2

UCRL--91019

TI85 008954

SPENT FUEL PIN TEMPERATURE PC CODE

Larry E. Fischer

This paper was prepared for submittal to
Waste Management '85
Tucson, Arizona
March 24, 1985

March 1, 1985

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.

MASTER

39
DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

SPENT FUEL PIN TEMPERATURE PC CODE*

ABSTRACT

During an annual outage, a Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) may discharge 60 or more spent fuel bundles into its storage pool. Most early PWRs were built to store 3-5 years of spent fuel in their pools and are beginning to exceed their capacities. One method currently being developed and licensed for expanding spent fuel storage capabilities is the dry storage of spent fuel in large casks. To reduce the probability of gross failures of fuel cladding during dry storage in casks, the fuel pin temperatures must be shown to remain within acceptable limits.

LLNL has developed, for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, a personal computer (PC) code for calculating fuel pin temperatures on the IBM PC. The code uses the Wootton-Epstein Correlation to calculate the pin temperatures and has been benchmarked against test data. An iterative type of solution is used to calculate the fuel pin temperatures for specified heat fluxes and pin configurations. The PC code is useful in performing confirmatory analyses and comparing the results with those submitted by applicants applying for storage licenses.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many of the utilities are running out of storage space in their reactor pools for storing spent fuel. Some of the utilities are considering the use

* This work was supported by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission under a Memorandum of Understanding with the United States Department of Energy.

of on-site Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installations (ISFSIs) to store this excess spent fuel. All ISFSIs, both wet and dry types, must be licensed under 10CFR72. To license an ISFSI, a utility must submit a Safety Analysis Report (SAR) to demonstrate that the ISFSI design, construction, and operation complies with the requirements of 10CFR72. For cask storage systems, the SAR may reference a Topical Safety Analysis Report (TSAR) which has been submitted by a cask manufacturer and shows compliance with 10CFR72.

One of the requirements that must be evaluated in a TSAR or SAR is contained in 10CFR72.73(h) which states that the fuel cladding shall be protected against degradation and gross rupture. The primary approach currently used to demonstrate compliance with 10CFR72.73(h) is to limit the fuel pin temperature to a maximum value and to demonstrate that the maximum temperature value is not exceeded during storage operations. Several methods, including computer codes, have been developed or are being developed for calculating the maximum temperatures of fuel pins in fuel bundles.¹⁻⁵ The validity and complexity of any method used is usually dependent on the assumptions used in modeling the radiative heat transfer.

One calculational method used extensively in licensing casks for transporting spent fuel is the Wootton-Epstein Correlation (WEC), which was developed at the Battelle Memorial Institute in 1963.¹ The WEC is based on a simplified radiative heat transfer model which replaces the fuel pin rows with equivalent concentric tubes. This paper describes the development and benchmarking of a pin temperature computer code that is based upon the WEC concentric tube model. The pin temperature code is programmed in Basic for the IBM personal computer. The code is used in the evaluation of TSAR and SAR submittals to check their compliance with 10CFR72.73(h).

2. SYMBOLS

The symbols used in this paper are the same as those used in Ref. 1 except for changes or additions made for clarification and the use of SI units.

A_m = Heat transfer area (m^2)

A_1 = Area of fuel bundle envelope (m^2)

C_1 = Geometric constant (radiation)

C_2 = Empirical dimensional constant (free convection) ($Kw/m^2 \text{ } ^\circ K^{4/3}$)

F_1 = Empirical constant (radiative)

I = I th tube or fuel in row

N = Number of rods or pins on side of an array

$Q = Q_{10}$ = Heating rate of bundle (Kw)

T_E = Maximum fuel cladding temperature ($^\circ K$)

T_c = Cask wall temperature ($^\circ K$)

m = Row number beginning at outer row

$n = m - 1$

ϵ = Surface emissitivity

σ = Boltzmann constant ($Kw/m^2 \text{ } ^\circ K^4$)

3. ANALYSIS

R. Wooton and H. Epstein performed their investigations with a simulated 17 x 17 PWR bundle in the horizontal position. The tests were performed in atmospheric air and resulted in the following correlation for radiative and convective heat transfer

$$Q = \sigma C_1 F_1 A_1 [T_E^4 - T_C^4] + C_2 A_1 [T_E - T_C]^{4/3} \quad (1)$$

The determinations of the constants C_1 , F_1 , and C_2 are discussed in Ref. 1. Wootton and Epstein thought that their correlation, Eq. (1), might be valid for other fuel assembly geometries through the use of appropriate constants, but did not have sufficient data to support their contention. In 1978, R. Cox performed several experiments under vacuum conditions with the hexagon fuel bundle shown in Fig. 1.² In reviewing Cox's work, it occurred that his experimental data could be used to benchmark the WEC, Eq. (1), for a hexagon fuel bundle in a vacuum ($C_2 = 0$). Applying the WEC concentric tube model for radiative heat transfer, the configuration factors for hexagon fuel bundles are derived in the following paragraphs.

The hexagon bundle in Fig. 1 has 217 fuel pins and can be modeled as nine equivalent concentric hexagon tubes. The first or outer tube has 9 fuel pins on each of the six sides. The second tube has 8 pins on a side, the third has 7 pins and so on until the ninth tube has only one pin. The radiative heat transfer between any two adjacent tubes is calculated from the relation

$$Q_{mn} = \sigma A_m F_{mn} (T_m^4 - T_n^4) \quad (2)$$

where

$$F_{mn} = F_1 = \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_m} + \frac{1}{\epsilon_n} - 1 \right)^{-1} \quad (3)$$

															Row or Tube
177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185		1					
176	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	...186	2					
175	133	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	...142...187	3					
174	132	96	66	67	68	69	70	71	...104...143...188	4					
173	131	95	65	41	42	43	44	45	...72...105...144...189	5					
172	130	94	64	40	22	23	24	25	...46...73...106...145...190	6					
171	129	93	63	39	21	9	10	11	...26...47...74...107...146...191	7					
170	128	92	62	38	20	8	2	3	...12...27...48...75...108...147...192	8					
217	169	127	91	61	37	19	7	1	...4...13...28...49...76...109...148...193	9					
216	168	126	90	60	36	18	6	5	14	29	50	77	110	149	194
215	167	125	89	59	35	17	16	15	30	51	78	111	150	195	
214	166	124	88	58	34	33	32	31	52	79	112	151	196		
213	165	123	87	57	56	55	54	53	80	113	152	197			
212	164	122	86	85	84	83	82	81	114	153	198				
211	163	121	120	119	118	117	116	115	154	199					
210	162	161	160	159	158	157	156	155	200						
209	208	207	206	205	204	203	202	201							

Fig. 1. Numbering of fuel pins and rows for hexagon array in Ref. 1.

as approximated in Ref. 1. For a series of concentric tubes, the temperature of the i th hexagon tube is

$$\sum_{m=1}^I (T_m^4 - T_n^4) = \frac{1}{\sigma F_1} \sum_{m=1}^I \frac{Q_{mn}}{A_m} \quad (4)$$

or after multiplying and dividing by Q_{10}/A_1

$$\sum_{m=1}^I (T_m^4 - T_n^4) = \frac{Q_{10}}{\sigma F_1 A_1} \sum_{m=1}^I \frac{Q_{mn}}{Q_{10}} \frac{A_1}{A_m} = \frac{Q_{10} C_1}{\sigma F_1 A_1} \quad (5)$$

As in Ref. 1, A_m is proportional to the number of fuel pins in one side of the hexagon tube and Q_{mn} is proportional to the number of fuel pins inside the tube,

$$\frac{A_1}{A_1} = \frac{9}{9}, \frac{A_1}{A_2} = \frac{9}{8}, \frac{A_1}{A_3} = \frac{9}{7}, \dots \frac{A_1}{A_m} = \frac{N}{(N - m + 1)} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\frac{Q_{10}}{Q_{10}} = \frac{217}{217}, \frac{Q_{21}}{Q_{10}} = \frac{169}{217}, \frac{Q_{32}}{Q_{10}} = \frac{127}{217}, \dots$$

$$\frac{Q_{mn}}{Q_{10}} = \frac{3(N-m+1)(N-m) + 1}{3N(N-1) + 1} \quad (7)$$

or

$$\frac{Q_{mn} A_1}{Q_{10} A_m} = \left[\frac{N}{N - m + 1} \right] \left[\frac{3(N-m+1)(N-m) + 1}{3N(N-1) + 1} \right] \quad (8)$$

The temperature of the Ith tube then becomes

$$\sum_{m=1}^I (T_m^4 - T_n^4) = \frac{Q_{10}}{\sigma F_1 A_1} \left[\frac{N}{3N(N-1) + 1} \right]$$

$$\sum_{m=1}^I \frac{3(N-m+1)(N-m) + 1}{(N-m+1)} \quad (9)$$

for $N = 9$ and $I = 9$

$$T_E = \left[.218 \left(\frac{Q_{10}}{\sigma F_1 A_1} \right) + T_c^4 \right]^{.25} \quad (10)$$

4. COMPUTER CODE

A computer code was written in Basic for the IBM personal computer for calculating fuel pin temperatures for hexagon and square fuel bundles. For hexagon bundles in a vacuum, Eq. (9) is used to calculate the temperature of each fuel pin row of interest. For square bundles in a vacuum, the fuel pin temperature is calculated from

$$\sum_{m=1}^I (T_m^4 - T_n^4) = \frac{Q_{10}}{\sigma F_1 A_1} \sum_{m=1}^I \frac{N - (2m-2)}{N} \quad (11)$$

When air is present, the fuel pin temperature is initially calculated for vacuum conditions using either Eq. (9) or (11). The resultant heat flow is then calculated using Eq. (1) and the appropriate C_1 , F_1 , and C_2 values and compared to the specified heat flow. If the difference between the resultant and specified heat flow is greater than .1 percent, a revised pin temperature

is calculated as the initial temperature plus 1 percent of the heat flow difference divided by the specified heat flow. This process of revising the fuel pin temperature is repeated until the resultant heat flow converges to within .1 percent of the specified heat flow.

5. BENCHMARK RESULTS

Experimental data for five tests are contained in Ref. 1. Using the computer code for a hexagon array, the fuel pin temperatures for each test condition and fuel pin row was calculated. As seen in Table 1 for the first test, the calculated and measured results for each fuel pin row agree quite well with each other for a clad emissivity equal to .55, which is typical for stainless steel for the described coloration and temperature conditions. The agreement between the calculated and measured results begins to diverge at the three outer rows, which might be expected for this simple model which replaces the pins with equivalent tubes.

The calculated and measured results for the other four experiments were also in good agreement. In Table 2, the temperature results for the central pin are summarized for the five experiments. Agreement between the temperature results was improved for the last two experiments which used a different test assembly when the assumed emissivity was .6.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The benchmark results show that the WEC can be used to calculate spent fuel pin temperatures in hexagon fuel assemblies under vacuum conditions. Under atmospheric conditions with air or helium, the empirical convection

Table 1. Fuel pin temperatures run No. 1 from Ref. 1 Assumed $\epsilon = .55$.

Row No.	Pin No.	Measured Temperature °K	Calculated Temperature °K
1	209	568	564
1	185	572	564
1	170	578	564
1	196	588	564
2	155	601	606
2	147	617	606
3	97	635	636
3	126	643	636
4	71	656	658
5	57	672	675
6	31	684	686
9	1	700	699

Table 2. Center pin temperatures five experiments from Ref. 1.

Run No.	PDR	Measured Temperature °K	Assume ε	Calculated Temperature °K
1	1.36	700	.55	699
2	1.36	812	.55	811
3	1.36	702	.55	709
4	1.24	703	.60	716
5	1.24	810	.60	812

constant, C_2 , measured by Wooton and Epstein, may be used to conservatively calculate the heat flow due to convection and conduction. Although the WEC and the associated computer code are limited to analyzing symmetrical geometries and temperature distributions, they have been useful at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in performing sensitivity studies and evaluating SAR submittals for a variety of spent fuel configurations and conditions.

REFERENCES

1. Bucholz, J. A., "Scoping Design Analysis for Optimizing Shipping Casks Containing 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, or 10 Year Old PWR Spent Fuel," ORNL/CSD/TM-149, (January 1983), Appendix J only.
2. Cox, R. L., "Radiative Heat Transfer in arrays of Parallel Cylinders," ORNL-5329 (June 1977).
3. Watson, J. S., "Heat Transfer from Spent Reactor Fuels During Shipping," ORNL-3439 (no date).
4. McCann, R. A., "HYDRA-I a Three Dimensional Finite Difference Code for Calculating the Thermalhydraulic Performance of a Fuel Assembly Contained Within a Canister," PNL-3367, 1980.
5. Butterworth, D., "The Development of a Model for Three-Dimensional Flow in Tube Bundles," Int. J. Heat and Mass Transfer, Vol. 21, pp. 253-256, 1978.