

CONF-840614--68

DE84 014257

A SODIUM BOILING DRYOUT CORRELATION FOR LMFBR  
FUEL ASSEMBLIES

Juan J. Carbajo      Simon D. Rose

OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY

Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

**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.

This research is sponsored by the Office of Breeder Reactor Projects, U. S. Department of Energy under contract W-7405-eng-26 with the Union Carbide Corporation.

**MASTER**

By acceptance of this article, the author or authors agree that the article is the property of the U.S. Government and that the U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for government purposes, not withstanding any copyright notation that may appear hereon.

*MF*

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

# A SODIUM BOILING DRYOUT CORRELATION FOR LMFBR

## FUEL ASSEMBLIES

Juan J. Carbajo    Simon D. Rose

OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

## SUMMARY

Under certain postulated accident conditions for a Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR), such as the failure of the shutdown heat removal system (SHRS), sodium boiling and clad dryout might occur in the fuel assemblies. It is important to predict the time from boiling inception to dryout, since sustained clad dryout will result in core damage. In this paper a dryout correlation is presented.

This correlation is based on 21 boiling tests which resulted in dryout from the THORS Bundle 6A [1], a 19-pin full-length simulated LMFBR fuel assembly and from the THORS Bundle 9 [2], a 61-pin full-length simulated LMFBR fuel assembly. All these tests were performed as follows: for each specified bundle power, an initial steady-state high sodium flow was established, for which sodium boiling did not occur in the bundle. The temperature at the outlet of the test section was  $\sim 700^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Then, using a programmable pump control system, the flow was reduced to a low value and boiling occurred. The flow at the beginning of the transient is called "initial flow,"  $Q$ .

In order to correlate the data, two separate factors were chosen:

$$K_1 = \frac{P}{Q\rho_{\text{in}}\Delta h_{\text{sub}}} \quad (1)$$

and

$$K_2 = 1000 \frac{L}{Nv} = \frac{1000 LA}{NQ} \quad (2)$$

where  $P$  is total input power (kW),  $Q$  is initial flow ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ),  $v$  is inlet velocity (m/s),  $\rho_{\text{in}}$  is the density of the sodium at the inlet ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^3$ ),  $\Delta h_{\text{sub}}$  is the specific inlet enthalpy subcooling or the difference between liquid saturation and inlet enthalpies of sodium (kJ/kg),  $L$  is the perimeter of the bundle housing (m),  $A$  is the flow area ( $\text{m}^2$ ) and  $N$  is the number of fuel pins in the bundle.

The factor  $K_1$  is dimensionless, and the factor  $K_2$  has the dimension of time (seconds). Factor  $K_1$  is the ratio of the total input power to the power needed to bring all the sodium inlet flow to saturated liquid at the downstream end of the heated section. A value of one for  $K_1$  will produce liquid saturation conditions for the sodium at the end of the heated section. Values larger than one will produce boiling. Values below one will produce only local boiling or no boiling. Boiling-to-dryout times are expected to increase with decreasing values of  $K_1$ .

By the trial and error method, the following correlating parameter,  $I_d$ , was obtained:

$$I_d = \frac{\sqrt{K_2}}{K_1} \quad (3)$$

This parameter is plotted in Figure 1 versus dryout time,  $t_d$ , defined as the time from boiling inception to dryout. Two distinct regions can be seen for the forced convection and for the natural convection tests. Also, a best estimate fitting curve is shown, with error bands. There is more scatter for the forced convection tests. However, most of the tests are within 25% of the curve.

A two-part correlation was obtained. For forced convection, using the least-squares method for the logarithm of the dryout time, the following expression was obtained:

$$t_d = 10^{0.76 I_d - 0.32} \quad (4)$$

valid for the limits:  $1.6 \leq I_d \leq 2.5$  corresponding to a range  $8 \text{ s} \leq t_d \leq 39 \text{ s}$ . The least-squares correlation coefficient was 0.76 and the maximum deviation was 31%.

For natural convection, the following curve was fitted:

$$t_d = 10^{0.32 (I_d)^3 - 0.98 (I_d)^2 + 2.7} \quad (5)$$

valid for  $2.5 < I_d \leq 3.15$  corresponding to values of  $t_d$  in the range  $39 \text{ s} < t_d \leq 1000 \text{ s}$ . The least-squares correlation coefficient was 0.85 and the maximum deviation was 29%.

In order to use this correlation, factor  $K_1$  should be calculated first. If this factor is less than one, no boiling occurs. If  $K_1 \geq 1$ , then factor  $K_2$  and the parameter  $I_d$  should be calculated.

If  $I_d < 1.6$ ,  $t_d < 8$  s, dryout occurs very rapidly.

If  $1.6 < I_d \leq 2.5$ , (forced convection run), Eq. 4 applies.

If  $2.5 < I_d \leq 3.15$ , (natural convection run), Eq. 5 applies.

If  $I_d > 3.15$ , then  $t_d > 1000$  s, a very long boiling time, which can be considered as no dryout.

This correlation was obtained from experimental facilities of 19 and 61 pins, powers from 4.1 to 15.3 kW/pin, inlet velocities between 0.22 and 1.35 m/s, corresponding to inlet flows per pin between  $4.6 \times 10^{-6}$  and  $26.3 \times 10^{-6}$  m<sup>3</sup>/s/pin, test section inlet temperatures from 386 to 450°C, boiling temperatures from 913 to 982°C, bundle housing perimeters of 0.11 and 0.20 m and flow areas of  $3.7 \times 10^{-4}$  and  $12.9 \times 10^{-4}$  m<sup>2</sup>.

The correlation was evaluated with other non-dryout boiling and non-boiling runs of the same series of experiments and good agreement was obtained. The correlation was capable of predicting if boiling occurred (by using factor  $K_1$ ), and for how long it could be maintained. Four experimental runs were prematurely terminated by instrumentation malfunction, and the correlation predicts that these runs would have culminated in dryout had they been continued. The correlation has been used to predict boiling and dryout times for ongoing tests being performed in the THORS SHRS Assembly 1 [3]. The values calculated by this correlation were in good agreement with the results from the code LOOP-1 [4].

In conclusion, a correlation to estimate boiling and dryout times of sodium in bundles has been developed. This correlation is of interest as a simple scoping tool for dryout studies. It may be applied to other experimental facilities with similar geometries and test conditions.

## REFERENCES

1. J. L. Wantland, et al., "Sodium Boiling Incoherence in a 19-Pin Wire-Wrapped Bundle," *Proc. of the Internat'l. Conf. on Fast Reactor Safety Technology*, Seattle, Washington, Vol. IV, pp 1678-1685, (August 19-23, 1979)
2. S. D. Rose, et al., "Experimental and Numerical Thermal-Hydraulic Results from a 61-Pin Simulated LMFBR Subassembly," *Trans. Amer. Nucl. Soc.* 34, pp 880-882 (1980)
3. Simon D. Rose and Juan J. Carbajo, "Pretest Predictions for Degraded Shutdown Heat Removal Tests in THORS-SHRS Assembly 1," *Trans. Amer. Nucl. Soc.* 45, pp 367-369 (1983).
4. J. J. Carbajo, "Comparison of One- and Two-Dimensional Sodium Boiling Models," *Trans. Amer. Nucl. Soc.* 44, pp 319-320 (1983)

## FIGURES

Fig. 1. Sodium Dryout Correlation -  $I_d$  parameter versus time to dryout,  $t_d$ .

