2

CONF-881031--2

UCRL-98468
PREPRINT

PACER Revisited

Ralph W. Moir

MASTER

This paper was prepared for submittal to
8th Topical Meeting on Technology of Fusion Energy
Salt Lake City, Utah
October 9-13, 1988

October 4, 1988

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

This is a preprint of a paper intended for publication in a journal or proceedings. Since changes may be made before publication, this preprint is made available with the understanding that it will not be cited or reproduced without the permission of the author.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof

PACER REVISITED*

UCRL--98468

DE89 001723

Ralph W. Moir
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
University of California
Livermore, CA 94550
(415) 422-9805

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses a modified version of the PACER concept for power and nuclear material production, which changes the working fluid in the cavity from steam to the molten salt, $LiF - BeF_2$. In the PACER concept, a 20-kt peaceful nuclear explosion is contained in a cavity about 200 m in diameter, filled with 200 atm of 500°C steam. Energy from the explosion is used to produce power, and the neutrons are used to produce materials such as ^{233}U, Pu, ^{60}Co, and T. The present idea is to modify the PACER concept in three ways, to improve the practicality, predictability, and safety of power production from this technology and thus improve public acceptance of this power source. These improvements are (1) line the cavity with steel; (2) replace the steam with molten salt; and (3) reduce the explosive yield to about 2 kt. This concept is the only fusion power concept where the underlying technology is proven and in hand today.

INTRODUCTION

Power can be produced with known technology by repetitive nuclear explosions (called peaceful nuclear explosions) contained in an underground engineered cavity. In the PACER concept [1], the steam in the cavity is passed through a turbine, producing 1000 MWe for an explosion every 7 hr. The steam, which is filtered of debris and useful materials, dampens the shock wave so the pressure against the cavity wall rises from 20 MPa before the explosion to 26 MPa right after the explosion.

The modified PACER concept and the thermodynamics leading to the cavity pressure after the explosion are discussed in Ref. 2. This paper discusses several aspects of a modified version of the PACER concept, including cavity design and fireball pressure dynamics.

The PACER concept is modified in three ways: (1) the cavity is lined with steel; (2) the steam is replaced with molten salt; and (3) the explosive yield is reduced to about 2 kt.[1] Lining the cavity with steel makes it engineerable and predictable, and prevents contamination of the working fluid. The steam working fluid is replaced with molten salt, $LiF + BeF_2$ (FLiBe) in the form of droplets, to absorb energy and suppress shocks.[2] This change results in an ambient pressure below 1 atm soon after the explosion and allows much of the energy to go into evaporation, thus reducing the pressure in the cavity right after the explosion to about 3 MPa. Also, because tritium is insoluble in the molten salt, it can be removed almost completely, thus reducing the tritium inventory by a factor of 100,000 -from $\sim 10^7$ Ci using steam to ~ 100 Ci using FLiBe. Then when the explosive yield is reduced to 2 kt, the cavity volume is reduced by a factor of 50, which reduces the peak pressure in the cavity by a factor of 9.

In the modified concept, the cavity is tall and cylindrical—rather than spherical—with a smaller radius of curvature and a hemispherical roof (Fig. 1). As such, the cavity should be much more durable.

A comprehensive test ban would exclude all peaceful nuclear explosions to test such concepts, however, a threshold test ban that limited tests to 15 kt or even 2 kt would permit testing such a concept. The low ambient pressure (< 1 atm), low tritium inventory, and low fissile inventories all contribute toward public acceptability of the concept. The close connection with nuclear weapons technology is problematic; however, interest in a reusable underground test chamber [4] may help develop this type of power source.

CAVITY DESIGN

As proposed, the cavity will be constructed underground in high-integrity rock material so the unsupported roof and sides of the cavity will not collapse under cyclic stresses. The suggested cavity shape is a tall cylinder with a hemispherical dome, i.e., in the shape of a farmyard silo. This shape will maximize volume and minimize the radius of the domed roof.

*This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract W-7405-Eng-48.

[1] Nuclear explosive yield traditionally is expressed in tons (2000 pounds) of TNT equivalent, which is 4.186×10^9 J and in this paper is abbreviated as kt of yield energy.

[2] An alternate shock suppression system using springs and shock absorbers behind plates is discussed in Ref. 3.



Fig. 1. Schematic of the fusion power system using peaceful nuclear explosions contained in an underground cavity. Molten salt technology is used to remove heat and absorb the explosive energy.

The cavity will be lined with steel and secured to the rock with rock bolts or tendons regularly spaced. The steel skin will be convex, as shown in Fig. 2, to keep it tightly stretched against the rock. Then when the pressure pulses arrive, the skin can transmit the pressure into the rock without a "slapping" effect and thus will prevent the rock from rebounding into the cavity, or spalling.

The static inward pressure on the skin will be up to 0.1 MPa (1 atm) if air infiltrates the rock. The region around the cavity must be pumped free of water because the hydrostatic pressure ($\gtrsim$ 1 atm) would collapse the skin. If this region is pumped below 1 atm, the stress in the rock bolts could be reduced while still ensuring that spalled material is retained and the rock is reinforced.



Fig. 2. The convex-shaped skin cavity liner is attached to the rock material with rock bolts. The liner prevents contamination of the molten salt with rock material and reinforces the rock media.

The steel skin is designed to overcome an inward pressure of 0.1 MPa. However, if the pressure behind the skin is $\ll 0.1$ MPa, then no inward load between pulses is on the skin other than that made by the rock bolts. During the pulse, the only added inward load will be caused by rebound, which is minimized by the droplet shock suppression system.

A convex skin resembling a tufted seat cushion, which was studied for another application [5], may be useful for the cavity-lined skin design shown in Fig. 2. Design parameters for one case used the scaling relation $Pr_2/at = 0.86$ for $r_1/r_2 = 0.36$. Two examples of parameters are shown in Table 1.

Since the excavated cavity will not conform to the desired skin shape, grout will be injected to fill the gap. A grout material must be chosen carefully so it has low vapor pressure at $\geq 500°C$. Ideally, the vapor should be low in oxygen, nitrogen, silicon, and other materials that would contaminate the molten salt if an inward leak occurred. Such contamination would cause difficulties when the molten salt is processed to remove fissile materials.

Table 1. Example parameters of cavity liner shown in Fig. 2.

Parameter	Case 1	Case 2
r_2 (m)	1	2
r_1 (m)	0.36	0.72
t (mm)	1	2
Number of 3-cm-diam bolts to hold vacuum load at 140 MPa stress in the bolts	1	4

Holes drilled for the rock bolts will form a collection system for pumping gaseous material in the region behind the skin to maintain the low gas-phase pressure ($\ll 1$ atm). In effect, the local hydrostatic pressure would be low. A system of tubes attached to the back of the skin connects each apex and can be used to check leaks in the skin, especially around the apex fixture plates. This system also can be used to keep the pressure well below 1 atm behind the skin. However, preventing grout from plugging the collection system may present a design problem. To make the job of pumping easy, the rock formation should be fairly gas tight, and the material should have low outgassing properties at elevated temperatures. Concrete has fairly low outgassing at room temperature [6], so some cracks could be filled with high-pressure pumped concrete grout. However, as mentioned, oxygen should be avoided, for example, in the form of H_2O.

Maintaining a low gas pressure in the cavity makes pumping tritium gas easy.

CAVITY SHAPE

The three cavity shapes considered in this report are shown in Fig. 3, all with the same volume and hence the same equilibrium pressure. The spherical cavity shape provides the greatest distance from the explosive, which minimizes the pressure pulse over that of the equilibrium pressure. However, its large dome must be supported. The horizontal cylindrical tunnel can be as long as necessary because each end is independent. The roof is supported as a simple arch. The vertical cylinder or shaft has a dome that is more self-supporting than a simple arch, however the vertical walls of the shaft must be supported against inward collapse. Nevertheless, with this shape the droplets will drain better.

CAVITY SKIN OR LINING DESIGN

The thermal design of the skin is important. If salt is sprayed on the walls before each shot, the salt-carrying debris from the nuclear device and its surrounding material will not be frozen directly onto the wall. Instead, it will flow to the pool at the bottom of the cavity or freeze onto the existing frozen salt layer. Flowing fresh molten salt can clear or remelt this layer. Therefore, the steel skin will remain at an ambient temperature much below the melting point of the molten salt (363°C), except for a short time ($\ll 1$ hr) between each shot (typically 1 hr). The frozen salt layer can then reduce the thermal stress on the wall.

The steel skin also must be corrosion resistant. For example, alloys high in nickel are good. Hastelloy-n would be excellent; and type 316 stainless steel may be adequate. Pipes used to carry the molten salt to the droplet spray system of nozzles and to spray the walls will be made of the same material as the skin. The system of pipes to carry the molten salt from the cavity to the pumps and primary heat exchanger is conventional, except the pipes must withstand pressures to about 3 MPa at a pulse rate of about 1/hr. The cavity, its liner, and the piping system must withstand about 200,000 shots over a 30-yr period.

The walls of the lower part of the cavity will be cooled actively so that a reasonable temperature ($\leq 650°C$) is maintained during the intershot time of ~ 1 hr while the heat is removed by circulating the molten salt. To keep the temperature rise of the salt pool reasonable, a bed of balls in the salt pool is assumed to store much of the heat. The balls could be made of nickel-coated iron.

FIREBALL PRESSURE DYNAMICS

The fireball composed predominantly of vaporized salt with a minority constituent of nuclear explosive debris is assumed to condense quickly onto the cold droplets. One limiting process is heat conduction from the surface of a droplet to its interior. The time is characteristic of the thermal diffusivity $k/\rho c$, which for FLiBe is 1.7×10^{-7} m^2/s, where k, the thermal conductivity, is 0.8 W/m K, ρ, the density, is 2050 kg/m^3, and c, the heat capacity, is 2350 J kg^{-1}K^{-1}. The thermal diffusivity time for a droplet of radius r is $\rho c r^2/k$. For a spherical cavity, substantial heat can be absorbed in one-tenth of the thermal diffusivity time. For a droplet 1 mm in diameter, this time is 140 ms. The vapor rushing passed the droplets from the expanding fireball will distort and break up droplets and cause internal circulation or vortex motion. This vortex motion can enhance heat transfer by up to a factor of 2.7.[7] After the heat is distributed over 2 kt of salt in liquid form for each 1 kt of nuclear energy yield, the pressure in the cavity will drop below 1 atm. If the



Fig 3 Two candidate cavity shapes each of 250,000 m³ are considered. The vertical cylinder is the preferred choice.

energy in the fireball can be transferred to the liquid droplets in a time less than the expansion time of the cavity (natural frequency of vibration), then the stress in the steel liner can be substantially reduced. By the end of this brief interval, the chemical composition of the salt is assumed to return to its former state.

CHEMICAL PROCESSING DYNAMICS

During the explosion and shortly afterward ($\ll 1$ s), the salt and other material will break into atoms and be ionized. The events in this short interval are left for a future paper as are the droplet spray system and cavity overpressure.

The salt can be kept in a reduced state by continuously reacting it with metallic beryllium. Then the tritium will exist as T_2 gas and can be removed by pumping. The uranium also can be removed by reacting with beryllium and separately removing the uranium from beryllium by fluorination or the salt can be fluorinated directly in a separate tank. Fission products can be continuously removed to keep their hazard potential limited, as suggested for the redesigned molten salt reactor [8,9] where safety is enhanced by removing fission products rapidly.

CONCLUSIONS

Power can be produced with known technology by repetitive nuclear explosions (called peaceful nuclear explosions) contained in an underground engineered cavity. This paper discusses a modified version of the concept known as PACER based on molten salt as the working fluid rather than steam. The modifications discussed in this paper should improve the practicality, predictability, and safety of power production from this technology, and thus should improve public acceptance of this power source.

REFERENCES

1 R.P. HAMMOND et al., "Practical Fusion Power," *Mech. Eng.* 104, 34 (July 1982).
2 C.J. CALL and R.W. MOIR, *A Novel Fusion Power Concept Based on Molten Salt Technology*, Lawrence

Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, UCRL-98346 (1988), submitted to *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*.

[3] C. DAVID, "A Mechanical Decoupling of Underground Nuclear Explosion Shock Waves from the Explosion Cavity Walls," *Trans. Am. Nucl. Soc.* **AO56**, 127 (1988).

[4] R.K. THORPE and F.E. HEUZE, "Preliminary Studies of Reinforcement Dynamics for a Reusable Underground Test Chamber," submitted to the 27th U.S. Rock Mechanics Symposium, University of Alabama, June 23-26, 1986; see also Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, UCRL-94211 (1986).

[5] R.W. MOIR, "Concept of a Blanket First Wall Supported by Radial Tubes," *Fusion Eng. Design* **5**, 379 (1988).

[6] H.S. CULLINGFORD, M.D. KELLER, and R.W. HIGGINS, "Compressive Strength and Outgassing Characteristics of Concrete for Large Vacuum-System Construction," *J. Vac. Sci. Technol* **20**, 1043 (1982).

[7] B. ABRAMZON and W.A. SIRIGNANO, "Droplet Vaporization Model for Spray Combustion Calculations," submitted for presentation in the session on Combustion Processes at the AIAA 26th Aerospace Sciences Meeting, Reno, NV, January 1988.

[8] U. GAT, "The Ultimate Safe (U.S.) Reactor – A Concept for the Third Millenium," 4th International Conference on Emerging Nuclear Energy Systems, June 30-July 4, 1986, Madrid, G. Velarde and E. Minguez, Eds. (Singapore: World Science, 1987), p. 287.

[9] U. GAT and S.R. DAUGHERTY, "The Ultimate Safe (U.S.) Reactor," 7th Miami International Conference on Alternative Energy Sources, Miami Beach, FL, December 9-11, 1985.