REACTOR SAFETY AND MECHANICAL DESIGN FOR THE ANNULAR PEBBLE-BED ADVANCED HIGH TEMPERATURE REACTOR

2009 NE 170 Senior Design Project

Rada Hong, Steve Huber, Kenneth Lee, Patrick Purcell, Sahak Margossian, and John-David Seelig

> University of California Department of Nuclear Engineering Berkeley, CA 94720-1730

> > Report UCBTH09-001

May 19, 2009

Executive Summary

The Pebble Bed Advanced High Temperature Reactor (PB-AHTR) is a liquid fluoride salt cooled, pebble-fuel high temperature reactor. This U.C. Berkeley NE 170 senior design report presents the results of the Reactor Safety and Mechanical Design (RSMD) group's project to design and test a new annular core design for the PB-AHTR. The project identified different geometric configurations for the core that provide a high degree of fast neutron shielding to the solid graphite reflectors. This required close coordination with the Neutronics and Fuel Cycle (NFC) design group that studied the core neutronics and developed a thorium seed/blanket core design. The NFC group verified that the PB-AHTR can achieve a conversion ratio approaching or exceeding 1.0 using thorium, with the new annular core design. The RSMD group designed and built a scaled pebble recirculation experiment to demonstrate the generation of a radially and axially zoned core configuration and an experiment to measure the friction coefficient of graphite pebbles lubricated by fluoride salt. The group also modeled the steady-state core pressure drop and flow distribution using RELAP5-3D, COMSOL, and analytical calculations. The results of these tasks yielded a fully-functional scaled experiment radially and axially zoned by color, in which the friction coefficient of polyethylene pebbles on acrylic matched closely the coefficient of graphite pebbles in liquid salt. The computational work revealed expected values of the pressure drops and flow distributions. This report summarizes the results of this design study and recommends areas for additional research.

Executive Summary	
1.0 INTRODUCTION	
2.0 CORE MECHANICAL DESIGN	7
3.0 THERMAL HYDRAULICS, FLUID MECHANICS DESIGN AND ANALYSIS	9
3.1 RELAP5-3D [©] Modeling	9
3.1.1 Code Description	9
3.1.2 Numerical Solution Schemes	
3.1.3 Data Visualization Tools	
3.1.4 Hydrodynamic Model	
3.2 COMSOL Modeling	12
3.2.1 Background	
3.2.2 Numerical Solution Method	13
3.2.3 COMSOL Modeling Conclusion	
3.3 Analytical Modeling	16
4.0 PREX-2 EXPERIMENT	19
5.0 SALT LUBRICITY EXPERIMENT	22
6.0 CONCLUSIONS	
7.0 REFERENCES	
Appendix A: RELAP5 Input Deck	
Appendix B: PREX-2 Experiment Operating Procedure	

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Advanced High Temperature Reactors (AHTR's) are Generation IV reactors that use hightemperature coated particle fuels, along with a liquid fluoride salt coolant, to achieve hightemperature operation at high power density and low pressure. The 2008 NE 170 senior design class developed a detailed plant design for a 410-MWe Pebble Bed AHTR [1.1], shown in Figs. 1-1 and 1-2. The 2009 NE 170 senior design class has studied a new annular core design for the PB-AHTR. The new core design studied here uses a solid graphite central reflector similar to the PBMR, with a radial and axially zoned pebble bed. As with other PB-AHTR designs, the pebbles float and are injected at the bottom of the core and removed from defueling chutes located above the top of the core. Our Reactor Safety and Mechanical Design (RSMD) group designed and built two experiments and used RELAP5-3D, COMSOL, and analytical calculations to study the core pressure drop, flow distribution, and transient response. The first experiment used polyethylene spheres to demonstrate the generation of a radially and axially zoned core configuration in a 15° section of the PB-AHTR core. The second experiment measured the friction coefficient of graphite pebbles lubricated by fluoride salt at the PB-AHTR operating temperature, and confirmed that fluoride salts are good lubricants and that the friction coefficients are very close to those for the polyethylene spheres.



Fig. 1-1 PB-AHTR 3-D power plant model.

The RSMD group worked with the other NE 170 design team, the Neutronics and Fuel Cycle (NFC) design group, which had responsibility for developing the reactor physics design for the annular PB-AHTR core [1.2]. This required close coordination to assure that the mechanical design also works for optimized neutronics.



Fig. 1-2 900 MWth, 410 MWe PB-AHTR power plant design.

The proposed approach to achieve radial zoning in the annular PB-AHTR is to have a diverging region at the bottom of the core. If the outside radius of the core diverges with a substantially larger angle than the inside radius, then the radial thickness occupied by driver pebbles drops rapidly toward the bottom of the core, as shown schematically in Fig. 1-3. This makes the bottom of the core subcritical, and thus reduces neutron fluence in this area (as occurs in the defueling chute of pebble bed reactors). This in turn makes it potentially possible to locate the radial partition rings in an area of sufficiently low neutron fluence to permit long life, particularly if the material is capable of withstanding large neutron fluences (e.g., ODS ferritic steels).

In the converging section at the top of the core, the pebbles converge into an annular slot that is 4 to 10 pebbles across, and this slot then converges above into 1 to 4 defueling chutes (with the transition designed to prevent pebble bridging), with the defueling channels then leading to defueling machines. Because the outside radius of the core converges while the inside radius remains constant or increases slightly, the thickness occupied by the fuel drops rapidly entering the defueling slot (because with plug flow the area occupied by the blanket pebbles and the driver pebbles must remain constant). This causes the core to be subcritical in the exit slot region. The length of the slot and the defueling chutes is designed to allow the pebbles to have 1 to 4 days residence time under subcritical conditions to allow fission product decay heat to drop before removal.



Fig. 1-3 Schematic diagram showing a radially and axially zoned pebble bed core with inner and outer radial blankets, center thorium pebble control channel, and coolant flow distribution.

Some type of partition is needed at the bottom of the annular PB-AHTR core to enable the radially-zoned injection of pebbles. Because pebbles bounce when they land on the bottom of the pebble bed, to generate a radially-zoned core it is necessary to have radial dividing partitions between the different pebble zones where the pebbles are added to the core [1.2]. Axially zoning is achieved by alternating the injection of seed and blanket pebbles. Because the partitions are in direct contact with the pebbles and the salt coolant, they must be constructed from a robust material capable of withstanding the resulting neutron flux, temperature, and corrosion. Fig. 1-4 shows an example of a radially zoned pebble core studied by MIT.



Fig. 1-4 Radially zoned distribution of pebbles in an MIT PBMR experiment [1.2].

This project studied several key topics for reactor safety and mechanical design for the new annular PB-AHTR core. Section 2 reviews the mechanical design of the initial core design, performed using Solidworks. Section 3 discusses the modeling of the core that was performed using analytical methods as well as the codes RELAP5-3D and COMSOL. Section 4 covers scaled experiments that were performed with high-density polyethylene (HDPE) pebbles to verify that radial zoning can be created in an annular pebble core. Section 5 presents the results of experiments to measure the friction coefficient for graphite pebbles sliding on a graphite surface lubricated by fluoride salt, that verified the friction coefficient is quite close to the value for the HDPE pebbles sliding on acrylic. Section 6 summarizes and provides conclusions for the work we completed in our senior design class project.

2.0 CORE MECHANICAL DESIGN

Given the reactor dimension specifications from the Neutronics and Fuel Cycle (NFC) design group, the initial design for the new PB-AHTR core shown in Fig. 2-1 and 2-2 was selected. Based upon our experimental results, future designs can evolve from this initial design. The outer and inner reflectors of the reactor (represented by the solid gray region) encase the annular pebble bed (represented by the red driver-pebble and green blanket-pebble regions). The outer reflector is determined to be at least 50 cm thick for adequate shielding, and the driver fuel region is 90 cm thick. The core geometry has a unique side profile specified to allow easy fueling and defueling chutes while maintaining the proper core width. At its widest, the core is 150 cm thick. A 30-cm layer of blanket pebbles (green) separate the seed pebbles (red) on either side from both the inner and the outer reflector. The diverging inlet on the bottom and converging outlet on the top are designed to have a angles of 30° and 45° off the vertical, respectively, ending in final inlet and output widths of 70 cm and 30 cm. The core constant-area height of the core is 300 cm, and with the conical top and bottom regions it has an effective height of approximately 320 cm. The inlet and outlet chutes are shown arbitrarily as 150 cm high. The optimal heights to provide adequate neutron shielding were not studied here.



Fig. 2-1 Elevation cross section of the annular PB-AHTR core design.



Fig. 2-2 3-D isometric view of the PB-AHTR core design.

3.0 THERMAL HYDRAULICS, FLUID MECHANICS DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

3.1 RELAP5-3D[©] Modeling

In order to analyze the steady state behavior of the core, one simulation tool used is RELAP5-3D[®] (Reactor Leakage Analysis Program). RELAP is a code designed for the analysis of transients and accidents in water-cooled nuclear power plants and related systems as well as the analysis of advanced reactor designs [3.1]. In the RELAP simulation developed here, only steady-state fluid flow modeling of flow distribution in the PB-AHTR core was performed. However, this same input deck can be used in the future for transient thermal analysis of annular PB-AHTRs. Appendix A provides a listing of this input deck.

3.1.1 Code Description

The hydrodynamic model used in RELAP5-3D[©] is a transient, two-fluid model for flow of a two-phase vapor/gas-liquid mixture that can contain noncondensable components in the vapor/gas phase and/or a soluble component in the liquid phase. A multi-dimensional component in RELAP is available for the user to model the hydrodynamic features of reactor applications, primarily in the vessel and steam generator [3.1]. In our case we are using the multi-dimensional component in cylindrical (r, θ ,z) coordinates. Figure 3-1-1 shows an example control volume used to generate the 2-D RELAP model for the PB-AHTR core.



Fig. 3-1-1 Example cylindrical control volume used to build the RELAP model for the annular PB-AHTR

3.1.2 Numerical Solution Schemes

RELAP5-3D[©] utilizes a semi-implicit numerical scheme to solve for the transport of mass, momentum, and energy across the boundaries of the geometric mesh shown in the computational model description later.

The following are the governing equations solved by RELAP, as reported by ref [3.1]

Conservation of Mass

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \left(\rho \overline{\nu} \right) = 0 \tag{3.1.1}$$

Conservation of Momentum

$$\rho\left(\frac{\partial \overline{v}}{\partial t} + \overline{v} \cdot \nabla \overline{v}\right) = -\nabla P + \overline{\sigma} + \rho \overline{f}$$
(3.1.2)

Conservation of Energy

$$\rho\left(\frac{\partial \overline{v}}{\partial t} + \overline{v} \cdot \nabla U\right) = -\nabla \cdot \overline{q} - P\nabla \cdot \overline{v} + tr\left(\overline{S} \cdot \nabla \overline{v}\right) + \rho Q \qquad (3.1.3)$$

These equations are discretized in time and space. The discretization of the components depends on the numerical scheme employed in order to solve these equations. In order to solve equations 3.1.1-3.1.3, these partial differential equations are replaced by finite difference equations. The difference equations are based on the concept of a control volume (or mesh cell) in which mass and energy are conserved by equating the accumulation to the rate of mass and energy in through the cell boundaries minus the rate of mass and energy through the cell boundaries plus the source terms. This model averages properties for all mesh cells and requires the knowledge of velocities at the volume boundaries. The velocities at the boundaries are most conveniently defined through the use of momentum control volumes centered on the mass and energy cell boundaries. This approach results in a numerical scheme having a shifted spatial mesh. The scalar properties of the flow are defined at cell centers, and vector quantities are defined on the cell boundaries [3.2].

3.1.3 Data Visualization Tools

An algorithm was constructed in MATLAB in order to better visualize the data output by RELAP. The algorithm takes the velocities at half of the junctions in the model, and averages them to display a velocity field inside the core.

3.1.4 Hydrodynamic Model

The hydrodynamic model was created using the multi-dimensional component in RELAP and several time-dependent volumes and junctions, single volumes, and single junctions. The multi-dimensional component is split into three vertical sections, each comprising of nine radial zones, nine axial zones, and one azimuthal zone, totaling 243 different zones, shown in Fig. 3-1-2.



Fig. 3-1-2 Geometric Representation of the Full Core using RELAP

The dashed lines in Fig. 3-1-2 represent how the core is actually modeled. The meshes that lie outside of the core region have been given an area factor of 0.0 signifying that no flow can pass through them. This approximates the actual conical shapes of the expanding and contracting sections of the core.

Coolant injection and removal are accomplished using 14 radial inlets from the bottom of the core to the middle and 5 radial outlets from the middle of the core up. There are also four axial inlets at the bottom, 6 azimuthal outlets across the diagonal of the defueling and 2 more axial outlets at the very top.

The flow rate was determined from the energy conservation equation

$$Q = \dot{m}C_{p}\Delta T \tag{3.1.4}$$

where Q is the power output of the core (currently at 900MW) multiplied by the volume fraction being modeled (1/8) and C_p is the specific heat of the flibe at 600°C. The temperature difference is 104°C taken from the design specifications. The flow rate for this model then equates to 471.5 kg/s. This value is fixed as the flow rate, but it is broken up proportionally into various meshes along the boundary of the core corresponding to the cross sectional area of each mesh. The source and sink pressures are kept constant and because the junctions are only logic functions, this creates a constant pressure boundary for the inlet and outlet.

	Inlet	Mid Core	Outlet
Pressure (Pa)	600.0 E+3	600.0 E+3	101.33 E+3
Temperature (°C)	600	600	600

The initial conditions for the system were set to the values shown in Table 3.1.1.

 Table 3.1.1 Initial core temperature and pressure.

All mass flow rates were set to zero initially and both inlets and outlets began their respective mass flows after 10.0 seconds. The time of simulation was set to 500.0 seconds.

A predictable and desirable steady-state flow pattern was produced, as shown in Fig. 3-1-3.



Fig. 3-1-3 Flow distribution in simulated core.

Another value we are interested in the radial pressure drop across the core. If we look at the greatest pressure drop across the mid section of the core we find that:

$$\Delta P_{tot} = \Delta P_{grav} + \Delta P_{flow} \tag{3.1.5}$$

 $\Delta P_{grav} = \rho_{flib}gh = 58.5kPa \tag{3.1.6}$

$$\Delta P_{f \, low} = 109 k P a - 58.5 k P a$$

$$\Delta P_{flow} = 50.5 kPa$$

These findings show desirable results in our design. Future simulations should study the core heat transfer and eventually LOFC transients and LOCA accidents.

3.2 COMSOL Modeling

The COMSOL computer code has the capability to solve detailed, 3-D fluid mechanics problems. Here we used COMSOL to simulate the flow distribution in the PB-AHTR core,

using a computational mesh that is much finer than the mesh possible with the RELAP code. A 2-D, axially symmetric model was used to predict the pressure drop, mass flow rate and the streamline velocity field. The same liquid-salt thermophysical properties that were used in RELAP5-3D[®] were also applied in COMSOL, and the pebble fuel is modeled using the porous media assumption.

3.2.1 Background

COMSOL modeling may be used for optimizing parameters within the experimental design, especially the arrangement of the inlet and outlet of the core. From a modeling point of view, this model is also a prerequisite for the understanding how the flow and heat transient systems work in the core. The hydrodynamic model used in COMSOL is a chemical engineering module using Brinkman's equation for porous media flow. An axially symmetric view of the model was developed, as shown in Fig. 3-2-1, with the inlet, outlet and impermeable wall surfaces represented by the blue, red and black color lines, respectively.



Fig. 3-2-1 Axially symmetric COMSOL model for the annular PB-ATHR core.

3.2.2 Numerical Solution Method

The transport of mass, momentum, and energy across the boundaries of the geometric mesh are implemented in COMSOL for the numerical calculation.

The following are the governing equations utilized by COMSOL for the sub-domain and boundary numerical calculation

$$\left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}\right)\vec{u} = \nabla \left[-p\vec{I} + \left(1/\varepsilon_p\right)\eta\left(\nabla\vec{u} + \left(\nabla\vec{u}\right)^T\right)\right] + \vec{F}$$
(3.2.1)

$$\nabla \vec{u} = 0 \tag{3.2.2}$$

 $\vec{u} = -U_0 \vec{n} \tag{3.2.3}$

The density (ϱ), permeability (k), porosity (ε_p), normal inflow velocity (U₀), and dynamic viscosity (η) are used in the above equations in order to perform the calculation. There are 604,379 mesh elements that were generated to ensure the proper calculation of the mass flow distribution.



Fig. 3-2-2 COMSOL geometric mesh representation of the annular core.

COMSOL has a built-in command to calculate the normal velocity to the inlet surface. Table 3-2-1 below shows the normal velocity of the axial and radial surface of the Fig. 3-2-2.

Volumetric Flow Rate [m^3/s]		
Vr	3.735	
Vz	0.771	

Knowing the volumetric flow rate from COMSOL, one could perform the calculation of mass flow rate given the density of the flibe coolant is 1986 kg/m³. Equation (3.2.4) is used to calculate the mass flow rate

$$\dot{m} = \varepsilon \rho \dot{V} \tag{3.2.4}$$

where \dot{m} is the mass flow rate, ε is the porosity, ρ the density and \dot{V} the volumetric flow rate. The resulting mass flow rate is 3536 kg/s.

Figure 3-2-4 shows the velocity field across the core for different axial and radial positions.



Fig. 3-2-4 COMSOL velocity field for the PB-AHTR core

The same values from RELAP5-3D^{$^{\circ}$} were used to calculate the pressure drop across the core using COMSOL. The inlet velocity is set at 0.153m/s and the outlet pressure is set at 101.33kPa. The greatest pressure drop across the core is about 50kPa as shown in Fig. 3-2-5 below (in the model, gravity has been set to zero so that the hydrostatic head difference can be neglected). Figure 3-2-6 shows streamlines for the flow distribution through the core.



Fig. 3-2-5 Pressure drop across the core



Fig. 3-2-6 COMSOL predictions for the surface pressure and velocity field streamlines

3.2.3 COMSOL Modeling Conclusion

As can be seen from Table 3-2-2, both the COMSOL and RELAP5-3D models give consistent predictions. The next section shows that they are also consistent with analytical solution for the pressure drop in the core.

Final Numerical Results					
Mass Flow Rate Pressure Drop [atm] [kg/s]					
RELAP5-3D	3772	0.50			
COMSOL	3536	0.52			

Table 3-2-2 Comparison of RELAP and COMSOL results

3.3 Analytical Modeling

To confirm the pressure losses predicted by the RELAP and COMSOL models, a simplified analytical model for the steady-state pressure drop was also developed. The velocity in the PB-AHTR core can be described as the superficial velocity through a porous media and thus the pressure drop can be predicted using the Ergun equation.

For the analytical solution several major simplifying assumptions must be introduced. The general discussion of the core then must be looked at in two geometrical perspectives, one for varying heat transfer and one for varying angle of flow across the core.

The first geometrical profile isn't required to be specifically accurate to the problem, so a simple 2-D geometrical basis is created. First it is assumed that the geometry is a simple right cylindrical annulus where the axis of rotation is the distance between the corners of rectangle created by making the differential radius of the reactor a side and the height a side. The radius of the right cylinder is then assumed to be the annular radius. This yields a simple cross sectional area of mass flow of $A=\pi r^2$ and a path length of the aforementioned axis length.

The second geometrical profile used to assimilate angle of fluid flow to the pressure drop, is done using an annular cylinder. The annular cylinder is kept at constant volume relative to the actual dimensions of the reactor. Then flow is rotated such that its starts uniformly radial and eventually becomes exactly vertical flow through the annular cylinder.

Once the approximate geometry is specified, it is important to understand the fluid mechanics of the design. The flow is described by assuming that the packed bed of spheres can be treated as a porous medium. In doing so one relates the dimensionless quantities such as the approximate friction factor and the Reynolds number [3.3]. It is important to note that the spheres are assumed to remain stationary, which is a valid assumption in this case due to the relatively large flow rate of the flibe coolant compared to the very slow motion of the seed and blanket pebbles.

The friction factor is defined as:

$$f_{p} = \frac{D_{p}\varepsilon^{3}}{\rho v_{\infty}^{2}(1-\varepsilon)} \frac{|\Delta p|}{L}$$
(3.3.1)

where D_p is the diameter or hydraulic diameter of the particle, ε is the void fraction created by the bed of particles, V_{∞} is the superficial velocity of the fluid, Δp is the pressure drop, and L is the characteristic length of flow. This dimensionless quantity can be related to the Reynolds number via the Ergun equation as

$$f_p = \frac{150}{\text{Re}_p} + 1.75 \tag{3.3.2}$$

The following representation of the Reynolds number is applicable to pebble beds:

$$\operatorname{Re}_{p} = \frac{D_{p} v_{\infty} \rho}{(1 - \varepsilon)\eta}$$
(3.3.3)

where η is the viscosity of the fluid and ϱ is the density of fluid.

These equations yield a reasonable approximation to the pressure drop. They mainly deal with geometrical and material properties aside from the v_{∞} , or superficial velocity. Without creating any assumptions about the superficial velocity one looks to the analytics of the heat transfer to find this averaged property of liquid flow. The superficial velocity is found using equation (3.1.4).

The first geometrical case is used as a means to study the effects of desiring temperature change versus pressure drop.



Fig. 3-3-1 Pressure drop with varying temperature differences

The second geometry takes into account angle distribution of the flow, from radial flow to completely vertical annular flow at a change in temperature drop of 104 degrees Celsius.



Fig. 3-3-2 Pressure drop vs angle of flow

4.0 PREX-2 EXPERIMENT

In the PB-AHTR, a major issue is the motion of the pebble bed throughout the reactor when pebbles are recirculated. In particular, achieving radial zoning is a key interest to this project. To verify the flow of pebbles through a reactor core, we designed and constructed a proof-of-principle Pebble Recirculation Experiment (PREX-2), shown in Figure 4-1. This section presents results from this experiment



Fig 4-1: PREX-2 filled with 129,840 pebbles. (Inner reflector is modeled on the left side, outer reflector is modeled on the right side)

The experiment was designed and built as a 15° slice of the core, scaled to 42% of the actual reactor size. The 3.0-cm diameter PB-AHTR pebbles were simulated using 1.253-cm (1/2") diameter high density polyethylene spheres. While earlier PREX experiments have

used water, for simplicity this PREX-2 experiment was designed to operate dry. Therefore the pebbles were added at the top of the experiment, instead of being injected into the bottom of the core and floating up to form the pebble bed. Styrofoam was used to construct the simulated inner and outer reflectors for the bed. Each section of the Styrofoam was individually cut to the correct shape using a heated nichrome wire cutter. The wire cutter created a flat surface that approximates the curved surface in the actual reactor, again simplifying the construction of the experiment. The pieces were then glued together and left 24 hours to set. The flat surface simplifies construction and approximates the curved surface of the actual reflector.

One-sixteenth inch acrylic was used to line the inner and outer reflector surfaces that the pebbles slide on. In order to fabricate the correct curved surface this thin acrylic sheet was heated with a heat gun so the sheet could be bent to the correct shape. To attach the thin acrylic sheet to the Styrofoam, Elmer's[©] Ultimate GlueTM was used. Then large sheets of one-half inch acrylic were used to sandwich the Styrofoam reflector blocks, with all-thread bolts used to hold the sheets together, creating the 15° slice of the model. The acrylic sheets were 1.28-cm thick, sufficient to prevent significant bowing outward in the middle under the pressure of the loaded pebbles.

Acrylic was chosen as the inner surface for the reflectors because has approximately the same the friction factor with HDPE pebbles (approximately 0.3) as was measured for graphite spheres lubricated by fluoride salt (Section 5).

The loading process for the pebbles involved adding pebbles at the top of the experiment, and removing them from the bottom. Four different colors of pebbles were used, with light green (LG) dark green (DG) representing the blanket layers, and yellow (Y) and white (W) the driver fuel region, Different colors of pebbles were added in each of the six radial zones, with the arrangement from the inside radius to outside radius of LG, Y, W, Y, DG, and LG. Periodically a divider layer of pebbles was inserted, with the order DG, LG, LG, LG, LG, DG. Figure 4-2 shows the resulting distribution of pebbles, at various times as the pebbles were added into the experiment. Appendix B provides the detailed pebble loading procedure, as well as the detailed as-built dimensions of the PREX-2 experiment and a description of the design of the defueling chute used to remove pebbles from the bottom of the experiment.



Fig 4-2: Pebble flow through the top of the PREX-2 (continued from left to right)

As one can see in Fig. 4-2, in the expanding region of the core the pebbles move more rapidly down the outer reflector (right side) than along the inner reflector (left side). This difference in the pebble speed is likely due to the asymmetric geometry of the expanding conic region. Because this difference in pebble speed causes shearing to occur in the pebble bed, some radial dispersion and mixing is observed between the pebble layers.

Conversely, in the constant cross section area of the core, the pebbles move in plug flow and no further radial dispersion or mixing occurs in this region. Finally, at the bottom of the experiment, in the contracting region of the core, the moving pebbles were again observed to undergo shear, in this case with the pebbles moving more rapidly down the inner reflector (left side) than outer reflector (right side).

Because it is desirable to minimize the radial mixing and dispersion of pebbles, it is recommended that the next PREX experiment use reflector designs that provide more symmetric inlet and outlet conical regions, to minimize shearing of the pebble flow.

5.0 SALT LUBRICITY EXPERIMENT

The PB-AHTR's liquid salt coolant offers many advantages over both traditional gas and water coolants. However, the impact of the liquid salt coolant on friction between graphite surfaces has, in the past, been unknown. This section of the report presents data for friction coefficients for hemispherical graphite pebbles lubricated by liquid-fluoride salt.

At room temperature in air, graphite acts as a lubricant. However, as temperature increases to over 200°C in a dry environment, adsorbed water vapor and oxygen are released, and graphite begins to lose lubricity [5.1-5.5]. Under Pebble Bed Modular Reactor (PBMR) operating conditions, graphite's friction coefficient can be almost an order of magnitude greater than that of room temperature graphite. This leads to concerns about wear and pebble bridging and blockage and excessive graphite dust production, because pebbles like that shown in Fig. 5-1 must slide along graphite reflectors in the cores of PBMRs and similar helium-cooled, pebble-fueled reactor designs.





Under PB-AHTR operating conditions, graphite will operate at somewhat lower maximum temperatures than in helium-cooled pebble bed reactors, but still sufficiently high that graphite friction would be substantial under dry conditions. However, the liquid salt acts as a lubricant, and works to reduce friction even after graphite has lost its lubricity.

Although the actual reactors will use flibe (67% LiF, 33% BeF₂) in the primary loop, due to the toxicity of the beryllium in flibe the salt flinak (46.5% LiF, 11.5% NaF, 42% KF)—the leading candidate for the PB-AHTR intermediate salt loop—was used in this experiment, due to its greater availability, lower cost, and low toxicity. The University of Wisconsin, Madison provided the flinak which had been used previously for material corrosion testing. The flinak was shipped with an argon-gas cover and had relatively high purity and low oxygen

contamination. All handling of the flinak during the experiment occurred in an inert gas environment.

To account for the difference in liquid salts, the experimental temperature—and as a result kinematic viscosity—was adjusted so that the Reynolds number would match that of flibe at reactor conditions, assuming that velocity and characteristic length remain constant, $\eta_{Flinak} = \eta_{Flibe}$, where η is the kinematic viscosity. Kinematic viscosities of flibe and flinak can be calculated using the following formulas [5.5, 5.6], respectively:

$$\eta_{Flibe} = \frac{.116 * \exp{\left(\frac{3755}{T(K)}\right)}}{2.280 - .000488 * T(^{\circ}C)} \qquad (\text{in cP*cm}^3/\text{g})$$
$$\eta_{Flinak} = \frac{.04 * \exp{\left(\frac{4170}{T(K)}\right)}}{2.530 - .00073 * T(^{\circ}C)} \qquad (\text{in cP*cm}^3/\text{g})$$

Figure 5-2 compares the kinematic viscosities for flibe and flinak.



Fig. 5-2 Kinematic viscosities for flibe and flinak. Experimental temperatures were picked so their viscosities would match those of flibe under reactor conditions.

Because the PB-AHTR's normal operating temperature is 600°C at the core inlet and 704°C at the outlet, measurements were made with flinak at temperatures that would match the kinematic viscosity of flibe at 600°C, 650°C, and 700°C. This required operating the

experiment at lower temperatures. Table 5-1 tabulates the temperatures that were used in the experiment.

T _{Flibe} (°C)	$\eta(cP*cm^3/g)$	$T_{Flinak}(^{\circ}C)$
600	4.31	492
650	3.45	525
700	2.84	559

Table 5-1 Temperatures for the pebble friction experiment.

In addition, the normal force between the pebble and the graphite surface was varied by adjusting the mass loaded in the apparatus. Masses of 0.915 kg, 1.39 kg, and 1.86 kg were used to provide different normal forces for each temperature. Besides the friction measurements with flinak, an additional friction measurement was conducted at 559°C in a dry helium environment without any flinak present in the apparatus, to verify the graphite friction coefficient under dry conditions.



(a)

(b)

Fig. 5-3 The 1.5-cm radius graphite hemispheres, spaced 5.1 cm apart on a torsion bar (a) and a graphite slab—with liquid flinak (b)—after use in the experiment.

The experimental apparatus was composed of two 1.5-cm radius graphite hemispheres attached 5.1 cm apart on a rotating stainless steel torsion bar (T-bar), shown in Fig. 5-3a. The T-bar was rotated by a shaft and pulley system. The hemispheres were placed in contact with a graphite plate, which had a shallow well machined in it to hold liquid flinak, shown in Fig. 5-3b after the experiment was completed. Both the hemispheres and plate were fabricated from graphite available in the Nuclear Engineering Department. Normal force was applied to the two hemispheres by weights placed in a container located on top of the T-bar shaft, shown in Fig. 5-4. The bottom half of the T-bar and graphite were placed in a stainless steel container, containing a helium purge tube to maintain a dry, inert atmosphere and a thermocouple to measure the local temperature.



Fig. 5-4 The experimental apparatus, in the open (left) and closed (right) furnace.

Static and dynamic friction coefficients were measured in this experiment. The static friction coefficient was determined by adding weight to the pulley system until the torque on the shaft caused it to begin to move. The dynamic friction was measured by finding the mass required to cause the shaft to rotate at a constant velocity after being nudged to start it moving.

The friction coefficient μ is defined as:

$$\mu = \frac{F_{friction}}{F_{normal}} = \frac{friction\;force}{M_{normal}\;*\;g}$$

where $F_{friction}$ is the tangential friction force, F_{normal} the normal force, M_{normal} the mass generating the normal force, and g gravitational acceleration. The friction force can be determined using a torque balance:

$$F_{friction}r_{shaft-hemi} = (m_{pulley}g)r_{drive}$$

where m_{pulley} is the mass suspended from the string wound around the pulley. The drive pulley radius r_{drive} and shaft-to-hemisphere radius $r_{shaft-hemi}$ are both 5.1 cm (2.0 in), so the equation reduces to:

$$F_{friction} = m_{pulley}g$$

The friction coefficient was therefore calculated using the following equation:

$$\mu = \frac{m_{pulley}}{M_{normal}}$$

First, a dry graphite trial was conducted in helium at 559°C. As Table 5-2 shows, the dry static friction coefficient is approximately 0.53 and the dynamic friction coefficient approximately 0.45. The 1.86-kg case required so much mass in the pulley system that the

apparatus began to tilt and the measurement had to be stopped—therefore reliable data could not be acquired for that high-normal-force trial, although it does show from a practical standpoint just how high the friction coefficient can be under dry conditions at high temperatures.

Normal Mass (kg)	$\mu_{ m d}$	μ_{s}
0.915	.457	.551
1.39	.449	.512
1.86	over-torque	over-torque

 Table 5-2
 Calculated friction coefficients for graphite without flinak

Under PBMR operating conditions, the friction coefficients are generally 0.5 to 1.0, but most often around .7-.75. The values obtained in this experiment are on the lower end of this range, but this is likely due to the fact that this temperature is less than the operating temperature of PBMRs. They are, however, consistent with those measured in previous experiments, as shown in Fig. 5-5





Graphite's friction coefficient generally increases with temperature, although at very high temperatures (well beyond those of PBMR's operating range) it starts to decrease again.

After completing the dry graphite friction measurement, flinak was added to the system, allowed to melt, and reach the desired temperature. Table 5-3 presents the results for the friction coefficients measured at the three different temperatures listed in Table 5-1. Figure 5-6 shows the results graphically. With the exception of the 0.915 kg normal mass trials and some dynamic measurements, the friction coefficients (both static and dynamic) did not undergo any significant change with the normal force. The greater coefficients in these cases were likely due to the discreteness of the weights added to the pulley system, an error which decreases as the normal mass increases. In analyzing the friction coefficient's error, it was determined that the error is inversely proportional to normal mass:

$$\sigma_{\mu} = \frac{\sigma_{m_{pulley}}}{M_{normal}}$$

Temperature (°C)	Normal Mass (kg)	μ_{d}	μ_{s}	σ_{μ}
492	0.915	.237	.273	$\pm .0328$
	1.39	.190	.256	±.0216
	1.86	.180	.253	±.0161
525	0.915	.224	.260	±.0328
	1.39	.189	.253	±.0216
	1.86	.182	.255	±.0161
559	0.915	.215	.251	$\pm .0328$
	1.39	.187	.251	±.0216
	1.86	.177	.250	±.0161

 Table 5-3 Calculated dynamic and static friction coefficients for trials with flinak.



Fig. 5-6 Friction coefficient vs. normal mass.

As shown in Fig. 5-7, friction coefficients remained relatively constant with increasing temperature, although some cases showed a very slight decrease. In theory, the friction factor (not to be confused with the friction coefficient) is directly proportional to kinematic viscosity—which is in turn inversely proportional to temperature—for laminar flow (which is assumed for lubrication); and as the friction factor increases, larger pressure differences are required to perform the same jobs (all else being equal). Thus, one would expect a stronger

decrease in friction coefficient with temperature. However, this experiment showed very little variation, as the PB-AHTR's operating temperature range is too narrow to produce noticeable changes in the system's viscous losses.



Friction Coeffi cient vs. Temperature

Fig. 5-7 Friction coefficient vs. temperature.

After recording the final measurement, the hemispheres were raised and the flinak was allowed to drip. Once cool, it was observed that small amounts of solid flinak remained frozen on the hemispheres' tips. The reason that the flinak adhered so well to the graphite was the fact that it was machined, and therefore had fine roughness on its surface. Flinak adheres to glassy carbon surfaces much less readily than to machined graphite. This observation points to the importance of developing processes to remove salt from the surfaces of pebbles after defueling from the PB-AHTR.



Fig 5-8 Graphite hemispheres after the experiment, showing flinak droplets adhering and frozen to the bottoms of the spheres.

This experiment demonstrated that graphite's friction coefficient can drop by over a factor of two in the presence of liquid fluoride salt at the PB-AHTR operating temperature. While the measurements were performed with flinak rather than flibe, the temperatures were adjusted to match the viscosities. These results suggest that the PB-AHTR will experience significantly less erosion damage and graphite dust generation compared to helium cooled pebble bed reactors. Additionally, these friction coefficients are relatively close to those measured for HDPE spheres sliding on acrylic, as are used in the PREX experiments. The results also have important implications regarding potential increases in operating temperature (pending material advances). Because the results did not show an increase in friction coefficient with temperature (some trials showed a slight decrease with temperature), raising the operating temperature would, from a purely frictional standpoint, not create any problems. Future experiments will be needed to measure friction coefficients for graphite pebbles lubricated by flibe, and to measure erosion and graphite dust generation rates for lubricated pebbles. But it can be concluded that liquid salt's lubricity gives the PB-AHTR yet another advantage over conventional helium-cooled pebble bed reactors.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

This project involved a multi-disciplinary effort to design and analyze a new radiallyzoned annular core design for the PB-AHTR. The Reactor Safety and Mechanical Design group collaborated with the Neutronics and Fuel Cycle group to assess design tradeoffs and reach an initial conceptual design.

The RSMD group used several tools (RELAP, COMSOL, and analytical solutions) to study the flow distribution and pressure loss in the reference annular core design. The group also constructed a scaled 15° sector of the annular core, and verified that radial pebble zoning can be achieved in an annular core. Finally, the group performed an experiment to measure the friction coefficient for graphite pebbles lubricated by fluoride salt, and confirmed that fluoride salts can be effective lubricants for high-temperature graphite.

Combined with the neutronic and depletion results obtained by the NFC group confirming the potential to reach conversion ratios greater than 1.0 with thorium, this work verifies the attractiveness of the annular PB-AHTR core design.

7.0 REFERENCES

- 1.1) D. Caron, A. Cheng, T. Dhanania, C. Eastridge, K. Evans, T. Fei, M. Foxe, D. Johnson, E. Keldrauk, Z. Kline, A. Mai, J. Mintz, D. Ogata, E. Park, K. Pham, B. Reinhart, J. Rodriguez, M. Solom, T. Visnjic, C. Wootton, C. Zhao, C. Xu, "A Modular Pebble-Bed Advanced High Temperature Reactor," NE-170 Senior Design Project, UC Berkeley Thermal Hydraulics Laboratory, Report UCBTH-08-001, May 16, 2008.
- 1.2) B. Frisbie, J. La Barba, F. Rangel, C. Schopke, V. Singh, and R. Stroberg, "Neutronic and Fuel Cycle Analysis for the Annular Pebble-Bed Advanced High Temperature Reactor," 2009 NE 170 Senior Design Project, U.C. Berkeley, Report UCBTH09-002, May 19, 2009.
- 1.3) Per F. Peterson, "Review of the Pebble-Bed Advanced High Temperature Reactor." Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, 2009.
- 3.1) *RELAP5-3D[©] Code Manual, Volume I: Code Structures, System Models, and Solution Methods,* INEEL-EXT-98-00834 (April 2005)
- 3.2) C. Galvez "Modeling and Simulation of the Laser Ignition Fission / Fusion Energy Systems (LIFE)." MS thesis University of California, Berkeley, 2006.
- 3.3) Morton M. Denn, <u>Process Fluid Mechanics</u>. Prentice Hall Ptr: Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 1980
- 5.1) A.P. Semenov, *Tribology at High Temperatures*. Tribology International, Elsevier Science Ltd.: Great Britian, Vol 28, 1995.
- 5.2) H. Zaidi, D. Paulmier, and J. Lepage. *The Influence of the Environment on the Friction and Wear of Graphitic Carbons*. Applied Surface Science: North Holland, 1989.
- 5.3) Luo Xiaowei, Yu Suyuan, Sheng Xuanyu, He Shuyan, *The Influence of Roughness on Tribological Properties on Nuclear Grade Graphite*. INET, Tsinghua University, Beijing: China, 2005.
- 5.4) X. Sheng, S. Yu, X. Luo, S. He, *Wear Behavior of Graphite Studies in an Air-Conditioned Environment*. Institute of Nuclear Energy Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing: China, 2003.
- 5.5) Dong Jianling, Yu Suyuan, *Concept of Pebble Bed Based HTGR with Fast Pebble Discharge System*. INET, Tsinghua University, Beijing: China, 2004.
- 5.5) D.F. Williams, L.M. Toth, K.T. Clarno, *Assessment of Candidate Molten Salt Coolants for the Advanced High Temperature Reactor*. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, ORNL/TM-2006/12, March 2006.
- 5.6) D.F. Williams, Assessment of Candidate Molten Salt Coolants for the NGNP/NHI Intermediate Loop. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, ORNL/TM-2006/69, June 2006.

Appendix A: RELAP5 Input Deck

= Pebble Bed 1/4 Main Core Region ***** *** Standard Input File Documentation *** * Description: Run PB core molten salt pipe flow * Created: 15 March 2009 * Updated: None *100 newath stdy-st * sscalc 100 newath transnt * trancalc: transient calculation * calc. mode: run (can do restart etc...) 101 run * units: SI 102 si si 105 1.0 2.0 500000.0 * Allocated CPU time 107 1 1 1 * Steady state options 110 air * NC gases 115 1.0 * Gravity Constant 119 1.0e-6 120 100010000 0 ms1 Primary * Definition of the first hydro system (ms1 = FliBe)201 500.0 1.0-6 0.5 007 10 10 10 * Time step control strategy ***** **Expanded Plot Variables ************* ***** ** 20800000 none 20800001 p 320101010 *press midcore lower entr rgn 20800002 p 320101050 *press midcore upper entr rgn 20800003 p 320901050 *press midcore lower exit rgn 20800004 p 320901090 *press midcore upper exit rgn 20800005 velfj 320101012 *velocity in r direction r=1 20800006 velfj 320101032 20800007 velfj 320101052 20800008 velfj 320101072 20800009 velfj 320101082 *z=8 needed when skipping rows 20800010 velfj 320101092 20800011 velfj 320101016 *velocity in z direction r=1 20800012 velfj 320101036 20800013 velfj 320101056 20800014 velfj 320101076 20800015 velfj 320101086 20800016 velfj 320301012 *velocity in r direction r=3 20800017 velfj 320301032 20800018 velfj 320301052 20800019 velfj 320301072 20800020 velfj 320301082 20800021 velfj 320301092 20800022 velfj 320301016 *velocity in z direction r=3 20800023 velfj 320301036 20800024 velfj 320301056 20800025 velfj 320301076 20800026 velfj 320301086 20800027 velfj 320501012 *velocity in r direction r=5 20800028 velfj 320501032 20800029 velfj 320501052 20800030 velfj 320501072 20800031 velfj 320501082 20800032 velfj 320501092 20800033 velfj 320501016 *velocity in z direction r=5 20800034 velfj 320501036 20800035 velfj 320501056 20800036 velfj 320501076 20800037 velfj 320501086 20800038 velfj 320701012 *velocity in r direction r=7 20800039 velfj 320701032 20800040 velfj 320701052 20800041 velfj 320701072

20800042 velfj 320701082 20800043 velfj 320701092 20800044 velfj 320701016 *velocity in z direction r=7 20800045 velfj 320701036 20800046 velfj 320701056 20800047 velfj 320701076 20800048 velfj 320701086 20800049 velfj 320801012 *velocity in r direction r=8 20800050 velfj 320801032 20800051 velfj 320801052 20800052 velfi 320801072 20800053 velfj 320801082 20800054 velfj 320801016 *velocity in z direction r=8 20800055 velfj 320801036 *needed to fill gap when skipping 20800056 velfj 320801056 *columns 20800057 velfj 320801076 20800058 velfj 320801086 20800059 velfj 320901016 *velocity in z direction r=1 20800060 velfj 320901036 20800061 velfj 320901056 20800062 velfj 320901076 20800063 velfi 320901086 ***** * hydrodynamics ***** **sources ***** ** 1000000 source tmdpvol 1000101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1000200 003 1000201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1000202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1000203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1000204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1010000 source tmdpvol 1010101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1010200 003 1010201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1010202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1010203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1010204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1020000 source tmdpvol $1020101 \quad 0.2356 \ 500.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0$ 1020200 003 1020201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1020202 10.0 600 0e3 873 0 1020203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1020204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1030000 source tmdpvol 1030101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1030200 003 1030201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1030202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1030203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1030204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1040000 source tmdpvol 1040101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1040200 003 1040201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0

1040202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1040203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1040204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1050000 source tmdpvol 1050101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1050200 003 1050201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1050202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1050203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1050204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1060000 source tmdpvol 1060101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1060200 003 1060201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1060202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1060203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1060204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1070000 source tmdpvol 1070101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1070200 003 1070201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1070202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1070203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1070204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1080000 source tmdpvol $1080101 \quad 0.2356 \ 500.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0$ 1080200 003 1080201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1080202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1080203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1080204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1090000 source tmdpvol 1090101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1090200 003 1090201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1090202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1090203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1090204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1100000 source tmdpvol 1100101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1100200 003 1100201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1100202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1100203 30.0.600.0e3.873.0 1100204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1110000 source tmdpvol 1110101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1110200 003 1110201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1110202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1110203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1110204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1120000 source tmdpvol 1120101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1120200 003 1120201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1120202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1120203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1120204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1130000 source tmdpvol 1130101 0.2356 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1130200 003 1130201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1130202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1130203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1130204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0

1140000 source tmdpvol 1140101 0.1287 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1140200 003 1140201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1140202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1140203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1140204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1150000 source tmdpvol 1150101 0.1505 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1150200 003 1150201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1150202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1150203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1150204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1160000 source tmdpvol 1160101 0.1724 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1160200 003 1160201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1160202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1160203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1160204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 1170000 source tmdpvol 1170101 0.1942 500.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1170200 003 1170201 0.0 600.0e3 873.0 1170202 10.0 600.0e3 873.0 1170203 30.0 600.0e3 873.0 1170204 100.0 600.0e3 873.0 ****** **sinks ****** ** 1200000 sink snglvol 1200101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1200200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1210000 sink snglvol 1210101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1210200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1220000 sink snglvol 1220101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1220200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1230000 sink snglvol 1230101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1230200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1240000 sink snglvol 1240101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1240200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1250000 sink snglvol 1250101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1250200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1260000 sink snglvol 1260101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1260200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1270000 sink snglvol 1270101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1270200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1280000 sink snglvol 1280101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1280200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1290000 sink snglvol

1290101 0.0 5.0 5.0e6 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 1290200 003 0101.33e3 873.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 ***** * connections ****** ***** **inlets ***** 2000000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2000101 100010000 310101011 0.2356 2000200 1 2000201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2000202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2010000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2010101 101010000 310101021 0.2356 2010200 1 2010201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2010202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2020000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2020101 102010000 310101031 0.2356 2020200 1 2020201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2020202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2030000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2030101 103010000 310101041 0.2356 2030200 1 2030201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2030202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2040000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2040101 104010000 310101051 0.2356 2040200 1 2040201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2040202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2050000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2050101 105010000 310101061 0.2356 2050200 1 2050201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2050202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2060000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2060101 106010000 310101071 0.2356 2060200 1 2060201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2060202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2070000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2070101 107010000 310101081 0.2356 2070200 1 2070201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2070202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2080000 tdinct tmdpiun 2080101 108010000 310101091 0.2356 2080200 1 2080201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2080202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2090000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2090101 109010000 320101011 0.2356 2090200 1 2090201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 $2090202 \quad 0010.00 \; 028.1644 \; 0.0 \; 0 \\$ 2100000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2100101 110010000 320101021 0.2356

2100200 1 2100201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2100202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2110000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2110101 111010000 320101031 0.2356 2110200 1 2110201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2110202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2120000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2120101 112010000 320101041 0.2356 2120200 1 2120201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2120202 0010.00 028.1644 0.0 0 2130000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2130101 113010000 320101051 0.2356 2130200 1 2130201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 $2130202 \ \ 0010.00 \ 028.1644 \ 0.0 \ 0$ 2140000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2140101 114010000 310101015 0.1287 2140200 1 2140201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2140202 0010.00 015.3874 0.0 0 2150000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2150101 115010000 310201015 0.1505 2150200 1 2150201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2150202 0010.00 017.9954 0.0 0 2160000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2160101 116010000 310301015 0.1724 2160200 1 2160201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2160202 0010.00 020.6035 0.0 0 2170000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2170101 117010000 310401015 0.1942 2170200 1 2170201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2170202 0010.00 023.2115 0.0 0 ***** **outlets **** 2200000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2200101 320901052 120000000 0.6283 2200200 1 2200201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2200202 0010.00 079.6192 0.0 0 2210000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2210101 320901062 121000000 0.6283 2210200 1 2210201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2210202 0010.00 079.6192 0.0 0 2220000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2220101 320901072 122000000 0.6283 2220200 1 2220201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2220202 0010.00 079.6192 0.0 0 2230000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2230101 320901082 123000000 0.6283 2230200 1 2230201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2230202 0010.00 079.6192 0.0 0 2240000 tdjnct tmdpjun

2240101 320901092 124000000 0.6283 2240200 1 2240201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2240202 0010.00 079.6182 0.0 0 2250000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2250101 330101096 125000000 0.1287 2250200 1 2250201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2250202 0010.00 016.3114 0.0 0 2260000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2260101 330201096 126000000 0.1505 2260200 1 2260201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2260202 0010.00 019.0760 0.0 0 2270000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2270101 330501023 127000000 0.05 2270200 1 2270201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2270202 0010.00 06.3361 0.0 0 2280000 tdinct tmdpiun 2280101 330501024 127000000 0.05 2280200 1 2280201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2280202 0010.00 06.3361 0.0 0 2290000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2290101 330701013 128000000 0.05 2290200 1 2290201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2290202 0010.00 06.3361 0.0 0 2300000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2300101 330701014 128000000 0.05 2300200 1 2300201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2300202 0010.00 06.3361 0.0 0 2310000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2310101 330301033 129000000 0.05 2310200 1 2310201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2310202 0010.00 06.3361 0.0 0 2320000 tdjnct tmdpjun 2320101 330301034 129000000 0.05 2320200 1 2320201 0.0 00.00 0.0 0 2320202 0010.00 06.3361 0.0 0 ******* * 3100000 insert multid *nr natheta naz massflow cylcoord(-1=<2pi) inrad 3100001 9 1 9 1 -1 0.9 *mesh intervals for r,theta,z 3100101 0 1667 1 3100102 0.1667 2 3100103 0.1667 3 3100104 0.1667 4 3100105 0.1667 5 3100106 0.1667 6 3100107 0.1667 7 3100108 0.1667 8 3100109 0.1667 9 3100201 45.0 1 3100301 0.3206 1 3100302 0.3206 2

3100303 0.3206 3

3100304 0.3206 4 3100305 0.3206 5 3100306 0.3206 6 3100307 0.3206 7 3100308 0.3206 8 3100309 0.3206 9 *volume fraction 40% packing fraction 3101001 1911190.40000000000 *Volume friction data 3102001 1911190.0010.030.0010.030.0010.03 *Junction Area Factors r1 r2 thet1 thet2 z1 z2 Face AreaFctr Af Ar jefvcahs $3103011 \hspace{.1in} 1 \hspace{.1in} 8 \hspace{.1in} 1 \hspace{.1in} 1 \hspace{.1in} 9 \hspace{.1in} 2 \hspace{.1in} 1.0 \hspace{.1in} 600.0 \hspace{.1in} 600.0 \hspace{.1in} 00000000$ 3103012 19111861.0600.0600.00000000 3103031 481115 20.0 000 3103032 58116620.000 3103033 681177 20.0 000 3103034 781188 20.0 000 3103035 591115 60.0 000 3103036 691166 60.0 000 3103037 791177 60.0 000 3103038 891188 60.0 000 ***** *Initial conditions 3106001 191119003600.0e3873.0 3107001 18111920.00.0 3107003 19111860.00.0 *Junctions connecting insertion section to mid core 4000000 inscre mtpljun 4000001 91 *frmmsh, tomsh, area, AF, AR, jcf, sdc, 2phdc, shdc, fr incr, to incr, 0, lmt 4000011 310101096 320101015 0.1287 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 1 4000021 310201096 320201015 0.1505 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 2 4000031 310301096 320301015 0 1723 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 4000041 310401096 320401015 0.1942 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 4 4000051 310501096 320501015 0.2160 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 5 4000061 310601096 320601015 0.2378 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 6 4000071 310701096 320701015 0.2596 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 7 4000081 310801096 320801015 0.2814 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 8 $4000091 \hspace{.1in} 310901096 \hspace{.1in} 320901015 \hspace{.05in} 0.3033 \hspace{.05in} 0.0 \hspace{.05in} 0 \hspace{.05in} 0 \hspace{.05in} 1.0 \hspace{.05in} 1.0 \hspace{.05in} 0 \hspace{.05in} 0 \hspace{.05in} 9$ 4001011 0.0 0.0 9 3200000 core multid *nr natheta naz massflow cylcoord(-1=<2pi) inrad 3200001 9 1 9 1 -1 0.9 *mesh intervals for r.theta.z 3200101 0.1667 1 3200102 0.1667 2 3200103 0.1667 3 3200104 0.1667 4 3200105 0.1667 5 3200106 0.1667 6 3200107 0.1667 7 3200108 0.1667 8 3200109 0.1667 9 3200201 45.01 3200301 0.3333 1 3200302 0.3333 2 3200303 0 3333 3 3200304 0.33334 3200305 0.3333 5 3200306 0.3333 6 3200307 0.33337 3200308 0.3333 8 3200309 0.3333 9 *volume fraction 40% packing fraction 3201001 1911190.400000000000 *Volume friction data 3202001 1911190.0010.030.0010.030.0010.03 *Junction Area Factors r1 r2 thet1 thet2 z1 z2 Face AreaFctr Af Ar jefvcahs

3203011 18111921.0600.0600.000000000.0 3203012 19111861.0600.0600.000000000000 ***** *Initial conditions 3206001 191119003600.0e3873.0 3207001 18111920.00.0 3207003 19111860.00.0 *Junctions connecting mid core to defuel 4100000 defcre mtpljun 4100001 91 *frmmsh, tomsh, area, AF, AR, jcf, sdc, 2phdc, shdc, fr incr, to incr, 0, Imt 4100011 320101096 330101015 0.1287 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 1 4100021 320201096 330201015 0.1505 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 2 4100031 320301096 330301015 0.1723 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 3 4100041 320401096 330401015 0.1942 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 4 $4100051 \hspace{.1in} 320501096 \hspace{.1in} 330501015 \hspace{.1in} 0.2160 \hspace{.1in} 0.0 \hspace{.1in} 0.0 \hspace{.1in} 1.0 \hspace{.1in} 1.0 \hspace{.1in} 0 \hspace{.1in} 0 \hspace{.1in} 0 \hspace{.1in} 5$ 4100061 320601096 330601015 0.2378 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 6 4100071 320701096 330701015 0.2596 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 7 4100081 320801096 330801015 0.2814 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 8 4100091 320901096 330901015 0.3033 0.0 0.0 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0 0 0 9 4101011 0.0 0.0 9 3300000 defuel multid *nr natheta naz massflow cylcoord(-1=<2pi) inrad 3300001 9 1 9 1 -1 0.9 *mesh intervals for r,theta,z 3300101 0.1667 1 3300102 0.1667 2 3300103 0.1667 3 3300104 0.1667 4 3300105 0.1667 5

3300106 0.1667 6 3300107 0.1667 7 3300108 0.1667 8 3300109 0.1667 9 3300201 45.0 1 3300301 0.30 1 3300302 0.30 2 3300303 0.30 3 3300304 0.304 3300305 0.30 5 3300306 0.306 3300307 0.307 3300308 0.308 3300309 0.30 9 *volume fraction 40% packing fraction 3301001 1911190.400000000000 *Volume friction data 3302001 1911190.0010.030.0010.030.0010.03 *Junction Area Factors r1 r2 thet1 thet2 z1 z2 Face AreaFctr Af Ar jefvcahs 3303011 18111921.0600.0600.00000000 3303012 19111861.0600.0600.00000000 $3303031 \hspace{.1in} 2 \hspace{.1in} 8 \hspace{.1in} 1 \hspace{.1in} 5 \hspace{.1in} 9 \hspace{.1in} 2 \hspace{.1in} 0.0 \hspace{.1in} 0 \hspace{.1$ 3303032 381144 20.0000 3303033 481133 20.0000 3303034 681122 20.0000 $3303035 \ \ 3\ 3\ 1\ 1\ 4\ 8\ 6\ 0.0\ 0\ 0\ 0$ 3303036 441138 60.0000 3303037 561128 60.0000 3303038 791118 60.0000 ***** *Initial conditions 3306001 191119003600.0e3873.0 3307001 18111920.00.0 3307003 19111860.00.0

Appendix B: PREX-2 Experiment Operating Procedure

The insertion point on PREX-2 has been marked at different points that determine our loading procedure.



Figure B-1: Pebble Insertion Zone

Starting from the top, the first two lines are used to create a divider layer. The second line, the "FILL TO POINT" line is the line we generally try to stay above when defueling. The third line from the top indicates the end of the dividers. There needs to be pebbles above this line at all times, or else the free surface will allow initial pebble mixing causing experimental errors. The next line down is our "TAKE PHOTO" line. When the bottom of the divider layer hits this line, we take a picture, but we have moved to taking a picture after every defueling. The last line, "ADD DIVIDER LAYER, TAKE PHOTO" is when, as stated, a new divider layer is filled in at the top. As is seen in the above photo, the pebbles move at different rates in the insertion point; the larger layers on the left flow fast than the layers on the right. Therefore, when the bottom of the divider layer reaches the last line, we level the

insertion pebbles to the best of our ability, bring the level down to the "FILL TO POINT" line, and add the divider layer of pebbles.

Layer	LG	Y	W	Y	DG	LG
1	193	250	300	300	300	300
2	0	200	250	450	508	490
3	150	250	250	300	400	450
4	100	300	400	400	400	450
5	100	250	300	400	400	450
6	0	83	0	84	150	118
Total	543	1333	1500	1934	2158	2258
Divider	DG	LG	LG	LG	LG	DG
Layer						
	100	175	225	265	283	239

A spreadsheet showing one complete layer fill is shown in Table B-1.

 Table B-1: One complete pebble layer

Each row shows the number of pebbles that will occupy the insertion region. The number of rows in the regular region dictate how many times defueling occurs before the divider layer is introduced.

The distances to each line in the insertion region are given in Table B-2.

Distance from top of insertion (cm) ± 0.32cm			
To "DIVIDER LAYER" line	6.83		
To "FILL TO POINT" line	13.65		
To end of divider plates	18.73		
To "TAKE PHOTO" line	28.73		
To "ADD DIVIDER LAYER, TAKE PHOTO" line	43.81		

Table B-2: Insertion Dimensions