	super heat steam	3400	490.9	37.17
8	super heat steam	3500	533.6	37.82
9	super heat steam	3600	576.6	38.51

In order to conform to conditions prevailed on combined cycle turbine system, resulting superheat steam temperature confined not to exceed 576°C . This is to prevent all risks which could endanger turbine blades due to extreme conditions. To achieve this temperature, we consider that gas combustion is done at pressure and temperature 100 kpa , 25°C respectively, and requirement power to achieve from 275°C to 538°C is $620146.44\text{ kJ/s}(=kw)$, natural gas fuel mass flow rate and air mass flow rate for combustion are 38.72 kg/s , 1335 kg/s respectively, factor proportion of air to natural gas fuel is $34.47\text{ kg(Air)/kg(Fuel)}$. As assistance for calculations, engineering equation solver (EES) is used [5].

At each step, enthalpy at point 1 on reference diagram is increased by 100 units and other physical properties at other key points are calculated with EES taking into account that aforementioned assumptions are observed.

4. Discussions

Referring to **Table 2**, it is quite obvious that hybrid NPP system could deliver high efficiencies up to around 39%. This model applies 2-staged turbine for the sake of simplicity while in reality, even higher efficiencies around 40% are achievable since 4-staged turbine is more efficient. With these high efficiencies, thermal pollution is

lessened and up to 30% less waste heat would be transferred to natural environment.

Table 3 shows economic savings one might get if natural gas superheat is employed in a typical 1000 MW_e NPP (data are given for BNPP). As a result of enthalpy boost to saturated steam, net extra power is calculated and tabulated. In the cost column, price of gas consumed per extra MW_e power produced as a result of superheating is computed and tabulated. In this table, W_{gas} is requirement power that should be generated from gas combustion, η is the efficiency, h_1 is the enthalpy in point 1, T_1 is the temperature in point 1 and \dot{m}_{gas} is flow rate of gas at m^3/s .

Two scenarios are used in this report. One scenario for Iran and other countries with low price tag as $2\text{ Cent}/\text{m}^3$ [6]. Second scenario for OECD countries with price tag as high as $26\text{ Cent}/\text{m}^3$ [7]. In this analysis heat content of natural gas is taken as $34680\text{ kJ}/\text{m}^3$. It is interesting to note that as the degree of superheating is increased, total plant efficiency is also increased and, with that, cost of extra power generation is decreased.

Table 3. Cost-benefit analysis of a generic NPP using natural gas as external heat source

Two scenarios: gas price= 2 Cent/m³ and gas price= 26 Cent/m³

step	h_1 (kJ/kg)	T_1 (°C)	η (%)	\dot{m}_{gas} (m^3/s)	W_{gas} (MW)	price of gas per MW_e extra power due to superheating (Cent/ MW_e)	
						2 Cent/ m^3 gas	26 Cent/ m^3 gas
1	2791	275.6	34.2	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
2	2900	304.5	34.73	5.03	68.1297	0.15	1.92
3	3000	334.9	35.04	9.53	134.5977	0.14	1.84
4	3100	370.0	35.45	13.99	204.88761	0.14	1.78
5	3200	408.4	35.96	18.30	279.33177	0.13	1.70
6	3300	449.0	36.54	22.62	357.93018	0.13	1.64
7	3400	490.9	37.17	26.98	440.84901	0.12	1.59
8	3500	533.6	37.82	31.43	528.75294	0.12	1.55
9	3600	576.6	38.51	35.98	620.14644	0.12	1.51

5. Conclusion

Parameters of BNPP are adopted as a generic 1000 MW_e nuclear power plant. It is shown that, as far as fuel is concerned, extra power produced by natural gas is very cheap. For gas producing countries, such as Iran and GCC countries, where gas is cheap, and for a case that plant efficiency is increased close to 40% price of gas per MW_e excess power is around 0.12 Cent. This figure, for the same conditions except for OECD countries with gas price around $26\text{ Cent}/\text{m}^3$ is about 1.5 Cents. Although capital investment for burner has not been taken into account, but it is conceived that even with including its costs, it is still economical to employ natu-

ral gas assisted burner for superheating steam and efficiency increase in nuclear power plants. This, again, emphasizes on the fact that maintaining higher efficiencies results to direct low power generation cost.

6. References

- [1] L.S. Tong & Joel Weisman, "Thermal analysis of pressurized water reactor", *Third Edition, American nuclear society book publishing committee*, 1996
- [2] Eric Jeffs, "Generating power at high efficiency: Combined-cycles technology for sustainable energy production" *Published by Woodhead Publishing Limited, Abington Hall, Granta Park, Great Abington, Cambridge*
- [3] Antony V.Nero, Jr, "A guidebook to nuclear reactors" *University of California Press*, 1979.
- [4] M.Gharib, "Natural gas superheat steam in PWRs", *The 4th International conference of safety assurance of nuclear power plants with WWER*, 23-26 May 2005, Podolsk, Moscow.
- [5] Kwangil Kim, "Engineering Equation Solver (EES) ", *Samsung Electronics Co. , Korea*, version 4.789, 1992-1io998.
- [6] National Iranian oil company site: <http://www.nc.org.ir>
- [7] "Projected cost of generating electricity", *IEA and OECD*, 2005.