

sci.energy: Re: Mook's quote about nuclear being a "low grade heat". Is it true?

Re: Mook's quote about nuclear being a "low grade heat". Is it true?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2004-07/0247.html>

From: Karl Johanson (karljohanson_at_shaw.ca)

Date: 07/07/04

Date: Wed, 07 Jul 2004 01:37:40 GMT

"daestrom" <daestrom@NO_SPAM_HEREtwcny.rr.com> wrote in message news:12IGc.23631

> *It is easy to be dismissive and claim bias without offering any proof.*

The

> *plain truth is, nuc plants run a lot better than the average manufacturing*

> *plant. If I *really* wanted to be biased and pick the*

> *'cream-of-the-crop',*

> *the reported capacity factor for some plants is >99.0 % for a*

> *non-refueling*

> *year and >95% for a refueling year (the shortest refueling outage on record*

> *is 15 days).*

And apparently some of the Candus in Korea pulled off greater than 100% capacity factor. The sea water for cooling turned out to be colder than expected, allowing for higher than rated power output.

> *The +90% is *not* for any single plant. It is the *industry* average.*

You

> *know, add up the capacity factor for all 104 operating plants and divide*

> *by*

> *104. This means *many* plants operate somewhat above 90% and only a few*

> *operate very far below.*

Karl Johanson