90
10-29-80
9 KC

DL 1890

MASTER

ORNL/TM-7490

OAK
RIDGE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

A Mathematical Model for Liquid Flow Transients in a Rotary Dissolver

B. E. Lewis
F. E. Weber

OPERATED BY
UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
FOR THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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.

DISCLAIMER

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

Printed in the United States of America. Available from
the Department of Energy
Technical Information Center
P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

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.

DISCLAIMER

This book 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.

ORNL/TM-7490
Dist. Category UC-86

Contract No. W-7405-eng-26

CONSOLIDATED FUEL REPROCESSING PROGRAM

A MATHEMATICAL MODEL FOR LIQUID FLOW TRANSIENTS IN A ROTARY DISSOLVER

B. E. Lewis and F. E. Weber
Chemical Technology Division

Date Published - October 1980

NOTICE: This document contains information of a preliminary nature. It is subject to revision or correction and therefore does not represent a final report.

OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830
operated by
UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
for the
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

leg

**THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS	v
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. MATHEMATICAL TREATMENT	3
3. EXPERIMENTAL REQUIREMENTS	7
4. RESULTS	9
5. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	11
6. CONCLUSIONS	13
7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	15
8. REFERENCES	17
APPENDIX – FORTRAN Program Listing	A-1

**THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

HIGHLIGHTS

A model describing the liquid outlet response to perturbations in the flow to a compartmented rotary dissolver has been developed. The model incorporates stagewise differential material balances coupled with the general equation for flow over a weir to calculate acid concentrations and liquid volumes in each stage. Data were taken from step-change flow experiments conducted on a 0.5-t/d rotary dissolver. The predicted response of the model was in good agreement with the data from the dissolver experiments. All constants in the model were obtained by independent tests. The model appears to be applicable over a wide range of dissolver operating conditions; however, temperature fluctuations and the presence of solids were not addressed.

1. INTRODUCTION

The prediction of the effects of perturbations in the flow and concentration of liquid feed to a continuous rotary dissolver is important in several aspects of dissolver process design and control. The initial startup of a continuous dissolver requires that a certain flow and concentration of acid be established before any testing or dissolving can be accomplished effectively. Initiation of the dissolution reactions before the proper acid concentration or flow has been established can lead to acid deficient situations. Also, during normal operations, acid flow and concentration perturbations may cause problems leading to the production of off-specification dissolver products. These problems could be minimized or possibly avoided with an early indication of the effect of flow changes on the acid concentration in each stage of the dissolver. Therefore, a computer code has been developed to model the acid flow and concentration in each stage of the compartmented rotary dissolver for the nitric acid-water system. The code also gives insight into a solution for the more complex unsteady-state material balance model with chemical reaction. This report is concerned with the development and presentation of the results from the computer simulation of the flow and concentration of the nitric acid-water system within the present 0.5-t/d continuous rotary dissolver.

The dissolver is a compartmented device consisting of a 0.75-m-diam drum enclosed in a rectangular shroud. An isometric view of the dissolver drum is shown in Fig. 1. The drum is ~ 2.4 -m long and has nine separate stages or compartments. Liquid moves through the dissolver by flowing through the slots in the walls (shown in the cutaway in Fig. 1) separating each stage. Eight of the stages contain nitric acid and one contains only a rinse water-acid solution. The rinse stage is not considered in this analysis. Each stage is ~ 26 -cm long and maintains a nominal liquid inventory of ~ 5 l. Each stage contains a single baffle to provide agitation and solids transfer as the drum is rotated; therefore, complete mixing is assumed.

It has been shown in previous experiments on a single-dissolving stage rotary dissolver that the acid concentration in the outlet stream can be approximated by a simple stirred tanks-in-series model.¹ Several variations of stirred tank models were used (with varying degrees of success) in an effort to model the 0.5 t/d dissolver. Initially, the simple single-parameter, tanks-in-series model with constant flow rate and tank volume was used.² This model, which is similar to the single-stage model, predicted concentrations that preceded the actual data by as much as ~ 10 min. A variation of this model involving the introduction of a time-lag term into the concentration equation was also used. This alternate model predicted the experimental data very well during the first half of the run but lagged during the latter half. The two models appeared to have deviated from the actual data because of the assumptions of constant flow rates and stage volumes. In order to take into account the variations in flow and volume, it was necessary to start with the differential material balance equation. A schematic diagram showing the flow through the dissolver is presented in Fig. 2. The overflow from the i th tank becomes the feed to the $(i-1)$ th tank. The fluid dynamics of the liquid were modeled as flow over a weir, since liquid flows through the slots in the stage walls without completely filling the slots.

Fig. 1. Cutaway view of the 0.5-t/d compartmented rotary dissolver drum.

Fig. 2. Schematic representations of model parameters.

2. MATHEMATICAL TREATMENT

Basically, there are four variables in this problem: the volumetric flow rate out of stage i , (F_i); the concentration of acid in stage i , (C_i); the liquid volume of stage i , (V_i); and the liquid density in stage i , (ρ_i). Thus, four equations are necessary to solve for unknowns.

Since we are dealing with a water-acid system, two material balances can be written:

$$\text{Acid: } F_{i+1}C_{i+1} - F_iC_i = \frac{d}{dt} (C_iV_i) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Total: } \rho_{i+1}F_{i+1} - \rho_iF_i = \frac{d}{dt} (\rho_iV_i) \quad (2)$$

A third equation that could be applied was an empirical relation between concentration and density for nitric acid:

$$\rho_i = f(C_i) \quad (3)$$

The final equation was from the fluid mechanics of the problem. The general equation describing flow over a weir is given by

$$F = KH^P, \quad (4)$$

where F is the volumetric flow rate, H is the height of fluid over the weir, and K and P are empirical constants. If V_0 is the volume of stage i up to the bottom of the weir, and A_s is the horizontal surface area of stage i , then the following relation between the liquid volume and the height over the weir holds:

$$V_i = V_0 + A_sH \quad (5)$$

Combining Eqs. (4) and (5),

$$V_i = V_0 + A_s \left(\frac{F_i}{K} \right)^{1/P} \quad (6)$$

Equations (1), (2), (3), and (6) comprise a closed system of simultaneous nonlinear differential equations, with initial conditions at $t = 0$: $C_i = C_{i,0}$ and $\rho_i = \rho_{i,0}$ for $i = 1, 8$.

Before the above set of equations could be solved, the functional relationship between ρ_i and C_i was required. For nitric acid solutions, the density is approximately linear with concentration up to 44% acid. Thus, Eq. (3) could be written as:

$$\rho_i = a + bC_i, \quad (7)$$

where the constants a and b were determined by linear regression.

Equations (1) and (2) were solved by a fully implicit finite difference technique. Earlier attempts with an explicit technique led to stability problems. The advantage of unconditional stability with a fully implicit technique was felt to outweigh the increase in computation time.

After application of the finite difference scheme with a time step of Δt and extensive algebraic manipulation, Eqs. (1), (2), (3), and (6) were written as:

$$C_i = \frac{aH_i}{J_i - bH_i} \quad , \quad (8)$$

$$\rho_i = \frac{aJ_i}{J_i - bH_i} \quad , \quad (9)$$

$$F_i = \frac{H_i}{C_i} - (E_i - GF_i^{1/P}) \frac{1}{\Delta t} \quad , \quad (10)$$

$$V_i = E_i + GF_i^{1/P} \quad , \quad (11)$$

where E_i and G depend only on the geometric properties of the dissolver and are given by:

$$E_i = V_0 \quad (12)$$

and

$$G = \frac{A_s}{K^{1/P}} \quad (13)$$

H_i and J_i depend on the state of the fluid both in the upstream stage and at the previous time step and can be written:

$$H_i = F_{i+1}C_{i+1} + \frac{C_i^0 V_i^0}{\Delta t} \quad , \quad (14)$$

and

$$J_i = \rho_{i+1}F_{i+1} + \frac{\rho_i^0 V_i^0}{\Delta t} \quad , \quad (15)$$

where the superscripts indicate the previous time step.

Equations (8) through (11) and the associated relationships in Eqs. (12) through (15) were required to solve the material balance for each of the eight stages in the 0.5-t/d dissolver. The solution order (Fig. 3) was from stage 8 (the acid-entry stage) to stage 1 (the liquid-outlet stage). Therefore, for stage i , all the information to solve for C_i , ρ_i , F_i , and V_i is known either from previous calculations or from the initial conditions. Because of the nonlinearity of Eq. (10), an iterative solution for F_i was required. The secant method was used since simpler methods, such as successive substitutions, diverge.

A listing of the FORTRAN computer program for the model is given in the Appendix.

ORNL DWG. 80-6862

Fig. 3. Liquid flow diagram for the compartmented dissolver.

THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

3. EXPERIMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

Basically, three different types of data were required to solve the model. The first type was the geometric volume and area of each stage. The volume of each stage was found by measuring the amount of water necessary to fill a stage to the bottom of the weir. The area was calculated from the known dimensions of the dissolver.

The data of the second type were the constants in the density-concentration correlation. The data for density vs weight fraction of HNO_3 and a linear fit of this data are presented in Fig. 4. For weight fractions less than 0.44, the constants a and b in Eq. (7) were determined by linear regression to be 1001.2 and 0.48916 g/l respectively.

The final required data were the weir equation constants K and P of Eq. (4). By measuring the total mass collected for various step changes in flow, the constants K and P were calculated to be 0.9888 cm and 2.83 respectively. The value of 2.83 for the exponent P compares reasonably well to the reported values of 1.8 to 2.5 for various shaped weirs.³

Fig. 4. Density-concentration correlation for the nitric acid-water system.

Acid concentration data were taken during an experiment in which a series of step changes in the acid and water feed rates were made. An outline of the operating conditions for this test is presented in Fig. 5. This experiment was the most severe test of the final model, covering most of the step changes in liquid flows which would be anticipated in normal operation of the dissolver (i.e., startup, small perturbations in acid flow, and shutdown).

Fig. 5. Experimental test procedure for model verification.

4. RESULTS

The predictions of the model, along with the experimental results from the step change tests, are presented in Fig. 6. Also shown is a summary of actual run conditions. The predicted response and the experimentally determined response agree very well for all cases. The deviation at 160 min into the test can be explained by a known failure in the titration equipment used to collect the data. The important feature of the model is that no adjustable parameters were necessary to achieve this close agreement between experimental and predicted values. All constants in the model were chosen by separate independent tests.

ORNL-DWG. 80-6784

Fig. 6. Comparison of model concentration predictions with experimental data.

**THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

5. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Several limiting assumptions have gone into the development of the model. A linear relationship between the nitric acid concentration and solution density was used and is only applicable up to an acid concentration of 44 wt %. Caution should be exercised in applying the model outside this concentration range, since deviations from linearity are assured with the nitric acid-water system and can be seen in Fig. 4. The success of the model is highly dependent on the accuracy of the density correlation.

The experimentally determined dissolver responses to step changes of 5 to 35 kg/h were compared to the predicted responses. Agreement was good except for the largest step change of 35 kg/h. In this case, the predicted response led the measured response by 3 to 4 min. This deviation was well within acceptable limits.

Temperature fluctuations have not been addressed in this model. The model was developed assuming a constant temperature of 25°C. Including a correlation for the nitric acid-water density, temperature, and acid concentration would allow the inclusion of temperature changes, which could easily be incorporated into the model if needed.

The presence of sheared material in the dissolver significantly complicates the modeling of the process. Complications arise primarily because of backmixing during solids transfer, deviations from the assumption of ideal mixing, and depletion of acid during reaction. The effects from sheared materials were not considered; therefore, it is not advisable to use this model to describe a system with sheared material. Only a very rough prediction of performance can be expected from the model for such a system.

**THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

6. CONCLUSIONS

A model has been developed which accurately predicts the outlet response to perturbations in the feed acid flow and concentration for a 0.5-t/d rotary dissolver. This model will be useful in predicting start-up times and will provide a better understanding of how fluids flow through the dissolver. The model is limited to use in the two-component nitric acid-water system (at 25°C) with no solids present.

**THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to M. E. Baldwin and R. J. Shannon of the dissolver operating staff for conducting the experiments and taking the requested data.

We also appreciate the helpful suggestions of J. Q. Kirkman and others associated with the dissolution effort.

THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

8. REFERENCES

1. W. D. Burch et al, *Advanced Fuel Recycle Program Progress Report for Period April 1 to June 30, 1977*, ORNL/TM-5993 (September 1977), p. 3-3.
2. O. Levenspiel, *Chemical Reaction Engineering*, 2nd ed., Wiley, New York (1972), pp. 290-91.
3. *Perry's Chemical Engineers Handbook*, 4th ed., McGraw-Hill, New York (1969), p. 18-9.

THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX

FORTRAN Program Listing

THIS PROGRAM CALCULATES THE EFFECT ON THE DISSOLVER OF A STEP
CHANGE IN EITHER THE FLOW, CONCENTRATION, OR BOTH.

THE VARIABLES:

A, B, C(I), E, F(I), G, H, J, RHO(I), AND V(I)
ARE AS DEFINED IN THE DERIVATION OF THE ORIGINAL EQUATIONS.

I IS THE NUMBER OF THE STAGE, WHERE FEED ENTERS IN STAGE 8
AND EXITS IN STAGE 1.

COLD(I) IS THE PREVIOUS TIME STEP CONCENTRATION.

RHOOLD(I) IS THE PREVIOUS TIME STEP DENSITY.

VOLD(I) IS THE PREVIOUS TIME STEP VOLUME.

FLAG1, FLAG2, AND IFLAG ARE ERROR PROCESSING FLAGS.

EPS IS THE CONVERGENCE CRITERION.

IMAX IS THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF TIME STEPS.

DELTAT IS THE TIME INCREMENT, AND RDT IS ITS RECIPROCAL.

P IS THE EXPONENT IN THE WEIR EQUATION, AND RP IS ITS RECIPROCAL.

CMAK IS THE MAXIMUM CHANGE IN CONCENTRATION BETWEEN TIME STEPS.

X0, X1, X2, F0, F1, AND F2 ARE SCRATCH VARIABLES USED IN CALCULATING F.

UNITS:

C(I) (=) G/L

F(I) (=) L/HR

RHO(I) (=) G/L

V(I) (=) L

COLD(I) (=) G/L

RHOOLD(I) (=) G/L

VOLD(I) (=) L

DELTAT (=) HR

A (=) G/L

B (=) NO UNITS

E (=) L

G (=) L

P (=) NO UNITS

CAUTION: DO NOT ATTEMPT TO USE THIS PROGRAM AS WRITTEN
FOR NITRIC ACID CONCENTRATIONS ABOVE 44%!

START:

REAL J

INTEGER FLAG1, FLAG2

DIMENSION RHO(9), COLD(9), VOLD(9), RHOOLD(9),
\$X(300), Y(300), X11(300), Y11(300)

COMMON E, RDT, H, C(9), G, RP, I, F(9), EPS, V(9)

BEGIN INITIALIZATION OF THE PROBLEM

SET THE CONVERGENCE CRITERION

EPS=1.E-3

FLAG2=0

KPT=0

TICOUNT=0.0

SET THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ITERATIONS

IMAX=2000

```

C      ZERO ARRAYS
      DO 160 K=1,300
        X(K)=0.0
        Y(K)=0.0
        X11(K)=0.0
        Y11(K)=0.0
160    CONTINUE
C      READ IN EXPERIMENTAL DATA
      K1=125
      READ(5,310) (X11(I),Y11(I),I=1,K1)
310    FORMAT(F10.2,F10.3)
C      SET THE TIME INCREMENT
      DELTAT=1.E-2
      RDT=1./DELTAT
C      SET THE PHYSICAL PARAMETERS OF THE DISSOLVER
      A=1001.2
      B=.48916
      E=4.9
      G=0.201941
      P=2.7
      RP=1./P
      TIME=.0
C      SET UP HEADINGS FOR DATA OUTPUT
      WRITE(6,15)
15     FORMAT(1X,' TIME',5X,'C(1)',6X,'C(2)',6X,'C(3)',6X,'C(4)',6X,
$ 'C(5)',6X,'C(6)',6X,'C(7)',6X,'C(8)',6X,'C(9)',6X,'F(1)')
C      SET THE STATE OF THE DISSOLVER BEFORE THE STEP CHANGE
      DO 1 I1=1,8
        I=8-I1+1
        COLD(I)=0.0
        RHOOLD(I)=A+B*COLD(I)
C      F(I) IS IN KG/HR
        F(I)=9.84
        VOLD(I)=F(I)*1.E3/RHOOLD(I)
1     VOLD(I)=E+G*F(I)**RP
C      SET THE VALUES OF THE STEP CHANGE
      C(9)=453.69
      RHO(9)=A+B*C(9)
C      F(9) IS IN KG/HR
      F(9)=36.79
      F(9)=F(9)*1.E3/RHO(9)
C      CALCULATE THE NEW C(I), F(I), PHO(I) AND V(I) FOR
C      EACH STAGE USING THE PREVIOUS TIME STEP VALUES.
      DO 10 I1=1,8
        I=8-I1+1
        H=F(I+1)*C(I+1)+COLD(I)*VOLD(I)*RDT
        J=RHO(I+1)*F(I+1)+RHOOLD(I)*VOLD(I)*RDT
        DENOM=1./(J-B*H)
        C(I)=A*H/DENOM
        RHO(I)=A*J/DENOM
C      CALCULATE NEW F(I) AND V(I) ONLY IF THE DISSOLVER IS NOT
C      FLUID HYDRAULICALLY AT STEADY STATE
        IF(ABS(F(9)-F(1)).GT.EPS) CALL SECANT
10    CONTINUE
C      AFTER NEW VALUES ARE CALCULATED, INCREMENT TIME AND CONTINUE
      TIME=TIME+DELTAT

```

```

C      SET UP STEP CHANGE VALUES
      TMIN=TIME*60.
      IF (TMIN.GE.180.AND.TMIN.LT.325) GO TO 110
      IF (TMIN.GE.325.AND.TMIN.LT.415) GO TO 120
      IF (TMIN.GE.415) GO TO 140
      GO TO 130
140    IF (TMIN.GT.630) GO TO 150
      C(9)=0.0
      F(9)=9.84
      RHO(9)=A+B*C(9)
      GO TO 130
110    F(9)=46.83
      C(9)=497.7
      RHO(9)=A+B*C(9)
      GO TO 130
120    F(9)=41.67
      C(9)=478.8
      RHO(9)=A+B*C(9)
130    CONTINUE
C      CALCULATE MAXIMUM CHANGE IN CONCENTRATIONS BETWEEN TIME
C      STEPS. IF CONCENTRATIONS HAVE CONVERGED, STOP CALCULATIONS.
C      IF NOT, CONTINUE UNTIL THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF TIME STEPS
C      HAS PASSED
      TCOUNT=TCOUNT+DELTAT
      CMAX=0.0
      FLAG2=FLAG2+1
      DO 6 I1=1,8
        I=8-I1+1
        6    CMAX=AMAX1(CMAX,ABS(C(I)-COLD(I)))
      IF (CMAX.LT.EPS) GO TO 150
      IF (FLAG2.EQ.IMAX) CALL ERROR(FLAG2,IMAX)
C      RESET THE PREVIOUS TIME STEP VALUES TO PRESENT VALUES
      DO 7 I1=1,8
        I=8-I1+1
        COLD(I)=C(I)
        VOLD(I)=V(I)
        7    RHOOLD(I)=RHO(I)
C      PRINT OUT THE CALCULATED VALUES.
      WRITE(6,100) TIME,(C(I),I=1,9),F(1)
100    FORMAT(1X,F8.4,9(2X,F8.4),2X,F8.4)
      IF (TCOUNT.LT.0.033) GO TO 5
      TCOUNT=0.0
      KPT=KPT+1
      X(KPT)=TMIN
      Y(KPT)=C(1)/63.01287
C      LOOP BACK FOR NEXT TIME STEP
      GOTO 5
150    CALL PLOT1D(X,Y,KPT,X11,Y11,K1)
      STOP
      END

```

```

C      THIS SUBROUTINE PROCESSES ANY ERRORS WHICH MAY
C      OCCUR DURING THE CALCULATIONS AND PRINTS AN
C      APPROPRIATE ERROR MESSAGE.
      SUBROUTINE ERROR (IFLAG, IMAX)
      IF (IFLAG.EQ.1500) GO TO 10
      IF (IFLAG.EQ.-10) GO TO 20
      IF (IFLAG.EQ.-11) GO TO 30
      IF (IFLAG.EQ.IMAX) GO TO 40
      GO TO 60
10     WRITE(6,15)
15     FORMAT(' SECANT METHOD IS NOT CONVERGING')
      GO TO 50
20     WRITE(6,25)
25     FORMAT(' SECANT METHOD CANNOT FIND STARTING VALUES')
      GO TO 50
30     WRITE(6,35)
35     FORMAT(' F HAS NO ROOT')
      GO TO 50
40     WRITE(6,45)
45     FORMAT(' NO CONVERGENCE OVER TIME')
60     WRITE(6,55)
55     FORMAT(' ERROR IN ERROR PROCESSING')
50     CONTINUE
      STOP
      END
C      THIS SUBROUTINE CALCULATES THE NEW F(I) AND V(I)
C      USING THE PREVIOUS TIME STEP VALUES
      SUBROUTINE SECANT
      COMMON E, RDT, H, C(9), G, RP, I, F(9), EPS, V(9)
      INTEGER FLAG1
      FLAG1=0
C      SET GUESS VALUES TO LEFT AND RIGHT OF ZERO
C      (X0 HAS NEGATIVE VALUE AND X1 HAS POSITIVE VALUE)
      X0=F(I)
      X1=0.0
      CON=E*RDT-H/C(I)
      TEMP=G*RDT
C      MAKE SURE X0 IS NEGATIVE
      DO 1 K1=1,500
      K=500-K1+1
      X0=X0-0.1
      IF (X0.LT.0.0) GOTO 1
      F0=CON+X0+TEMP*X0**TP
      IF (F0.LT.0.0) GOTO 5
1     CONTINUE
C      IF X0 IS POSITIVE, PRINT APPROPRIATE ERROR MESSAGE
      FLAG1=-10
      CALL ERROR(FLAG1, IMAX)
C      MAKE SURE X1 IS POSITIVE
5     DO 10 K=1,500
      X1=X1+0.1
      F1=CON+X1+TEMP*X1**RP
      IF (F1.GT.0.0) GOTO 15
10    CONTINUE
C      IF X1 IS NEGATIVE, PRINT APPROPRIATE ERROR MESSAGE
      FLAG1=-11

```



```

      CALL ERROR(FLAG1,IMAX)
C      IF SECANT METHOD HAS CONVERGED, PREPARE TO RETURN
15      IF (ABS(P0).LT.EPS.OR.ABS(P1).LT.EPS) GOTO 25
      FLAG1=FLAG1+1
C      IF SECANT METHOD IS NOT CONVERGING, PRINT
C      APPROPRIATE ERROR MESSAGE
      IF (FLAG1.EQ.IMAX) CALL ERROR(FLAG1,IMAX)
C      CALCULATE NEW END POINT USING THE SECANT METHOD
      ALPHA=(X1-X0)/(F1-P0)
      X2=X1-ALPHA*F1
      F2=CON*X2+TEMP*X2**RP
C      REPLACE ONE END POINT WITH NEW END POINT
C      WHERE THE OLD AND NEW VALUE HAVE THE SAME SIGN
      IF (ABS(F2).LT.EPS) GOTO 25
      IF (ABS(F1/ABS(F1)-F2/ABS(F2)).GT.EPS) GOTO 20
      X1=X2
      F1=F2
      GOTO 15
20      X0=X2
      F0=F2
      GOTO 15
C      PREPARE TO RETURN VALUE OF F(I) AND V(I)
25      IF (ABS(P0).LT.EPS) F(I)=X0
      IF (ABS(F1).LT.EPS) F(I)=X1
      IF (ABS(F2).LT.EPS.AND.FLAG1.GT.0) F(I)=X2
      V(I)=E+G*P(I)**RP
      RETURN
      END

C
C
C
      SUBROUTINE PLOT1D(X,Y,K,X11,Y11,K1)
      DIMENSION X(300),Y(300),X11(300),Y11(300),IPAK(150)
      CALL CALCMP
      CALL COMPLX
      CALL MX1ALP('STANDARD','')
      CALL MX2ALP('L/CSTD','')
      CALL MX3ALP('INSTRU','+')
      CALL TITLE(' $',
1-100,'E(LAPSED ) T(IME (MIN)) $',100,
2'O(UTLET ) HNO+LI.5) 3+LXHX) C(ONCENTRATION (I M) $',100,8.25,6.0)
      CALL BLNK3(-0.015,-.12,-.1,6.5,0)
      CALL BLNK4(-.1,8.95,-.015,-.12,0)
      CALL GRAF(0.,50.,650.,0.,1.,9.)
      CALL BLNK1(-.125,.25,0.0,6.5,0)
      CALL BLNK2(0.0,8.95,.125,.25,0)
      CALL YGRXS(0.0,.2,9.,6.0,' $',-100,0.,0.)
      CALL XGRXS(0.0,10.,650.,8.25,' $',-100,0.0,0.0)
      CALL RESET('BLNKS')
      CALL MARKER(2)
      CALL DOT
      CALL SPLINE
      CALL CURVE(X,Y,K,0)
      CALL RESET('DOT')
      CALL CURVE(X11,Y11,K1,0)
      CALL RLVEC (110.,1.08,60.0,1.08,301)

```

```

CALL RLMESS(' (MODEL DATA) $', 100, 115., 3.74)
CALL RLVEC (110., 3.74, 83., 3.74, 301)
CALL RLMESS(' (EXPERIMENTAL DATA) $', 100, 115., 1.08)
CALL RLMESS(' HNO+LH.5) 3+EXLX) $', 100, 520, 5.25)
CALL RLMESS('      TIME      FLOW      CONC $', 100, 310.0, 4.90)
CALL RLMESS('      ((MIN))      ((KG/H))      ((M) $', 100, 310.0, 4.55)
CALL RLMESS(' (INITIAL)      9.84      0.0 $', 100, 310.0, 4.0)
CALL RLMESS('      0      36.79      7.2 $', 100, 310.0, 3.5)
CALL RLMESS('      180      46.83      7.9 $', 100, 310.0, 3.0)
CALL RLMESS('      325      41.67      7.6 $', 100, 310.0, 2.5)
CALL RLMESS('      415      9.84      0.0 $', 100, 310.0, 2.0)
CALL ENDPL(1)
CALL DONEPL
STOP
END

```

0

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

1.	S. M. Babcock	29.	R. H. Powell
2.	M. E. Baldwin	30.	G. W. Renfro
3.	G. L. Borsheim	31.	T. W. Semple
4-8.	W. D. Burch	32.	J. H. Shaffer
9.	R. M. Counce	33.	R. J. Shannon
10.	D. J. Crouse	34.	B. B. Spencer
11.	W. E. Eldridge	35.	R. G. Stacy
12.	M. J. Feldman	36.	D. W. Swindle, Jr.
13.	W. S. Groenier	37.	W. E. Unger
14.	W. D. Holland	38.	V. C. A. Vaughen
15.	R. A. Jacobus	39.	J. W. Wachter
16.	R. T. Jubin	40-44.	F. E. Weber
17.	H. T. Kerr	45.	M. E. Whatley
18.	J. Q. Kirkman	46.	O. O. Yarbrow
19-23.	B. E. Lewis	47-48.	Laboratory Records
24.	J. F. Mincey	49.	Laboratory Records, ORNL-RC
25.	A. D. Mitchell	50.	ORNL Patent Office
26.	R. E. Norman	51.	Nuclear Safety
27.	E. D. North		Information Center
28.	R. L. Philippone, DOE		

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

- 52-53. W. W. Ballard, Nuclear Fuel Cycle Division, Office of Light-Water Reactors, DOE, Washington, DC 20545
54. Office of Assistant Manager for Energy Research and Development, DOE-ORO Oak Ridge, TN 37830
- 55-140. Given distribution as shown in TID-4500 under UC-86, Consolidated Fuel Reprocessing Category (Applied)