

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR



## COMMENTS ON "TOTAL ENERGY INVESTMENT IN NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS"

I would like to thank Rombough and Koen<sup>1</sup> for their very useful contribution on this topic. However, there appears to be an unfortunate inconsistency in the way they report their results. For construction energy, they compare thermal energy input with electricity produced; for the fuel cycle, they compare electrical energy input with electricity produced. In the case of coal, they revert to thermal input against electricity produced. Thus, their results are unfair to coal. Also, they have neglected the construction energy investment required for enrichment plants.

Each separative work unit (SWU) consumes 2582 kWh(e) or ~8600 kWh(th) of process energy. In addition, a 9 million SWU/a plant will cost ~\$4 billion, including the power stations needed to supply it, and this will contribute an additional 240 kWh(th)/SWU. Thus, pressurized water reactor (PWR) fuel requires

$$4.31 \frac{\text{SWU}}{\text{kg}} \times \frac{8840 \text{ kWh(th)}}{\text{SWU}} = 38\,100 \text{ kWh(th)/kg}$$

The PWR fuel burnup is 792 000 kWh(th)/kg or ~237 000 kWh(e)/kg. Thus, the thermal energy expended on the fuel is ~16% of the electricity produced. By comparison, the total thermal energy investment required for natural uranium CANDU-PHW fuel is <2% of the electricity produced.

W. J. Bradley

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited  
Chalk River Nuclear Laboratories  
Chalk River, Ontario  
Canada, KOJ 1J0

March 1, 1976

### REFERENCE

1. CHARLES T. ROMBOUGH and BILLY V. KOEN, "Total Energy Investment in Nuclear Power Plants," *Nucl. Technol.*, **26**, 5 (1975).

## REBUTTAL TO "COMMENTS ON 'TOTAL ENERGY INVESTMENT IN NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS' "

We thank Bradley<sup>1</sup> for his interest and observations regarding our analysis. The current debate<sup>2</sup> surrounding energy analysis has centered on the point raised by

Bradley—how we are to handle different forms of energy in the calculation.

Basically, there are four ways to solve this problem.

1. Convert all input energy to electricity and compare with the electrical output energy. This assumes that the thermal input energy could have been used to generate electricity. In this case, the energy ratio (ER) (in/out) becomes 5.8% for nuclear and 2.6% for coal.

2. Convert all input energy to thermal and compare with the electrical output energy. In this case, ER becomes 17.5% for nuclear and 7.8% for coal.

3. Assume that the output electricity can be substituted directly for all forms of input energy in which case no conversions from electricity to thermal or vice versa are made. The ER then becomes 7.1% for nuclear and 7.8% for coal.

4. Convert all energy forms to some other unit representing the amount of equivalent useful work available from the energy. This last case would account for the differences in efficiencies between electricity and thermal energy. For example, a natural-gas water heater may be 62% efficient compared to a 95% efficient electric water heater. Using these values, let our unit be the equivalent number of pounds of water that can be heated 1°F for each energy form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nuclear: } & 1.38 \times 10^{13} \text{ Btu(th)} \times 0.62 = 0.86 \times 10^{13} \text{ lb} \\ & 3.71 \times 10^{13} \text{ Btu(e)} \times 0.95 = 3.52 \times 10^{13} \text{ lb} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Total: } 4.38 \times 10^{13} \text{ lb}$$

$$\text{Coal: } 5.63 \times 10^{13} \text{ Btu(th)} \times 0.62 = 3.49 \times 10^{13} \text{ lb}$$

$$\text{Output: } 71.7 \times 10^{13} \text{ Btu(e)} \times 0.95 = 68.12 \times 10^{13} \text{ lb}$$

$$\text{Nuclear ER} = 6.4\%$$

$$\text{Coal ER} = 5.1\%$$

As noted in our paper,<sup>3</sup> we chose method 3 for simplicity, although method 4 is probably the most realistic. The assumption that the thermal input "could have been" used to generate electricity, used in method 1, is purely hypothetical, while the assumption that electricity from the plant could be used for any input energy directly (method 3) is not hypothetical at all. For example, it is realistic to assume that a 1000-MW(e) nuclear plant could be used to supply the energy requirements for a large enrichment facility. Since

enrichment requires ~35 MW(e) per 1000-MW(e) nuclear plant, this one plant could support the enrichment requirements of ~28 other nuclear plants.

In method 2, recommended by Bradley, the electrical input energy is first converted to thermal and then "compared" to the electrical output energy. This would imply (based on the resulting numbers) that one 1000-MW(e) plant could support the enrichment requirements of only  $28/3 = 9$  other plants, certainly an unrealistic conclusion.

We agree that the construction energy of the enrichment facility should be considered as an indirect energy input to the calculation. A more complete accounting of the energy investment can be found in Ref. 4, which evaluates the indirect energy costs associated with the fuel cycle facilities, transportation, waste disposal, government subsidy, nuclear accidents, and environmental aspects. Such an exhaustive analysis for a coal plant has not been performed, and therefore, these secondary costs were not included so that the comparison could be made on the same basis.

It should be emphasized that natural uranium fuel is much less energy intensive than enriched fuel but that the energy needed to produce the heavy water required in a natural uranium plant can be enormous. [The 5000 kWh/lb by distillation works out to be ~3% of the

total energy output from a 1000-MW(e) heavy water reactor; by electrolysis the energy requirement is 55 000 kWh/lb.]<sup>4</sup>

C. T. Rombough

Babcock & Wilcox Company  
Power Generation Group  
P.O. Box 1260  
Lynchburg, Virginia 24505

March 29, 1976

#### REFERENCES

1. W. J. BRADLEY, "Comments on 'Total Energy Investment in Nuclear Power Plants,'" *Nucl. Technol.*, **30**, 441 (1976).
2. PETER F. CHAPMAN, "Energy Analysis of Nuclear Power Stations," *Energy Policy* (Dec. 1975).
3. CHARLES T. ROMBOUGH and BILLY V. KOEN, "Total Energy Investment in Nuclear Power Plants," *Nucl. Technol.*, **25**, 5 (1975).
4. CHARLES T. ROMBOUGH and B. V. KOEN, "The Total Energy Investment in Nuclear Power Plants," ESL-31, Energy Systems Laboratories, College of Engineering, The University of Texas, Austin (Nov. 1974).