





Speaker

Tuesday, November 7th, **2023** Venue: ITB Campus, CRCS Building, 2nd Floor



Professor Łukasz Barteła DESiRE Consortium Introduction (Conducted Online) 16.30-17.00



Professor Paweł Gladysz DESiRE Consortium **Coal Repowering in Poland** (Conducted Online) 16.30-17.00





Silesian University of Technology

7-8 November, 2023

Coal Repowering in Poland

Łukasz Bartela Paweł Gładysz

International Partner Conference on Repowering 2023 Coal to X Repowering Towards Energy Transition Pathway



Ministry of Science and Higher Education









Rzeczpospolita Polska

DEsire Team:



Silesian University of Technology



Ministerstwo Klimatu i Środowiska





Main goals of the DEsire project

A plan of decarbonization of the power industry through modernization with the use of III+ and IV generation nuclear reactors

which will be a roadmap for the organization of investment processes aimed at transforming centralized generation systems, considering the criteria of sustainable development

Pilot of the national Cluster of Power Industry Transformation (CPIT)

which will provide organizational support for activities aimed at increasing the effectiveness of various stakeholder groups in the process of transformation of domestic power plants and combined heat and power plants.







Structure of project











Genesis of the DEsire project

- works done by the Qvist-Gładysz-Bartela team

C2N#0 Greenfield

- NPP is being built near the decommissioned CPP,
- no material links between the liquidation and the investment,
- it may be beneficial, for example, to transfer the rights to use water intakes, access to transmission lines and workforce.

C2N#1 Brownfield

- NPP is being built in place of the decommissioned CPP,
- space and support infrastructure are used,
- any type of nuclear reactor may be used.

C2N

- CPP,
- space, support
- turbine island.



Repurposing

C2N#2 Direct

NPP is being built in place of the decommissioned

infrastructure and main infrastructure are used,

direct coupling of the reactor island with the

C2N#3 Indirect

- NPP is being built in place of the decommissioned CPP,
- space, support infrastructure and main infrastructure are used,
- direct coupling of the reactor island with the turbine island (steam generator + TES system)

Investigating Benefits and Challenges of Converting Retiring Coal Plants into Nuclear Plants

Nuclear Fuel Cycle and Supply Chain

> Prepared for U.S. Department of Energy Systems Analysis and Integration Hansen, W. Jenson, A. Wrobel (INL) N. Stauff, K. Biegel, T. Kim (ANL) R. Belles, F. Omitaomu (ORNL) September 13, 2022 INL/RPT-22-67964

Full Repowering

& Partial Repowering





Genesis of the DEsire project

- works done by the Qvist-Gładysz-Bartela team



Scope:

- General assessment of Polish energy sector and options for decarbonization within retrofit of existing units
- Small modular reactors reftrofit case studies for three different coal-fired plants in Poland (**Coal-to-Nuclear option**)

Scope:

- Coal-to-Nuclear with Thermal Energy Storage (TES) option case study for Lagisza Power Plant and Kairos KP-FHR
- Gas-to-Nuclear option case studies for (i) reference state-ofthe-art NGCC and (ii) specific CHP NGCC located in Poland

















Genesis of the DEsire project - works done by the Qvist-Gładysz-Bartela team development (20% Pre-construction costs Non-EPC indirect costs 5.0% Owner's costs Supplementary costs Contingency Fuel Core Load Reactor Minimal Possible Retrofit Savings: Primary heat transfer system 28% structure Intermediate heat transfer system Steam cycle Maximum Possible Retrofit Savings: Reactor Aux Systems 35% Instrumental and control Plant auxiliaries Electrical Civil structures 50.0% Budget share Minimal Possible Retrofit Savings Maximum Possible Retrofit Savings

Fig. Possible investment savings due to the use of the existing infrastructure of the coal-fired power unit







Total capital investment cost (TCIC) = overnight capital cost (OCC) + interests during construction (IDC)

$TCIC_{RET} = OCC_{GF}(1 - RS) + IDC_{RET}$

RS – **retrofit savings in direct retrofit (C2N#2)** option for Łagisza power plant were estimated to be **up to**:

- 97% for steam cycle,
- 35% for instrumental, controls and other plant auxiliaries,
- 70% for electrical side,
- 50% for civil structures.





Genesis of the DEsire project

- works done by the Qvist-Gładysz-Bartela team

 $\Delta NPV = \sum_{ au=1}^{n} rac{(NCF_{ ext{RET}, au} - NCF_{ ext{REF}, au)}}{(1+r)^{ au}} - TCIC_{ ext{RET}}$



Fig. ΔNPV as a function of project lifetime for the GF and RET investment pathways for *Łagisza unit*







Fig. Diagram of integrations of SMR systems with a 460 MW Łagisza unit



Investment pathways

Fig. ΔNPV for base assumptions for three investment pathways (retrofit investment) pathway for three different values of retrofit savings) for Lagisza 460 MW unit











period relative to the average price





Fig. ΔNPV as a function of TES thermal energy flux supply for the eleven values of *deviation index* (from 0 to 1, with step 0.1).







Coal-to-Nuclear classification – DEsire project

C2N#0 Greenfield

- NPP is being built near the decommissioned CPP,
- no material links between the liquidation and the investment,
- it may be beneficial, for example, to transfer the rights to use water intakes, access to transmission lines and workforce.

C2N#1 Brownfield

- NPP is being built in place of the decommissioned CPP,
- space and support infrastructure are used,
- any type of nuclear reactor may be used.



C2N

- space, support infrastructure and main infrastructure are used,
- direct coupling of the reactor island with the turbine island.



Repurposing

C2N#2 Direct

NPP is being built in place of the decommissioned

C2N#3 Indirect

- NPP is being built in place of the decommissioned CPP,
- space, support infrastructure and main infrastructure are used,
- direct coupling of the reactor island with the turbine island (steam generator + TES system)



Nuclear Fuel Cycle and Supply Chain

Full Repowering

& Partial Repowering





as part of a **Just Transformation of Coal Regions**







Fig. Locations indicated in the Polish Nuclear Power *Programme and analyzed in the DEsire project*

















Locations

Gross electrical output [MW] 1200 1000 800 600 400 200 0 Jurów 81. Turów 802 Turów 803 Turów 804 Turów 805 Turów 805 Turów 206 Opole B1 Opole B2 Opole B3 Opole B4 Opole B5

Fig. Gross electric power of all considered units



Silesian University of Technology







Stage I – evaluation criteria

Technical aspects:

- power output **infrastructure** (electrical grid capacity)
- access to transport **infrastructure** (sea, railroad, highways)
- assess to **cooling water** (sea, lakes, rivers) \bullet
- **area availability** (dates, complexity) \bullet
- **demand for heat** (district heating systems, industrial heat demand)

Safety aspects:

- operation of nuclear power systems (e.g. seismic activity, floods, mineral deposits, selected types of facilities)
- potential **nuclear hazards** to the personnel of the unit and the **local population** (e.g. population density) \bullet
- \bullet advancement, redundancy of safety systems)





C2N#1 Brownfield

C2N#2 Direct

- different weighting factors for evaluation criteria depending on the pathway (C2N#1 vs C2N#2)
- final conclusions based on unified approach
- first step for **CtNRL** (Coal-to-Nuclear Readinnes Level)

formal requirements and recommendations imposed by international and national organizations on the design and applied solutions for reactor protection systems, steam turbine thermal cycle, and auxiliary infrastructure (technology

management of **spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste** (management technology/facilities, enrichment of nuclear fuel)



Stage II – evaluation criteria

Economic aspects:

- **CO**, emissions and EU-ETS costs to be avoided
- actual **on-site infrastructure** to be reused (electrical grid, cooling systems)
- existing coal-unit **projected lifetime** \bullet
- **complexity of integration** with existing steam turbine and other systems
- potential **investment savings** compared to greenfield
- partial costs offset by means of heat production \bullet

Extended site- and nuclear reactor-specific safety aspects:

- operation of nuclear power systems (e.g. seismic activity, floods, mineral deposits, selected types of facilities)
- potential **nuclear hazards** to the personnel of the unit and the **local population** (e.g. population density)
- \bullet advancement, redundancy of safety systems)





C2N#1 Brownfield

C2N#2 Direct

- independent safety and techno-economic studies
- final conclusions based on expert assessment
- detailed studies for sitespecific features (including the same area for safety, just more detailed and in-depth studies)

formal requirements and recommendations imposed by international and national organizations on the design and applied solutions for reactor protection systems, steam turbine thermal cycle, and auxiliary infrastructure (technology

management of spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste (management technology/facilities, enrichment of nuclear fuel)





Reactors matching

Provider	Name	Type of reactor	Electrical power (gross / net)	Status (in operation / in construction)
Westinghouse (USA)	AP-1000	pressurized water reactor (PWR)	1250 / 1150 MW	4 / 2
KHNP (South Korea)	APR1400	pressurized water reactor (PWR)	1420 / 1350 MW	4/6
EDF (France)	EPR	pressurized water reactor (PWR)	1720 / 1600 MW	3/3
EDF (France)	EPR-1200	pressurized water reactor (PWR)	c.a. 1200 MW	0/0
KHNP (South Korea)	APR1000	pressurized water reactor (PWR)	c.a. 1000 MW	0/0





C2N#1 Brownfield







Primary side Secondary side



Silesian University of Technology





800



Reactor thermal power [MW]

Selection of SMRs:

- we do not consider reactors \bullet smaller then **250 MW**_{th};
- for prelimiary selected units, we would need to install 4 – 6 reactors;
- 500 MW_{el} class units (Turów B11, Pątnów 2 B9 and Łagisza B10) might be more attractive due to lower number of reactors needed.







Reactors matching



Country	Туре	Moderator	Coolant	Fuel	Reactor thermal power	Coolant outlet temperature	Status and pre	dictive d	
China				8,5% LEU	2x250 MW	750°C	in operation	202	
USA	GCR		helium	14,5% HALEU	625 MW	750°C	preliminary design	203	
Japan				14% HALEU	600 MW	950°C	basic design	204	
Canada	NSR	_	flueride celte	<5,0% LEU	440 MW	700°C	detailed design	203	
Japan			graphite	nuoride saits	2,0% LEU	450 MW	704°C	basic design	b/
USA						<5,0% LEU	557 MW	704°C	basic design
USA			molten salts	19,7% HALEU	320 MW	650°C	conceptual design	2026 c	
USA				²³³ U Th	600 MW	650°C	conceptual design	b/	
USA		-	chloride salts	15% HALEU	125/500/ 1000/3000	750°C (950°C)	conceptual design	203	
	China USA Japan Canada Japan USA USA	ChinaUSAGCRJapan	ChinaUSAGCRJapan	ChinaUSAGCRJapanCanadaJapanUSAUSAUSAUSAUSA	China8,5% LEUUSAGCRhelium14,5% HALEUJapan14% HALEU14% HALEUCanada14% HALEU14% HALEUJapan2,0% LEU2,0% LEUUSA<5,0% LEU	CountryTypeModeratorCoolantFuelthermal powerChinaAAA <td< td=""><td>CountryTypeModeratorCoolantFuelthermal powertemperatureChinaAAAAAAAAAAAAUSAGCRAAAAAAAAAAAJapanJapanBBAAA<t< td=""><td>CountryTypeModeratorCoolantFuelthermal powertemperatureStatus and pressChinaGCR8,5% LEU2x250 MW750°Cin operationUSAGCRhelium14,5% HALEU625 MW750°Cpreliminary designJapanIde to the salts14% HALEU600 MW950°Cbasic designJapangraphitefluoride salts<5,0% LEU</td>440 MW700°Cdetailed designUSAMSRmolten salts<5,0% LEU</t<></td>557 MW704°Cbasic designUSAMSR-molten salts19,7% HALEU320 MW650°Cconceptual designUSAchloride salts15% HALEU125/500/750°Cconceptual design</td<>	CountryTypeModeratorCoolantFuelthermal powertemperatureChinaAAAAAAAAAAAAUSAGCRAAAAAAAAAAAJapanJapanBBAAA <t< td=""><td>CountryTypeModeratorCoolantFuelthermal powertemperatureStatus and pressChinaGCR8,5% LEU2x250 MW750°Cin operationUSAGCRhelium14,5% HALEU625 MW750°Cpreliminary designJapanIde to the salts14% HALEU600 MW950°Cbasic designJapangraphitefluoride salts<5,0% LEU</td>440 MW700°Cdetailed designUSAMSRmolten salts<5,0% LEU</t<>	CountryTypeModeratorCoolantFuelthermal powertemperatureStatus and pressChinaGCR8,5% LEU2x250 MW750°Cin operationUSAGCRhelium14,5% HALEU625 MW750°Cpreliminary designJapanIde to the salts14% HALEU600 MW950°Cbasic designJapangraphitefluoride salts<5,0% LEU	











Stage I and II results









Potential threats (local) Waste fuel handling

Safety features



OPOLE

PĄTNÓW	Tab. Stage II results – TEA summary				
BEŁCHATÓW	Location	Current capacity [GW _{el}]	Estimated NPP capacity [GW _{el}]	Estimated CAPEX savings	Avo emissi CO ₂ /I
KAROLIN	KOZIENICE	4.02	(2.30 – 3.20) 2.70	high (above 20%)	8
ROCŁAW	DOLNA ODRA	1.35	(1.15 – 1.60) 1.35	moderate (15% - 20%)	9
	POŁANIEC	1.66	(1.15 – 2.30) 1.60	moderate (15% - 20%)	9
OSGE / USA 🖈 Phoenix project	OSTROŁĘKA	0.69	(1.15 – 1.35) 1.15	moderate (15% - 20%)	8

Formal requirements



Fig. Stage II results – extended safety features points





















Fig. Stage II results – extended safety features points

Tab. Stage II results – TEA summary

Puławy	Location	Current capacity [MW _{el}]	Type of reactor	Integration complexity	Estimated CAPEX savings	Av em CO ₂
1	Opole B6 (and B5)	905	6 x KP-FHR	low (dedicated HRSG)	high (above 30%)	
	Opole B6 (and B5)	905	4/5 x HTR-PM	medium	moderate (20% - 30%)	
	EC Puławy (CHP unit)	100	0.5 x HTR-PM	medium	moderate (20% - 30%)	







Fig. Locations of CPPs selected for the assessment of the brownfield C2N conversion pathway potential ∑ 92 units **Σ 22.4 GW**_{el}





Fig. Locations of CPUs selected for the assessment of the direct C2N conversion pathway potential







Summary

Technical and economic considerations:

- power plants and specific coal-fired units
- and combining of the reactors thermal output with the replaced coal-boilers
- \bullet integration and considered reactor type

Safety and public relevance (acceptance):

- obstacles needs to be acknowledged
- **regions**, utilizing the existing workforce and infrastructure





both C2N#1 (brownfield) and C2N#2 (direct) **pathways are suitable for Poland**, with several highly-scored

critical technical aspects are associated with **cooling systems** and – for direct integration with SMRs – **matching** potential **investment savings reported between 18.7% and 35.5%**, depending on specific location, type of

similar challenges as for greenfield investments in terms of nuclear safety, although some site-specific

nuclear energy for coal-fired power plant locations could help maintain the economic activities in those



Potential for the World











QuantifiedCarbon

Capacity (MW)				
0	30			
0	1,000			
	2,000			
\square	3,300			
Yea	r			
	2021			
	2020			
11 - 11	2019			
	2018			
	2017			
	2016			
	2015			
	2014			
	2013			

2012

2011

2010

2009

2008

2007

sire

Follow-up in DEsire project

Clustering activities:

- (events every 2-3 months)
- **C2N International Forum** in Poland in March 2025 \bullet
- **technical dialog** as part of the planned feasibility studies lacksquare

Public outreach:

- **public acceptance study** for C2N pathways of decarbonization
- scope of re-training programme for coal-fired power plant operators and personnel
- social media and local community outreach activities in Poland
- politician outreach as part of the proposed energy mix of Poland by 2050 studies





dedicated seminars for Polish and international C2N stakeholders planned starting from Q1 2024

study visits of DEsire team to technology vendors and project developers around the world





Selected publications

- Qvist, S.; Gładysz, P.; Bartela, Ł.; Sowiżdżał, A. Retrofit Decarbonization of Coal Power Plants—A Case Study for Poland. *Energies* **2021**, *14*, 120. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/en14010120</u>
- Bartela, Ł.; Gładysz, P.; Andreades, C.; Qvist, S.; Zdeb, J. Techno-Economic Assessment of Coal-Fired Power Unit Decarbonization Retrofit with KP-FHR Small Modular Reactors. Energies 2021, 14, 2557. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/en14092557</u>
- Bartela, Ł.; Gładysz, P.; Ochmann, J.; Qvist, S.; Sancho, L.M. Repowering a Coal Power Unit with Small Modular Reactors and Thermal Energy Storage. Energies 2022, 15, 5830. https://doi.org/10.3390/en15165830
- Łukowicz, H.; Bartela, Ł.; Gładysz, P.; Qvist, S. Repowering a Coal Power Plant Steam Cycle Using Modular Light-Water Reactor Technology. Energies 2023, 16, 3083. https://doi.org/10.3390/en16073083
- Haneklaus N., Qvist S., Gładysz P., Bartela Ł. Why coal-fired power plants should get nuclearready. *Energy* **2023**, 280. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2023.128169</u>





RETROFIT Decarbonization RE-USING COAL POWER PLANT ASSETS IN AFULLYDECARBONIZED POLISH POWER SECTOR The Future of Coal Power Plant Asset. **t** energies



