12
8-5-97 JS①

FIREPLUME Model for Plume Dispersion from Fires: Application to Uranium Hexafluoride Cylinder Fires

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

MASTER

**Environmental Assessment Division
Argonne National Laboratory**

Operated by The University of Chicago,
under Contract W-31-109-Eng-38, for the

United States Department of Energy

Argonne National Laboratory

Argonne National Laboratory, with facilities in the states of Illinois and Idaho, is owned by the United States Government, and operated by the University of Chicago under the provisions of a contract with the Department of Energy.

This technical memo is a product of Argonne's Environmental Assessment Division (EAD). For information on the division's scientific and engineering activities, contact:

Director, Environmental Assessment Division
Argonne National Laboratory
Argonne, Illinois 60439-4815
Telephone (630) 252-3107

Presented in this technical memo are preliminary results of ongoing work or work that is more limited in scope and depth than that described in formal reports issued by the EAD.

Publishing support services were provided by Argonne's Information and Publishing Division (for more information, see IPD's home page: <http://www.ipd.anl.gov/>).

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.

Reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831; prices available from (423) 576-8401.

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

FIREPLUME Model for Plume Dispersion from Fires: Application to Uranium Hexafluoride Cylinder Fires

by D.F. Brown,* W.E. Dunn,* A.J. Policastro, and D. Maloney

Environmental Assessment Division,
Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Avenue, Argonne, Illinois 60439

June 1997

Work sponsored by United States Department of Energy, Office of Facilities,
Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology

**Brown and Dunn are affiliated with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.*

This report is printed on recycled paper.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

CONTENTS

NOTATION	viii
ABSTRACT	1
1 INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 The FIREPLUME Model	3
1.2 Characterization of Depleted UF ₆ Fire Releases	3
2 DESCRIPTION OF FIREPLUME	6
2.1 The Monte Carlo Lagrangian Dispersion Model	6
2.1.1 The Langevin Equation and Its Application	6
2.1.2 Source Buoyancy Effects	8
2.1.3 Boundary Conditions	9
2.2 Determination of Ground-Level Concentrations	9
2.2.1 The Puff Dispersion Model	10
2.2.2 Averaging Time	11
2.2.3 Treatment of the Smoldering or Cool-Down Release Phase	11
3 APPLICATION OF FIREPLUME TO RELEASES OF DEPLETED URANIUM HEXAFLUORIDE	13
3.1 Description of Scenarios	13
3.1.1 Overview	13
3.1.2 Release and Temperature Information	15
3.1.3 Meteorological Conditions	18
3.2 Treatment of Release Phases	18
3.2.1 The Hydraulic Rupture Release	19
3.2.2 Release into the Fire	22
3.2.3 Release during Cooldown	22
3.3 Health Criteria Considered	23
3.4 Results and Discussion	23
3.4.1 Scenarios T1a and T1b: Results for F1 Stability	23
3.4.2 Scenarios T1a and T1b: Results for D4 Stability	27
3.4.3 Summary Statistics for Remaining Release Scenarios	28
4 REFERENCES	35

CONTENTS (Cont.)

APPENDIX A: Calculation of Lagrangian Particle Trajectories in the Atmospheric Boundary Layer	A-1
APPENDIX B: Plume and Thermal Rise Relationships Used in FIREPLUME	B-1
APPENDIX C: Results for all Other FIREPLUME Scenarios	C-1
APPENDIX D: Analysis of Initial Uranium Hexafluoride Release to Initialize FIREPLUME	D-1

TABLES

1 Five Accident Scenarios Evaluated in the Current Study	14
2 Summary of 6FIRE and SUBLIME Results, as Presented by Williams and Anderson (1996)	16
3 Temperature and Release History for 48G and 48Y Depleted UF ₆ Cylinders Exposed to a 1,475°F Regulatory Fire for 30 Minutes, as Presented by Williams and Anderson (1996)	17
4 Summary of Meteorological Conditions Used in the FIREPLUME Runs	18
5 Limiting Toxicological Values for HF and UO ₂ F ₂	24
6 Key to the Five Accident Scenarios	26
7 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T1 with F1 Stability	28
8 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO ₂ F ₂ for Scenario T1 with F1 Stability	29
9 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T1 with D4 Stability	31
10 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO ₂ F ₂ for Scenario T1 with D4 Stability	32

TABLES (Cont.)

11	Distance to the Maximally Exposed Individual and Concentration at That Distance for the Five Accident Scenarios with D and F Stability	33
12	Total Area and the Maximum Distance for Which Concentration Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Criterion for the Five Accident Scenarios with D and F Stability	33
13	Total Area and the Maximum Distance for Which Concentration Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Criterion for the Five Accident Scenarios with D and F Stability	34
C.1	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T2 with D4 Stability	C-3
C.2	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T2 with D4 Stability	C-4
C.3	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T2 with F1 Stability	C-5
C.4	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T2 with F1 Stability	C-6
C.5	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T3 with D4 Stability	C-7
C.6	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T3 with D4 Stability	C-8
C.7	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T3 with F1 Stability	C-9
C.8	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T3 with F1 Stability	C-10
C.9	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T4 with D4 Stability	C-11
C.10	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T4 with D4 Stability	C-12

TABLES (Cont.)

C.11	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T4 with F1 Stability	C-13
C.12	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T4 with F1 Stability	C-14
C.13	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T5 with D4 Stability	C-15
C.14	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T5 with D4 Stability	C-16
C.15	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T5 with F1 Stability	C-17
C.16	Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T5 with F1 Stability	C-18

FIGURES

1	Dispersion of the Three Phases of the Release Scenario for Class F Stability Conditions	26
2	Predicted Potential-Adverse-Effects Impacted Areas for HF and UO_2F_2 for the Three-48G-Cylinder Release for F1 Meteorological Conditions	30
3	Dispersion of the Three Phases of the Release Scenario for Class D Stability Conditions	30
A.1	Standard Deviation of the Vertical Velocity Fluctuations as Given by Equation A.18, Shown in Comparison with Data from Water Tank Studies and ABL Studies	A-7
A.2	Comparison of the Interpolation Formula with Both Numerical and Actual Vertical Velocity Standard Deviation Data from Near-Neutral Boundary Layers	A-9
A.3	Standard Deviation of Vertical Velocity Fluctuations as Given by Equation A.20, Shown in Comparison with Data from Minnesota, Cabauw, and Oklahoma	A-11

FIGURES (Cont.)

A.4	Third-Order Vertical Velocity Moments as Given by Equation A.24, Shown in Comparison with Data from Water Tank Studies and ABL Studies	A-13
A.5	Horizontal Velocity Variances as Given by Equation A.36, Shown in Comparison with Data from Minnesota, Cabauw, and Oklahoma	A-18
A.6	Vertical Velocity Fluctuation Skewness within the Canopy as Provided by Equation A.45	A-23

NOTATION

The following is a list of the acronyms, initialisms, and abbreviations (including units of measure) used in this document. Acronyms used only in tables are defined in the respective tables.

ACRONYMS, INITIALISMS, AND ABBREVIATIONS

ERPG	Emergency Response Planning Guideline
MCLDM	Monte Carlo Lagrangian Dispersion Model
MEI	maximally exposed individual
PEIS	programmatic environmental impact statement
STP	standard temperature and pressure

CHEMICALS

HF	hydrogen fluoride
UF ₆	uranium hexafluoride
UO ₂ F ₂	uranyl fluoride

UNITS OF MEASURE

cm	centimeter(s)
°F	degree(s) Fahrenheit
K	(degree[s]) Kelvin
kg	kilogram(s)
kJ	kilojoule(s)
km	kilometer(s)
km ²	square kilometer(s)
lb	pound(s)
m	meter(s)
m ²	square meter(s)
m ³	cubic meter(s)
mg	milligram(s)
min	minute(s)
mol	mole(s)
s	second(s)
μm	micrometer(s)

FIREPLUME MODEL FOR PLUME DISPERSION FROM FIRES: APPLICATION TO URANIUM HEXAFLUORIDE CYLINDER FIRES

by

D.F. Brown, W.E. Dunn, A.J. Policastro, and D. Maloney

ABSTRACT

This report provides basic documentation of the FIREPLUME model and discusses its application to the prediction of health impacts resulting from releases of uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) in fires. The model application outlined in this report was conducted for the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Alternative Strategies for the Long-Term Management and Use of Depleted UF_6 . The FIREPLUME model is an advanced stochastic model for atmospheric plume dispersion that predicts the downwind consequences of a release of toxic materials from an explosion or a fire. The model is based on the nonbuoyant atmospheric dispersion model MCLDM (Monte Carlo Lagrangian Dispersion Model), which has been shown to be consistent with available laboratory and field data. The inclusion of buoyancy and the addition of a postprocessor to evaluate time-varying concentrations lead to the current model. No data currently exist to test the model for the UF_6 fire cases analyzed in this study; however, the algorithms for predictions of plume buoyancy have been evaluated previously and performed well. The FIREPLUME model, as applied to fire-related UF_6 cylinder releases, accounts for three phases of release and dispersion. The first phase of release involves the hydraulic rupture of the cylinder due to heating of the uranium hexafluoride in the fire. The second phase involves the emission of material into the burning fire, and the third phase involves the emission of material after the fire has died during the cool-down period. The model predicts the downwind concentration of the material as a function of time at any point downwind at or above the ground. Application of suitable health criteria leads to the prediction of impacts on the basis of human health end points; these end points are based on potential adverse effects and irreversible adverse effects. All together, five fire-related release scenarios are examined in this report. For each scenario, downwind concentrations of the UF_6 reaction products, uranyl fluoride and hydrogen fluoride, are provided for two meteorological conditions: (1) D stability with a 4-m/s wind speed, and (2) F stability with a 1-m/s wind speed. Also provided are the concentrations for the maximally exposed individual, the exposed area, and the greatest downwind distances for which respective health criteria are exceeded.

1 INTRODUCTION

This report provides basic documentation of the FIREPLUME model for plume dispersion from fires and its application to uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) fires. The model has been used in preparation of the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for evaluating alternative strategies for long-term management and use of depleted UF_6 . That PEIS is hereafter referred to as the Depleted UF_6 PEIS.

1.1 THE FIREPLUME MODEL

The FIREPLUME model is an extension of the Monte Carlo Lagrangian Dispersion Model (MCLDM) developed over the past 10 years. That model was originally developed to predict dispersion from military smoke (fog oil and hexachloroethane) from generators and smoke pots near the ground and was later extended to treat all passive releases. The evolution of the current model began with a study of dispersion in convective conditions (Liljegren 1989). The Monte Carlo model developed for that application compared very well with available field and laboratory data for such conditions. A particularly valuable feature of the model was its ability to match the rising centerline phenomenon that has been observed with plumes from surface releases under convective conditions (e.g., water tank data by Willis and Deardorff [1974]). Brown (1997) extended the model to treat dispersion in stable and near-neutral conditions and refined the Monte Carlo modeling in the surface layer to better estimate ground-level concentrations. In the current effort, (1) buoyancy was added to the MCLDM model, and (2) a postprocessor was added to evaluate time-varying concentrations. Although the current effort, as discussed in this report, has been specifically for the prediction of the consequences of UF_6 fire plume scenarios, the model is equally applicable to the prediction of fire plume consequences other than those from UF_6 accidents. (FIREPLUME does not explicitly handle the UF_6 chemistry. The important chemical and physical transformations are taken into account in setting up FIREPLUME, as discussed in Section 3.2.) Specific details concerning the modeling methodology are provided in Section 2 and in Appendixes A and B.

1.2 CHARACTERIZATION OF DEPLETED UF_6 FIRE RELEASES

Off-site and on-site transportation accidents and in-facility accidents involving UF_6 may include the possibility of fire engulfing cylinders containing solid UF_6 . The fire accident can be an important case for off-site impacts, leading to potentially significant ground-level concentrations and deposition of fire products. Although such accidents have only recently been examined, the impacts of a variety of accident scenarios coupled with specific meteorological conditions are important to characterize.

The fundamental physical processes involved in the fire and its plume dispersion are simple to summarize, although a detailed analysis of each step can be quite complex. A typical scenario is the following. One or more cylinders containing solid UF_6 are involved in an accident in which the diesel fuel from a transport vehicle spills and ignites, engulfing the cylinder(s). During the fire, the heat transferred to the cylinder sublimates a portion of the solid inside. This sublimation causes pressure to build inside of the cylinder to a level that leads to hydraulic rupture of the cylinder. This rupture releases to the atmosphere a puff of hot UF_6 vapor, which quickly reacts with atmospheric water vapor to produce a mixture of uranyl fluoride (UO_2F_2) and hydrogen fluoride (HF). The continuing fire then sends additional UF_6 upward with the fire plume; this UF_6 also reacts quickly to form UO_2F_2 and HF. Finally, as the fire subsides, the cool-down or smoldering phase of the release continues for 30 minutes or more. During this cool-down period, the temperature of the emitted plume decreases rapidly (reducing emitted buoyancy) until the emission ceases. All fire-related scenarios outlined in the Depleted UF_6 PEIS and studied in this report are variations of this basic case.

In the application of FIREPLUME to the Depleted UF_6 PEIS fire scenarios, the assumption is made that the UF_6 released into the fire is quickly converted to UO_2F_2 (1- μm particles) and HF (vapor) and that those two substances act as tracers in the dispersion of the fire plume. In this procedure, the important chemical and physical transformations are taken into account in establishing the initial conditions for FIREPLUME. For the scenarios examined in this report, this approximation is reasonable. Uranyl fluoride can deposit on the ground at very low deposition rates during the accident. The deposition rate of HF is negligible because of its gaseous state. (Hydrogen fluoride can potentially be taken up by vegetation; however, this possibility was not accounted for in the current study.)

Application of the FIREPLUME model requires the user to identify the health or ecological end points needed for the analysis of human health or environmental impacts. In the Depleted UF_6 PEIS, two health end points are considered: (1) potential adverse effects, and (2) potential irreversible adverse effects. The potential-adverse-effects level for uranium compounds is represented by an intake of 10 mg (McGuire 1991); for HF, the potential-adverse-effects level is represented by the Emergency Response Planning Guideline 1 (ERPG-1) one-hour value (AIHA 1996). The potential-irreversible-adverse effects level for uranium compounds is represented by an intake of 30 mg (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission guidance, 10 CFR Part 76); for HF, the potential-irreversible-adverse-effects level is represented by the ERPG-2 one-hour value. To extrapolate the health criteria for averaging times under an hour, chemical-specific exponential functions relating toxicity to exposure time are used (i.e., probit equations; see Section 2.2.2). Details on the extrapolation of the uranium compound and HF health criteria for averaging times less than an hour are given in the Depleted UF_6 PEIS, Appendix C.

For any downwind location, the FIREPLUME model predicts a rolling (in time) average concentration. Comparing that value with the concentration value for the corresponding health end

point being considered determines if that point lies inside of the impact area. Because of the transient nature of the UF_6 releases, the maximum average concentration varies widely with averaging time. Therefore, FIREPLUME determines a worst-case averaging time by considering several averaging times at each downwind location and comparing these concentrations with the health criteria extrapolated to the same averaging time.

2 DESCRIPTION OF FIREPLUME

The FIREPLUME model predicts the ground-level concentration field resulting from releases of hazardous materials from (1) instantaneously discharged thermals, (2) fires, or (3) passive releases. Releases during smoldering or cool-down phases of fires are also considered. The FIREPLUME model consists of two primary components. The first component is a Monte Carlo dispersion model, denoted as MCLDM (Monte Carlo Lagrangian Dispersion Model), that estimates dispersion of both buoyant and nonbuoyant releases in the atmospheric boundary layer. For computational efficiency, MCLDM is constrained to two-dimensional dispersion (x, z) because lateral dispersion is well characterized with simple Gaussian models. The strength of MCLDM is in treating the vertical dispersion part of the problem, because simple Gaussian relationships do not adequately represent vertical concentration distributions in the atmospheric boundary layer. Furthermore, the Monte Carlo approach allows for convenient inclusion of the effects of plume rise (however, negatively buoyant plumes are not currently treated in MCLDM or FIREPLUME). The second component of FIREPLUME is a puff dispersion model that acts as a postprocessor to MCLDM. The puff dispersion model uses MCLDM-generated estimates of vertical dispersion, together with standard Gaussian relationships for horizontal dispersion, to estimate the ground-level concentration for a time-dependent release rate and a specified averaging time. For a time-varying release, the postprocessor is necessary because MCLDM provides only steady-state results.

In this chapter, we first briefly discuss MCLDM and then describe the puff dispersion model. Additional details of MCLDM are provided in Appendixes A and B. Appendix A discusses the calculation of Lagrangian particle trajectories in the atmospheric boundary layer, and Appendix B outlines the plume and thermal rise relationships used in FIREPLUME. Further details on MCLDM are provided by Brown (1997).

2.1 THE MONTE CARLO LAGRANGIAN DISPERSION MODEL

2.1.1 The Langevin Equation and Its Application

In MCLDM, the Lagrangian trajectories of a large number of particles are simulated to develop the mean concentration field directly from the probability density function of the particle positions. The particle trajectories are calculated by using atmospheric boundary layer statistics as well as initial source buoyancy. To calculate particle trajectories, MCLDM employs the Langevin equation, which provides the best physical description of particle behavior in a turbulent flow field. Application of the Langevin equation to model turbulent motion takes advantage of the fact that the time scales governing variations in acceleration are much smaller than the time scales governing

variations in velocity. Indeed, for the atmospheric boundary layer, this assumption proves to be very good, as illustrated in the photographic evidence of van Dop et al. (1985).

For one-dimensional particle motion, the Langevin equation reads

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -\frac{u}{T_L} + \eta(t) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where

u = a fluctuating velocity component (i.e., $\bar{u} = 0$),

T_L = the Lagrangian time scale, and

$\eta(t)$ = a white-noise random process.

For homogeneous turbulence, integration of this stochastic differential equation provides the following Markov-chain relationship for the particle velocity:

$$u(t + \Delta t) = \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{T_L} \right) u(t) + \mu \quad , \quad (2)$$

where

$$\bar{\mu} = 0$$

and

$$\overline{\mu^2} = \frac{2 \Delta t \sigma_u^2}{T_L} \quad .$$

Here, μ is a random forcing function that is Gaussian for homogeneous turbulence. Reid (1979) and Ley (1982) have illustrated the applicability of the Langevin equation for modeling dispersion in the homogeneous neutral surface layer and have shown that predicted vertical distributions of particles (i.e., vertical concentration profiles) are in close agreement with experimental data.

The application of the Langevin approach to model dispersion in vertically inhomogeneous turbulence (such as that seen in the convective boundary layer) is more complicated. Early investigators (Legg and Rapauch 1982; Ley and Thomson 1983; Wilson et al. 1983) noted that the addition of a mean vertical velocity was necessary to prevent particles from clustering in regions of

low vertical velocity variance or low Lagrangian time scale. Thomson (1984, 1987) further argued that additional moments of the random forcing function needed to be modified to prevent unphysical particle behavior. By requiring the steady-state density function of the particle distribution to approach the density function of the air as specified by the Eulerian velocity moments, Thomson (1984) derived a general expression for relating the moments of μ to the Eulerian velocity field. Thomson's expressions include a mean vertical velocity, corrections to $\overline{\mu^2}$, and expressions for higher order moments of μ . De Baas et al. (1986) and Liljegren (1989) employed the approach of Thomson to study dispersion in the convective boundary layer using Eulerian velocity moment data from both atmospheric and water tank studies. Predictions of concentrations from these studies agreed very well with water tank concentration data reported by Deardorff and Willis (1985) and with atmospheric concentration data from several field experiments.

The MCLDM model extends the convective boundary layer models advanced by De Baas et al. (1986) and by Liljegren (1989) in two primary directions. First, MCLDM treats dispersion in near-neutral and stable conditions by incorporating statistics for these boundary layers as determined from several numerical and observational studies. Second, MCLDM provides a more careful treatment of the lower boundary by correctly representing all turbulent statistics through the surface layer and incorporating a realistic canopy layer utilizing turbulence statistics from several laboratory and field studies, as summarized by Kaimal and Finnigan (1994). This more realistic lower boundary has allowed for more accurate estimates of near-ground concentrations, especially from near-ground sources. Further discussion of MCLDM for the treatment of nonbuoyant releases is contained in Appendix A.

2.1.2 Source Buoyancy Effects

In the development of the FIREPLUME model, the effects of buoyancy have been included in MCLDM by adding a mean vertical velocity to the particles, as determined from standard plume rise relationships. The downwind distance over which buoyancy effects are included is determined by using associated limiting rise relationships. Additionally, the variances in particle velocity are also increased in a stochastic manner to account for the buoyant plume entrainment. Two sets of rise equations are incorporated in MCLDM: one for fires and another for instantaneous thermals. Fires are modeled by using standard plume relationships, whereas the instantaneous thermals are modeled by using relationships for buoyant thermals (Morton et al. 1956). As discussed by Weil (1982), buoyant thermal relationships are not as well developed as those for continuous plumes because of the limited laboratory and field data from which entrainment relationships can be refined. The plume and buoyant thermal rise relationships are further discussed in Appendix B.

2.1.3 Boundary Conditions

We shall now discuss the boundary conditions invoked in MCLDM and their effect on the results of the simulation. At the ground, a reflection boundary condition is used for all cases; however, because of the fact that both the Lagrangian time scale and the vertical velocity variance approach zero as z approaches zero (see Appendix A), the lower boundary is statistically unattainable, and reflection rarely occurs. A reflection boundary condition is also employed at the upper boundary for all conditions for nonbuoyant releases. For buoyant releases, the upper boundary condition is dependent on the meteorological conditions. The convective boundary layer is usually capped by a rather strong inversion. Thus, we use a reflection boundary condition for all particles at all times at the inversion. For our application, this assumption is reasonable because the initial buoyancy required to penetrate inversions typical of those capping the convective boundary layer is substantially larger than the initial buoyancy typical of the depleted UF_6 release scenarios we consider (see Weil [1988] for a discussion of elevated inversion penetration).

Our treatment of the upper boundary condition for the stable boundary layer is more complicated, but understanding it is very important in terms of interpreting the results of the model. In short, particles under the effect of ambient turbulence are reflected at the boundary layer height, whereas particles experiencing buoyant rise are allowed to exit the boundary layer. This treatment means that particles that pass completely through the boundary layer *under the effects of buoyant rise* do not return to the boundary layer and thus do not contribute to ground-level impacts. This formulation is a direct consequence of the turbulence structure of the stable boundary layer, as discussed in Appendix A. Although this assumption may seem at first to be unrealistic, the basic premise involved here is strongly supported by observations of both turbulence and dispersion in the stable boundary layer. Observations of turbulence show that the turbulence energy (in particular the vertical velocity variance σ_w) falls to near zero at the boundary layer height h (Nieuwstadt 1984). Thus material that rises above h because of buoyancy effects or is released above h (e.g., from a stack) does not diffuse back down into the boundary layer. This interpretation of events is clearly inferred from elevated releases, which often show undetectable concentrations at ground level until the boundary layer becomes convective in the morning (Csanady 1973; Hanna and Paine 1989).

2.2 DETERMINATION OF GROUND-LEVEL CONCENTRATIONS

The MCLDM model treats only stationary, or steady-state, problems. This fact means that MCLDM cannot model concentrations from instantaneous or time-varying releases. For this reason, we use a puff dispersion model to postprocess the "steady-state" MCLDM results so that problems with time-varying release rates and problems where several release phases exist (e.g., a fire with a cool-down period) can be treated. The puff dispersion model and its application are outlined in the following subsections.

2.2.1 The Puff Dispersion Model

For each depleted UF_6 release scenario modeled in this study (i.e., a given source configuration and set of meteorological conditions), up to three classes of MCLDM simulations are used, corresponding to (1) a baseline case with no buoyancy, (2) a fire plume case, and (3) a buoyant thermal case. The ground-level, nondimensionalized crosswind-integrated concentrations for these cases are then used directly to model the vertical dispersion of the puffs within the puff dispersion model. In this framework, the estimates of ground-level vertical dispersion that MCLDM provides are applied like the σ_z curves in traditional Gaussian plume models (Turner 1969); however, the MCLDM estimates of " σ_z " intrinsically correct the deficiencies in standard Gaussian σ_z relationships and incorporate source buoyancy effects. Note that the σ_z implied here is not the true σ_z determined from the vertical concentration distribution but is rather a fitting parameter that, when inserted into the puff dispersion model, will provide the correct ground-level crosswind-integrated concentration.

The puff dispersion model is constructed in a standard manner. The release is broken up into a series of two-dimensional Gaussian puffs [i.e., $(x, y, z = 0)$] that are released in a certain time interval (a 30-s release interval is currently used for all simulations discussed here). Each puff is advected downwind while growing in lateral and streamwise directions. The concentration at a particular point at a particular time $C(x, y, t)$ is provided by summing the contributions from all of the puffs, such that

$$C(x, y, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{M_i}{(2\pi)^{3/2} \sigma_{xi} \sigma_{yi} \sigma_{zi}} \exp \left[-\left(\frac{y - y_o}{\sqrt{2} \sigma_{yi}} \right)^2 \right] \exp \left[-\left(\frac{x - U(t - t_i)}{\sqrt{2} \sigma_{xi}} \right)^2 \right], \quad (3)$$

where

N = the number of puffs;

$M_i, \sigma_{xi}, \sigma_{yi}, \sigma_{zi}$, and t_i = the mass, plume spread parameters, and release times for each puff i ; and

U = the average wind speed.

The σ_z values in Equation 3 come directly from the MCLDM simulations. The σ_z relationship for each puff corresponds to whether the puff is from (1) a thermal, (2) a fire, or (3) a smoldering fire. This latter category will be explained shortly. In the puff model, we assume that transverse diffusion and streamwise diffusion of the puffs are equal (i.e., $\sigma_x = \sigma_y$). The parameters for horizontal plume spread are estimated by using the relationships by Draxler (1976) for stable conditions and by Weil (1988, Equation 4.61) for unstable conditions. Enhancement of σ_y due to buoyancy effects is neglected. For the scenarios considered in this study, this approximation is adequate.

2.2.2 Averaging Time

To relate the concentration to a toxicological end point, the puff model integrates over time the concentration expression in Equation 3 to provide an average concentration over a given time interval. In the averaging process, the puff model uses a "rolling average," returning the maximum average concentration over the time interval in question.

The puff dispersion model either (1) can use a preset averaging time (e.g., a one-hour averaging time such as would correspond to a one-hour ERPG health criterion) or (2) can search various averaging times and corresponding health criteria to determine the worst case. The second method is employed in this study. Here, we define a probit exponent that relates the health criteria to the averaging time, such that

$$\frac{C_{lim}(T_1)}{C_{lim}(T_2)} = \left(\frac{T_2}{T_1} \right)^b, \quad (4)$$

where b is the probit exponent. The probit exponent typically varies between about 0.3 and 0.67 for corrosive toxic gases such as HF (Wilson 1991). An exponent of 1 indicates a linear relationship of toxicity with exposure time. For the chemicals of interest in this study, the probit exponent assumed was 0.5 for HF and 1.0 for UO_2F_2 . (See Appendix C of the Depleted UF_6 PEIS for details on these assumptions.) For HF averaging times less than five minutes, the health criterion was fixed at the five-minute value. Health criteria values for HF and UO_2F_2 are further discussed in Section 3.3.

2.2.3 Treatment of the Smoldering or Cool-Down Release Phase

Within the framework outlined, the modeling of passive releases, as well as releases in thermals and fires, is straightforward in that the MCLDM σ_z values are directly used in Equation 3. However, for releases that continue after a fire dies, the problem becomes more difficult because the buoyancy gradually decreases as the burned material cools. The treatment of this phase of the problem is especially important because ground-level concentrations within a few kilometers of the source can be dominated by this low-buoyancy phase of the release. Unfortunately, using the MCLDM model for the intermediate-buoyancy cases is not practical because each MCLDM model run consumes from one to five hours on a Sun-5 workstation. In principle, 10 or more such runs would be necessary to adequately characterize the plume behavior through the cool-down period.

To model the smoldering phase of the release in an economical manner, we have developed an interpolation scheme using the MCLDM results from two runs: one with a fire plume and another with zero buoyancy. For these intermediate-buoyancy cases, our scheme uses simpler empirical models to scale the MCLDM results between the fire plume and the zero-buoyancy case. Although

the concentration estimates of the simple empirical models estimates, their use in our interpolation scheme provides a scheme has been tested against estimates directly from the MCLDM model provides concentration estimates within 20% of actual MCLDM effort; we are currently working toward a more physically realistic description of the smoldering phase of the release because of its importance in near-source ground-level concentrations. Our treatment of the cool-down phase of the release is outlined in the following paragraphs.

The buoyancy of the plume in the cool-down phase is estimated from the release temperature. For depleted UF_6 release scenarios considered in this study, this release temperature is provided by Williams and Anderson (1996) (see Section 3). During the cool-down period, the Froude number is assumed to be constant. Therefore, the buoyancy ratio, $K = U_r / w_o$ (where w_o is the source vertical velocity, and U_r is the reference wind speed at 10 m)], varies as

$$K^2 \sim \frac{T_r(t)}{T_f} \quad (5)$$

By using the time-dependent value of K , the ground-level concentrations are estimated by the fire plume MCLDM runs. The interpolation scheme for interpolation is constructed by using estimates of the ground-level concentrations from the baseline (nonbuoyant) MCLDM model for stable conditions and the simple, empirical buoyant plume models. By using empirical estimates of the ground-level concentrations determined by the models by Weil (1988) for unstable conditions, the ground-level, crosswind-integrated concentration estimates as determined by using the interpolation equation,

concentrations are estimated by the fire plume MCLDM runs. The ground-level concentrations from the baseline MCLDM model for stable conditions are used as determined by Venkatram (1988) for stable conditions. For arbitrary K [i.e., $C(x,K)$] is estimated by using the interpolation equation,

$$C(x,K) = C_b(x) + [C_f(x) - C_b(x)] \frac{\tilde{C}(x,K) - \tilde{C}(x,K=0)}{\tilde{C}(x,K_{fire}) - \tilde{C}(x,K=0)} \quad (6)$$

where

C_b = the baseline MCLDM case,

C_f = the fire plume MCLDM case, and

$\tilde{C}$ = the concentration estimated with the simpler empirical method.

3 APPLICATION OF FIREPLUME TO RELEASES OF DEPLETED URANIUM HEXAFLUORIDE

This chapter details the application of the FIREPLUME model in predicting the consequences of accidents involving depleted UF_6 . First, the release scenarios are described in Section 3.1, including (1) a basic overview of the release scenarios, (2) a review of the temperature and release rate information, and (3) a discussion of the meteorological conditions analyzed. Next, the treatment of the three release phases (i.e., the initial hydraulic rupture, the release in the fire, and the smoldering or cool-down phase) in setting up the model runs is outlined in Section 3.2. Then health criteria are reviewed in Section 3.3; and finally in Section 3.4, the results of FIREPLUME are presented and discussed for one scenario. Also provided are result summaries for the four other scenarios. More detailed results are presented in Appendix C.

3.1 DESCRIPTION OF SCENARIOS

3.1.1 Overview

Table 1 lists the five accident scenarios evaluated in the current study. These scenarios consist of three primary scenarios with two subcases involving different types of depleted UF_6 cylinders.

The first primary scenario involves a fuel fire engulfing three cylinders of depleted UF_6 that are in storage. Here, one possible initiating event is a vehicle operator losing control of his vehicle and striking the storage area. In this accident, diesel fuel contained in the fuel tank of the vehicle spills and ignites, resulting in a 30-minute fuel fire. Considering the typical capacity of a vehicle fuel tank, three cylinders is a reasonable upper limit of the total number of cylinders that would be affected by such a fuel fire. As discussed further in Section 3.1.2, the fuel fire ultimately leads to the hydraulic rupture of the three cylinders. Upon rupture, each cylinder releases a large puff of UF_6 , which quickly mixes with air and becomes slightly buoyant. This instantaneous release of UF_6 is followed by a continuous release of UF_6 into the fire plume during the remaining period of the 30-minute fire. Because it is very unlikely that all three cylinders would rupture at the same moment, it was assumed that they rupture at 30-second intervals. Once the fire dies, the cylinders cool, releasing additional UF_6 . Although several types of depleted UF_6 cylinders could be affected by this storage-yard scenario, only 48G and 48Y cylinders are considered in this analysis because, due to their projected release rates, their impacts should be bounding.

The second primary scenario considered in our analysis involves the crash landing of a small aircraft. Upon impact, one cylinder is assumed to rupture immediately, and a second cylinder

TABLE 1 Five Accident Scenarios Evaluated in the Current Study

Accident Scenario	Accident Description	Release (Source Term)			Release Level
		Chemical Form	Amount (lb)	Duration (min)	
Vehicle-induced fire; three full 48G cylinders	Three full UF ₆ cylinders hydraulically rupture during a fire resulting from the ignition of fuel or hydraulic fluid from the transport vehicle, etc.	UF ₆	0	0-12	Ground
			11,500	12	
			8,930	12-30	
			3,580	30-121	
Vehicle-induced fire; three full 48Y cylinders	Three full UF ₆ cylinders hydraulically rupture during a fire resulting from the ignition of fuel or hydraulic fluid from the transport vehicle, etc.	UF ₆	0	0-24	Ground
			18,000	24	
			2,770	24-30	
			8,010	30-236	
Small aircraft-induced fire; two full 48G cylinders	A full UF ₆ cylinder hydraulically ruptures during a fire resulting from the ignition of aviation fuel.	UF ₆	0	0-12	Ground
			3,840	12	
			2,980	12-30	
			1,190	30-121	
	Initial breach of one cylinder due to impact with aircraft debris, followed by sublimation due to fire.	UF ₆	4,240	0-30	Ground
			1,190	30-121	
Small aircraft-induced fire; two full 48Y cylinders	A full UF ₆ cylinder hydraulically ruptures during a fire resulting from the ignition of aviation fuel.	UF ₆	0	0-24	Ground
			6,020	24	
			920	24-30	
			2,670	30-236	
	Initial breach of one cylinder due to impact with aircraft debris, followed by sublimation due to fire.	UF ₆	3,210	0-30	Ground
			2,730	30-236	
Vehicle-induced fire; two heel cylinders	A vehicle crashes into the depleted UF ₆ heel cylinder storage pad, damaging two cylinders. The fuel from the vehicle ignites and releases all of the depleted UF ₆ .	UF ₆	39	30	Ground
			10	30	

remains in the fire and ruptures later. The characteristics of the fuel fire (e.g., temperature, size, and duration) in this scenario are the same as in the previous scenario. Like the first primary scenario, this case has two subcases involving (1) two 48G cylinders and (2) two 48Y cylinders.

The third primary scenario, which has no subcases, involves heel cylinders exposed to the same fuel fire as in the vehicle and aircraft accidents. (Heel cylinders are relatively small cylinders containing small amounts of depleted UF_6 .) This third scenario does not include either a puff release (due to a hydraulic rupture) or a cool-down phase; the entire contents of the heel cylinders is released into the fire over its 30-minute duration.

3.1.2 Release and Temperature Information

The release rate and temperature information for the releases of depleted UF_6 considered in this study were generated by Williams and Anderson (1996) using the 6FIRE and SUBLIME models. In their analysis, Williams and Anderson (1996) modeled the release characteristics of 14-ton 48G and 48Y cylinders of depleted UF_6 that were fully engulfed in a 1,475°F fire for 30 minutes. For both the 48G and 48Y cylinders, two release scenarios were considered. The first scenario, corresponding to the first primary scenario noted in Section 3.1.1, involves a cylinder that is initially undamaged but fully engulfed in a fire. In this scenario, the 48G and 48Y cylinders rupture after 12 and 24 minutes in the fire, respectively. In each case, the rupture of the cylinder is due to hoop stress failure caused by internal pressure buildup, resulting in an instantaneous hydraulic release. After rupture, the cylinders release UF_6 vapor at a nearly constant rate for the remainder of the fire. After the 30-minute fire, the cool-down phase begins, where emissions are reduced until the temperature of the cylinder decreases to 133°F. This cool-down phase of the release lasts for 91 and 206 minutes for the 48G and 48Y cylinders, respectively. (The cool-down phase of the 48Y cylinder is greater because of its larger heat capacity.)

The second release scenario considered by Williams and Anderson (1996) is similar to the first, except here one cylinder is assumed to be breached initially (i.e., no hydraulic rupture occurs). This release scenario corresponds to the cylinder in the aircraft scenario (primary scenario 2, as noted in Section 3.1.1) that is breached upon impact. Here, the release rate is initially zero but quickly increases as the temperature of the cylinder increases. After the 30-minute fire, the cool-down characteristics for the second scenario are very similar to those of the first scenario.

A summary of 6FIRE and SUBLIME results for 48G and 48Y cylinders for the previous scenarios is provided in Table 2. Information on the release rate and temperature is provided in Table 3.

TABLE 2 Summary of 6FIRE and SUBLIME Results, as Presented by Williams and Anderson (1996)

		a. Thermal rupture			b. Initial breach	
		48G	48Y		48G	48Y
6FIRE Results						
Initial UF ₆ mass, lb		28000	28000		28000	28000
Time of rupture, min		12.2	23.9		0 [†]	0 [†]
Composition at rupture, lb (%)	Solid	24163 (86.3)	21984 (78.5)			
	Liquid	3523 (12.6)	4744 (16.9)			
	Vapor	314 (1.1)	1272 (4.6)			
Cylinder pressure at rupture, psia		231.8	670.9			
Liquid temperature at rupture, °F		260.0	284.9			
Vapor temperature at rupture, °F		672.7	611.5			
Average shell temperature at rupture, °F		1125	1085			
Initial release, lb		3837	6016		0 [†]	0 [†]
SUBLIME Results						
Time from rupture to end of fire, min		17.8	6.1		30	30
Vapor sublimated during remainder of fire, lb		2975	924		4240	3213
Vapor temperature at end of fire, °F		912	882		912	905
Vapor sublimated after fire, lb		1192	2670		1192	2733
Duration of post-fire release, min		91.4	205.7		91.4	206.1
Total UF ₆ released, lb (% initial UF ₆)		8004 (28.6)	9610 (34.3)		5432 (19.4)	5946 (21.2)

[†] A cylinder will always contain some UF₆ vapor, some of which may be released when a cylinder is breached. This quantity of material, practically speaking, would be insignificant relative to uncertainties in the overall modeling of a cylinder that is breached coincident with the initiation of a fire.

TABLE 3 Temperature and Release History for 48G and 48Y Depleted UF₆ Cylinders Exposed to a 1,475°F Regulatory Fire for 30 Minutes, as Presented by Williams and Anderson (1996)

a. Thermal rupture

	48G		48Y	
	T, °F	m _{cum} , lb	T, °F	m _{cum} , lb
"Initial" conditions	t = 12.2		t = 23.9	
	X = 0.757		X = 0.923	
	133.8	3837	133.8	6016
t, min	Transient conditions, X = 1			
15	893	4267		
20	910	5105		
25	911	5957	837	6170
30	912	6812	882	6940
35	562	7292	685	7543
40	429	7505	575	7917
50	302	7727	447	8386
60	239	7843	372	8683
75	188	7935	301	8975
90	160	7979	255	9167
105	144	7999	224	9301
120	134	8004	201	9396
150			170	9516
180			152	9578
"Final" conditions	t = 121.4		t = 235.7	
	133.8	8004	133.8	9610

b. Initial breach

	48G		48Y	
	T, °F	m _{cum} , lb	T, °F	m _{cum} , lb
t, min	Transient conditions, X = 1			
0	133.8	0	133.8	0
5	691	191	407	62
10	882	851	644	330
15	909	1680	792	850
20	911	2531	863	1558
25	912	3385	893	2365
30	912	4239	905	3213
35	562	4720	696	3844
40	429	4933	581	4229
50	302	5155	451	4708
60	239	5270	374	5010
75	188	5363	302	5305
90	160	5407	256	5499
105	144	5426	225	5633
120	134	5432	201	5730
150			171	5851
180			152	5913
"Final" conditions	t = 121.4		t = 236.1	
	133.8	5432	133.8	5946

T = temperature, °F

m_{cum} = cumulative mass of UF₆ released, lb

t = time, min

X = vapor mass fraction

3.1.3 Meteorological Conditions

For each scenario outlined in Section 3.1.1, FIREPLUME was run for two different meteorological conditions corresponding to a class-F-stability 1-m/s case and a class-D-stability 4-m/s case. Because FIREPLUME characterizes meteorological conditions in terms of boundary layer parameters (friction velocity u_* , Monin-Obukhov length L , and inversion or boundary layer height z_i or h), rather than stability classes, conversion of the standard stability-class inputs to boundary layer parameters was necessary. To these ends, we chose boundary layer parameters to be consistent with the given stability classes and a roughness length of 10 cm. For the class-F-stability 1-m/s case, a friction velocity (u_*) of 0.02 m/s and a Monin-Obukhov length (L) of 5 m were used in the modeling. These parameters are typical of clear nighttime conditions with a 1-m/s wind speed in an area with roughness length of 10 cm. The boundary layer height (h) of 15 m was estimated from u_* and L by using the diagnostic relationship of Zilitinkevich (Nieuwstadt 1984; Brown 1997). Estimation of representative boundary layer parameters for the class D stability case is more difficult than for the class F stability case because the class D stability case spans both unstable and stable meteorological conditions. For this study, we chose a weakly unstable class D stability case for analysis. Here, we used a friction velocity of 0.32 m/s, a Monin-Obukhov length (L) of -150 m, and an inversion height of 500 m. The applicable meteorological parameters are summarized in Table 4.

3.2 TREATMENT OF RELEASE PHASES

This section discusses the treatment of the three release phases (i.e., hydraulic rupture, release into a fire, and release during cooldown) in initializing FIREPLUME for the scenarios outlined in Section 3.1.1. The temperature and general release information used to model each release phase is that outlined in Section 3.1.2. In this study, releases from multiple cylinders are assumed to proceed independently; for instance, in the vehicle accident scenario, where three cylinders are involved, the release information is determined for a single cylinder. Then the dispersion results for the three-cylinder release are obtained by superimposing three single-cylinder releases.

TABLE 4 Summary of Meteorological Conditions Used in the FIREPLUME Runs

Case	Wind Speed (m/s)	Friction Velocity (m/s)	Monin-Obukhov Length (m)	Mixing Height (m)
Class F stability	1	0.02	5	15
Class D stability	4	0.32	-150	500

Our treatment of the initial hydraulic rupture is reviewed in Section 3.2.1. Because FIREPLUME does not explicitly account for the chemical transformations of UF_6 and associated physical effects, an independent analysis of the UF_6 chemistry and physics is made to determine the initial size and buoyancy of the UF_6 -air mixture released in the hydraulic rupture. This information is then used to initialize FIREPLUME. In this analysis, all UF_6 is assumed to transform into HF and UO_2F_2 within the first several seconds following the release. This transformation creates a HF-air mixture containing small UO_2F_2 particles. Our analysis demonstrates that this mixture is positively buoyant. As a result, FIREPLUME is fully applicable to calculate the subsequent dispersion. [Note that FIREPLUME *may not* be applicable for other release scenarios, especially those that do not involve fires or hydraulic ruptures. Scenarios of UF_6 release for which FIREPLUME may not be applicable include liquid or vapor releases that (1) lead to dense gas plumes or (2) may take considerable time to undergo chemical transformation.]

The characterizations of the fire and cool-down release phases are reviewed in Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3. As demonstrated in these sections, the physical effects of UF_6 are not important for these release phases. As a result, the UF_6 products (HF and UO_2F_2) are assumed to be entrained into the fire or cool-down plume without altering plume buoyancy.

3.2.1 The Hydraulic Rupture Release

As outlined in Section 3.1.2, the 48G and 48Y cylinders rupture after 12 and 24 minutes in the fuel fire, respectively. For the vehicle accident scenario, where three cylinders are involved, we assume that the cylinders rupture at 30-s intervals. As discussed previously, the products of each ruptured cylinder are assumed to react and travel independently.

Upon rupture of the cylinder, UF_6 is released as solid, liquid, and vapor. Because of the large instantaneous drop in pressure, the liquid immediately flashes to vapor and solid UF_6 . The solid UF_6 generated in this flashing process quickly sublimates to vapor. This vapor forms a cloud or puff of a UF_6 -air mixture that quickly reacts with water vapor to form HF and UO_2F_2 and then moves downwind. The key issues in determining the downwind concentrations from this puff revolve around the buoyancy of this initial mixture. Three principal factors influence the initial buoyancy:

- Uranium hexafluoride is a very dense gas because of its high molecular weight ($\sim 14 \text{ kg/m}^3$ at standard temperature and pressure [STP]). This density imparts strong negative buoyancy, which, without the addition of heat, would lead to a dense, ground-hugging plume.

- Heat is released into the initial puff because of the reaction of UF_6 with water vapor, namely,

In this reaction, 2 mol of water vapor are required for every 1 mol of UF_6 . This water vapor is provided through the entrainment of combustion gases and atmospheric air into the plume. Although combustion gases do provide some water vapor for the hydrolysis reaction, their contributions are small compared with the amount of water vapor entrained from ambient air because the fuel fire provides water vapor at only about 1 kg/s.

- The hydraulic rupture of the cylinder will lead to the initial entrainment of some hot combustion gas. Additional fuel combustion products may also be entrained into the plume in the first few seconds following the release. This entrainment will increase the temperature of the plume and lead to an increase in the buoyancy of the initial puff.

Because the physical effects of UF_6 are clearly important to this release phase, we have incorporated the key chemical and physical effects in developing the initial conditions for the dispersion calculation. The FIREPLUME model does not consider the transformation of UF_6 as the plume evolves (such as is done in the HGSYSTEMS/ UF_6 model); however, because of the nature of this release, we are able to apply FIREPLUME because we believe that the hydrolysis reaction converting UF_6 to HF and UO_2F_2 occurs fairly soon (within several seconds) after the hydraulic rupture of the cylinder. This general conclusion is supported by the results of HGSYSTEMS/ UF_6 as presented by Lombardi (1996). The initial hydraulic rupture in the fire environment leads to a large amount of initial entrainment. In such an explosive release, the entrainment greatly exceeds that observed in jet releases. The entrainment of 50–75 m^3 of air to each cubic meter of UF_6 gas within the first few seconds after release is certainly a realistic assumption. Entrainment amounts of this order can be inferred from fireball diameters observed in the first few seconds after hydraulic ruptures of propane and liquefied natural gas tanks (AIChE 1994). Initial entrainment amounts in this range allow the hydrolysis reaction to approach completion very quickly. For all calculations discussed here, we assume that 75 m^3 of air is entrained for every cubic meter of UF_6 that is initially released. This assumption is thought to be somewhat conservative because in the range of entrainment amounts, downwind concentrations generally increase with increasing initial entrainment (however, very low entrainment amounts lead to dense-gas effects and elevated concentrations close to the source).

For the reasons set forth, we initialize FIREPLUME with a puff containing the by-products of the initial UF_6 released in the hydraulic rupture, together with air mixed at an initial volume ratio

of 75:1. The temperature and buoyancy of this puff are determined by conducting a mass and enthalpy balance on the mixture. This analysis was accomplished by using a detailed set of equations that was solved by using the Engineering Equation Solver. The equation set and solutions for the 48G cylinder are provided in Appendix D. This analysis provides results very similar to those from the "mxuf6" code used by Lombardi (1996) to model similar release scenarios for depleted UF_6 . In calculating the mixture buoyancy, the enthalpy changes due to (1) the entrainment of combustion gases, (2) the hydrolysis reaction, and (3) the sublimation of solid UF_6 to vapor UF_6 are included in our calculation. Specific assumptions employed in this calculation for the 48G cylinder are listed below. A similar set of assumptions is applicable for the 48Y cylinder.

- A total of 1,744 kg (3,837 lb) of UF_6 is initially released in the explosion. Of this amount, 143 kg is vapor at 628 K (672°F), and the remaining 1,601 kg is liquid. The liquid flashes to form a solid-vapor mixture at 330 K (133°F). After flashing, 75.5% of the total initial release is vapor, with the remaining amount being solid.
- In the initial explosion and in the following several seconds after release, 400 m³ of combustion air at 1,075 K (1,475°F) and about 10,300 m³ of ambient air at 300 K (80°F) are entrained into the plume. This amount of combustion air entrained is approximately equivalent to the volume of combustion gases produced every 4 s for the fuel fire outlined in Section 3.1.1.
- The hydrolysis reaction provides 101.5 kJ/mol of UF_6 released. This reaction is assumed to be completed in the first several seconds after release. This reaction provides 502,886 kJ of energy to the thermal.
- The 24.5% of the initial release that is in solid form sublimates to vapor, consuming 47.6 kJ/mol of solid UF_6 (57,780 kJ total).
- By using the analysis outlined in Appendix D, the above assumptions lead to an initial puff of cylindrical shape with a radius of about 16 m and a height of about 16 m. (The geometry of the puff is chosen to be consistent with that of buoyant thermals; see Scorer [1978].) From our energy balance and the thermodynamic relationships, the temperature and density of this HF-air- UO_2F_2 particle mixture are 344 K (170°F) and 1.138 kg/m³. (For comparison, ambient air density is 1.174 kg/m³.) This puff is used to initialize FIREPLUME.

3.2.2 Release into the Fire

After the hydraulic rupture, UF_6 continues to sublime into vapor. This vapor, which quickly transforms to HF and UO_2F_2 , is entrained into the fire plume. The fire is modeled as a buoyant plume by using the plume rise relationships provided in Appendix B. For all fuel fires considered in our analysis, the fire parameters are

- Fire diameter = 5 m,
- Fire temperature = 1,075 K (1,475°F), and
- Froude number = 0.8.

On the basis of the definition of the Froude number, the above parameters provide that the vertical velocity directly above the fire is about 5 m/s. Our analysis has shown that the negative buoyancy of the UO_2F_2 is negligible compared with the positive buoyancy of the combustion gases. The fire produces about 100 m^3 of combustion gases every second. This air is at a temperature of about 1,200 K, leading to an initial buoyancy ($\Delta\rho/\rho$) of about 0.75. The release rate of UF_6 into the fire is about 1.7 kg/s. The buoyancy of the resulting UO_2F_2 -combustion gas mixture is about 0.74, about 1% less than the buoyancy of the fire plume alone.

3.2.3 Release during Cooldown

After the fire is extinguished, the release of UF_6 continues as the cylinders cool. This so-called "cool-down" phase of the release continues for 91 and 205 minutes for the 48G and 48Y cylinders, respectively. Recall from Section 2.2.3 that the cool-down phase is treated by using an interpolation scheme that is based on MCLDM results from an initial fire run and a neutrally buoyant run. The fire parameters used in the initial fire run, which are somewhat different from those used for the actual fire release, are as follows:

- Fire diameter = 3 m,
- Fire temperature = 800 K, and
- Froude number = 0.8.

The initial temperature is selected on the basis of the data provided by Williams and Anderson (1996), as outlined in Section 3.1.2. The fire diameter is chosen to be consistent with the cylinder dimensions. Clearly, the cylinder, ground, and any other material involved in the fire will be cooling after the fire subsides; however, because of its size and weight, we assume that the heat

capacitance of the cylinder dominates the postfire buoyancy and, therefore, adjust the fire diameter accordingly.

During the cool-down phase, the temperatures and UF_6 release rates used in the puff dispersion model in FIREPLUME (i.e., Equations 3, 5, and 6) are taken from the analysis of Williams and Anderson (1996), as discussed in Section 3.1.2.

3.3 HEALTH CRITERIA CONSIDERED

The health criteria considered for this study are provided in Table 5. Toxicological values are provided for averaging times between 1 and 60 minutes. These toxicological values are used with corresponding time-averaged concentrations predicted from FIREPLUME. As discussed in Section 2.2.2, the worst-case combination of averaging time and health criteria is used at each downwind distance considered. Note that the health criteria for UO_2F_2 are based on dosage; that is, the health criteria are linear with respect to averaging time.

3.4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses results of FIREPLUME as applied to the five accident scenarios outlined in Section 3.1.1. First, detailed concentration and exposure results are provided for the truck accident scenario where three 48G cylinders are exposed to a fuel fire and hydraulically rupture. The results for the F and D stability cases are presented in Sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.2, respectively. Then, in Section 3.4.3, summary statistics for the other release scenarios are presented. Detailed data on concentration and exposure for the remaining four scenarios are provided in Appendix C.

In the following discussions, the five accident scenarios are denoted as T1 to T5, as noted in Table 6. Where applicable, the tags "a" and "b" are used to denote results for UO_2F_2 and HF, respectively.

3.4.1 Scenarios T1a and T1b: Results for F1 Stability

Figure 1 pictorially illustrates the dispersion of the three phases of the release scenario for class F stability conditions with 1-m/s wind speed (F1). Here the initial puff originating from the hydraulic rupture is slightly buoyant and rises only about 10 m. The fire plume, on the other hand, rises considerably above the boundary layer and, therefore, does not lead to ground-level impacts. During the smoldering or cool-down phase, buoyancy decreases, leading to progressively lower plume rise and eventually ground-level impacts. The overall impact of the cool-down phase is small, however, because the release rate decreases substantially as the cylinders cool.

TABLE 5 Limiting Toxicological Values for HF and UO₂F₂^a

Averaging Time (min)	HF		UO ₂ F ₂	
	Potential Irreversible Adverse Effects (mg/m ³)	Potential Adverse Effects (mg/m ³)	Potential Irreversible Adverse Effects (mg/m ³)	Potential Adverse Effects (mg/m ³)
1	57	5.7	1,600	520
2	57	5.7	780	260
3	57	5.7	520	170
4	57	5.7	390	130
5	57	5.7	310	100
6	52	5.2	260	86
7	48	4.8	220	74
8	45	4.5	190	65
9	42	4.2	170	58
10	40	4.0	160	52
11	38	3.8	140	47
12	37	3.7	130	43
13	35	3.5	120	40
14	34	3.4	110	37
15	33	3.3	100	35
16	32	3.2	97	32
17	31	3.1	91	30
18	30	3.0	86	29
19	29	2.9	82	27
20	28	2.8	78	26
21	28	2.8	74	25
22	27	2.7	71	24
23	26	2.6	68	23
24	26	2.6	65	22
25	25	2.5	62	21
26	25	2.5	60	20
27	24	2.4	58	19
28	24	2.4	55	18
29	24	2.4	54	18
30	23	2.3	52	17
31	23	2.3	50	17
32	22	2.2	49	16
33	22	2.2	47	16
34	22	2.2	46	15

TABLE 5 (Cont.)

Averaging Time (min)	HF		UO ₂ F ₂	
	Potential Irreversible Adverse Effects (mg/m ³)	Potential Adverse Effects (mg/m ³)	Potential Irreversible Adverse Effects (mg/m ³)	Potential Adverse Effects (mg/m ³)
35	21	2.1	44	15
36	21	2.1	43	14
37	21	2.1	42	14
38	21	2.1	41	14
39	20	2.0	40	13
40	20	2.0	39	13
41	20	2.0	38	13
42	20	2.0	37	12
43	19	1.9	36	12
44	19	1.9	35	12
45	19	1.9	35	12
46	19	1.9	34	11
47	18	1.9	33	11
48	18	1.8	32	11
49	18	1.8	32	11
50	18	1.8	31	10
51	18	1.8	30	10
52	18	1.8	30	10
53	17	1.7	29	10
54	17	1.7	29	10
55	17	1.7	28	9.4
56	17	1.7	28	9.2
57	17	1.7	27	9.1
58	17	1.7	27	8.9
59	17	1.7	26	8.8
60	16	1.6	26	8.6

^a One-hour HF values are based on ERPG values (AIHA 1996); UO₂F₂ values are based on intake levels of 30 mg (potential irreversible adverse effects) and 10 mg (potential adverse effects). Details are provided in the Depleted UF₆ PEIS, Appendix C.

TABLE 6 Key to the Five Accident Scenarios

Case	Accident Scenario
T1a	Vehicle-induced fire; three full 48G cylinders; UO_2F_2
T1b	Vehicle-induced fire; three full 48G cylinders; HF
T2a	Vehicle-induced fire; three full 48Y cylinders; UO_2F_2
T2b	Vehicle-induced fire; three full 48Y cylinders; HF
T3a	Small aircraft-induced fire; two full 48G cylinders; UO_2F_2
T3b	Small aircraft-induced fire; two full 48G cylinders; HF
T4a	Small aircraft-induced fire; two full 48Y cylinders; UO_2F_2
T4b	Small aircraft-induced fire; two full 48Y cylinders; HF
T5a	Vehicle-induced fire; two heel cylinders; UO_2F_2
T5b	Vehicle-induced fire; two heel cylinders; HF

FIGURE 1 Dispersion of the Three Phases of the Release Scenario for Class F Stability Conditions

Tables 7 and 8 present the downwind centerline concentrations from the three-48G-cylinder release for HF and UO_2F_2 , respectively. Concentrations are shown for averaging times that represent the worst-case ratio of concentration with respect to the health criteria. Because the health criteria for UO_2F_2 are based on dosage (i.e., the health criteria are linear with respect to averaging time), a 3,600-s (60-min) average concentration is the worst-case value for UO_2F_2 over any time period of consideration between 0 and one hour at all downwind distances. A potential-irreversible-adverse-effects concentration of HF is predicted to extend out to less than 100 m downwind, with an impacted area of 2,600 m^2 ; and a potential-adverse-effects concentration of HF is predicted to extend approximately 9,900 m downwind, with an impacted area of 10 km^2 . A potential-irreversible-adverse-effects concentration of UO_2F_2 is predicted to extend out to less than 100 m downwind, with an impacted area of 1,500 m^2 ; and a potential-adverse-effects concentration of UO_2F_2 is predicted to extend approximately 7,400 m downwind, with an impacted area of 3.6 km^2 . Figure 2 depicts the predicted impacted areas (for both HF and UO_2F_2) for the three-48G-cylinder release for F1 meteorological conditions, considering the potential-adverse-effects criterion.

3.4.2 Scenarios T1a and T1b: Results for D4 Stability

Figure 3 pictorially illustrates the dispersion of the three phases of the release scenario under class D stability conditions with 4-m/s wind speed (D4). Here, both the initial puff originating from the hydraulic rupture and the fire plume rise into the upper part of the boundary layer. The overall plume rise for this case is much greater than for class F stability conditions because of the absence of thermal stratification. Because of the weak convective turbulence, the puff and fire plume subsequently diffuse back to ground level, leading to ground-level impacts at distances greater than about 2 km. During the smoldering or cool-down phase, buoyancy decreases, leading to progressively lower plume rise and eventually ground-level impacts close to the source. These near-source impacts, however, are relatively small.

Tables 9 and 10 present the downwind centerline concentrations for the three-48G-cylinder release for HF and UO_2F_2 , respectively. As before, concentrations are shown for averaging times that represent the worst-case situation with respect to the health criteria. Downwind impacts are minimal, considering the potential-irreversible-adverse-effects criteria for both HF and UO_2F_2 , with no exceedance beyond 100 m downwind. The impacted areas for the potential-irreversible-adverse-effects criteria for HF and UO_2F_2 are 1,700 m^2 and 810 m^2 , respectively. The downwind impacts considering the potential-adverse-effects criteria for HF include a small isolated region centered at around 2.5 km downwind. Downwind impacts are minimal, considering the potential-adverse-effects criteria for UO_2F_2 , with no exceedances beyond 100 m from the source. The impacted areas for the potential-adverse-effects criteria for HF and UO_2F_2 are 190,000 m^2 and 1,400 m^2 , respectively.

TABLE 7 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T1 with F1 Stability^a

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.026	3,600	No	No
150	0.018	3,600	No	No
250	0.011	3,600	No	No
305	0.46	60	No	No
350	1.8	60	No	No
368	2.8	60	No	No
450	6.8	60	No	Yes
550	13	60	No	Yes
650	16	60	No	Yes
750	30	60	No	Yes
805	33	60	No	Yes
840	35	60	No	Yes
850	36	60	No	Yes
920	41	60	No	Yes
1,210	28	60	No	Yes
1,350	28	60	No	Yes
1,450	26	60	No	Yes
2,414	15	750	No	Yes
4,023	8.5	1,200	No	Yes
5,632	4.6	1,800	No	Yes
7,241	3.2	2,100	No	Yes
12,068	1.3	3,600	No	No

^a Class F stability with 1-m/s wind speed.

3.4.3 Summary Statistics for Remaining Release Scenarios

Tables 11 to 13 list summary statistics for all five release scenarios discussed in this report. Table 11 provides (1) the distance to the maximally exposed individual (MEI) and (2) the centerline concentration at that distance. For scenarios T1 to T4, the MEI is located 30 m from the release point, which is the minimum distance from the source for which FIREPLUME concentration predictions are believed reliable. For the T5 scenario, the MEI location is over 12 km downwind for the D stability meteorological conditions because all material is released into the fire plume, which takes a long time to disperse back down to ground level. For the T5 scenario with F stability, no ground-level impacts occur beyond 30 m because the fire plume rises considerably above the mixing

TABLE 8 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T1 with F1 Stability^a

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.10	3,600	No	No
150	0.07	3,600	No	No
250	0.04	3,600	No	No
305	0.07	3,600	No	No
350	0.20	3,600	No	No
368	0.29	3,600	No	No
450	0.78	3,600	No	No
550	1.6	3,600	No	No
650	2.6	3,600	No	No
750	4.7	3,600	No	No
805	6.0	3,600	No	No
840	6.6	3,600	No	No
850	6.4	3,600	No	No
920	7.5	3,600	No	No
1,210	7.9	3,600	No	No
1,350	8.7	3,600	No	Yes
1,450	9.2	3,600	No	Yes
2,414	14	3,600	No	Yes
4,023	13	3,600	No	Yes
5,632	10	3,600	No	Yes
7,241	8.8	3,600	No	Yes
12,068	5.1	3,600	No	No

^a Class F stability with 1-m/s wind speed.

height. Note that the averaging times for the HF and UO_2F_2 concentrations in Table 11 are 60 s and 3,600 s, respectively, except for scenario T5, where the averaging time for HF concentrations is 1,800 s.

Tables 12 and 13 provide (1) the overall area in which the health criteria are exceeded and (2) the maximum distance at which the health criteria are exceeded. Table 12 provides results for potential irreversible adverse effects, and Table 13 provides results for potential adverse effects. Note that the overall exposed areas and maximum distances for which the health criteria are exceeded are larger for the HF component of the releases for all cases considered here. The large differences between HF and UO_2F_2 exposure areas and downwind distances result from the lower health criteria for HF, coupled with the use of a probit exponent of 0.5 for HF.

FIGURE 2 Predicted Potential-Adverse-Effects Impacted Areas for HF and UO_2F_2 for the Three-48G-Cylinder Release for F1 Meteorological Conditions

FIGURE 3 Dispersion of the Three Phases of the Release Scenario for Class D Stability Conditions

TABLE 9 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T1 with D4 Stability^a

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.60	3,600	No	No
150	0.49	2,700	No	No
250	0.33	2,700	No	No
305	0.28	2,700	No	No
350	0.24	2,700	No	No
368	0.23	2,700	No	No
450	0.20	2,400	No	No
550	0.16	2,400	No	No
650	0.14	2,100	No	No
750	0.13	2,100	No	No
805	0.13	1,800	No	No
840	0.13	1,800	No	No
850	0.13	1,800	No	No
920	0.61	60	No	No
1,210	1.5	60	No	No
1,350	3.3	60	No	No
1,450	4.4	60	No	No
2,414	6.0	60	No	Yes
4,023	3.5	60	No	No
5,632	1.6	60	No	No
7,241	0.99	60	No	No
12,068	0.26	1,500	No	No

^a Class D stability with 4-m/s wind speed.

For the five release scenarios discussed in this report, the maximum distance at which health effects criteria are exceeded is about 70 m; however, for the potential-adverse-effects criteria, concentrations are exceeded up to almost 10 km for scenarios T1 and T2 with F stability. For D stability, the potential-adverse-effects criteria are not exceeded beyond 100 m except for scenarios T1 and T2, where the health criteria for HF are exceeded at distances in excess of 2,700 m.

Detailed data on centerline concentration and exposure for scenarios T2 to T5 are provided in Appendix C.

TABLE 10 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T1 with D4 Stability^a

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	2.3	3,600	No	No
150	1.6	3,600	No	No
250	1.1	3,600	No	No
305	0.91	3,600	No	No
350	0.80	3,600	No	No
368	0.76	3,600	No	No
450	0.61	3,600	No	No
550	0.48	3,600	No	No
650	0.39	3,600	No	No
750	0.35	3,600	No	No
805	0.33	3,600	No	No
840	0.32	3,600	No	No
850	0.32	3,600	No	No
920	0.32	3,600	No	No
1,210	0.54	3,600	No	No
1,350	0.77	3,600	No	No
1,450	0.92	3,600	No	No
2,414	1.3	3,600	No	No
4,023	0.97	3,600	No	No
5,632	0.68	3,600	No	No
7,241	0.55	3,600	No	No
12,068	0.48	3,600	No	No

^a Class D stability with 4-m/s wind speed.

TABLE 11 Distance to the Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI) and Concentration at That Distance for the Five Accident Scenarios with D and F Stability

Scenario	D Stability		F Stability	
	MEI Distance (m)	Maximum Concentration (mg/m ³)	MEI Distance (m)	Maximum Concentration (mg/m ³)
T1a	30	36	30	130
T1b	30	520	30	2,000
T2a	30	92	30	180
T2b	30	1,400	30	2,700
T3a	30	13	30	43
T3b	30	180	30	660
T4a	30	34	30	60
T4b	30	490	30	930
T5a	12,377	9.8×10^{-4}	>20,000	0
T5b	12,168	4.6×10^{-4}	>20,000	0

TABLE 12 Total Area and the Maximum Distance for Which Concentration Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Criterion for the Five Accident Scenarios with D and F Stability

Scenario	D Stability		F Stability	
	Total Exposed Area (m ²)	Maximum Distance (m)	Total Exposed Area (m ²)	Maximum Distance (m)
T1a	810	35	1,500	43
T1b	1,700	45	2,600	56
T2a	1,500	43	2,200	54
T2b	2,700	55	3,800	69
T3a	170	22	910	37
T3b	1,100	41	2,000	51
T4a	780	35	1,300	42
T4b	1,800	49	2,900	59
T5a	0	0	0	0
T5b	0	0	0	0

TABLE 13 Total Area and the Maximum Distance for Which Concentration Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Criterion for the Five Accident Scenarios with D and F Stability

Scenario	D Stability		F Stability	
	Total Exposed Area (m ²)	Maximum Distance (m)	Total Exposed Area (m ²)	Maximum Distance (m)
T1a	1,400	43	3.6×10^6	7,400
T1b	190,000	2,800	1.0×10^7	9,900
T2a	2,300	54	2.1×10^6	6,100
T2b	33,000	2,900	8.1×10^6	9,200
T3a	790	37	1,500	43
T3b	2,000	54	1.1×10^6	4,000
T4a	1,400	44	2,200	54
T4b	2,900	62	320,000	2,500
T5a	0	0	0	0
T5b	0	0	0	0

4 REFERENCES

AICHE: See American Institute of Chemical Engineers.

AIHA: See American Industrial Hygiene Association.

American Industrial Hygiene Association, 1996, *The AIHA 1996 Emergency Response Planning Guidelines and Workable Environmental Exposure Level Guides Handbook*, Fairfax, Va.

American Institute of Chemical Engineers, 1994, *Guidelines for Evaluating the Characteristics of Vapor Cloud Explosions, Flash Fires and BLEVE's*, Center for Chemical Process Safety, New York, N.Y.

Bjorklund, J.R., et al., 1996, *Open Burn/Open Detonation Dispersion Model (OBODM) User's Guide: Volume 2, Technical Description*, DPG-TG-96-008b, U.S. Army Dugway Proving Ground, West Desert Test Center, Dugway, Utah.

Briggs, G.A., 1984, "Plume Rise and Buoyancy Effects," in *Atmospheric Science and Power Production*, D. Randerson (editor), DOE/TIC-27601, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Weather Service Nuclear Support Office, Las Vegas, Nev., pp. 327-366.

Brown, D.F., 1997, *An Improved Methodology for Characterizing Atmospheric Boundary Layer Turbulence and Dispersion*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Csanady, G.T., 1973, *Turbulent Diffusion in the Environment*, D. Reidel Publishing Co., Boston, Mass.

Deardorff, J.W., and G.E. Willis, 1985, "Further Results from a Laboratory Model of the Convective Planetary Boundary Layer," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 32:205-236.

De Baas, A.F., et al., 1986, "An Application of the Langevin Equation for Inhomogeneous Conditions to Dispersion in a Convective Boundary Layer," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 112:165-180.

Draxler, R.R., 1976, "Determination of Atmospheric Diffusion Parameters," *Atmospheric Environment* 10:99-105.

Hanna, S.R., and R.J. Paine, 1989, "Hybrid Plume Dispersion Model (HDPM) Development and Evaluation," *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 28:206-224.

Horst, T.W., et al., 1979, *Evaluation of Empirical Atmospheric Diffusion Data*, PNL-2955, Batelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richmond, Wash.

Kaimal, J.C., and J.J. Finnigan, 1994, *Atmospheric Boundary Layer Flows*, Oxford University Press, New York, N.Y.

Legg, B.J., and M.R. Raupach, 1982, "Markov-Chain Simulation of Particle Dispersion in Inhomogeneous Flows: The Mean Drift Velocity Induced by a Gradient in Eulerian Velocity Variance," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 24:3-13.

Ley, A.J., 1982, "A Random Walk Simulation of Two-Dimensional Turbulent Diffusion in the Neutral Surface Layer," *Atmospheric Environment* 16:2799-2808.

Ley, A.J., and D.J. Thomson, 1983, "A Random Walk Model of Dispersion in the Diabatic Surface Layer," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 109:847-880.

Liljegren, J.C., 1989, *The Atterbury-87 Field Study of Smoke Dispersion and a New Stochastic Dispersion Model*, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Lombardi, D.A., 1996, *Design and Analysis Calculation: Dispersion Analysis for Accidental UF₆ Releases for the K-25 Site*, DAC-19045-CCA-84, Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

McGuire, S.A., 1991, *Chemical Toxicity of Uranium Hexafluoride Compared to Acute Effects of Radiation*, Final Report, NUREG-1391, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Washington, D.C., Feb.

Morton, B.R., et al., 1956, "Turbulent Gravitational Convection from Maintained and Instantaneous Sources," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* A234:1-23.

Nieuwstadt, F.T.M., 1984, "The Turbulent Structure of the Stable, Nocturnal Boundary Layer," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 41:2202-2216.

Reid, J.D., 1979, "Markov Chain Simulations of Vertical Dispersion in the Neutral Surface Layer for Surface and Elevated Releases," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 16:3-22.

Scorer, R.S., 1978, *Environmental Aerodynamics*, Halsted Press, New York, N.Y.

Thomson, D.J., 1984, "Random Walk Modelling of Diffusion in Inhomogeneous Turbulence," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 110:1107-1120.

- Thomson, D.J., 1987, "Criteria for the Selection of Stochastic Models of Particle Trajectories in Turbulent Flows," *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 180:529-556.
- Turner, D.B., 1969, *Workbook of Atmospheric Dispersion Estimates*, AP-26, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Programs, Washington, D.C.
- van Dop, H., et al., 1985, "Random Walk Models for Particle Displacements in Homogeneous Unsteady Turbulent Flows," *Physical Fluids* 28:1639-1653.
- Venkatram, A., 1988, "Vertical Dispersion of Ground-Level Releases in the Surface Boundary Layer," *Atmospheric Environment* 26A:947-949.
- Weil, J.C., 1982, "Source Buoyancy Effects in Boundary Layer Diffusion," in *Workshop on the Parameterization of Mixed Layer Diffusion*, R. Cionco (editor), New Mexico State University, Physical Sciences Laboratory, Las Cruces, N.M.
- Weil, J.C., 1988, "Plume Rise," in *Lectures on Air Pollution Modeling*, A. Venkatram and J.C. Wyngaard (editors), American Meteorological Society, Boston, Mass., pp. 119-157.
- Williams, W.R., and J.C. Anderson, 1996, *UF₆ Cylinder Accident Simulations (1475 °F Regulatory Fire)*, DAC-EA-710660-A010 (draft), Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc., Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Willis, G.E., and J.W. Deardorff, 1974, "A Laboratory Model of the Unstable Planetary Boundary Layer," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 31:1297-1307.
- Wilson, D.J., 1991, "Accounting for Peak Concentrations in Atmospheric Dispersion for Worst Case Hazard Assessments," in *Proceedings of the International Conference and Workshop on Modeling and Mitigating the Consequences of Accidental Releases of Hazardous Materials, May 20-24, 1991, New Orleans, Louisiana*, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, New York, N.Y.
- Wilson, J.D., et al, 1983, "Calculation of Particle Trajectories in the Presence of a Gradient in Turbulent Velocity Variance," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 27:163-169.

APPENDIX A:
CALCULATION OF LAGRANGIAN PARTICLE TRAJECTORIES
IN THE ATMOSPHERIC BOUNDARY LAYER

APPENDIX A:

CALCULATION OF LAGRANGIAN PARTICLE TRAJECTORIES
IN THE ATMOSPHERIC BOUNDARY LAYER

In this appendix, we outline the calculation of Lagrangian particle trajectories in the Monte Carlo Lagrangian Dispersion Model. This discussion is broken into two sections. The first describes the Langevin model for particle motion, and the second discusses turbulence statistics of the atmospheric boundary layer used within the model.

A.1 THE LANGEVIN MODEL FOR PARTICLE MOTION

The one-dimensional Langevin equation was presented in Equation 1 in the main text of this report. Extending the discrete Langevin model to two dimensions, the u and w velocity equations become:

$$u(t + \Delta t) = \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{T_{Lu}}\right) u(t) + \mu_u \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and

$$w(t + \Delta t) = \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{T_{Lw}}\right) w(t) + \mu_w, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where u and w are the horizontal and vertical particle velocities, and T_{Lu} and T_{Lw} are their respective Lagrangian time scales. Here we have two random forcing functions μ_u and μ_w , which are related through the velocity covariance $\overline{uw}$. From their respective velocities, the particle positions are simply provided by the forward difference equation:

$$x(t + \Delta t) = x(t) + \Delta t u(t + \Delta t) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$z(t + \Delta t) = z(t) + \Delta t w(t + \Delta t) . \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The random forcing function μ is specified using the moment generating function of Thomson (1984). Considering two-dimensional dispersion in horizontally homogeneous conditions, moments of μ become

$$\langle \mu_u \rangle = \Delta t \frac{\partial \overline{uw}}{\partial z}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\langle \mu_w \rangle = \Delta t \frac{\partial \overline{ww}}{\partial z}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\langle \mu_u^2 \rangle = 2 \Delta t T_u \overline{uu} , \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\langle \mu_w^2 \rangle = \Delta t \left(2 T_w \overline{ww} + \frac{\partial \overline{www}}{\partial z} \right) , \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\langle \mu_u \mu_w \rangle = \Delta t (T_u + T_w) \overline{uw} , \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$\langle \mu_u^3 \rangle = -3 \Delta t \overline{uu} \frac{\partial \overline{uw}}{\partial z} , \quad (\text{A.10})$$

and

$$\langle \mu_w^3 \rangle = \Delta t \left(3 \overline{www} T_w - 3 \overline{ww} \frac{\partial \overline{ww}}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial \overline{www}}{\partial z} \right) , \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where $T_u = 1/T_{Lu}$, and $T_w = 1/T_{Lw}$. Here we have neglected terms containing $\overline{uuu}$, $\overline{uuw}$, $\overline{uww}$, and all fourth-order moments except $\overline{www}$.

For all cases considered in this report, 50,000 particles are used. Initially, each particle is randomly assigned a horizontal and vertical velocity based on the Eulerian statistics at the source. From the source, particles are tracked until they leave the domain (farthest downwind distance of interest). During the simulation, the time scale for each particle is continually adjusted such that it lies between 0.05 and 0.025 T_{Lw} . Reflection boundary conditions are imposed at the ground and the boundary layer height. However, particles almost never reach the ground, since the vertical velocity variances and Lagrangian time scales $\rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow 0$. Concentrations are determined directly from the transition probabilities by considering the amount of time particles spend within discrete volume elements. Additional details on the numerical implementation and concentration estimation are contained in Brown (1997).

A.2 ATMOSPHERIC TURBULENCE STATISTICS

In simulating particle trajectories, the Monte Carlo model uses Eulerian atmospheric statistics to simulate Lagrangian particle trajectories according to the equations in the previous section. Eulerian atmospheric statistics used in the Monte Carlo model include the vertical distributions of (1) the first four moments of the vertical velocity, (2) the first two of the horizontal velocity, and (3) the peak frequencies for horizontal and vertical fluctuations. These required statistics are obtained from relations and data in the literature and are discussed in the following sections.

A.2.1 Lagrangian Time Scale Relationships

For application of our Monte Carlo model, the Lagrangian time scale is the parameter most difficult to estimate. Indeed, defining general relationships between Lagrangian and Eulerian reference frames is one of the most daunting problems in dispersion research as a whole, since

dispersion is clearly a Lagrangian process, yet available turbulence data are almost always Eulerian. Fortunately, research into this problem has uncovered strong relationships between Eulerian and Lagrangian time and length scales, allowing the Lagrangian time scale to be estimated from Eulerian properties.

Measurements within the atmospheric boundary layer (ABL), most notably those of Gifford (1955) and Hay and Pasquill (1959), have demonstrated a distinct relationship between the Lagrangian and Eulerian spectra. In short, the Lagrangian spectra were similar in shape to their Eulerian counterparts but were shifted to lower frequencies. This observation is in accordance with Taylor's (1938) well-known "frozen eddy" hypothesis, which states that the spatial turbulence structure remains unchanged, or frozen, as it is advected past a fixed point by the local mean wind. Employing these arguments, Gifford (1955) proposed a simple relationship between the Eulerian and Lagrangian integral time scales,

$$T_L = \beta T_E, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where T_L and T_E are the Lagrangian and Eulerian integral time scales, and β is a scaling parameter. Here β is inversely proportional to the turbulence intensity, such that

$$\beta = \gamma \frac{U}{\sigma_i}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where γ is a proportionality constant, generally accepted to be around 0.7 (Hanna 1981).

With this relation, we write the Lagrangian integral time scale as a function of the peak wavelength λ , such that

$$T_L = \beta T_E = \frac{\beta \lambda_i}{2\pi U} = \frac{\gamma \lambda_i}{2\pi \sigma_i}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

For T_L of the horizontal velocity fluctuations, we use $\gamma = 0.68$. However, for vertical velocity fluctuations, a value of $\gamma = 0.68$ leads to underestimation of the vertical dispersion and, thus, an overestimation of ground-level concentrations from a ground-level source. For the convective boundary layer (CBL), De Baas et al. (1986) and Liljegren (1989) have reported that γ for T_{Lw} must be set to around 2 to more closely agree with dispersion characteristics reported by Willis and Deardorff (1974) and observed surface-layer concentrations from Project Prairie Grass. Such a value is certainly reasonable, since it provides that the Lagrangian time scale near the middle of the convective mixed layer is roughly the convective time scale z_i/w_* .

In neutral and stable conditions, we also found that setting $\gamma = 2$ provides closer agreement of both ground-level concentrations and plume heights between the Monte Carlo model and data from Project Prairie Grass (Barad 1958).

A.2.2 Vertical Velocity Moments and Length Scales

A.2.2.1 Velocity Variances

In the CBL, the vertical velocity variance σ_w scales with u_* in the surface layer. Above the surface layer, the scaling velocity becomes the convective velocity scale w_* . When $z_i/|L| > 10$, there exists a matching layer between these regions where neither the surface nor the top of the boundary layer (the inversion) exerts influence. Here both the vertical velocity variance and also the corresponding time scales scale as $z^{1/3}$.

Observations of σ_w within the surface layer have shown the vertical velocity variance may be conveniently specified by interpolating between the neutral limit of $\sigma_w = 1.25 u_*$ and the free convective limit of $\sigma_w \sim z^{1/3}$. In analysis of data from the Minnesota experiments and a variety of low-flying aircraft data, Panofsky et al. (1977) have suggested that

$$\sigma_w = 1.25 u_* \left(1 - 3 \frac{z}{L} \right)^{1/3} . \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Within the mixed layer, σ_w has been parameterized empirically by several workers. Except for slight overprediction of the maximum values, the general expression for the vertical velocity variance as proposed by Lenschow and Stephens (1980), namely,

$$\sigma_w = 1.34 w_* \left(\frac{z}{z_i} \right)^{1/3} \left(1 - 0.8 \frac{z}{z_i} \right) , \quad (\text{A.16})$$

fits the available mixed-layer σ_w data most closely. In the Monte Carlo model, we must pass smoothly from the surface layer to the convective mixed layer, since a discontinuity in σ_w is not allowed in light of the random forcing relations. Here we employ a combined equation,

$$\sigma_w = 1.25 u_* \left(1 - 3 \frac{z}{L} \right)^{1/3} \left(1 - 0.8 \frac{z}{z_i} \right) , \quad (\text{A.17})$$

which is applicable for the entire boundary layer above the canopy. In Figure A.1, this relation is shown in comparison with data from (1) the Minnesota experiments (Caughey et al. 1979), (2) aircraft data of Lenschow and Stephens (1980), (3) water tank data of Adrian et al. (1986), and (4) data from Willis and Deardorff (1974).

The preceding relation is considered valid for conditions where a clearly defined surface layer and mixed layer exist ($z_i/|L| > 10$). When the boundary layer becomes less unstable (i.e., $z_i/|L| < 10$), we consider the boundary layer to be near-neutral. Obviously, significant convection can still exist within the near-neutral ABL. However, the scaling within the boundary layer becomes less well defined, since the surface layer extends into the mixed layer, creating a region where both u_* and w_* are scaling parameters.

FIGURE A.1 Standard Deviation of the Vertical Velocity Fluctuations as Given by Equation A.18, Shown in Comparison with Data from Water Tank Studies (Adrian et al. 1986; Willis and Deardorff 1974) and ABL Studies (Lenschow and Stephens 1980)

No general theory exists for scaling the near-neutral ABL. This is undoubtedly linked to the lack of observational data from neutral and near-neutral boundary layers. The available data useful for our concerns include the computational experiments of Wyngaard et al. (1974) and Deardorff (1972) and observational studies of the marine ABL by Nicholls and Readings (1979).

We shall start our discussion by defining σ_w for the neutral boundary layer (NBL). Based on results from the second-order model study of the neutral ABL by Wyngaard et al. (1974), Hanna (1984) suggests that

$$\sigma_{wn} = 1.3 \exp \left(-\frac{2 f z}{u_*} \right). \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Here we have changed the leading constant to 1.25 to conform with the convective boundary-layer relation and other observations within the neutral boundary layer. For the near-neutral ABL, a reasonable scaling choice is an interpolation between surface-layer and convective effects. Thus, for $-10 < -z_i/|L| < 0$, we define σ_w using the cubic interpolation formula,

$$\sigma_w = \left(\sigma_{wn}^3 + \sigma_{wc}^3 \right)^{1/3}, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where σ_{wc} is defined according to Equation A.16. A comparison of this relation with σ_w data from the second-order turbulence model of Wyngaard et al. (1974), the large-eddy simulation model of Deardorff (1972), and observations of marine boundary layers (Nicholls and Readings 1979) is shown in Figure A.2. The agreement between the interpolation formula and the numerical modeling results is very good. The agreement between the actual observations and the interpolation formula is not quite as good but is still reasonable in light of the uncertainties in both the σ_w data and the estimation procedures for z_i and L employed by Nicholls and Readings (1979). Part of this discrepancy is undoubtedly due to the comparison of marine-boundary-layer turbulent statistics to those modeled over land. The most obvious artifact of this comparison is the lower value of σ_w/u_* at the surface that occurs over water. Additionally, the boundary layers investigated by Nicholls and Readings (1979) were cloud-topped in several cases. In such boundary layers, convection is often driven by radiative cooling of the cloud deck, not heating of the ground, and consequently the governing heat flux parameters are defined at the top of the CBL. Observations from such boundary layers show that the σ_w profile shape as suggested by Equation A.17 is inverted in the mixed layer, with the maximum vertical velocity variance occurring around $0.8 z_i$ (Nicholls 1989). The inclusion of such cases may have affected the data of Nicholls and Readings (1979), in both the maximum σ_w and its location within the boundary layer.

Under stable conditions, the behavior of σ_w and of other turbulence statistics is less well characterized than in convective conditions. This is largely due to the lack of a solid scaling framework for turbulence in the stable boundary layer (SBL); this lack, in turn, is associated with a rather limited array of experimental data. Two principal problems afflict experimental studies of

Legend

- $\circ$ $\overline{z_i/|L|} = 0.9$; stability range $0.5 < z_i/|L| < 1.3$ } Marine boundary layer observations (Nicholls and Readings, 1979)
 $\square$ $\overline{z_i/|L|} = 3.9$; stability range $1.6 < z_i/|L| < 7.3$ }
 ----- $z_i/|L| = 1.5$ } Large eddy simulation (Deardorff, 1972) .
 ----- $z_i/|L| = 4.5$ }
 ----- $z_i/|L| = 10$: Second-order closure model (Wyngaard, 1974)
 ----- Eq. (A.19) for $z_i/|L| = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8$ and 10

FIGURE A.2 Comparison of the Interpolation Formula (Equation A.19) with Both Numerical and Actual Vertical Velocity Standard Deviation Data from Near-Neutral Boundary Layers. (Data points for the marine boundary layer observations represent averages over the range of stabilities presented in the legend. The error bars corresponding to these points represent standard deviations of averaged data.)

SBL turbulence. The first is that the turbulence intensities are very low, so that noise in the data becomes a significant source of uncertainty. The second is that the SBL is very sensitive to subtle terrain undulations and inhomogeneous surface characteristics. Thus, experimental data obtained at different sites are often different in character and, therefore, not easily collapsed with universal relationships.

Despite these problems, simple scaling relationships based on the boundary layer height have proven very useful in representing SBL turbulence data, although little theoretical guidance for the appropriate functional forms exists. An example of this boundary-layer-height scaling is shown in Figure A.3 using σ_w data from Minnesota (Caughey et al. 1979), Cabauw (Nieuwstadt 1984), and Oklahoma (Lenschow et al. 1988). An empirical relationship that we employ in the Monte Carlo model which adequately represents these data is

$$\sigma_w = 1.25 u_* \left(1 - \left(\frac{z}{h} \right)^2 \right), \quad (\text{A.20})$$

which is also shown in Figure A.3. We note that this relationship is similar in nature to those proposed by Caughey et al. (1979), Nieuwstadt (1984), and Lenschow et al. (1988) in their respective data analyses.

It is important to highlight the reasons that our empirical expression, Equation A.20, approaches the limit, $\sigma_w \rightarrow 1.25 u_*$ as $z \rightarrow 0$, whereas the data suggest that $\sigma_w \rightarrow 1.50 u_*$ as $z \rightarrow 0$. Here, we have chosen to obey Monin-Obukhov similarity scaling rather than merely fitting the observational data for $z \rightarrow 0$. The Monin-Obukhov similarity hypothesis states that

$$\sigma_w = C_1 u_* \phi(z/L), \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where C_1 is a constant, and $\phi(z/L)$ is a universal function of z/L . Clearly, if the Monin-Obukhov theory applies, statistics from the neutral boundary layer should be similar to those in the CBL and SBL for $z/|L| \ll 1$. Data for the near-neutral boundary layer from various field studies as catalogued by Panofsky and Dutton (1984) indicate that the surface-layer σ_w values are proportional to u_* such that

$$\sigma_w = u_* (1.25 \pm 0.03), \quad z/L \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Observational data from the CBL for $z \ll L$ generally agree with this near-neutral boundary layer relationship (e.g., see Equation A.15). In contrast, data from the SBL as shown above imply that $\sigma_w \rightarrow 1.5 u_*$ as $z/L \rightarrow 0$.

We believe that these discrepancies are an artifact of uncertainties in σ_w and u_* observations rather than a true representation of the turbulent state of the SBL. Observations of σ_w/u_* in the SBL represent the ratios of two small numbers, each of which contains rather large uncertainties.

FIGURE A.3 Standard Deviation of Vertical Velocity Fluctuations as Given by Equation A.20, Shown in Comparison with Data from Minnesota (Caughey et al. 1979), Cabauw (Nieuwstadt 1984), and Oklahoma (Lenschow et al. 1988)

Furthermore, uncertainties in u_* generally exceed those of σ_w , causing a substantial bias toward higher values for the ratio σ_w/u_* (Merry and Panofsky 1976). An example of this bias can be seen in a simple test. Consider 100 hypothetical observations of σ_w and u_* with respective means of 0.125 and 0.10 and standard deviations of 0.03 and 0.015. Clearly, $\langle \sigma_w \rangle / \langle u_* \rangle = 1.25$, where $\langle \rangle$ represents an ensemble average of the observations. However, if we average the ratio, we see that $\langle \sigma_w/u_* \rangle \approx 1.45$. It is our belief that data from Minnesota, Oklahoma, and, to a lesser extent, Cabauw suffer similar problems. For instance, the Minnesota data represent 75-min averages in evolving stable layers, leading to considerable uncertainty in turbulence properties. The Oklahoma data, which provide the highest estimates of σ_w/u_* , are the most uncertainty-prone, since the σ_w and u_* were obtained from 20-km airplane flights in semitransitional conditions.

It is interesting to point out a particular study where this effect is clearly pronounced. Upon evaluation with near-surface data (i.e., 2–10 m), Merry and Panofsky (1976) suggested that $\sigma_w/u_* \rightarrow 1.3$ as $z/L \rightarrow 0$ and that σ_w/u_* actually *increases* with increasing z/L , such that

$$\sigma_w = 1.3 u_* (\phi_m(z/L) - 2.5 z/L)^{1/3} . \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Clearly, this is not a physical effect, since σ_w profile observations from Minnesota, Cabauw, and Project Prairie Grass clearly show σ_w/u_* decreasing with height. We believe the answer to this apparent paradox lies in the bias as discussed above. Note that Merry and Panofsky (1976) only employed near-surface (<10 m) observations. Therefore, larger z/L values are indicative of higher stabilities (i.e., lower values of L) rather than higher elevations. Since turbulence intensities are generally inversely proportional to stability at night, it is only natural that the ratio $\langle \sigma_w/u_* \rangle$ increases with stability, since values of u_* and σ_w are more uncertain as L decreases.

A.2.2.2 Higher Order Moments

Vertical velocity fluctuations in the CBL are markedly non-Gaussian due to the distribution of updrafts and downdrafts within the boundary layer. Generally, updrafts consist of small regions of intense upward vertical motion and are surrounded by larger regions of subsidence or downdrafts. This characteristic imparts a positive skewness in CBL vertical velocity measurements which must be accounted for in the particle motions. Here we use the relation of Bærentsen and Berkowicz (1984):

$$\overline{www} = 0.8 w_*^3 \frac{(z/z_i)(1-z/z_i)}{1+0.667z/z_i} \quad (A.24)$$

This relation is compared with applicable laboratory and atmospheric data in Figure A.4. In the stable and neutral boundary layers, the turbulence is more homogeneous, and thus $\overline{www}$ is close to zero.

We also require fourth moments of the vertical velocity variations. Here, we follow De Baas et al. (1986) in invoking the Gaussian assumption:

$$\overline{www} = 3 \sigma_w^4 \quad (A.25)$$

In comparison with the water tank data of Adrian et al. (1986), this relation has proven to be adequate for the CBL. Of course, in stable and neutral conditions, the applicability of Equation A.27 is quite sound due to the more homogeneous nature of the turbulence field.

A.2.2.3 Peak Wavelengths

From the ground to a height of about twice the surface-roughness elements or plant canopy, the peak wavelength for vertical velocity variations is roughly constant at a value of about $2z_c$, where z_c is the canopy height (Kaimal and Finnigan 1994). Above this level, λ_w varies with

FIGURE A.4 Third-Order Vertical Velocity Moments as Given by Equation A.24, Shown in Comparison with Data from Water Tank Studies (Adrian et al. 1986; Willis and Deardorff 1974) and ABL Studies (Lenschow and Stephens 1980)

height according to stability. For convective conditions, spectral data from the Minnesota experiments suggest λ_w varies (Kaimal et al. 1976; Caughey et al. 1979) as

$$\lambda_w = \begin{cases} \frac{z}{0.55 + 0.38 z/L} & 2z_c < z < -L \\ 5.9 z & -L \leq z \leq 0.1z_i \\ 1.8 z_i \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{4z}{z_i}\right) - 0.0003 \exp\left(-\frac{8z}{z_i}\right) \right) & 0.1z_i \leq z \leq z_i \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

Here, λ_w increases quickly with height, first reaching the free convection limit between $-L$ and $0.1 z_i$, and then approaching $1.5 z_i$ in the middle of the mixed layer. At heights above $0.8 z_i$, λ_w decreases substantially, since the turbulent energy shifts from the large convective eddies to smaller scales in the dissipative and shear regions of the inversion.

When neutral conditions are approached, considerable evidence suggests that large convective-type structures are present until $z_i/|L|$ is of order 1 (LeMone 1973; Nicholls and Readings 1979). As $z_i/|L|$ decreases from around 10, the chaotic three-dimensional convective thermals give way to more-organized two-dimensional roll vortices which span the depth of the CBL (LeMone 1973). Such behavior indicates the peak wavelengths in the near-neutral boundary layer are similar to those in the fully convective boundary layer, even though the physical mechanisms are somewhat different and the turbulent energy is less intense. For $z_i/|L| < 10$, Equation A.26 is not fully applicable, however, since a free convective layer is not present. Here the surface shear layer and the convective layer overlap, and the scaling relationships are not clear. In the absence of other data, we apply the following general form based on the convective λ_w :

$$\lambda_w = \begin{cases} \frac{z}{0.55 + a z/L + b (z/L)^2} & 2z_c \leq z \leq z_t \\ 1.8 z_i \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{4z}{z_i}\right) - 0.0003 \exp\left(-\frac{8z}{z_i}\right) \right) & \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

where a and b are selected to match λ_w and $d\lambda_w/dz$ at z_t , and z_t is the minimum of $|L|$ and $0.5z_i$. This functional form is consistent with the aforementioned observational evidence while allowing λ_w to approach the neutral limit ($\lambda_w = z/0.55$) as L becomes large.

In stable conditions, λ_w data from both the Minnesota and Kansas experiments are adequately represented by Kaimal and Finnigan (1994):

$$\lambda_w = \begin{cases} \frac{z}{0.55 + z/L} & 2z_c < z < L \\ \frac{z}{1.1 + 0.45 z/L} & L \leq z \leq 2L \\ L & z > 2L \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

This expression provides that for $z/L \ll 1$, λ_w is similar to its neutral values, whereas for heights above $2L$, λ_w is constant, following the z -less stratification concept of Wyngaard et al. (1974). Data from Minnesota support the invariance of λ_w in the upper part of the SBL as predicted by Equation A.28, thus demonstrating its applicability for the whole depth of the SBL.

A.2.3 Horizontal Velocity Moments and Length Scales

A.2.3.1 Wind Profile

Neglecting Coriolis effects, the mean wind speed throughout the ABL is governed by the geostrophic wind speed, the surface roughness, and the sensible heat flux at the surface. Typically, however, the geostrophic wind speed is unknown. Thus, we estimate the wind profile in the Monte Carlo model using only surface characteristics. This will naturally lead to some errors in the wind profile form near the top of the boundary layer, since surface-based scaling relationships clearly do not apply in this region. However, these errors are assumed to be small and only manifest themselves in the concentration field at large downwind distances after the contaminant is well mixed into the boundary layers.

The horizontal wind profile is given by the similarity relation

$$U(z) = \frac{u_*}{k} \left[\ln \frac{z'}{z_0} - \Psi_m \left(\frac{z'}{L} \right) + \Psi_m \left(\frac{z_0}{L} \right) \right], \quad (\text{A.29})$$

where $z' = z - d$, d is the displacement height, z_0 is the roughness length, $U(z)$ is the mean wind speed at height z , and Ψ_m is the integrated stability function for momentum transfer. The displacement height represents the elevation to which the wind profile is displaced due to the

presence of the canopy. Typically, d is 70-80% of the canopy height but may be substantially lower within sparse canopies. In unstable conditions, we use Ψ_m as provided by Dyer (1974),

$$\Psi_m(z) = \ln \left[\left(\frac{1+x}{2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1+x^2}{2} \right) \right] - 2 \tan^{-1}(x) + \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad (\text{A.30})$$

where $x = \left(1 - 16 \frac{z'}{L} \right)^{1/4}$.

Although this relation is only strictly valid for $z' < -2L$, we apply it for the full CBL. The profile given by Equation A.32 quickly asymptotes to a near-constant value providing, at least, good qualitative agreement with observational evidence (i.e., constant wind speeds in the mixed layer). Values at the boundary layer top are between 20% and 40% of those at $-2L$, depending on stability and roughness length; thus, we expect errors in the profile magnitude to be less than 20% within the mixed layer.

For stable conditions, we use the wind profile relation of Holtslag and de Bruin (1988):

$$\Psi_m = -0.7 \frac{z'}{L} - 0.75 \left(\frac{z'}{L} - 14.29 \right) \exp \left(-0.35 \frac{z'}{L} \right) - 10.71, \quad (\text{A.31})$$

which is valid for $z'/L < 7$. The extended range of application of this relation deems it preferable to many previously proposed expressions for stable conditions. When z'/L is greater than 7, the wind speed gradient becomes less than that predicted using Equation A.31 (Beljaars and Holtslag 1991). For these cases, we modify the wind speed profile to approach a constant as $z \rightarrow 0$, such that:

$$U(z) = U(6L) - (U(8L) - U(6L)) \left[1 - \exp(-\gamma(z' - 6L)) \right], \quad (\text{A.32})$$

where $\gamma = \frac{1}{U(8L) - U(6L)} \left(\frac{dU}{dz} \right)_{z=6L}$

and $U(6L)$ and $U(8L)$ are the wind speeds at heights $6L$ and $8L$ as predicted using Equation A.31. This correction provides the behavior seen in stable wind profile data from Cabauw, as reported by Holtslag and de Bruin (1988) and Beljaars and Holtslag (1991).

A.2.3.2 Velocity Variances and Higher Order Moments

In unstable conditions, the horizontal velocity variance within the surface layer is well represented by the interpolation equation of Panofsky et al. (1977):

$$\sigma_u = u_* \left(12 - 0.5 \frac{z_i}{L} \right)^{1/3}, \quad (\text{A.33})$$

which varies between a neutral value of $2.3 u_*$ and a free convective value of $0.6 w_*$. Often, this relation is used to describe the behavior of σ_u throughout the boundary layer even though considerable evidence exists that the σ_u does indeed vary somewhat with height. In neutral stability, little ABL data exist; however, second-order modeling results of Wyngaard et al. (1974) suggest an exponential behavior (Hanna 1984), such that

$$\sigma_u = 2.28 u_* \exp \left(- \frac{3 f z}{u_*} \right), \quad (\text{A.34})$$

where f is the Coriolis parameter. Here the leading coefficient has been adjusted from 2 to 2.28 to agree with the relation of Panofsky et al. (1977).

In the Monte Carlo model, we use a hybrid equation that combines both behaviors seen in neutral and free convective regimes. Here we define σ_u such that

$$\sigma_u = u_* \left(12 \exp \left(- \frac{9 f z}{u_*} \right) - 0.5 \frac{z_i}{L} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (\text{A.35})$$

This relation provides the correct height-dependent behavior in convective conditions.

For stable conditions, data are less available than for convective conditions. Additionally, fundamental scaling relationships are not nearly as obvious. The principal problem is that the boundary layer height is less well defined. Generally, the boundary layer height h is taken to be a height where turbulent energy drops to a very small fraction of its surface value. Based on this scale height, statistics in the stable boundary layer collapse surprisingly well. Within this scaling regime, σ_u is well represented by

$$\sigma_u = 2.3 u_* \left(1 - \frac{z}{h} \right). \quad (\text{A.36})$$

This relation is compared with ABL data of Caughey et al. (1979), Nieuwstadt (1984), and Lenschow et al. (1988) in Figure A.5.

In all regions of the ABL, except the canopy, $\overline{uuu}$ is zero, since horizontal turbulence is close to Gaussian in nature (canopy turbulence will be discussed in Section A.6). Higher moments of u are not necessary in the Monte Carlo model.

FIGURE A.5 Horizontal Velocity Variances as Given by Equation A.36, Shown in Comparison with Data from Minnesota (Caughey et al. 1979), Cabauw (Nieuwstadt 1984), and Oklahoma (Lenschow et al. 1988)

A.2.3.3 Peak Wavelengths

Except for very near the surface, the peak wavelengths for horizontal velocity fluctuations λ_u in convective conditions are governed by the large-scale convective motions. Data from the Minnesota experiments and the numerical simulations of Deardorff (1974) show that

$$\lambda_u = 1.5 z_i . \quad (\text{A.37})$$

Within and immediately above the canopy, λ_u is roughly constant at $6.5 z_c$. Most likely, a sharp transition in λ_u exists between the near surface layer and the rest of the boundary layer. In the Monte Carlo model, this transition is smoothed such that λ_u rises linearly from $6.5 z_c$ to $1.5 z_i$ between the canopy and $0.01 z_i$. The details of this transition are not important, however, since substantial variations in λ_u have little impact on the resulting concentration fields.

In stable conditions, we use the relation

$$\lambda_u = 4\lambda_w . \quad (\text{A.38})$$

This relation reasonably captures the λ_u behavior seen in spectral data from the Kansas (Kaimal 1973) and Minnesota (Caughey et al. 1979) experiments.

A.2.4 Covariances and Higher Order Cross Moments

The $\overline{uw}$ covariance is employed in the Monte Carlo model to properly correlate the horizontal and vertical particle velocities, although the sensitivity to this parameter is rather weak. In the CBL, the covariance is generally assumed to decrease linearly with height such that

$$\overline{uw} = u_*^2 \left(1 - \frac{z}{z_i} \right)^\eta , \quad (\text{A.39})$$

where $\eta = 1$. This form is supported by the numerical modeling results of Wyngaard et al. (1974) and Deardorff (1972). However, observational evidence is in conflict with this assumption in some cases. In particular, turbulence data from the Minnesota experiments show a maximum in the $\overline{uw}$ profile within the lower to middle CBL. The reasons for this behavior are not fully understood, but Deardorff (1973) has postulated that entrainment of momentum at the inversion may play a role. Fortunately, material concentrations within the CBL are insensitive to the shape of the covariance profile. The maximum differences between predicted concentrations using a linear stress profile and a constant stress profile ($\eta = 0$) are only around 3%.

Observational and numerical evidence shows stress variations with height in the stable and neutral boundary layers are described well using Equation A.39 with $\eta = 1.5$ (Deardorff 1974; Caughey et al. 1979; Nieuwstadt 1984). Again, concentration estimates are not particularly

sensitive to the exponent on Equation A.39 in near-neutral and stable conditions. In the Monte Carlo model, we use Equation A.39 with η given by

$$\eta = \begin{cases} 1 & z_i/L < -10 \\ 1.5 + 0.05 z_i/|L| & -10 \leq z_i/L \leq 0 \\ 1.5 & z_i/L > 0 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.40})$$

In the Monte Carlo model, we neglect all higher order cross moments. Based on the general insensitivity to the exact formulation of $\overline{uw}$, this is very justifiable. Furthermore, the construction of the random variables governing the particle velocities is significantly more complex if third-order cross correlations are enforced.

A.2.5 Canopy Turbulence Relations

To estimate material concentrations in the lower surface layer, the lower boundary condition becomes very important. Other Monte Carlo studies of the CBL (De Baas et al. 1986; Liljegren 1989) have fixed velocity statistics constant below $z < 0.0025 z_i$ and imposed a reflection boundary condition at the ground. Such an approach is not only clearly unphysical but also strongly affects the near-ground concentrations, especially when near-surface releases are considered.

In the current Monte Carlo model, we provide a more physical lower boundary by constructing a canopy layer. In this region, the pertinent velocity statistics u , σ_u , σ_w , www , and T_L go from their above-canopy values to zero at the ground. Relations governing velocity statistics in the canopy layer have been developed from a multitude of wind-tunnel and field studies. Analysis of these studies has shown the remarkable collapse of turbulent statistics for an extremely wide range of canopy types and geometries using z_c as the governing length scale and u_* as the governing velocity scale (Raupach and Thom 1981; Brutsaert 1982; Kaimal and Finnigan 1994).

The wind profile through a canopy is theoretically derivable if one makes an assumption concerning either the mixing length or the diffusivity within the canopy. For instance, with a constant mixing length, an exponential wind profile is achieved, such that (Cionco 1965)

$$u(z) = u(z_c) \exp(-a_1 z') \quad , \quad (\text{A.41})$$

where a_1 is a constant, and $z' = 1 - z/z_c$. If one assumes that the diffusivity is constant throughout the canopy, the wind profile becomes

$$u(z) = \frac{u(z_c)}{(1 - a_2 z')^2}, \quad (\text{A.42})$$

where a_2 is a constant. In these relations, the constants a_1 and a_2 vary from about 1-4, depending on plant types and density within the canopy.

An immediate observation about Equations A.43 and A.44 is that neither relation has $u(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, such relations are typically employed only for upper and mid canopy regions. In the Monte Carlo model, we use a different approach. Here we fit the wind profile to the parabolic relation:

$$u(z) = a_3 z + a_4 z^2, \quad (\text{A.43})$$

where a_3 and a_4 are chosen to match the wind speed and wind gradient at a reference height h_0 . To encompass a large array of possible canopy and terrain types, the reference height is chosen as the maximum of $1.75 d$ or $20 z_0$. The first limit applies for a regular uniform canopy in fairly flat terrain. The second limit applies in cases where either the terrain is not uniform, such that z_0 is based not on surface roughness but terrain undulations, or for uniform terrain whose surface is characterized by large, widely spaced roughness elements, such as suburban areas or fields with occasional large trees. The actual value of the limits in both cases represents the minimum heights for which the wind profile becomes logarithmic with height. A comparison of the wind profile fitting equation with canopy wind profile data reviewed by Kaimal and Finnigan (1994) is shown in Figure A.6.

The variances within the canopy are selected to agree qualitatively with the large variety of data reviewed by Kaimal and Finnigan (1994). These data include observations within cornfields (Shaw and Pereira 1974; Wilson et al. 1982) and several forest types (Denmead and Bradley 1987). The data were fit using the functional form:

$$\sigma_{ij}^2 = \sigma_{fs}^2 \left(1 - \exp \left(-2 \left(\frac{z}{z_c} \right)^v \right) \right), \quad (\text{A.44})$$

where σ is the variance in question, σ_{fs} is the free stream value of σ (i.e., the value considerably above the canopy), and u is a constant. Here $v = 2$ for σ_w , $v = 2.5$ for σ_u , and $v = 4$ for $\sqrt{uw}$.

The third-order velocity moments (or skewness) within plant canopies are markedly higher than their above-canopy values. This characteristic reflects the highly intermittent nature of canopy turbulence. Here the turbulence is dominated by infrequent but intense incursions, or gusts, of air into the canopy from above. This imparts large negative values of Sk_w and large positive values of Sk_u within the canopy. Much scatter exists in the observations reported in the literature (e.g., Maitani 1978; Raupach and Thom 1981; Raupach et al. 1986; and Baldocchi and Meyers

1988). Generally, $-Sk_w$ and Sk_u increase from 0 above the canopy to maximum values within the canopy and then decrease quickly to zero at the ground. The position and magnitude of the maximum skewness is largely dependent on the canopy structure and density. For instance, for fairly uniform canopies representing wheat or corn, skewnesses reach their maximum at $z/z_c \sim 0.5-0.7$ with values of 0.6-0.8 for Sk_w and 1.0 for Sk_u . The maximum skewnesses for forest canopies, on the other hand, occur near the canopy top (the crown region), with a secondary maximum occurring near the ground.

In the Monte Carlo model, we designate the skewness based upon the simpler uniform-canopy model. A functional form which matches the qualitative description of Sk_w discussed in Kaimal and Finnigan (1994) is

$$Sk_w = -2 \frac{z}{z_c} \exp \left(- 2 \left(\frac{z}{z_c} \right)^2 \right). \quad (A.45)$$

As shown in Figure A.6, although Sk_u is certainly of importance when discussing concentration fluctuations within the canopy, its importance is minimal for average concentrations outside of the canopy. Thus, for simplicity, we neglect Sk_u within the canopy.

FIGURE A.6 Vertical Velocity Fluctuation Skewness within the Canopy as Provided by Equation A.45

A.3 REFERENCES

- Adrian, R.J., et al., 1986, "Turbulent Thermal Convection in Wide Horizontal Fluid Layers," *Experiments in Fluids* 4:121-141.
- Bærentsen, J.H., and R. Berkowicz, 1984, "Monte Carlo Simulation of Plume Dispersion in the Convective Boundary Layer," *Atmospheric Environment* 18:701-712.
- Baldocchi, D.D., and T.P. Meyers, 1988, "Turbulence Structure in a Deciduous Forest," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 43:345-364.
- Barad, M.L. (editor), 1958, *Project Prairie Grass: A Field Program in Diffusion*, AD-152572 and AD-152573, vols. 1 and 2, Geophysical Research Papers No. 59, Air Force Cambridge Research Center.
- Beljaars, A.C.M., and A.A.M. Holtslag, 1991, "Flux Parameterization over Land Surfaces for Atmospheric Models," *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 30:327-341.
- Brown, D.F., 1997, *An Improved Methodology for Characterizing Atmospheric Boundary Layer Turbulence and Dispersion*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- Brutsaert, W., 1982, *Evaporation into the Atmosphere*, D. Reidel Publishing Co., Boston, Mass.
- Caughey, S.J., et al., 1979, "Turbulence in the Evolving Stable Boundary Layer," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 36:1041-1052.
- Cionco, R.M., 1965, "A Mathematical Model for Air Flow in a Vegetative Canopy," *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 4:517-522.
- Deardorff, J.W., 1972, "Numerical Investigation of Neutral and Unstable Planetary Boundary Layers," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 29:91-115.
- Deardorff, J.W., 1973, "An Explanation of Anomalous Large Reynolds Stresses within the Convective Planetary Boundary Layer," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 30:1070-1076.
- Deardorff, J.W., 1974, "Three-Dimensional Numerical Study of the Height and Mean Structure of a Heated Planetary Boundary Layer," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 7:81-106.
- De Baas, A.F., et al., 1986, "An Application of the Langevin Equation for Inhomogeneous Conditions to Dispersion in a Convective Boundary Layer," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 112:165-180.
- Denmead, O.T., and E.F. Bradley, 1987, "On Scalar Transport in Plant Canopies," *Irrigation Science* 9:131-149.

Dyer, A.J., 1974, "A Review of Flux-Profile Relationships," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 7:363-372.

Gifford, F.A., 1955, "A Simultaneous Lagrangian-Eulerian Turbulence Experiment," *Monthly Weather Review* 83:293-301.

Hanna, S.R., 1981, "Lagrangian and Eulerian Time-Scale Relations in the Daytime Boundary Layer," *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 20:242-249.

Hanna, S.R., 1984, "Applications of Air Pollution Modeling," in *Atmospheric Turbulence and Air Pollution Modeling*, Nieuwstadt, F.T.M., and H. van Dop (editors), D. Reidel Publishing Co., Boston, Mass., pp. 275-311.

Hay, J.S., and F. Pasquill, 1959, "Diffusion from a Continuous Source in Relation to the Spectrum and Scale of Turbulence," *Advances in Geophysics* 6:345-365.

Holtslag, A.A.M., and H.A.R. de Bruin, 1988, "Applied Modeling of the Nighttime Surface Energy Balance over Land," *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 27:689-704.

Kaimal, J.C., 1973, "Turbulence Spectra, Length Scales and Structure Parameters in the Stable Surface Layer," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 4:289-309.

Kaimal, J.C., and J.J. Finnigan, 1994, *Atmospheric Boundary Layer Flows*, Oxford University Press, New York, N.Y.

Kaimal, J.C., et al., 1976, "Turbulence Structure in the Convective Boundary Layer," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 33:2152-2169.

LeMone, M.A., 1973, "The Structure and Dynamics of Horizontal Roll Vortices in the Planetary Boundary Layer," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 30:1077-1091.

Lenschow, D.H., and P.L. Stephens, 1980, "The Role of Thermals in the Convective Boundary Layer," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 19:509-532.

Lenschow, D.H., et al., 1988, "The Stably Stratified Boundary Layer over the Great Plains," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 42:95-121.

Liljegren, J.C., 1989, *The Atterbury-87 Field Study of Smoke Dispersion and a New Stochastic Dispersion Model*, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Maitani, T., 1978, "On the Downward Transport of Turbulent Kinetic Energy in the Surface Layer over Plant Canopies," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 14:571-584.

Merry, M., and H.A. Panofsky, 1976, "Statistics of Vertical Motion over Land and Water," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 102:255-260.

- Nicholls, S., 1989, "The Structure of Radiatively Driven Convection in Stratocumulus," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 115:487-511.
- Nicholls, S., and C.J. Readings, 1979, "Aircraft Observations of the Structure of the Lower Boundary Layer over the Sea," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 105:785-802.
- Nieuwstadt, F.T.M., 1984, "The Turbulent Structure of the Stable, Nocturnal Boundary Layer," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 41:2202-2216.
- Panofsky, H.A., and J.A. Dutton, 1984, *Atmospheric Turbulence: Models and Methods of Engineering Applications*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, N.Y.
- Panofsky, H.A., et al., 1977, "The Characteristics of Turbulent Velocity Components in the Surface Layer under Convection Conditions," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 11:355-361.
- Raupach, M.R., and A.S. Thom, 1981, "Turbulence in and above Plant Canopies," *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 13:97-129.
- Raupach, M.R., et al., 1986, "Experiments on Scalar Dispersions within a Model Plant Canopy: Part I. The Turbulence Structure," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 35:21-52.
- Shaw, R.H., et al., 1974, "Some Observations of Turbulence and Turbulence Transport within and above Plant Canopies," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 5:429-440.
- Shaw, R.H., and A.R. Pereira, 1982, "Aerodynamic Roughness of a Plant Canopy: A Numerical Experiment," *Agricultural Meteorology* 26:51-65.
- Taylor, G.I., 1938, "The Spectrum of Turbulence," *Proceedings of the Royal Society* 164:476-490.
- Thomson, D.J., 1984, "Random Walk Modelling of Diffusion in Inhomogeneous Turbulence," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 110:1107-1120.
- Thomson, D.J., 1987, "Criteria for the Selection of Stochastic Models of Particle Trajectories in Turbulent Flows," *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 180:529-556.
- Willis, G.E., and J.W. Deardorff, 1974, "A Laboratory Model of the Unstable Planetary Boundary Layer," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 31:1297-1307.
- Wilson, J.D., et al., 1982, "Statistics of Atmospheric Turbulence within and above a Corn Canopy," *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 24:495-519.
- Wyngaard, J.C., et al., 1974, "Modeling of the Atmospheric Boundary Layer," *Advances in Geophysics* 18A:193-212.

APPENDIX B:

PLUME AND THERMAL RISE RELATIONSHIPS USED IN FIREPLUME

APPENDIX B:

PLUME AND THERMAL RISE RELATIONSHIPS USED IN FIREPLUME

This appendix outlines the plume and thermal rise relationships used within the FIREPLUME model. Section B.1 reviews plume rise relationships, and Section B.2 reviews thermal rise relationships.

B.1 FIRE PLUMES

B.1.1 Rise Relationships

The initial momentum of a fire plume is insignificant in comparison with the plume buoyancy. Therefore, we use the Briggs two-thirds law to model fire plume rise. Although the Briggs relationship is primarily used for stack emissions, its extension to fire buoyancy is straightforward. Expressed in terms of the Froude number and the velocity ratio K , and including virtual source effects (see Bjorklund et al. [1996] for a discussion of virtual source effects), the Briggs two-thirds law reads

$$\Delta z = \left[\frac{3r_o}{4\beta^2 F^2 K^3} x^2 + \left(\frac{r_o}{\beta} \right)^3 \right]^{1/3} - \frac{r_o}{\beta}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where

Δz = plume rise (m),

x = downwind distance (m),

r_o = fire radius (m),

K = velocity ratio $\frac{U}{w_o}$,

U = 10-m wind speed (m/s),

β = entrainment coefficient ($\beta = 0.6$),

$$F = \text{Froude number} = w_o \left(\frac{\Delta \rho}{\rho_a} 2 r_o g \right)^{-1/2},$$

w_o = initial vertical velocity (calculated from F , $\Delta \rho$, and r_o) (m/s),

$\Delta \rho$ = initial density difference = $\rho_a - \rho_f$ (kg/m³) (note that $\Delta \rho / \rho_a \sim \Delta T / T_f$),

ρ_a = ambient density (kg/m³), and

T_f = fire temperature (K).

Equation B.1 is used to predict fire plume rise in both stable and unstable conditions; however, in stable conditions, Equation B.1 is not strictly correct. The more correct formulation in stable conditions is

$$\Delta z = \left\{ \frac{3 r_o U^2}{2 \beta F^2 K^3} \left[1 - \cos \left(\frac{Nx}{U} \right) \right] + \left(\frac{r_o}{\beta} \right)^3 \right\}^{1/3} - \frac{r_o}{\beta}, \quad \frac{Nx}{U} < \pi, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where N , the Brunt Vasaila frequency, is given by

$$N = \left(\frac{g}{\theta} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

By expansion of the cosine term, Equation B.2 clearly reduces to the Briggs two-thirds law close to the source. For longer travel times, the principal difference between Equation B.2 and the Briggs two-thirds law is the overshoot of plumes past their equilibrium value predicted by Equation B.2. This overshoot is such that the equilibrium plume height is about 84% of the maximum plume height. For practical applications, however, the plume overshoot is of minor significance in predicting near-surface concentrations as long as the final rise is properly estimated. Therefore, for simplicity and computational convenience, the Briggs two-thirds law is employed for all conditions.

B.1.2 Limiting Plume Rise

Because of the effects of entrainment into the plume and thermal stratification of the atmosphere, the rise of the fire plume is limited. For stable conditions, the limiting rise is governed

by thermal stratification. On the basis of a survey of field data, Briggs (1984) suggests that the final rise in stably stratified air is (in terms of F and K)

$$\Delta z_f = 2.1 \left(\frac{r_o U^2}{K^3 F^2 N^2} \right)^{1/3}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where Δz_f is the final rise (m), and N is the Brunt Vasaila frequency defined previously in Equation B.3.

For neutral conditions, ambient turbulence, rather than thermal stratification, limits the rise by breaking up the plume. The final rise in this case is the level at which the internal turbulent dissipation rate of the plume matches the ambient turbulent dissipation rate. Equating these quantities, Briggs (1984) specifies the final rise as

$$\Delta z_f = 0.76 \left(\frac{r_o U^2}{u_*^2 K^3 F^2} \right), \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where u_* is the friction velocity (m/s).

In unstable conditions, plume rise is also limited by turbulence. Here, however, the turbulent dissipation of the downdrafts is equated with the plume dissipation rate because downdrafts are responsible for bringing elevated material to ground level. Under this premise, Briggs (1989) and Weil (1988) suggest that

$$\Delta z_f = 4.5 \left(\frac{r_o U^2 z_i^2}{4 F^2 K^3 w_*^2} \right)^{3/5}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where z_i is the inversion height (m), and w_* is the convective velocity scale (m/s).

Because truly neutral boundary layers are rare, the neutral plume rise serves as a limiting case within our framework. In practice, we use the lesser of the stable or unstable final rise estimate (whichever is applicable) and the neutral estimate. Therefore, in unstable conditions, the final rise is given by

$$\Delta z_f = \min [\Delta z_f(\text{Eq. B.6}), \Delta z_f(\text{Eq. B.5})] ; \quad (\text{B.7})$$

whereas for stable conditions,

$$\Delta z_f = \min [\Delta z_f(\text{Eq. B.4}), \Delta z_f(\text{Eq. B.5})] \quad . \quad (\text{B.8})$$

B.2 BUOYANT THERMALS

B.2.1 Rise Relationships

On the basis of a variety of laboratory data, Morton et al. (1956) and Scorer (1978) estimate the rise of a buoyant thermal as

$$\Delta z = 2.35 F_T^{1/4} t^{1/2} \quad , \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where

t = time (s),

F_T = initial buoyancy of thermal = $g V_i \frac{\Delta \rho}{\rho_a}$ (m^4/s^2), and

V_i = initial volume of thermal (m^3).

Incorporating virtual source effects (Bjorklund et al. 1996), Equation B.9 becomes

$$\Delta z = \left[30.5 F_T t^2 + \left(\frac{r_o}{\beta} \right)^4 \right]^{1/4} - \frac{r_o}{\beta} \quad , \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where β is an entrainment coefficient taken as 0.25.

Note that for cases in which the buoyant thermal has initial momentum such as that provided by an explosive force, the thermal rise can be related to the initial buoyancy of the thermal, such that (Weil 1982)

$$\Delta z = 2.35 F_T^{1/4} (2.8 t + t^2)^{1/4} \quad . \quad (\text{B.11})$$

In this expression, Weil (1982) sets the ratio of the initial buoyancy flux to the initial momentum flux to be 1.4 on the basis of explosive release data from Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (Horst et al. 1979). Whether Equation B.10 or Equation B.11 is the most appropriate for a particular problem depends on whether source momentum is important. For explosive releases where the initial buoyancy is based on the explosive charge or the energy available, initial momentum is important. On the other hand, for releases where the thermal has an initial size, the initial momentum is usually not a factor. In FIREPLUME, we initialize the thermal with a prescribed size and buoyancy. Thus, we neglect source momentum and use Equation B.10.

B.2.2 Limiting Rise

Because of the wide variety of atmospheric, numerical, and laboratory data, the limiting rise of thermals is characterized well for stable conditions. In his analysis of the numerical and laboratory data of Morton et al. (1956), Weil (1982) suggested that

$$\Delta z = 2.66 F_T^{1/4} N^{-1/2} \quad . \quad (B.12)$$

Limiting rise relationships for convective and neutral conditions are substantially less precise because of the lack of observational data of quality. The expressions used in FIREPLUME are adapted from proportional relationships provided by Weil (1982), where the proportionality constants are chosen to provide physically consistent behavior with the limiting plume rise relationships. For neutral conditions, we specify the limiting rise as

$$\Delta z_f = 1.5 \left(\frac{F_T}{u_*^2} \right)^{1/2} \quad , \quad (B.13)$$

whereas for unstable conditions, we specify the limiting rise as

$$\Delta z_f = 3.5 z_i \left(\frac{F_T}{w_*^2 z_i^2} \right)^{3/8} \quad . \quad (B.14)$$

Analogous to the application of the fire plume limiting rise relationships, the minimum of the neutral and unstable or stable rise (whichever is applicable) is used in a particular problem.

B.3 REFERENCES

Bjorklund, J.R., et al., 1996, *Open Burn/Open Detonation Dispersion Model (OBODM) User's Guide: Volume 2, Technical Description*, DPG-TG-96-008b, U.S. Army Dugway Proving Ground, West Desert Test Center, Dugway, Utah.

Briggs, G.A., 1984, "Plume Rise and Buoyancy Effects," in *Atmospheric Science and Power Production*, D. Randerson (editor), DOE/TIC-27601, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Weather Service Nuclear Support Office, Las Vegas, Nev., pp. 327-366.

Horst, T.W., et al., 1979, *Evaluation of Empirical Atmospheric Diffusion Data*, PNL-2955, Batelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richmond, Wash.

Morton, B.R., et al., 1956, "Turbulent Gravitational Convection from Maintained and Instantaneous Sources," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* A234:1-23.

Scorer, R.S., 1978, *Environmental Aerodynamics*, Halsted Press, New York, N.Y.

Weil, J.C., 1982, "Source Buoyancy Effects in Boundary Layer Diffusion," in *Workshop on the Parameterization of Mixed Layer Diffusion*, R. Cionco (editor), New Mexico State University, Physical Sciences Laboratory, Las Cruces, N.M.

Weil, J.C., 1988, "Stochastic Modeling of Dispersion of Convective Boundary Layer," in *Lectures on Air Pollution Modeling*, A. Venkatram and J.C. Wyngaard (editors), American Meteorological Society, Boston, Mass., pp. 167-226.

APPENDIX C:
RESULTS FOR ALL OTHER FIREPLUME SCENARIOS

APPENDIX C:

RESULTS FOR ALL OTHER FIREPLUME SCENARIOS

TABLE C.1 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T2 with D4 Stability

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.77	3,600	No	No
150	0.57	3,600	No	No
250	0.39	3,600	No	No
305	0.33	3,600	No	No
350	0.29	3,600	No	No
368	0.28	3,600	No	No
450	0.23	3,600	No	No
550	0.18	3,600	No	No
650	0.15	3,600	No	No
750	0.14	3,600	No	No
805	0.13	3,600	No	No
840	0.13	3,600	No	No
850	0.13	3,600	No	No
920	0.13	3,600	No	No
1,210	0.28	1,800	No	No
1,350	0.38	1,500	No	No
1,450	0.41	1,500	No	No
2,414	5.51	60	No	No
4,023	4.77	60	No	No
5,632	2.69	60	No	No
7,241	1.43	60	No	No
12,068	0.54	600	No	No

TABLE C.2 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T2 with D4 Stability

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	2.96	3,600	No	No
150	2.19	3,600	No	No
250	1.49	3,600	No	No
305	1.26	3,600	No	No
350	1.11	3,600	No	No
368	1.07	3,600	No	No
450	0.88	3,600	No	No
550	0.70	3,600	No	No
650	0.57	3,600	No	No
750	0.53	3,600	No	No
805	0.51	3,600	No	No
840	0.50	3,600	No	No
850	0.50	3,600	No	No
920	0.50	3,600	No	No
1,210	0.74	3,600	No	No
1,350	0.89	3,600	No	No
1,450	0.95	3,600	No	No
2,414	1.63	3,600	No	No
4,023	1.41	3,600	No	No
5,632	1.03	3,600	No	No
7,241	0.72	3,600	No	No
12,068	0.53	3,600	No	No

**TABLE C.3 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T2
with F1 Stability**

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential- Irreversible-Adverse- Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential- Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.0279	3,600	No	No
150	0.0192	3,600	No	No
250	0.0120	3,600	No	No
305	0.0103	3,600	No	No
350	0.00930	3,600	No	No
368	0.00894	3,600	No	No
450	0.23	60	No	No
550	1.19	60	No	No
650	2.31	60	No	No
750	3.81	60	No	No
805	4.07	60	No	No
840	4.23	60	No	No
850	4.31	60	No	No
920	6.99	60	No	Yes
1,210	24.66	60	No	Yes
1,350	28.51	60	No	Yes
1,450	30.65	60	No	Yes
2,414	12.30	600	No	Yes
4,023	6.89	1,200	No	Yes
5,632	4.60	1,500	No	Yes
7,241	2.75	2,100	No	Yes
12,068	1.21	3,600	No	No

TABLE C.4 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T2 with F1 Stability

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.11	3,600	No	No
150	0.074	3,600	No	No
250	0.0464	3,600	No	No
305	0.0398	3,600	No	No
350	0.0359	3,600	No	No
368	0.0345	3,600	No	No
450	0.0456	3,600	No	No
550	0.17	3,600	No	No
650	0.36	3,600	No	No
750	0.64	3,600	No	No
805	0.8	3,600	No	No
840	0.95	3,600	No	No
850	1.00	3,600	No	No
920	1.59	3,600	No	No
1,210	6.82	3,600	No	No
1,350	9.02	3,600	No	Yes
1,450	9.94	3,600	No	Yes
2,414	10.02	3,600	No	Yes
4,023	10.63	3,600	No	Yes
5,632	9.4	3,600	No	Yes
7,241	7.5	3,600	No	No
12,068	4.69	3,600	No	No

**TABLE C.5 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T3
with D4 Stability**

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential- Irreversible-Adverse- Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential- Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.39	3,600	No	No
150	0.33	2,700	No	No
250	0.22	2,700	No	No
305	0.18	2,700	No	No
350	0.16	2,700	No	No
368	0.16	2,700	No	No
450	0.13	2,400	No	No
550	0.11	2,400	No	No
650	0.0911	2,100	No	No
750	0.0835	2,100	No	No
805	0.0866	1,800	No	No
840	0.0849	1,800	No	No
850	0.0846	1,800	No	No
920	0.22	60	No	No
1,210	0.54	60	No	No
1,350	1.17	60	No	No
1,450	1.56	60	No	No
2,414	2.05	60	No	No
4,023	1.20	60	No	No
5,632	0.57	60	No	No
7,241	0.36	60	No	No
12,068	0.14	1,500	No	No

TABLE C.6 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T3 with D4 Stability

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	1.49	3,600	No	No
150	1.09	3,600	No	No
250	0.72	3,600	No	No
305	0.61	3,600	No	No
350	0.53	3,600	No	No
368	0.51	3,600	No	No
450	0.41	3,600	No	No
550	0.32	3,600	No	No
650	0.26	3,600	No	No
750	0.23	3,600	No	No
805	0.22	3,600	No	No
840	0.22	3,600	No	No
850	0.22	3,600	No	No
920	0.21	3,600	No	No
1,210	0.31	3,600	No	No
1,350	0.41	3,600	No	No
1,450	0.47	3,600	No	No
2,414	0.59	3,600	No	No
4,023	0.40	3,600	No	No
5,632	0.32	3,600	No	No
7,241	0.27	3,600	No	No
12,068	0.27	3,600	No	No

**TABLE C.7 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T3
with F1 Stability**

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential- Irreversible-Adverse- Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential- Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.0176	3,600	No	No
150	0.0121	3,600	No	No
250	0.00754	3,600	No	No
305	0.17	60	No	No
350	0.64	60	No	No
368	0.97	60	No	No
450	2.39	60	No	No
550	4.41	60	No	No
650	5.61	60	No	No
750	10.19	60	No	Yes
805	11.24	60	No	Yes
840	11.93	60	No	Yes
850	12.28	60	No	Yes
920	13.97	60	No	Yes
1,210	9.29	60	No	Yes
1,350	9.46	60	No	Yes
1,450	8.69	60	No	Yes
2,414	5.70	600	No	Yes
4,023	2.85	1,200	No	Yes
5,632	1.53	1,800	No	No
7,241	1.08	2,100	No	No
12,068	0.44	3,600	No	No

TABLE C.8 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T3 with F1 Stability

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.0680	3,600	No	No
150	0.0467	3,600	No	No
250	0.0291	3,600	No	No
305	0.0309	3,600	No	No
350	0.0747	3,600	No	No
368	0.10	3,600	No	No
450	0.27	3,600	No	No
550	0.53	3,600	No	No
650	0.86	3,600	No	No
750	1.58	3,600	No	No
805	2.00	3,600	No	No
840	2.22	3,600	No	No
850	2.28	3,600	No	No
920	2.52	3,600	No	No
1,210	2.65	3,600	No	No
1,350	2.91	3,600	No	No
1,450	3.07	3,600	No	No
2,414	4.66	3,600	No	No
4,023	4.32	3,600	No	No
5,632	3.44	3,600	No	No
7,241	2.93	3,600	No	No
12,068	1.71	3,600	No	No

**TABLE C.9 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T4
with D4 Stability**

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential- Irreversible-Adverse- Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential- Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.52	3,600	No	No
150	0.38	3,600	No	No
250	0.26	3,600	No	No
305	0.22	3,600	No	No
350	0.19	3,600	No	No
368	0.19	3,600	No	No
450	0.15	3,600	No	No
550	0.12	3,600	No	No
650	0.0997	3,600	No	No
750	0.0922	3,600	No	No
805	0.0892	3,600	No	No
840	0.0877	3,600	No	No
850	0.0874	3,600	No	No
920	0.0869	3,600	No	No
1,210	0.19	1,800	No	No
1,350	0.26	1,500	No	No
1,450	0.28	1,500	No	No
2,414	1.92	60	No	No
4,023	1.64	60	No	No
5,632	0.94	60	No	No
7,241	0.52	60	No	No
12,068	0.21	750	No	No

TABLE C.10 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T4 with D4 Stability

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	2.00	3,600	No	No
150	1.48	3,600	No	No
250	1.00	3,600	No	No
305	0.85	3,600	No	No
350	0.75	3,600	No	No
368	0.72	3,600	No	No
450	0.59	3,600	No	No
550	0.47	3,600	No	No
650	0.38	3,600	No	No
750	0.36	3,600	No	No
805	0.34	3,600	No	No
840	0.34	3,600	No	No
850	0.34	3,600	No	No
920	0.34	3,600	No	No
1,210	0.50	3,600	No	No
1,350	0.60	3,600	No	No
1,450	0.64	3,600	No	No
2,414	0.84	3,600	No	No
4,023	0.62	3,600	No	No
5,632	0.46	3,600	No	No
7,241	0.33	3,600	No	No
12,068	0.28	3,600	No	No

**TABLE C.11 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T4
with F1 Stability**

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential- Irreversible-Adverse- Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential- Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.0188	3,600	No	No
150	0.0129	3,600	No	No
250	0.00811	3,600	No	No
305	0.00695	3,600	No	No
350	0.00627	3,600	No	No
368	0.00603	3,600	No	No
450	0.0830	60	No	No
550	0.42	60	No	No
650	0.80	60	No	No
750	1.32	60	No	No
805	1.40	60	No	No
840	1.45	60	No	No
850	1.48	60	No	No
920	2.40	60	No	No
1,210	8.40	60	No	Yes
1,350	9.68	60	No	Yes
1,450	10.42	60	No	Yes
2,414	4.16	600	No	Yes
4,023	2.33	1,200	No	No
5,632	1.55	1,500	No	No
7,241	0.93	2,100	No	No
12,068	0.41	3,600	No	No

TABLE C.12 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T4 with F1 Stability

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0.0725	3,600	No	No
150	0.0499	3,600	No	No
250	0.0313	3,600	No	No
305	0.0268	3,600	No	No
350	0.0242	3,600	No	No
368	0.0233	3,600	No	No
450	0.0234	3,600	No	No
550	0.0629	3,600	No	No
650	0.13	3,600	No	No
750	0.22	3,600	No	No
805	0.27	3,600	No	No
840	0.32	3,600	No	No
850	0.34	3,600	No	No
920	0.54	3,600	No	No
1,210	2.31	3,600	No	No
1,350	3.05	3,600	No	No
1,450	3.36	3,600	No	No
2,414	3.39	3,600	No	No
4,023	3.59	3,600	No	No
5,632	3.18	3,600	No	No
7,241	2.53	3,600	No	No
12,068	1.58	3,600	No	No

**TABLE C.13 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T5
with D4 Stability**

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential- Irreversible-Adverse- Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential- Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0	0	No	No
150	0	0	No	No
250	0	0	No	No
305	0	0	No	No
350	0	0	No	No
368	0	0	No	No
450	0	0	No	No
550	0	0	No	No
650	0	0	No	No
750	0	0	No	No
805	0	0	No	No
840	0	0	No	No
850	0	0	No	No
920	0	0	No	No
1,210	0	0	No	No
1,350	0	0	No	No
1,450	0	0	No	No
2,414	7.06×10^{-8}	1,800	No	No
4,023	3.68×10^{-5}	1,800	No	No
5,632	2.42×10^{-4}	1,800	No	No
7,241	2.87×10^{-4}	1,800	No	No
12,068	4.58×10^{-4}	1,800	No	No

TABLE C.14 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T5 with D4 Stability

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse-Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0	0	No	No
150	0	0	No	No
250	0	0	No	No
305	0	0	No	No
350	0	0	No	No
368	0	0	No	No
450	0	0	No	No
550	0	0	No	No
650	0	0	No	No
750	0	0	No	No
805	0	0	No	No
840	0	0	No	No
850	0	0	No	No
920	0	0	No	No
1,210	0	0	No	No
1,350	0	0	No	No
1,450	0	0	No	No
2,414	2.07×10^{-7}	2,400	No	No
4,023	1.10×10^{-4}	2,400	No	No
5,632	6.55×10^{-4}	2,700	No	No
7,241	5.90×10^{-4}	3,600	No	No
12,068	9.71×10^{-4}	3,600	No	No

**TABLE C.15 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for HF for Scenario T5
with F1 Stability**

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m ³)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential- Irreversible-Adverse- Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential- Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0	0	No	No
150	0	0	No	No
250	0	0	No	No
305	0	0	No	No
350	0	0	No	No
368	0	0	No	No
450	0	0	No	No
550	0	0	No	No
650	0	0	No	No
750	0	0	No	No
805	0	0	No	No
840	0	0	No	No
850	0	0	No	No
920	0	0	No	No
1,210	0	0	No	No
1,350	0	0	No	No
1,450	0	0	No	No
2,414	0	0	No	No
4,023	0	0	No	No
5,632	0	0	No	No
7,241	0	0	No	No
12,068	0	0	No	No

TABLE C.16 Downwind Centerline Concentrations for UO_2F_2 for Scenario T5 with F1 Stability

Downwind Distance (m)	Concentration (mg/m^3)	Averaging Time (s)	Exceeds Potential-Irreversible-Adverse Effects Limit	Exceeds Potential-Adverse-Effects Limit
100	0	0	No	No
150	0	0	No	No
250	0	0	No	No
305	0	0	No	No
350	0	0	No	No
368	0	0	No	No
450	0	0	No	No
550	0	0	No	No
650	0	0	No	No
750	0	0	No	No
805	0	0	No	No
840	0	0	No	No
850	0	0	No	No
920	0	0	No	No
1,210	0	0	No	No
1,350	0	0	No	No
1,450	0	0	No	No
2,414	0	0	No	No
4,023	0	0	No	No
5,632	0	0	No	No
7,241	0	0	No	No
12,068	0	0	No	No

APPENDIX D:

**ANALYSIS OF INITIAL URANIUM HEXAFLUORIDE RELEASE
TO INITIALIZE FIREPLUME**

APPENDIX D:

ANALYSIS OF INITIAL URANIUM HEXAFLUORIDE RELEASE
TO INITIALIZE FIREPLUME

Below are the relationships used to estimate the initial properties of the uranium hexafluoride (UF_6)-air mixture after the initial hydraulic rupture. This set of equations was solved in EES (Engineering Equation Solver). The listing provides the equations and comments (i.e., the text within braces) as they appear in the program, followed by the solutions. The analysis shown is for a single 48G cylinder.

D.1 EQUATION LISTING (Comments in Braces)

```
{ all masses are in Kg, all temperatures are in K, all volumes are in cubic meters }
{ set atmospheric pressure }
patm = 101300
{ set initial mass of UF6 and initial vapor fraction of UF6 }
massUF6 = 1744
fracvapor = 0.082
{ calculate initial temperature and volume of UF6 }
TiUF6 = (1 - fracvapor)*330 + fracvapor*628
viUF6 = (kmolesUF6*8314*TiUF6/patm)
{ entrain air into UF6 at the rate of 75/1 by volume }
vair = 75*viUF6
{ set temperatures of hot (combustion) and cold (ambient air) }
Thair = 1075
Tcair = 300
{ calculate volumes and masses of hot and cold air entrained }
vhair = min(400,vair)
vcair = max(0,vair - vhair)
masshair = vhair*patm/((8314/nair)*Thair)
masscair = vcair*patm/((8314/nair)*Tcair)
{ calculate heat added due to hydrolysis reaction }
fract = 1.0
hhydro = fract*101500*kmolesUF6
{ calculate cooling due to solid UF6 sublimation }
fractsolid = 0.245
hsubl = fractsolid *47600*kmolesUF6
{ calculate enthalpy changes of constituents }
```

```

deltEuf6 = massUF6*cpUF6*(Tmix - TiUF6)
deltEhair = masshair*cpair*(Tmix - Thair)
deltEcair = masscair*cpair*(Tmix - Tcair)
{balance enthalpy to determine mixture temperature}
deltEuf6 + deltEhair + deltEcair = hhydro - hsubl
{molecular weights for species involved}
nUF6 = 352
nair = 28.9
nHF = 20
nUO2F2 = 308
{specific heat for air and UF6 in Kj/Kg}
cpUF6= 0.312
cpair = 1.005
{kilomoles of various species involved}
kmolesUF6 = massUF6/nUF6
kmoleshair = masshair/nair
kmolescair = masscair/nair
kmolesHF = 4 * kmolesUF6
kmolesUO2F2 = kmolesUF6
{calculate equivalent molecular weight of final mixture - i.e, air with HF}
tkmoles = kmolesHF + kmoleshair + kmolescair
nmix = (kmolesHF/tkmoles)*nHF + ((tkmoles - kmolesHF)/tkmoles)*nair
{calculate volume and density of mixture adding mass of UO2F2 particles}
vmix = tkmoles*8314*Tmix/patm
massUO2F2 = kmolesUO2F2*nUO2F2
denmix = patm/((8314/nmix)*Tmix) + massUO2F2/vmix
{calculate ambient air density}
denair = patm/((8314/nair)*Tcair)
{Calculate buoyancy b, Bouyancy flux Fb and radius of thermal}
Ft = 9.8*((denair - denmix)/denair)*vmix
ro = (vmix/3)^0.333
b = (denair - denmix)/denair

```

D.2 RESULTS

```

b = 0.030
deltEcair = 546689.441
deltEhair = -96188.294
deltEuf6 = -5394.692
denair = 1.174

```

denmix = 1.138
Ft = 3651.706
hhydro = 502886.364
hsubl = 57779.909
kmolescair = 422.772
kmoleshair = 4.534
kmolesHF = 19.82
kmolesUF6 = 4.955
kmolesUO2F2 = 4.955
masscair = 12218.100
masshair = 131.023
massUF6 = 1744.000
massUO2F2 = 1526.000
ro = 15.988
Tcair = 300.000
Thair = 1075.000
TiUF6 = 354.436
tkmoles = 447.123
Tmix = 344.522
vair = 10809.447
vcair = 10409.447
vhair = 400.000
viUF6 = 144.126
vmix = 12362.649