Nuclear Energy: And Production of Hydrogen

Hydrogen Technical and Fuel Cell Advisory Committee (HTAC)

Dan R. Keuter Vice President, Planning & Innovation Entergy Nuclear December 18, 2007



Entergy Does Not Have a Crystal Ball

But we do know...



- Supply of oil and gas is finite
- Environmental regulations are stricter
- America needs energy security/diversity

Future of Nuclear and Hydrogen energy are promising

Getting H₂ From Nuclear Enegy



High Temperature Electrolysis

Based on Solid Oxide Fuel Cell (SOFC) technology –Solid Oxide Electrolysis Cell (SOEC) \Rightarrow Basically A SOFC Operating In Reverse –Uses Thermal Energy to Reduce Electrical Energy Requirements



High Temperature Electrolysis at INL

"Button Cell" Experiments Completed (2003) - Characterized Basic Operating Properties

H2/Steam Inlet





Furnace Base

"Planar Stack" Experiments Underway

- 10-cell Stack Tested October 2004
 - Temps \Rightarrow 800°C 900°C
 - H₂ Production Rates \Rightarrow 50 L/hr 115 L/hr
- 18-cell Stack Being Constructed

Thermochemical Water Splitting



Efficiencies 47%- 53% 600 MW_{Th} Module \Rightarrow ~200 Tons / Day

Nuclear H₂ – Commercially Viable?

Comparative Economics - - Based on SRNL Study



Source: SRNL

Centralized Nuclear H₂ Production



The Freedom Reactor[™]

Modular Construction

- 288 MWe / Unit - 4 Units / Site
- ~200 Tons/Day H₂ Production/Unit
- Below Grade Silo & Terrorist Hardened
- Construction Time < 3 years

Low Capital & Operating Cost

- Capital Cost ~ \$1000 \$1417 /kW
- Low Staffing Levels
- Low Decommissioning Costs

Proven Nuclear Technology Base

- 40 Years Gas Reactor Experience
- U.S. & International

Safety

- Passive cooling
- Meltdown Proof
- Proliferation Resistant



The Next Generation Nuclear Plant

The Energy Policy Act includes \$1 billion for the Next Generation Nuclear Plant at Idaho National Lab

Need demonstration at INL

- Prove design, construction
- Produce electricity and hydrogen
- Validate costs, operations
- Show other benefits waste reduction, fuel flexibility



High volume with low cost
Does not pollute the air
Stable, domestic fuel

.... If the hydrogen economy emerges in the transportation sector as I believe it will, then nuclear power generation will have to play a paramount part in its evolution.

... Hydrogen is the currency of an energy system. To create the currency, hydrogen, primary power must be utilized. The most likely candidate to produce the power is nuclear.

Dr. Geoffrey Ballard, founder of the fuel cell and *Scientific American's* 2002 Business Leader of the Year

Myths & Truths Of Nuclear Energy

Nuclear Myths: Safety



It's safer to work in a nuclear plant than in an office

Nuclear Myths: Chernobyl

<u>Myth</u> A Chernobyl here would kill thousands of Americans <u>Truth</u> Chernobyl-type accident could not happen in the U.S.

• Chernobyl design would not be permitted in U.S.

- U.S. reactors have containment structures; Chernobyl did not
- 56 died at the time of the accident all were on-site plant and emergency workers
- UN study estimates ~ 4,000 thyroid cancers are expected to occur, but few deaths
 - Thyroid cancer is one of most curable with survival rate of 99%
 - No evidence of increase in leukemia or other cancers

Chernobyl death toll has been greatly overstated

Nuclear Myths: Aging Plants



Nuclear Myths: Cancer



<u>Truth</u> No increased risk of cancer for people living near nuclear energy plants

- Nuclear plant workers have LOWER mortality than Americans overall
 - 35% lower for all cancers
 - 66% lower for all non-cancer deaths
- Americans receive significantly more radiation from natural sources than from nuclear energy plants
 - Average resident gets 360 millirem a year from natural sources
 - Average nuclear energy plant worker receives 160 millirem a year
 - The limit at plant fence is 5 millirem a year

Nuclear Energy Institute

"(There is) no general increased risk of death from cancer for people living in 197 U.S. counties containing or closely adjacent to 62 nuclear energy facilities." National Cancer Institute Report,

Journal of the American Medical Association, 1991

Nuclear Myths: Terrorist Targets

<u>Myth</u> Nuclear energy plants are terrorist targets

<u>Truth</u>

Not attractive targets due to strong security and reinforced structures

Nuclear energy plants have the highest security in American industry

- Well-armed, trained security forces
- Strong physical security barriers
- Continuous link to Department of Homeland Security and local law enforcement

Established response procedures and contingency plans

"[Nuclear power plants] are probably our best-defended targets. There is more security around nuclear power plants than anything else we've got. Its infrastructure, especially against these kinds of terrorist threats, is extremely good." John Hamre, President, Center for Strategic & International Studies

Other industrial facilities are far more susceptible

Nuclear Myths: Nuclear Weapons

<u>Myth</u> Nuclear energy will cause a proliferation of nuclear weapons

<u>Truth</u> Commercial plants do not have bomb-grade materials

Weapons grade uranium 235 must be highly enriched

- Nuclear fuel is only 5% pure uranium 235
- It is difficult and expensive to enrich uranium
 - Requires large nationalized industrial complexes
- It is difficult and expensive to obtain plutonium from spent fuel
 - Spent fuel is highly radioactive
- It is not easy to divert spent fuel for other purposes
 - Britain, France, Japan, Russia are reprocessing their fuel
 - Plutonium can be recycled into new fuel best way to dispose of it

It is easier to enrich natural uranium

Nuclear Myths: High Operating Cost



Nuclear is the lowest of all (except hydro)

Nuclear Myths: New Plants Cost Prohibitive

<u>Myth</u> New nuclear is too expensive, not competitive with fossil

<u>Truth</u> MIT shows nuclear energy is very competitive

New Nuclear (LWR)	Opportu	nity	\$/MW	h \$67
Reduce construction cost	\$2000 to	5 \$1500/KW	-1	2 55
Reduce construction time	5 to 4 ye	ears	-	2 53
Reduce O&M, including fuel	\$15 to \$13/MWh		-	2 51
Reduce cost of capital	15% to 12% equity		-	9 42
Increase capacity factor	85% to 9	90%	-	2 40
Carbon Tax Effect	\$0/ton	\$50/ton	\$100/ton	\$200/ton
Pulverized Coal	42	54	66	90
CCGT (Low Gas \$3.77/ MCF)	38	43	48	59
CCGT (Moderate Gas \$4.42/MCF)	41	47	52	62
CCGT (High Gas \$6.72/ MCF)	56	61	67	77

The Future of Nuclear Energy, MIT

Nuclear is competitive with no carbon restrictions, and very competitive with carbon restrictions

Nuclear Myths: Low Reliability



Capacity factor increase at 103 plants in the last 15 years is equivalent to building 26 new 1,000MW plants

Nuclear Myths: Environment

<u>Myth</u> Nuclear energy is bad for the environment <u>Truth</u> Nuclear energy is improving the environment

U.S. nuclear energy plants avoided tons of emissions in 2004

- 3.43 million tons of sulfur dioxide
- 1.11 million tons of nitrogen oxide
- 700 million tons of carbon dioxide
- U.S. nuclear energy plants avoided carbon emissions equal to 94% of U.S. auto emissions (138 million cars)
- World wide, 440 nuclear energy plants save more than twice the Kyoto Accord carbon targets annually
 Nuclear Energy Institute

Nuclear power reduces air pollution and greenhouse gases by displacing other generation

Nuclear Myths: Greenhouse Gases



Life Cycle CO₂ Emissions Analyses Tonnes CO₂-equiv/GW_eh



Nuclear emits very little greenhouse gasses



Nuclear energy is on par with renewables

Nuclear Myths: Nuclear Waste

<u>Myth</u> There is no solution to nuclear waste

<u>Truth</u> Deep geologic repository is a very good solution

<u>Yucca Mountain</u>

- Technically sound
 - 1,000' below ground
 - Repository in solid rock
 - 1,000' above water table
- Remote location on Nevada Test Range
- Current repository in NM Waste Isolation Project (WIP)



Spent nuclear fuel in one remote location is appropriate solution

Nuclear Myths: Massive Amounts of Waste

<u>Myth</u> There are huge volumes of nuclear waste

You could stack all spent fuel from 40 years of operations (103 plants) on a football field about 5 yards deep

Reprocessing would reduce waste to one end zone

- Vastly decreases volume
- Converts long-lived isotopes into short-lived ones (10,000 Years → 300 Years)
- Extends uranium fuel

Other countries ARE reprocessing

Nuclear Energy Institute

<u>Truth</u> Spent fuel is small in volume, easily managed

Spent Fuel from 40 years of Operations (103 plants)



U.S. should reprocess to reduce volume and reclaim the 96% fuel that is unburned in our once-through fuel cycle

Nuclear Myths: Waste Transportation

<u>Myth</u> Nuclear waste cannot be transported safely <u>Truth</u> Spent fuel is being shipped safely by truck and rail today

3,000 shipments for 1.7 million miles in U.S. already (U.S. DOD)

- No container has leaked or cracked
- No radiation released
- Shipping container design is tested and tough
 - 30-foot free fall to unyielding surface (120 mph head-on collision)
 - Puncture test is a 40-inch fall onto vertical steel rod 6" in diameter
 - 30-minute exposure to fire (1475 °F), then submerged in 3 feet of water 8 hrs
- Approved transportation routes with detailed planning
 - Law enforcement support
 - Emergency response support and secure stopover facilities

Nuclear Energy Institute

Spent fuel can be and is being safely shipped

Nuclear Myths: Renewables

<u>Myth</u> Renewables are better than nuclear energy

Land required for emissions-free generation

Truth

Renewables are good, but nuclear energy is more economical, dependable, and uses much less land

Method	Requirement/ Description	Land Area (sq. miles)
Photovoltaic	100 km² @ 10% efficiency	40
Wind	3,000 Wind Turbines @ 1 MW ea.	40-70
Biogas	60,000,000 pigs or 800,000,000 chickens	??
	6,200 km ² of sugar beets	2,400
Bioalcohol	7,400 km ² of potatoes	2,800
	16,100 km ² of corn	6,200
	272,000 km ² of wheat	104,000
Bio-oil	24,000 km ² of rapseed	9,000
Biomass	30,000 km ² of wood	12,000
Nuclear	<1 km ²	1/3

We need to recognize the limits of renewables

Nuclear Myths: Environmental Support

<u>Myth</u> Environmentalists don't support nuclear energy <u>Truth</u> Leading environmentalists worldwide are turning to nuclear energy

"Nuclear energy is <u>the only non-greenhouse gas-emitting power source</u> that can effectively replace fossil fuels and satisfy global demand."

Patrick Moore, Founder Of Greenpeace,

Chair and Chief Scientist of Greenspirit

"If we NIMBY anywhere and anytime, we should not expect the utility industry to provide electricity to everyone, everywhere, all of the time. If we believe that global warming is a real threat to our planet, then <u>the very best</u> way to provide baseload electricity is through emission-free nuclear power."

Norris McDonald, President African American Environmental Assoc.

"Nuclear energy is the only green solution."

James Lovelock, London geophysicist who developed the Gaia Theory on which the Greenhouse Effect is based

Nuclear is clean, green energy

Nuclear Myths: Out of Favor



Truth Americans favor nuclear energy

Americans who favor or oppose use of nuclear energy

83-06 (Annual averages until 04); %



There is strong nuclear energy support and it is increasing

What Has Changed Since We Built Nuclear Plants The First Time

The Industry Has Learned From the Past

Past failures include...

- **1.** Nuclear Regulation Uncertainty post-TMI
- 2. Plant Design Individual/unique designs
- 3. Construction Over schedule and budget
- 4. Owner/Operations Immature industry
- 5. Economics Recession and high inflation

These conditions have changed

1. Nuclear Regulation



New one-step licensing significantly reduces risk

2. Plant Design

Then

Now

- New un-proven designs
- Individual unique designs
 - Numerous changes
 - Custom plants
- Pre-computer engineering methods
 - Analog technology

- Proven designs
- Standard designs
 - Pre-certified designs
 - Standard, identical plants
- Automated design processes
 - Digital technology

New standard designs enable evolutionary technology

3. Construction

Then

Now

- Multi-prime contractors
- Design as you construct
- On-site stick built
- Limited scheduling tools
- Manual document/data control

- Turnkey EPC approach
- Design >85% complete at start of construction
- Modular techniques
- Sophisticated scheduling software
- Automated document/data control

New construction methods minimize construction time and risk

4. Owner/Operations

Then

- Small, individual owner operators
- Low quality standards
- Poor industry communications
- Immature industry
 - Primarily fossil operators
 - Low capacity factors
 - High operating costs

Now

- Large, consolidated fleet operators
- High quality assurance
- Well connected industry (INPO/WANO)
- Mature industry
 - 30+ years experience
 - >90% capacity factors
 - Low, stable cost

Mature industry offers proven track record

5. Economics

Then

Double digit interest rates

- Local rate compacts approved after-the-fact
 - Phased-in rate plans mitigate rate shock
- No environmental recognition
- First of kind costs and risks
 - Construction delays
 - Financial stress

Now

- Single digit interest rates
- Local rate compacts pre-approved
 - CWIP in rate base
 - Stable solid fuel benefits
- Recognized greenhouse gas benefit
- Federal incentives
 - Risk insurance
 - Loan guarantees
 - Production tax credit

Energy Policy Act/local rate compacts reduce costs and risks

Why the Nuclear-H₂ Partnership?

- Large Scale, Economical H₂ Source
- Emissions-Free Production of H₂
- Stable Fuel Costs
- Energy Security
- Preserves Natural Gas & Oil
- Helps Maintain Domestic Industry Base
- Strengthens U.S. Economy