

[Scholars' Mine](https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/)

[Masters Theses](https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/masters_theses) **Student Theses and Dissertations** Student Theses and Dissertations

1974

Waste heat utilization from a direct cycle high temperature gas cooled nuclear reactor for district heating and air conditioning

John Joseph Blase

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/masters_theses](https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/masters_theses?utm_source=scholarsmine.mst.edu%2Fmasters_theses%2F3450&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Part of the Nuclear Engineering Commons Department:

Recommended Citation

Blase, John Joseph, "Waste heat utilization from a direct cycle high temperature gas cooled nuclear reactor for district heating and air conditioning" (1974). Masters Theses. 3450. [https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/masters_theses/3450](https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/masters_theses/3450?utm_source=scholarsmine.mst.edu%2Fmasters_theses%2F3450&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

This thesis is brought to you by Scholars' Mine, a service of the Missouri S&T Library and Learning Resources. This work is protected by U. S. Copyright Law. Unauthorized use including reproduction for redistribution requires the permission of the copyright holder. For more information, please contact scholarsmine@mst.edu.

WASTE HEAT UTILIZATION FROM A DIRECT

CYCLE HIGH TEMPERATURE GAS COOLED NUCLEAR REACTOR FOR DISTRICT HEATING AND AIR CONDITIONING

BY

JOHN JOSEPH BLASE, 1947-

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ROLLA

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN NUCLEAR ENGINEERING

1974

Approved by

c.1

De Ray Educaduratisor) Jewitzon 7 demy 9 Wiele / / Tsnilfarieli

T2952 98 pages

ABSTRACT

An analysis was conducted to determine the economic as well as technical feasibility of waste heat utilization from the proposed direct cycle high temperature gas cooled nuclear reactor, as designed by the General Atomic Company.

The rejected heat from this system is at considerably higher temperatures than those normally encountered in conventional steam-electric Rankine cycles. By taking advantage of these higher rejection temperatures, heat was translated into energy available to a district heating and air conditioning service. The transportation of this energy was considered to be in the form of heated and chilled water.

A refrigeration capacity on the order of 100,000 Tons and a heating capability of 5.0 x 10^9 BTU/hr at a distance of 70 miles was found to be a possibility.

An economic analysis using a discounted cash flow technique, indicated that most of the systems analyzed could be profitable ventures. During the operation of the district heating and air conditioning network, overall utilization of the total reactor heat generation would be in excess of 80.0 per cent.

ii

 $\frac{2}{3}$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to thank Dr. D. Ray Edwards for his continued technical and financial support while at the University of Missouri-Rolla. Special thanks to Dr. Henry Wiebe whose expertise in engineering economics proved most beneficial. The author would also like to thank Dennis Blondin for his help in the review and preparation of this analysis, David Hurley for his technical competence in refrigeration systems and Glenn Schade for his computer programming assistance. Finally, appreciation to my wife, Karen, who prepared the drawings and illustrations for this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (cont.)

LIST OF TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

Direct cycle high temperature gas cooled reactor systems, designed for the generation of electricity, will operate at a cycle efficiency of 37.0 per cent. $[11]$ The remainder of the energy will be rejected as waste heat to the local environment by way of dry air cooling towers. [11] The temperature range of the rejected heat in any one system is between 472°F and 130°F at the precooler stage of the cycle.

The objective of this analysis is to determine an economically and technically feasible method of utilizing the energy rejected from this cycle. The energy is transported to the load center by means of pumped hot and/or cold water, depending on the requirements of the season.

The rejected heat from the reactor cycle provides hot water for the heating system and dry saturated steam for a series of steam jet refrigeration units, that will in turn chill the water for the cooling season.

An investigation into the economic aspects of financing the purchase and construction costs, determination of the operating costs, depreciation allowances, and resultant revenues is of the utmost importance, if the ultimate feasibility of the system is to be determined. A discounted cash flow technique is employed in this aspect of the analysis.

A FORTRAN IV computer program (HOTNCOLD) was developed to assist in the technical and economic analysis of the district heating and cooling networks.

II. METHOD

II.A. Outline of Procedure

The method used in defining and analyzing the district heating and cooling system is as follows:

- 1. Briefly describe the direct cycle high temperature gas cooled reactor thermal cycle.
- 2. Analyze the energy source using the following procedure.
	- a. determine the heat rejected from the reactor cycle.
	- b. determine the heat available to the district heating system at the plant site.
	- c. briefly describe the steam jet refrigeration cycle.
	- d. determine the quantity of 100 psig steam available to the steam jet refrigeration units.
	- e. determine the refrigeration available to the district cooling network at the plant site.
- 3. Determine the quantity of heat and refrigeration actually delivered to the load center.
	- a. conduct a heat transfer analysis to determine the amount of heat and refrigeration that arrives at the load center. Use the computer program HOTNCOLD (routine TECH) to determine this delivery capability.
- 4. Conduct a discounted cash flow analysis.
	- a. determine the installed cost of each operating system. b. determine the operating costs of each operating system.

c. determine a cumulative present worth schedule for a thirty year life.

II.B. The Motive Energy Source

As a starting point the energy source of the system must be considered. This source will provide the input energy required to heat and chill the water, that will in turn transport the energy to a district heating and cooling network.

Figure 1.0 is a typical schematic representation of a direct cycle high temperature gas cooled reactor, as designed by General Atomics International. [11] The precooler section is of particular interest here, since it is this area where nearly all the rejected heat of the cycle appears. The temperature of the rejected heat is relatively high when compared to the typical rejection temperatures encountered in conventional steam Rankine cycle. In this system the temperature drop across the precooler ranges from 470°F at the entrance of the precooler to l30°F at the exit; whereas, in the Rankine steam cycle condenser rejection temperatures would be around 105°F. For the case investigated herein a reactor with an electrical power output of 1100 MWe and a cycle efficiency of 3 7 per cent was chosen as being typical of design considerations at this time. $[11]$

Fig. 1.0. Direct Cycle High Temperature Gas Cooled Reactor. [11]

II.B.l. Thermal balance on the precooler section to determine the steam available to the refrigeration units

Figure 2.0 is a schematic representation of a steam generator acting as the heat rejection point for the precooler stage of the cycle. The steam generator is designed such that helium can transfer heat through a temperature range of 472°F to an exit temperature of 103°F. This heat is transferred to water entering the steam generator at 80°F and exiting as dry saturated steam at 100 psig and a temperature of 338°F. What follows is a thermal balance on the steam generator to determine the mass rate of flow of 100 psig dry saturated steam that is available to the refrigeration units.

Fig. 2.0. Precooler as Steam Generator.

5

Where

 \mathring{m}_1 = incoming and exiting mass rate of flow of the helium (lbm/hr) $\stackrel{\bullet}{m}_{2}$ = incoming and exiting mass rate of flow of either the water or steam (lbm/hr) h_1 = incoming enthalpy of the helium (BTU/lbm) $h₂$ = incoming enthalpy of the water (BTU/lbm) h_3 = exit enthalpy of the helium (BTU/lbm) h_{Δ} = exit enthalpy of the steam (BTU/lbm)

Performing an energy balance:

$$
\mathbf{m}_1 \mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{m}_2 \mathbf{h}_2 = \mathbf{m}_1 \mathbf{h}_3 + \mathbf{m}_2 \mathbf{h}_4
$$
 (1)

rearranging

$$
\dot{m}_1(h_1 - h_3) = \dot{m}_2(h_4 - h_3)
$$
 (2)

However, it is known that the left hand term in Equation (2) represents the rejected heat from the cycle. Thus,

$$
Q_r = m_2 (h_4 - h_3) \tag{3}
$$

also

$$
Q_{\rm th} = Q_{\rm r} + Q_{\rm e} \tag{4}
$$

and

$$
Q_e = Q_{th} N_{cy}
$$
 (5)

Substituting (5) in (4),

$$
Q_{r} = \frac{Q_{e}}{N_{CV}} - Q_{e}
$$
 (6)

where

 Q_r = rejected thermal energy (BTU/hr) Q_{th} = total energy output of the reactor (BTU/hr) Q_e = total electrical energy generated (BTU/hr) N_{cy} = cycle efficiency

hence from (6) and (3) we have:

$$
\dot{m}_2 = \frac{Q_r}{h_4 - h_3} \tag{7}
$$

from (6) Q_r may be determined:

$$
Q_e
$$
 = 1100 MWe
\n N_{cy} = .37
\n Q_r = $\frac{(1100 \text{ MWe})(3.414 \times 10^6) \text{ BTU/hr} - \text{ MWe}}{.37}$
\n- (1100 MWe)(3.414 x 10⁶ BTU/hr - MWe)
\n Q_r = 6.394 x 10⁹ BTU/hr

For the refrigeration system that was selected, 100 psig dry saturated steam is required. [20]

Then at 115 psia saturated:

$$
\text{h}_4 = \text{1189.6 BTU/lbm}
$$

The water entering the steam generator is at 70°F then:

$$
h_3 = 38.025 \text{ BTU/lbm}
$$

solving for the mass rate of flow from (7):

$$
\dot{m}_2 = \frac{6.394 \times 10^9 \text{ BTU/hr}}{(1189.6 - 38.025) \text{ BTU/lbm}}\n\dot{m}_2 = 5.55 \times 10^6 \text{ lbm/hr}
$$
\n(8)

II.C. 40°F Water Available to the System

The energy in the steam calculated in section II.B.l will act as the motive energy source for a steam jet refrigeration cycle.

II.C.l. Description of the cycle

Water is used as the working fluid in this system. Figure 3.0 is a schematic representation of the refrigeration $\text{unit.} \begin{bmatrix} 20 \end{bmatrix}$ The evaporator, as in any refrigeration system, is the point at which the actual refrigeration takes place.

Water is evaporated under low pressure thereby cooling the water returning from the load. In order to maintain a sufficiently low pressure in the evaporator, water vapor must be continuously removed from the evaporator. Vapor is removed by entraining evaporator

 \sim

Fig. 3.0. Schematic of the Steam Jet Cycle.

 $\bar{\epsilon}$

 $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$

vapor with a supersonic flow of steam from the jet nozzle. Steam leaves the jet nozzle at supersonic velocities and requires a back pressure usually between 20 and 100 psig. The supersonic flow entrains the evaporator vapor at a ratio between 2.0 lbm motive steam per lbm evaporator vapor and 3.0 lbm motive steam per lbm of evaporator vapor. The mixture moves at supersonic velocities through the mixing section at constant pressure to the throat where a shock wave is formed. The mixture compresses through the wave and is returned through the diffuser to the condenser at a higher pressure. Liquid water is pumped from the condenser to the boiler to create motive steam and some is valved to the evaporator as make up water. The cycle is now repeated to maintain a sufficiently low temperature at a continuous rate.

II.C.2. Refrigeration available at the plant site

The amount of refrigeration may now be determined by the use of a parametric graph. [20] Rather than solve the steam jet thermodynamic cycle to determine the refrigeration available, graphs plotting the parameters governing the thermodynamic cycle of the steam jet units are used. Figure 4.0 is a plot of the parameters that govern the operation of the steam jet cycle for standard manufactured units. [20] In this figure the parameters of condenser temperature, condenser water flow rate, booster steam consumption and chilled water temperatures are plotted in their relationships to each other at a constant steam back pressure of 100 psig.

10

For this case a condenser temperature of l00°F is typical for summer operation and a required chilled water temperature of 40°F is selected. Water in this temperature range is desirable due to the dew point requirements of humidity control. Then from Fig. 4.0

at T = 100°F c

it is found that

1.0 Tons of refrigeration are available for every 27.5 lbm/hr of 100 psig. dry saturated steam moved through the jet nozzle.

where

$$
T_C
$$
 = condenser temperature
\n T_{CW} = childled water temperature
\n $RA = \frac{m_2}{SRA}$

where

 $RA = refrigeratorationalable (Tons)$ $SRA = specific refrigerator$

thus

$$
RA = \frac{5.55 \times 10^6 \text{ lbm/hr}}{27.5 \text{ lbm/hr} - \text{Top}}
$$

Fig. 4.0 Steam Jet Cycle Parameters

$$
RA = 2.05 \times 10^5
$$
 Tons

in terms of BTU/hr this would be

RA =
$$
(2.02 \times 10^5 \text{ Tons}) \times (12000 \text{ BTU/hr} - \text{ Ton})
$$

RA = 2.424 x 10⁹ BTU/hr

II.C.3. Cooling water available to the pipeline

Consider the thermal balance on the cooling unit given in Fig. 5.0, with water returning from the load, entering the refrigeration unit, being chilled, then returned to the load.

Fig. 5.0. Cooling Unit Thermal Balance.

where

 \mathbf{m}_{r} = mass rate of flow of chilled water available to the load (lbm/hr)

 h_r = enthalpy of the water returning from the load (BTU/lbm) h_1 = enthalpy of water leaving the refrigeration unit

Performing a thermal balance yields:

RA =
$$
\dot{m}_r h_r - \dot{m}_r h_1
$$

\n $\dot{m}_1 = \frac{RA}{h_r - h_1}$
\n $\dot{m}_1 = \frac{2.424 \times 10^9 \text{ BTU/hr}}{(28.06 - 8.027) \text{ BTU/lbm}}$
\n $\dot{m}_1 = 1.21 \times 10^8 \text{ lbm/hr}$

II.D. 200°F Water Available to the System

It must now be determined how much hot water may be delivered from the plant at a temperature of 200°F.

Fig. 6.0. Thermal Balance for Heating System.

where

 $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{w}}^*$ = mass rate of flow of heated water available to the system (lbm/hr) h_{tr} = enthalpy of the water returning to the plant (BTU/lbm) h_{1w} = enthalpy of the water leaving the plant and returning to the load (BTU/lbm)

Performing an energy balance:

$$
Q_{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbf{h}_{1\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{w}}
$$
(12)

$$
\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{r}}}{\mathbf{h}_{1\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{w}}} \tag{13}
$$

Determining the enthalpies h_{ν} and $h_{1\nu}$ from the steam tables at the given temperatures and substituting these values in (13) we have:

$$
\mathbf{m}_{\rm w} = \frac{6.394 \times 10^9 \, \text{BTU/hr}}{(168.09 - 117.95) \, \text{BTU/lbm}}
$$

$$
\dot{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{w}} = .910 \times 10^8 \text{ lbm/hr}
$$

It is now known that 0.910 x 10^8 lbm/hr of 200 \rm{F} water and 1.210 x 10^8 lbm/hr of 40°F water is available to the pipeline system.

III. HEAT TRANSFER AND PRESSURE DROP CALCULATIONS

At this point the energy available to the system in the form of heated and chilled water is known. However, since the energy must be transmitted over some distance to the load center, additional factors affecting the actual quantity of energy delivered to the load center must be considered. These factors include; pressure drop calculations as a function of linear water velocity and pipe diameter, and heat transfer through the pipe over the distance to the load.

III.A. Pipeline Pressure Drop Calculations

For a given size pump rated for a fixed horsepower, the proper diameter pipe must be matched to the mass rate of flow at which the pump is rated. This will be done for various diameter pipes by the following procedure.

- 1. Select the size of the pump.
- 2. The maximum mass rate of flow has been determined in section II.
- 3. Determine the linear velocity of the water in the pipe.
- 4. Determine the pressure drop for a specific diameter linear velocity and friction factor in the pipe .
- 5. Determine the distance between the pumps in the pipeline.

III.A.l. Pressure drop per mile of pipe

$$
DP = \frac{(f) (SV) (5280 ft/mile)}{D} \frac{G}{10000}^{2}
$$
 (14)

where

DP = pressure drop (psi)/unit length

\nf = friction factor (Moody determination)

\nD = pipe diameter (inches)

\nSV = specific volume
$$
(ft^3/lbm)
$$

\nG = mass rate of flow/pipe cross sectional area $(\mu m/hr - ft^2)$

III.A.2. Horsepower required per mile

$$
HP = \frac{(A) (H)}{36000}
$$
 (15)

where

 $HP =$ horsepower required/mile H = pressure drop in feet of water/mile $A = mass rate of flow (lbm/sec)$

and

$$
DBP = \frac{HORSEPOWER OF PUMP SELECTED}{HP}
$$
 (16)

where

 $DBP = distance between pumps (miles)$

III.B. Pipeline Heat Transfer Calculations

There are two important determinations to be made at this point in the analysis.

1. Determine the heat transfer in or out of the pipeline for a given distance.

2. Determine the energy addition to the water by the pumps. Consider the schematic in Fig. 7.0 representing a pipeline with a series of pumps.

Fig. 7.0. Pipeline Schematic.

Water enters pump P_1 at mass flow rate m lbm/hr. The energy added across the pump would be:

$$
h_w^{\dagger} = h_w + \frac{HP}{\dot{m}}
$$
 (17)

where

 h_w = internal energy of the water before entering pump P₁

 $HP = power output of the pump (BTU/hr)$ h' = internal energy of the water after the pump

Immediately following the pump P_1 , energy will begin to flow across the wall of the pipe if the ambient temperature is different from that of the water in the pipe (this will be the case in most circumstances) . As the water moves downstream from the pump heat will transfer out or into the pipe, as a result of this heat flow the temperature of the water will be a different value from one instant to the next. This fact will in turn effect the rate of heat transfer in or out of the pipe, because the rate of heat transfer is determined by the temperature difference across the pipe. It is possible to approximate the actual case by assuming the temperature of the water to be essentially constant for very small subsections (S_n) of the distance between the pumps (L).

These calculations would be carried out by first determining the rate of heat loss per unit length for a constant temperature difference.

Consider Fig. 8.0 which is a cross sectional representation of an insulated pipe buried in the ground. The steady state heat transfer per unit length is given by: [5]

$$
Q_{a} = \frac{2 \pi (r_{i} - r_{G})}{\frac{1}{n_{1}r_{1}} + \frac{\ln(r_{2} - r_{1})}{k_{p}} + \frac{\ln(r_{3} - r_{2})}{K_{I}} + \frac{\ln(r_{4} - r_{3})}{K_{g}}}
$$
(18)

where

$$
h_1 = \frac{(NU_d)(k_w)}{2r_1} = \text{the film coefficient} \tag{19}
$$

and

$$
NU_d = Nusselt number
$$
\n
$$
= .023 (R_d)^{-8} (Pr)^B
$$
\n
$$
B = .4 \text{ for heating the water}
$$
\n
$$
B = .3 \text{ for cooling the water}
$$
\n
$$
Re_d = \text{Reynolds number}
$$
\n
$$
= \frac{V 2r_1}{v_k}
$$
\n
$$
P_r = \text{Prandtl number}
$$
\n
$$
V = \text{water velocity}
$$
\n
$$
V_k = \text{kinematic viscosity of the water}
$$
\n
$$
k_w = \text{thermal conductivity of the water}
$$
\n
$$
T_i = \text{temperature of the water}
$$
\n
$$
T_G = \text{temperature of the ground the pipe is buried in}
$$
\n
$$
r_1 = \text{inner radius of the pipe}
$$

 r_3 = outer radius of the insulation r_A = outer radius of the soil around the pipe k_{n} = thermal conductivity of the pipe (BTU/hr-ft-°F) k_{T} = thermal conductivity of the insulation k_{σ} = thermal conductivity of the ground $Q_{\rm a}$ = heat transfer per unit length (BTU/hr-ft)

The sequence of events used in determining the heat transfer in each section would be:

For heat transfer in section s_{1} Fig. 7.0:

- 1. Determine the pump energy addition to the water by using equation (17) and find h_v^{\bullet} .
- 2. From the steam tables determine the temperature T_{2} (Fig. 7.0) from the value h_w^{\dagger} .
- 3. Given the ground temperature T_{G} (Fig. 8.0) and having calculated the water temperature $T_1 = T_i$ use equation (18) to determine the heat transferred per unit length.
- 4. Determine the film coefficient h_1 by equation (19).
- 5. Determine the heat transferred through section $\mathbf{s}_1^{}$ of the pipe $Q_{\rm a}$.
- 6. Determine the new enthalpy of the water by:

$$
h_w'' = h_w' + \frac{Q_a}{m}
$$

7. Knowing h" determine the corresponding temperature $T_2 = T_i$ from the thermodynamic tables and use this as the constant temperature for section s_2 .

8. Repeat steps 1 through 7 for all sections through s_n until the next pump or the load center is reached.

III.C. Energy Available at the Load Center

In section III.A and III.B, the technique for determining the temperature at any point in the pipeline was discussed. Now the actual amount of energy available at the load center may be determined.

Fig. 9.0. Schematic of Pipeline Delivery System.

The three important factors involved in this analysis are:

- 1. Determination of the temperature before the load
- 2. Determination of the temperature after the load
- 3. Determination of the mass rate of flow

The temperature before the load was calculated by the technique

outlined in the previous sections and m is known. The temperature after the load, is in most instances variable, dependent on the weather conditions effecting the local requirements. For purposes of this analysis a maximum temperature differential across the load is specified.

The temperature increase across the load for the air conditioning service never exceeds l2°F. Temperature increases greater than l2°F would make humidity control difficult. The temperature change across the load for heating was chosen to be 35°F. Temperature drops greater than 35°F are possible; however, the lower the temperature entering the load center the greater the heat exchanger surfaces required to deliver an equivalent amount of energy. Since the temperature change across the load will be a function of the temperature of the water entering the load center; the temperature change across the load must also be a function of the distance from the load center.

Assumptions

 T_{a1} = 55°F for the air conditioning service T_{a1} = 150°F for the heating service

where

 T_{a1} = temperature after the load

The energy left at the load would be:

23

$$
Q_1 = \dot{m}h_{b1} - \dot{m}h_{a1}
$$

where

 Q_1 = energy removed from, or added to the load center (BTU/hr) h_{bl} = enthalpy of the water before the load (BTU/lbm) h_{a1} = enthalpy of the water after the load (BTU/lbm)

III.D. Demonstration of Method

A computer program HOTNCOLD (subroutine TECH) was developed to utilize the type of analysis outlined in the above sections. The following input to the program was used for the systems analyzed in this investigation.

III.D.l. Program input

Temperature drop across the load = 20° F to 35° F (heating) Temperature rise across the load = less than 12° F (cooling) Number of pipes = 2 in each direction** Water mass rate of flow = variable .8 x 10^8 lbm/hr to .3 \times 10⁸ lbm/hr Pump size = 7000 horsepower

Thermal conductivity of the water $= .338$ BTU/hr-ft°F Thermal conductivity of the pipe $= 25.0 \text{ BTU/hr-ft}^{\circ}F$

** two pipes were selected because there is sufficient water available to the system at full load to accommodate a two pipe system

Thermal conductivity of the insulation = $.13$ BTU/hr-ft°F Thermal conductivity of the soil $= 1.0$ BTU/hr-ft°F Friction factor (Moody determination) $= .015$ Maximum distance to the load centre $= 110$ miles Pipe diameter $=$ 30 to 60 inches Kinematic viscosity of the water $=$ function of temperature in tabular form Prandtl Number $=$ function of temperature in tabular form Months of heating service $= 4$ months (full load) Months of cooling service $= 3$ months (full load)

III.E. Results

The following figures are the results of the calculations done in subroutine TECH in the program HOTNCOLD.

The graphs illustrate the refrigeration or heat available at a given distance PER PIPE. For example it is seen from Fig. 16.0 that 51820.0 tons of refrigeration is available per delivery pipe at a distance of 100.0 miles with a 60 inch pipe and a mass rate of flow of 56.0 x 10^6 lbm/hr of chilled water.

At the same distance from Fig. 10.0, 1.91×10^9 BTU/hr is available to a heating load with the same mass rate of flow of water. It is known from sections II.C.2 and II.B that 1.21×10^8 lbm of chilled water and .910 x 10⁸ lbm/hr of heated water are actually available to **the** pipeline. Obviously what this means is that two pipes may be used **to deliver** at maximum load. When the season does not require a

strictly heating or air conditioning service, hot water may be shipped in one pipe and cold in the other.

The following symbols key the mass rates of flow on Figures 10.0 through 17.0.

 \sim

DISTANCE FROM THE PLANT (MILES)

Fig. 10.0. Heat Rate vs. Distance. ml-m8

Fig. 11.0. Heat Rate vs. Distance. m9-m13

Fig. 12.0. Heat Rate vs. Distance. m6-m13

Fig. 13.0. Heat Rate vs. Distance. m11-m13

Fig. 14.0. Refrigeration vs. Distance from the Plant. ml-m8

Fig. 15.0. Refrigeration vs. Distance from the Plant. m9-ml3

Fig. 16.0. Refrigeration vs. Distance from the Plant.m6-ml3

 \sim

Fig. 17.0. Refrigeration vs. Distance from the Plant. mll-ml3

IV. CASH FLOW ANALYSIS

A discounted cash flow analysis is conducted to yield an initial look at the economic desirability of undertaking the district heating and cooling project.

IV.A. Procedure

The following procedure was used to carry out the cash flow analysis:

- 1. These parameters are held at fixed levels:
	- a. The revenue rate for energy sold
	- b. The discounting rate
	- c. The cost and revenue escalation rate
	- d. Depreciation scheme for capital investments
- 2. Decide which parameters to vary as a function of the physical system:
	- a. The installed cost of the piping system
	- b. The maintenance cost of the system
	- c. Installed cost of the refrigeration system
	- d. Operating cost of the system
	- e. Tax costs
- 3. For each unique set of parameters carry out the following:
	- a. Establish a 30 year face value cash flow table with escalation (inflation) costs included
	- b. Discount the face value table to a single present worth cash in and cash out value

c. Calculate the cumulative present worth table for the 30 year life of the project.

IV.A.l. Rates

IV.A.2. Example cash flow

The following is an excerpt from Appendix D where a detailed development of this example is given. The following example situation was developed for cash flows in the years they occur for an initial investment of \$1000.00, maintenance expense of \$1000.00/year and \$2000.00/year revenue.

Table 1.0. \$1000 Investment Cash Flow Table.

where

 $CI = capital$ investment $FC = finance charges + dividends$ $= (.40 \times CI \times BROI) + (.30 \times CI \times CROI) + (.30 \times PROI)$ $BROI = bond rate of interest$ $CROI = common rate of interest$ $PROI = preferred rate of interest$ per cent bonds = 40% per cent preferred 30% per cent common 30%

```
PRTX = property taxes= 2.0% x CI
TAXES = income taxes
```
IV.A.3. Depreciation scheme

The following method was used to calculate a dual declining balance depreciation scheme.

where

SLR = straight line depreciation rate
=
$$
\frac{1}{\text{Project life (years)}}
$$
 (21)

In this scheme we switch to a straight line depreciation scheme when the undepreciated balance divided by the number of years remaining in the life of the project is greater than the dual declining balance depreciation value.

IV.A.4. Income tax calculations

Knowing the depreciation schedule, the income tax calculations

may now be carried out. A tax rate of 50% of net income is used.

Taxes(N) = $[(R(N) - (OP(N) + MAINT(N) + DEP(N) + PT(N)$

+Bond interest(N))] x .50 (22)

where

 $N =$ any one year in the project life from 1 through 30 inclusive R(N) = revenue in any one year FC(N) finance charges for any one year OP(N) operating expenses in any one year $= R(1 + k)^N$ $= OP(1 + k)^N$ $MAINT(N) = maintenance expenses in any one year$ $=$ MAINT(1 + k)^N DEP(N) depreciation expense (outlined in section IV.A.3) PT(N) property tax in any one year Bond Interest = interest paid on the bonds only to finance part of the project IV.A.5. Net cash flow The face value net cash flow may now be determined. $NCF(N) = [R(N) - (OP(N) + MAINT(N) + INCOME TAKES(N) + PT(N)]$ $+ FC(N) + CR)$] (23)

where

NCF(N) = net cash flow for any one year

CR capital recovery

and

$$
PW_{O}(N) = \frac{NCF(N)}{(1 + i)^{N}}
$$
 (24)

where

 $PW_{O}(N)$ = the present worth at time zero for any one year (N).

thus

$$
PVI = PW_{O}(1) + PW_{O}(2) + PW_{O}(3) + \cdots PW_{O}(30)
$$
 (25)

where

PVI cumulative present value of income at i% for a project life of 30 years.

This type of cash flow analysis was conducted for the systems represented in figures 20 through 25. The computer program HOTNCOLD subroutine CASH was developed using the technique outlined in the above sections to process the cash flow calculations and prepare the plots therefrom.

Fig. 18.0 Installed Cost of Refrigeration Systems vs. Refrigeration Capacity.

The following figure (Fig. 19.0) was developed from cost projections from pipeline data given for the years 1951 through 1967. These data were projected to the year 1974 to give the curve represented in Fig. 19.0. These data were published by the Federal Power Commission in the March 1969 issue of Pipeline Engineer. With the shortage of fabricated steel pipe there is no accurate way of determining the actual price of the pipe in March 1974. Although the graph does most probably represent the range in which the pipe costs would fall if pipe were available.

Fig. 19.0. Installed Cost of Pipe vs. Diameter.

IV.B. Results of the Cash Flow Analysis

The following figures are the results of the calculations done in subroutine CASH in the program HOTNCOLD. The graphs illustrate the present value net cumulative cash flow for a two pipe (two in each direction) hot water and cold water delivery system. For example, it is seen from figure 20.0 that the 10% cumulative present worth of the net cash flow for a 50 mile installation at a mass rate of flow of 56 x 10^6 lbm/hr (m2) is \$52,000,000. At the distance where the line crosses the 0.0 point the system would have an internal rate of return of 10.0%. Above the dashed line represents money earned above 10.0%, below the dashed line represents money short of 10.0% internal rate of return.

The following symbols key the mass rates of flow on figures 20 through 25.

ml 57 X 106 lbm/hr m2 56 X 106 lbm/hr m3 55 X 106 lbm/hr m4 54 X 106 lbm/hr m5 53 X 106 lbm/hr m6 52 X 106 lbm/hr m7 51 X 106 lbm/hr m8 50 X 106 lbm/hr m9 48 X 106 lbm/hr mlO 48 X 106 lbm/hr

Fig. 20.0. Present Value of Cumulative Income at 10% for a 30 Year Life vs. Years. ml-m4

Fig. 21.0. Present Value of Cumulative Income at 10% for a 30 Year Life vs. Years. m5-m8

Fig. 22.0. Present Value of Cumulative Income at 10% for a 30 Year Life vs. Years. m9-m12

Fig. 23.0. Present Value of Cumulative Income at 10% for a 30 Year Life vs. Years. m6-m9

Fig. 24.0. Present Value of Cumulative Income at 10% for a 30 Year Life vs. Years. ml0-ml3

Fig. 25.0. Present Value of Cumulative Income at 10% for a 30 Year Life vs. Years. mll-ml3

V. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Depending on the mass rate of flow and pipe diameter, it is possible to realize at least a 10% internal rate of return at distances from the load center between 50 and 75 miles. At distances greater than this range internal rates of return less than 10% would be realized. At distances less than this range internal rates of return greater than 10% would be realized.

It must be remembered that the most significant assumption made in this investigation was the fact that the system would operate at full load capacity for the heating period of four months and a cooling period of three months. Hence, these systems are being presented as supplemental in nature to existing heating and refrigeration systems. The heating and cooling network is designed to handle a major portion of the steady load season, which is usually in the middle of the summer and winter seasons. If the systems were to be applied on a year round basis, the load requirements for the local area would have to be determined and the water flow rate adjusted according to the varying load requirements, in variable seasons as the spring and fall. However, even if these systems were used as suggested herein, that is, as supplemental systems, the energy savings and economic benefit would still be quite high.

The efficient utilization of energy from high temperature gas cooled reactors not only has the attractive point of utilizing **much** of the energy that would be otherwise wasted; but, also the

added advantage of conserving fossil fuel resources, that would ordinarily have been required to supply the heating and air conditioning service during high load periods.

The fossil fuel savings would of course be equivalent to the energy consumed by the load center during operation of the waste heat systems. For example, if the load required 3 x 10^9 BTU/hr for a heating season of 4 months and 100,000 tons of refrigeration for a 3 month cooling season, a savings would be realized for any one of the following sources of energy:

Natural gas HEATING

9 BTU $\frac{1}{2880}$ hrs $\frac{2}{10}$ ft³ $3.0 \times 10^9 \frac{\text{BTU}}{\text{hr}} \times 2880 \text{ hrs} \times \frac{\text{ft}}{(1000 \text{ BTU}) (.8)}$

 $= 5.18 \times 10^{9}$ ft.³

COOLING

100000 tons x
$$
\frac{12000 \text{ BTU}}{\text{HR} - \text{ton}}
$$
 x 2160 hrs x $\frac{\text{ft}^3}{(1000 \text{ BTU})(.5)}$

$$
Total = 15.98 \times 10^9 \text{ ft}^3 \text{ natural gas}
$$

No. 2 Feel oil

Using 19110.0 $\frac{B T U}{1 b m}$

Savings = $1,749,800$ barrels

Electric

Savings = $3,280,000$ megawatt-hours

It is clearly seen that considerable quantities of fossile fuels can

be conserved, in addition, a profit can be realized by the installation of such a system.

As a suggestion for further study, an investigation into the load following characteristics and the subsequent impact on the economic development would be of considerable interest. In addition the investigation of the utilization of this energy in agricultural and industrial processes (for example, grain drying operations) would merit further study.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

It is possible to service a district heating and cooling network by utilizing the rejected heat from a direct cycle high temperature gas cooled reactor as designed by the General Atomic Company .

The objective of this thesis was to investigate the feasibility of utilizing the rejected energy from the direct cycle HTGR to serve a district heating and cooling network. The objective has been accomplished, insomuch as the results clearly indicate that with the advent of the direct cycle HTGR, waste heat utilization will approach a more realistic solution. New technological advancements such as the direct cycle HTGR will provide the opportunity of increasing our energy utilization efficiency.

Since that which moves the technological society is inventiveness, magnified and implemented by an energy base, it is the techno-sociological responsibility of energy system designers to efficiently and equitably utilize our energy resources. In so doing, an optimized system of environmental, technological and sociological benefits will be realized .

The results of this investigation indicate that the state of the art in reactor design is reaching a point where the maximum energy utilization efficiency may be realized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Engineers Inc., ASHRAE Guide and Data Book, Menasha Wisconsin: George Banta Co., Inc., 1964.
- [2] Babcock and Wilcox Inc., Steam: Its Generation and Use, New York: Babcock and Wilcox Co., Inc., 1964.
- [3] Beall Jr., S. E., "Uses of Waste Heat", American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Bulletin No. 70-WA/Ener-6, United Engineering Center, New York, New York.
- [4] Boersma, Larry L., "Uses of Reactor Cooling Water from Nuclear Power Plants for Irrigation of Agricultural Crops", PB-210747, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va., 1972.
- [5] Chapman, Alan J., Heat Transfer, Toronto: The Macmillan Company, 1967.
- [6] Chemtron Corporation, Piping Engineering, Louisville: Tube Turns Division of Chemtron Corp., 1969.
- [7] Diamant, R. M. E., Total Energy, New York: Pergamon Press, 1970.
- [8] Graham Manufacturing Company, Inc., "Cooling with Steam", Bulletin No. 2127, Great Neck, New York, 1972.
- [9] Hale, Dean, "Foam Insulated Pipelines", Pipeline and Gas Journal 200 (10) , 20.
- [10] Hudson, R. G., The Engineers Manual, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- [11] Krase, J. M., Morse D. C., and Schone, T. W., "The Direct Cycle Nuclear Gas Turbine with Economical Dry Air Cooling", General Atomic Bulletin No. GA-Al0220, San Diego, California, 1972.
- [12] Johnston, Thomas A., "The High Temperature Gas Cooled Reactor for Process Heat", General Atomic Bulletin No. GA- 10317, San Diego, California, 1972.
- [13] Martinovsky, W., "Use of Waste Heat for Refrigeration", Kholodilaya Tecnika (Russian) 30 (1), 60, 1953.
- [14] Martinovsky, W., Personnel Communication, June 9, 1973.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (cont.)

- [15] Miller, A. J., "Use of Steam Electric Power Plants to Provide Thermal Energy to Urban Areas", ORNL Report No. ORNL-HUD-14, Oak Ridge National Laboratories, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 1971.
- [16] Parker, J.D., Boggs, J. H., and Blick, E. F., Introduction to Fluid Mechanics and Heat Transfer, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.
- [17] Price, H. C., "Super Inch Lines to 60 Inches Can be Built with Today's Equipment", Pipeline and Gas Journal, August 1973, 20.
- [18] Piper, H. B., West Jr., G. L., "The Siting of Nuclear Power Plants as Related to Urban Heat Supply", ORNL Report No. ORNL-HUD-11, Oak Ridge National Laboratories, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 1970.
- [19] Reisbig, R. L., "Beneficial Uses of Waste Heat", American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Bulletin No. 70-WA/Ener-10, New York, New York, 1970.
- [20] Spencer, W. F., "Estimating the Size and Cost of Steam Vacuum Refrigeration", Hydrocarbon Processing, June 1967.
- [21] Stoecker, W. F., Refrigeration and Air Conditioning, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1958.
- [22] "Waste Heat Utilization" Proceedings of the National Conference CONF-711031 on Waste Heat Utilization, Gatlinburg, Tennessee, October 27-29, 1971.

VITA

John J. Blase was born February 13, 1947 in Girardville, Pennsylvania . He was raised in Girardville which is located in the Anthracite coal mining region. After completing his high school education at Cardinal Brennan High School, he attended the Academy of Aeronautics in New York City where he earned his Associate in Applied Science Degree in aircraft design. He also attended Parks College - St. Louis University where he received his B.S. in Aerospace Engineering.

Mr. Blase worked in the capacity of liaison engineer for Grumman Aircraft Engineering Company on the Apollo Project Lunar Module for a period of two years. He also held the position of Mechanical Engineer with the Environmental Protection Agency for two years.

He is President of the UMR Chapter of the American Nuclear Society, Vice President of the Nuclear Engineering and Science Honor Society, and an associate member of the National Society of Professional Engineers. Mr. Blase is married to the former Karen Wolf of St. Louis, Missouri .

APPENDIX A

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The utilization of low temperature waste heat from steamelectric power plants has always been a difficult task. The temperature of the rejected heat is relatively low (around 105°F) , thus making the utilization of this energy quite difficult. There have been significant efforts, however, involved in utilizing waste energy. An entire range of heating $[3] [18]$ and agricultural $[4]$ uses have been proposed. Some have met with success and many have not.

A unique approach to the use of this low value energy has been made by W. Martinovsky^{[13][14]} of the Odessa Technical Institute in the Soviet Union. In 1953 Martinovsky proposed $[13]$ the rejection of low value waste heat to a steam jet refrigeration cycle. In his proposal the steam jet cycle did not use water as a refrigerant as is the usual case, instead it was suggested that a freon or similar refrigerant be utilized in the steam jet refrigerating process. The low condenser temperatures of the steam jet cycle limited the use of such a system because of the large heat exchanger surfaces required at the condenser end of the cycle. The utilization of waste energy from steam-electric cycles is indeed worthy of future investigation when one considers the number of such plants in existence.

The advent of high temperature gas cooled reactors as designed by General Atomic, has added a new dimension to the possibilities

of utilizing the heat rejected from the nuclear-electric energy cycle. The only helium cooled nuclear reactor in operation in the United States at this time is the 330 MWe unit operated by Public Service Company of Colorado. This unit utilizes a conventional steam-electric cycle, coupled to a helium-water steam generator. A new design under consideration at this time by General Atomic is the direct cycle high temperature gas (helium) cooled reactor $[11]$. In this machine, the helium is heated in the reactor core and then expanded directly through a gas turbine which consequently turns the electric generator $[11]$. The attractive feature of this cycle is the temperature at which the waste heat is rejected. Rejection temperatures across the precooler stage of the cycle is from 470° F to 105° F $[11]$. Immediately it can be seen that this high value waste heat has many utilization possibilities. In fact, much research into the effective utilization of this energy is underway at the General Atomic facility in San Diego, California.

Rejection temperatures in this range could provide sufficiently high temperature input to generate low energy steam which may in [8] turn power a water cycle series of steam jet refrigeration units. This chilled water could in turn be used either in industrial processes or it could provide for a district refrigeration service (air conditioning). Chilled and heated water district heating and cooling systems have been in existence for many years^[1], and, therefore, this technological consideration is neither surprising

nor new. However, the great distance of nuclear power plants from load centers $^{[18]}$ increases the difficulty involved in transporting heated and chilled water to the load center. The pipeline technology required to move large quantities of water has been available to the oil and natural gas industries for many $years [9][17]$.

The object of this investigation is the determination of the technical and economic feasibility of transporting large quantities of heated and chilled water to a concentrated load center by using the rejected heat from the high temperature gas cooled reactor as the energy source.

APPENDIX B

 $\sim 10^{-10}$

FORTRAN IV COMPUTER PROGRAM LISTING

- 0004
0005
0006
	-

99

 \sim

 \overline{C}

PAGE 0003

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{O})$. The set of $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{O})$

 $\frac{\left\langle \left(\mathbf{1} \right) \right\rangle \left\langle \mathbf{1} \right\rangle \left\langle \left(\mathbf{1} \right) \right\rangle \left\langle$

PAGE 0002

 $\overline{7}$

APPENDIX C

COMPUTER PROGRAM FLOW CHART

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE CASH FLOW PROBLEM

The following is a sample problem demonstrating the technique used in the discounted cash flow analysis in the economics section of this investigation.

Given:

Find:

The present value net cumulative profit at 10%

for a 10 year life.

Straight line depreciation rate:

$$
DR = \frac{1}{10 \text{ years}}
$$

$$
= 10\%
$$

Dual declining balance rate:

$$
DDR = 2.0 \times DR
$$

$$
= 20\%
$$

The following table is a dual declining balance depreciation scheme which will be used for the tax calculations.

$DDB = DDR \times Undepreciated balance$

where

$DDB = Depreciation$ expense

FINANCING EXPENSES/\$1000.00 Capital Investment

The project will be financed by:

30% Bonds @ 7% interest 30% Common @ 14% interest 40% Preferred @ 7% interest

Return on Bonds

 $ROB = Per cent bonds x interest rate x capital investment$ $= .30 x .07 x 1000.00$ $= 21.00/year$

Return on Common

 $ROC = Per cent common x interest rate x capital invested in
Test$ $= .30 \times .14 \times 1000.00$ $= 42.00/year$ Return on Preferred $ROP = Per$ cent preferred x interest rate x capital investment $= .40 \times .07 \times 1000.00$ $= 28.00/year$ Total return/\$1000.00 Capital Investment $TRO = ROB + ROC + ROP$ $= 91.00$ Property tax/\$1000.00 Capital Investment $PRTX = Tax rate x capital investment$ $= .02 \times 1000.00$

 $= 20.00/year$

85

Table Dl.O. Schedule for Tax Calculations.

Where

 $SPCA = single payment compound amount factor$ escalated = adjusted by SPCA for a $4.5%$ inflation

Income tax

TAX(N) = Tax rate (revenue - bond interest - property tax - maintenance and operating - depreciation)

Example

 $\text{Tax}(1) = .50(2090.00 - 21.00 - 1045.00 - 200.00)$ $= 402.00$

Table D2.0. Yearly Tax.

Capital recovery

CR = Capital investment
$$
(\frac{i(1 + i)^n}{(1 + i)^{n-1}})
$$

= 1000.00 x .16275
= 162.75

Table D3.0. Face Value Cash.

Table D4.0. Present Worth at Time 0. Discounted at 10%.

 $\tilde{\kappa}$

Cash in = Re venue

Cash out = Income tax + interest + dividends + property tax + maintenance + operating + capital recovery

Table D5.0. Cumulative Cash Flow.

 $NP = 15247.53 - 12639.71$ $= 2607.82$

Where

 NP = Present value net cumulative profit at 10% for a life of 10 years.