

Re: About good, bad and ugly power stations

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2005-02/0835.html>

From: Hatunen (hatuunen_at_cox.net)

Date: 02/27/05

Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 12:58:39 -0800

On Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:37:38 GMT, "Baby Elian" <[sandrino77\(NO SPAM\)@virgilio.it](mailto:sandrino77(NO SPAM)@virgilio.it)> wrote:

>
>> *Co-generation is good, but the piping to distribute heat from a nuclear
>> power plant many miles from a population center must no be economical.
>> Otherwise, it would be used now.
>> Dist rict heating requires a district to heat. Nuclear power
>> plants in the USA are purposefully located far from population
>> centers. The distances are simply too great for piping heat to
>> the population center. Even conventional plants stopped supplying district
>> heat once
>> central stations were moved out of city centers.*
>
>*For example,I thought about a small Htgr reactor,e.g. a 165 MWe pebble bed
>reactor,located *not so far* from a city center
>How far could we put a thermal plant to be this district heat cost
>effective?Is there an economical- technical document (or paper) on the web?
>What can we estimate the thermal energy requiriments for a one hundred
>thousand (or more) of inhabitants town?*

>
Wrong questions.

How can you convince the public they want a nuclear reacotr
closer to town?

***** DAVE HATUNEN (hatunen@cox.net) *****
* Tucson Arizona, out where the cacti grow *
* My typos & misspellings are intentional copyright traps *