Comments on: “Reducing the Hazards from Stored Spent Power-Reactor Fuel in the United States”

Allan S. Benjamin

I am one of the reviewers of the paper entitled: “Reducing the Hazards from Stored Spent Power-Reactor Fuel in the United States,” and am also the principal author of the Sandia report that is cited several times by the authors of the paper. The subject of spent-fuel pool vulnerabilities is a very important one in the present day environment, and I am pleased to be able to provide input. I think the paper correctly points out a problem that needs to be addressed, i.e., the fact that a loss of water from a high-density spent-fuel pool could have serious consequences. However, I also believe the paper falls short of addressing all the considerations that accompany the problem. Some of these considerations could affect the results of the cost-benefit analysis that is used to justify the authors’ proposed solution: the re-racking of the pool to a low-density, open-lattice arrangement and the removal of the older fuel to dry storage casks. In a nutshell, the authors correctly identify a problem that needs to be addressed, but they do not adequately demonstrate that the proposed solution is cost-effective or that it is optimal.

On the plus side of the assessment, I agree with the authors’ analysis of what would happen if there were a total loss of water from a high-density...
spent-fuel pool that is packed wall-to-wall with zirconium-clad fuel. If some of that fuel had been recently discharged from a reactor core, there is not much doubt that the release of fission products to the environment would be significant. Our analyses in the referenced 1979 Sandia report did indeed show that the hottest part of the pool would heat up to the point where the cladding would first rupture and then ignite. Subsequent experiments we performed with electrically heated zirconium tubes (not formally reported) showed that there was a potential for a fire to propagate from hotter to colder fuel assemblies. It is not clear whether the fire would envelop the whole pool or just a part of it, but either way, the result would be undesirable.

I agree in principle with the calculations in the paper regarding the potential consequences of such an accident, except that it is unlikely that the whole inventory of fission products captured in the spent fuel would escape to the environment or that the wind would blow in one direction only (as assumed in the paper). Although there is clear evidence that some of the fuel would melt in such a situation, we don’t know how much. Since we don’t, it is conservative and appropriate to assume that a large fraction of the fission product inventory could become released to the environment. Whether that fraction is 0.20 or 1.00 doesn’t change the fact that the release would be unacceptable.

It is also correct to say, as the authors have pointed out, that the situation could be even worse if enough water remained in the pool to cover the bottom of the storage racks so that air could not circulate, but not enough water to act as a significant heat sink for all of the decay heat produced by the fuel. This point was also made in the Sandia report.\textsuperscript{1}

The authors’ assessment of probabilities of occurrence is also reasonable in a bounding sense. They correctly point out that the likelihood of an accident leading to a critical loss of water is very low (estimated by the NRC to be less than one in 100,000 per pool per year). The probability of the same scenario resulting from a terrorist attack is unknown, and so the authors postulate a range of values. They point out, reasonably enough, that the upper end of the range could be significantly higher than the value for a loss of water initiated by an accident. I personally believe that the probability of a successful terrorist attack is very low, and I will give my reasons in a moment. Notwithstanding, the authors are correct in pointing out that the possibility of a terrorist attack is an issue that requires serious attention.

The problem occurs when the authors assert that these figures prove the cost effectiveness of their proposed solution. Before a judgment on cost effectiveness can be made, a variety of additional considerations have to be taken into account. These pervade all areas of the discussion: the calculation of the probabilities of occurrence, the resulting consequences, the effectiveness of the
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proposed solution, the competing risks introduced by that solution, and the cost of implementation.

Let’s talk first about the probability of a successful terrorist attack. The assumed situation is that the adversaries create a large hole in the spent-fuel pool, near the bottom of the pool, without dispersing the fuel or significantly deforming the racking structure. That situation is very unlikely. Using explosives or missiles, including the intentional crash of an aircraft, it would be difficult to accomplish a loss of almost all the water in the pool without disrupting the spent-fuel geometry. Significant damage to the racking structure or outright dispersal of the fuel would create a geometry that is more coolable by air flow and less susceptible to propagation of a zirconium fire than is the actual storage geometry.

Moreover, it would be very difficult for adversaries to achieve enough water loss by draining the pool even if they somehow gained direct access to the pool. The drain valves and gates are all located high enough to prevent the water from draining down to a dangerous level. As originally stated in the Sandia report and acknowledged in the paper, something like 75% of the height of the fuel rods would have to be uncovered for an overheating condition to result.

Gaining access to the pool in itself would be a very difficult proposition. The adversaries would have to figure out a way to avoid being detected by the on-site monitoring equipment and overcome by the on-site security forces. The probability of success in this venture can be analyzed using existing tools, but this has apparently not been done. Such tools exist at the company where I now work, ARES, and at the laboratory where I used to work, Sandia. Both have methods for identifying the pathways an adversary could take to a target and evaluating the probability of success associated with each pathway.

The upshot is that more work needs to be done in accounting for how an adversary’s method of attack would change the initial conditions of the analysis, and in evaluating the adversary’s likelihood of success.

Now let’s discuss the consequences of a loss-of-water incident, which according to the paper could include “hundreds of billions of dollars” in property loss. An accurate accounting of costs versus benefits requires a best-estimate assessment of consequences, not a worst-case assessment. Normally, the evaluation is accomplished by formulating probability distributions to reflect the full range of radioactive releases that could emanate from the spent fuel pool and the full range of meteorological conditions that could affect the dispersion of that material. The most commonly-used result from this analysis is the mean consequence, which is obtained by sampling the probability distributions in a random fashion. It can reasonably be expected that the mean value of the expected property loss would be considerably lower than the worst-case value.
Let's now progress to the subject of evaluating the effectiveness of the proposed solutions. The main one given in the paper is to remove all the fuel that is more than five years old to dry storage casks and to re-rack the pool so that the remaining, younger spent fuel can be contained in a widely-spaced, open-lattice arrangement. The arguments in favor of that approach appear attractive. First, it assures that air cooling would be effective even if all the water were drained from the pool. Second, it reduces the inventory of the long-lived fission products remaining in the pool, so that even if all of them were dispersed to the environment, the long-term effects would be sharply reduced.

Several important factors are not considered here. First, as mentioned above, an adversary's attack involving an explosive, a missile, or an airplane crash that is serious enough to create a big hole in the spent-fuel pool would also probably disperse the fuel or at least rearrange the geometry. Therefore, the final configuration would not necessarily be more coolable than that for a high density pool subjected to the same insult. That leaves only the reduced fission product inventory as a definitive point of difference that could reduce the losses incurred from the event.

However, the results in the paper concerning radioactive contamination are flawed by the fact that the shorter-lived radioisotopes are not considered. Most notable among these are $^{131}$I, which has a half-life of 8 days, and $^{134}$Cs, which has a half-life of just over two years. Most of these radionuclides are contained within the younger fuel that still remains in the spent-fuel pool. While they do not contribute as highly to long-term property loss as the longer-lived isotope, $^{137}$Cs, they contribute more highly to early fatalities and latent cancer fatalities. Thus, a true cost-benefit accounting of the proposed solution must include consideration of these short-lived but very nasty radioisotopes.

Then there is the question of how effective the dry storage casks would be over a long period of time. The paper correctly acknowledges that an airplane crash into an array of dry storage casks could cause a release of radionuclides to the environment. It also presumes that only a few of the many casks in the array would be affected by the crash. Given the robust design of these casks, these observations are probably correct. However, the paper has failed to consider that many materials degrade or become brittle after a long exposure to radioactivity. Degradation or embrittlement can lead to leakage. Cask leakage has been a problem for some dry storage casks in the past, and the paper should acknowledge this. In performing a cost-benefit analysis, the risk from high probability, low consequence incidents, such as cask leakage, has to be considered along with the risk from low probability, high consequence incidents.

Finally, one must consider the competing risks. The process of removing such a large amount of fuel from the spent-fuel pool and transferring it to the
dry storage casks carries its own set of hazards. During the transfer process, both the probability of an accident and the degree of exposure in the event of a potential terrorist attack are greater than before or after the transfer. The paper suggests that the transfer would take place over a ten-year period. Someone needs to look at the question of vulnerability during that period.

Another competing risk can be identified for the authors’ proposed design change, based on an earlier recommendation made in the Sandia report, to install emergency water sprays. The authors suggest that the hottest fuel should be stored along the sides of the pool, where the spray would be heaviest even if the building collapses on top of the pool. This argument ignores the fact that heat removal by air cooling is most effective when the hottest fuel is stored in the middle of the pool and the coolest fuel is stored along the sides. That arrangement promotes natural convective air flow currents, whereas the one being proposed in the paper inhibits them.

The question of implementation costs is one that I am not prepared to address at the present time. I would note, however, that special consideration needs to be given to the question of whether, on the basis of available space and security requirements, on-site dry storage of so much fuel is feasible at all reactor sites.

As a final but pivotal point, the evaluation of costs versus benefits should consider all plausible alternative risk reduction options. Certainly one such option is to accelerate the transfer of the spent fuel from spent-fuel pools directly to a permanent underground storage site. The paper claims that this process could take decades, given the controversial status of the Yucca Mountain project and the current budgetary limitations. However, if there is a national security issue at stake, Government projects can be accelerated. The Manhattan Project is a good example. It may turn out that when all risks and costs are taken into account, a direct transfer to underground storage is more cost-effective than a temporary transfer to on-site storage casks and a re-racking of the spent-fuel pools.

In summary, the authors are to be commended for identifying a problem that needs to be addressed, and for scoping the boundaries of that problem. However, they fall short of demonstrating that their proposed solution is cost-effective or that it is optimal.

NOTE AND REFERENCE

1. Although most of the references made in the paper to the Sandia report are accurate, in the version reviewed by me, the first paragraph in the Introduction made two incorrect attributions. First, the accident evaluated in the Sandia study was a sudden loss of all the water, not a “sudden loss of water cooling.” Loss of the water cooling system would
not result in the consequences cited by the authors since the water would remain as a large heat sink. Second, the Sandia report did not state that the loss-of-water scenario would lead to “the airborne release of massive quantities of fission products.” Although zircaloy burning and some fuel melting would certainly occur, the Sandia study stopped short of evaluating, either qualitatively or quantitatively, the amount of fission products that would be released. Both of these points have now been corrected in the final version of the article.