

August 31, 2012

MEMORANDUM TO: Christopher P. Jackson, Chief
Reactor Systems Branch
Division of Systems Safety

FROM: Tai L. Huang, Reactor Engineer **/RA/**
Reactor Systems Branch
Division of Systems Safety

SUBJECT: PRESENTATION OF A PAPER AT THE 9th INTERNATIONAL
TOPICAL MEETING ON NUCLEAR THERMAL-HYDRAULICS,
OPERATION AND SAFETY (NUTHOS-9), KAOHSIUNG,
TAIWAN, SEPTEMBER 9-13, 2012

Enclosed is a paper "LAPUR6 Benchmark of Stability Data Measured in The Delft University of Technology's Genesis Loop," which I am going to present at the 9th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Thermal-Hydraulics, Operation and Safety (NUTHOS-9). The details of the paper are described in NUREG/CR-7047 which is publicly available.

Enclosure:
As Stated

August 31, 2012

MEMORANDUM TO: Christopher P. Jackson, Chief
Reactor Systems Branch
Division of Systems Safety

FROM: Tai L. Huang, Reactor Engineer */RA/*
Reactor Systems Branch
Division of Systems Safety

SUBJECT: PRESENTATION OF A PAPER AT THE 9th INTERNATIONAL
TOPICAL MEETING ON NUCLEAR THERMAL-HYDRAULICS,
OPERATION AND SAFETY (NUTHOS-9), KAOHSIUNG,
TAIWAN, SEPTEMBER 9-13, 2012

Enclosed is a paper "LAPUR6 Benchmark of Stability Data Measured in The Delft University of Technology's Genesis Loop," which I am going to present at the 9th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Thermal-Hydraulics, Operation and Safety (NUTHOS-9). The details of the paper are described in NUREG/CR-7047 which is publicly available.

Enclosure:
As Stated

DISTRIBUTION:

SRXB R/F JDavis, NRR WRuland, NRR CJackson, NRR
THuang, NRR

ADAMS Accession No. ML12243A292

OFFICE	NRR/DSS/SRXB
NAME	THuang
DATE	08/31/2012

LAPUR6 Benchmark Of Stability Data Measured In The Delft University Of Technology's Genesis Loop

Martin Rohde

Delft University of Technology; Mekelweg 15, Delft, The Netherlands

M.Rohde@tudelft.nl

José March-Leuba

Oak Ridge National Laboratory; P.O. Box 2008, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6010, USA

MarchLeubaJA@ornl.gov

Tai L. Huang

U.S. NRC; OWFN-10B3, Washington, DC 20555-0001, USA

Tai.Huang@nrc.gov

ABSTRACT

This paper contains an evaluation of the LAPUR6 code against stability data measured in the GENESIS facility in Delft University of Technology, Netherlands. The LAPUR code has been validated in the past against a reasonable array of BWR test data. The GENESIS facility is located in the Reactor Institute of Delft University of Technology, Netherlands. It is a boiling, natural circulation facility where flows, void fraction, and density wave instabilities can be studied over a wide range of conditions. The facility was initially constructed to simulate the conditions of the ESBWR design and was scaled so that, using Freon 134a at low power, the results could be extrapolated to water at full ESBWR power and pressure. The GENESIS facility may be run on purely thermal-hydraulic mode, by keeping the thermal power constant, or with a simulated reactor neutronic feedback. For the later purpose, the core pressure drop is measured and the core-average void fraction is estimated based on a one-channel model. The reactivity feedback and the fuel response are modeled on a control computer, and the thermal power is modulated according to the predicted reactor response. All data used for this benchmark includes the simulated reactivity feedback.

Twenty seven GENESIS measurements at different operating conditions were simulated by LAPUR6. All geometry and measurements were scaled to water properties for use in LAPUR6. Ninety two axial nodes were used to model GENEIS (17 for the core and 75 for the chimney). The results of these benchmark calculations show that LAPUR6 predicts an oscillation frequency of ~0.7 Hz, which agrees with the measured frequency, and indicates that the chimney has little or no effect on the dynamic oscillations. The DRs calculated by LAPUR6 are in agreement with those measured in GENESIS.

KEYWORDS

BWR Stability, Stability Benchmark, Stability, LAPUR, GENESIS

Enclosure

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper contains an evaluation of the LAPUR 6.0 code (Escriva 2007) against stability data measured in the GENESIS facility [3, 4] in Delft University of Technology, Netherlands.

LAPUR, a computer program in FORTRAN, is a mathematical description of the core of a boiling water reactor (BWR). Its two linked modules, LAPURX and LAPURW, respectively solve the steady-state governing equations for the coolant and fuel and the dynamic equations for the coolant, fuel, and neutron field in the frequency domain. The result of these calculations is a closed-loop transfer function that relates power oscillations to external perturbations in core reactivity. The stability parameters of merit, decay ratio (DR) and frequency of oscillation are estimated from the calculated transfer function.

The LAPUR code has been validated in the past against a reasonable array of BWR test data as documented by March-Leuba [1] and Escrive [2]. These old validation data include:

1. Peach Bottom tests.
2. Vermont Yankee stability tests.
3. Dresden local stability test.
4. Browns Ferry single-loop stability test.
5. Susquehanna-2 stability tests.
6. Grand Gulf-1 stability tests.
7. Cofrentes stability tests.

2. LAPUR6 DESCRIPTION

This section presents the computer program LAPUR, a version coded in the FORTRAN language of the mathematical description of a BWR. This program consists of two autonomous modules, LAPURX and LAPURW, which are linked by means of an intermediate storing device.

The first module, LAPURX, solves the coolant and the fuel steady-state governing. Maps of core steady-state parameters are generated by LAPURX and stored into two data files for subsequent use by the dynamics module LAPURW. The second module, LAPURW, solves the dynamic equations for the coolant, fuel, and neutron field in the frequency domain.

Steady-state calculation (LAPURX) generates a map of the thermo hydraulic parameters in the core, including: (1) Channel flow rate, pressure drops, and exit quality (or power) for each channel, (2) Nodal coolant density, void fraction, enthalpy, quality, velocities, and friction components at each node along each channel, and (3) Set of coefficients for the dynamics calculation. The dynamic calculation (LAPURW) determines the response of the fuel, channel flows, and nuclear core. From this response, Nyquist and magnitude phase plots for all open-loop TFs are generated; along Bode plots for closed-loop TFs. The reactor decay ratio is estimated from these TFs.

3. GENESIS FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The GENESIS facility (Marcel 2008, Rohde 2010) is located in the Reactor Institute of Delft University of Technology, Netherlands. It is a boiling, natural circulation facility where flows, void fraction, and density wave instabilities can be studied over a wide range of conditions. The facility was initially constructed to simulate the conditions of the ESBWR design and was scaled so that using Freon 134a at low power the results could be extrapolated to water at full ESBWR power and pressure. The operating pressure of GENESIS is 11.4 bar (Rohde 2010), compared to ~70 bar for a typical BWR. The power required is approximately 50 times smaller due to the boiling characteristics of Freon 134a [4]. Marcel [3] describes the GENESIS scaling laws in detail.

Figure 1 shows a schematic of the facility. A heated area with 25 heated rods is followed by a long adiabatic chimney. A heat exchanger at the top of the facility condenses the steam and returns feedwater flow through the downcomer. Two valves can be adjusted manually to simulate the inlet and steam separator pressure drops. To evaluate the K value of the valves, single phase flow is established with the pump and the pressure drop and flow are measured. For all other measurements, the flow is established by natural circulation as voids are formed in the heated section. Relevant instrumentation includes: (1) inlet temperature, (2) exit void fraction, (3) thermal power, and (4) pressure drops across the valves.

The GENESIS facility may be run on purely thermal-hydraulic mode, by keeping the thermal power constant, or with a simulated reactor neutronic feedback. For the later purpose, the core pressure drop is measured and the core-average void fraction is estimated based on a one-channel model [3]. The reactivity feedback and the fuel response are modeled on a control computer. The thermal power is modulated according to the reactor response predicted by the simulated point kinetics reactivity feedback. The GENESIS heated rods have a very fast time constant (< 0.5 sec), and the time constant of the reactor fuel must be simulated in the control computer. Typically, the fuel time constant is simulated in the GENESIS control computer as ~5 seconds.




Figure 1. Schematic of the GENESIS facility

A series of experiments have been conducted in the GENESIS facility to determine: (1) the natural circulation flow, and (2) the stability of the facility for a combination of operating conditions. Both the stability of the purely thermal-hydraulic system and the reactivity-feedback system were studied. The primary finding is that when the reactivity feedback is enabled, the frequency of the resulting oscillation changes significantly as the mode of oscillation changes from a loop- (manometer-) type to a density wave in the core. The complete results of these experiments are shown by Marcel [3] and Rohde [4].

4. LAPUR6 MODEL

The LAPUR code only describes in detail the core region. The recirculation loop, including the downcomer and recirculation pumps are only modeled by an integral momentum approach, which provides dynamic core flow feedback given changes in core pressure drop. However, it does not model variations in temperature and density of the downcomer necessary to model the U-tube or loop oscillations that were observed in GENESIS when the neutronic feedback is turned off. When the neutronic feedback is turned on in the GENESIS facility, the dominating dynamics occur on the core, and LAPUR6 is design to model that dynamic behavior.

The LAPUR6 model for GENESIS includes a single radial channel with 92 axial nodes (17 for the core and 75 for the chimney). The variable flow area feature of LAPUR6 was used to specify the areas of the core and chimney respectively. Six spacers were explicitly modeled as local losses. The inlet and outlet valves in the GENESIS facility were modeled in LAPUR6 as the channel-inlet and channel-outlet local losses. Note that the LAPUR6 channel for these simulations covers both the core and chimney regions. The core region is 3 m and the chimney is 12.81 m. These dimensions are scaled values for water. The real dimensions of the GENESIS facility are 47% smaller. All dimensions, pressures, powers and flows were scaled to the water equivalent. Table 2 shows the scaling rules that were developed by Marcel [3].

Table 1. Scaling Rules

Variable	Scaling Factor
Length	0.4700
Power	0.0230
Mass flux	1.0070
Time	0.6800
Pressure	0.1600
Flow area	0.2209
Mass flow	0.2224

As seen in Table 2, the operating conditions for these tests ranged from 580 to 1400 kW and from 251 to 276 C inlet temperatures (scaled to water conditions). The inlet and outlet valves were set at a constant value and not changed for the duration of the tests.

The GENESIS facility is designed to operate in purely thermo-hydraulic mode (i.e., constant power) or with simulated reactivity feedback. The reactivity feedback is simulated by estimating the core-average void fraction from the measured core pressure drop using a TH model. The point kinetics approximation is used to simulate the power feedback in a reactor core. The

GENESIS heaters are thin rods with a very fast thermal time constant. In reactors, the fuel has a slow time response, of the order of 5 seconds. The GENESIS facility simulates the fuel thermal conductivity in the computer side by filtering the power feedback before it is applied to the rods. For this purpose, a 5-second first order filter is used. For these LAPUR6 benchmark cases, UO₂ fuel rods were used. The radius of the fuel rod was adjusted by trial and error for each case until the calculated fuel time constant was 5 seconds. In particular, the fuel rod radius was adjusted by trial and error until transfer function CBQ calculated by LAPUR (see Escriva, 2007) has -45 degrees phase at 0.2 Hz, equivalent to a first order 5-second delay.

Table 2. Analyzed Conditions

Point	P (kW)	T _{inlet} (°C)	Point	P (kW)	T _{inlet} (°C)
0602060959	1053	257.8	0602141115	1400	265.3
0602071330	1040	262.9	0602141621	827	252.5
0602071434	1324	261.4	0602171331	770	262.6
0602071501	1378	261.5	0602171451	785	270.4
0602071535	1201	262.8	0602171526	708	270.5
0602081159	894	262.6	0602201437	636	253.1
0602081340	921	266.1	0602201513	580	275.6
0602081421	988	253.7	0602211422	1072	265.9
0602081548	1321	252.0	0602221156	1010	265.6
0602081615	1388	251.6	0602221344	958	266.2
0602091140	1192	254.3	0602221502	879	267.2
0602101357	1251	266.4	0602221620	1138	267.4
0602101413	1177	267.0	0603011234	1048	268.0
0602131122	1235	264.6			

5. LAPUR6 RESULTS

A number of operating conditions in the GENESIS facility have been analyzed with LAPUR6. All variables have been scaled to water-equivalent conditions.

5.1. Steady State Void Fraction Benchmark

Error! Reference source not found. shows the calculated void fractions for three conditions at different power levels. We can observe that the void fraction calculated by LAPUR increases in the core, but it remains constant in the adiabatic chimney. **Error! Reference source not found.** and **Error! Reference source not found.** show a comparison between the core exit quality and void predicted by LAPUR6 and the one measured in the GENESIS facility for the steady state measurements of Table 2. Excellent agreement is observed. This is an excellent validation of the LAPUR6 void correlations against a large number of experimental conditions covering exit qualities from 3% to 25%.




Figure 2. Void fraction vs power level




Figure 3. Predicted vs measured core exit quality




Figure 4. Predicted vs measured core void fraction

5.2. Steady State Pressure Drop Benchmark

Figure 5 shows the pressure drop calculated by LAPUR6 for all tests. This pressure drop encompasses both the core and chimney regions. Since the GENESIS facility is operated at natural circulation, the calculated pressure drop should be the same for all conditions because this pressure drop must equal the weight of the downcomer.

We observe that LAPUR6 computes essentially the same pressure drop for all tests within a precision of $\pm 1.5\%$. The only exception is a test point (0602201437) where the exit void fraction is very low ($\sim 30\%$) and the dP error is of the order of 8%. All other conditions have void fractions more representative of reactor operating conditions.





Figure 5. Calculated pressure drop as function of chimney void fraction

A review of the LAPUR6 calculations indicates that, the inlet and outlet friction from the adjustable valves is a small fraction of the total pressure drop. Friction and density head are the two dominant components. We conclude that LAPUR6 benchmarks the GENESIS pressure drops accurately.


5.3. Decay Ratio Benchmark

LAPUR6 calculates transfer functions (TF) in the frequency domain for all the components of the dynamic response of the reactor. In particular, LAPUR6 computes the open-loop TF, which contains all the reactor dynamics minus the reactivity feedback. This open-loop TF represents the TH conditions in GENESIS when the reactivity feedback is turned off. The LAPUR6 closed-loop TF joins together the open-loop TH TF with the point kinetics reactivity feedback to estimate the reactivity-to-power TF, which represents the GENESIS dynamics when the reactivity feedback is turned on.

Figure 6 shows the open-loop TH TF calculated by LAPUR for case 0602141115. We can see a small resonance (representative of an oscillation frequency) at ~ 0.2 Hz, which represents the loop time constant including the chimney. A smaller resonance can be observed at ~ 0.6 Hz, which represents the average time voids reside in the core. When the reactivity feedback is turned on, we obtain the closed loop TF of Figure 7. We see that when the reactivity feedback is active, the 0.2 Hz resonance disappears and only one main frequency at ~ 0.8 Hz is visible.



**Figure 6. Thermal-Hydraulic (no feedback)
Transfer function for case 0602141115**



**Figure 7. Closed loop (with feedback) transfer
function for case 0602141115**

The above results are consistent with the observed behavior in the GENESIS facility when the feedback is enabled (Marcel 2008, Rohde 2010). Experimentally, the GENESIS facility exhibits a low frequency oscillation (0.1 to 0.2 Hz, depending on conditions) when the power is kept constant (purely TH conditions). This frequency is associated experimentally with the loop time constant, including the chimney. When the reactivity feedback is enabled and the power is allowed to oscillate as function of the measured void fraction, the low frequency component disappears and only a high frequency component (0.6 to 1 Hz, depending on operating conditions) is observed. This high frequency is associated experimentally with the residence time in the channel.

To further investigate this phenomenon, LAPUR6 simulations were conducted where the TH stability of the loop was reduced artificially by increasing the outlet friction coefficient (K_{out}). Figure 8 shows the open-loop TH TF as function of K_{out} . We observe that as K_{out} is increased, the ~ 0.2 Hz peak increases significantly, and by the time K_{out} is ~ 10 , the TF is essentially unstable for these conditions (test 0602141115). The channel peak at ~ 0.6 Hz also increases in amplitude when K_{out} is increased, but the ~ 0.2 Hz is always dominant when the reactivity feedback is not enabled. When the reactivity feedback is enabled, LAPUR6 obtains the results shown in Figure 9. We observe that when the TH conditions are de-stabilized by increasing K_{out} , the ~ 0.8 Hz peak is more dominant. For conditions that are almost unstable without feedback, a second peak starts forming in the closed loop transfer function at ~ 1 Hz, but the ~ 0.8 Hz peak is dominant.




Figure 8. TH open loop transfer function as function of outlet friction




Figure 9. Closed loop transfer function as function of outlet friction




Figure 10. Closed loop transfer function as function of reactivity feedback coefficient

To further study the effect of the reactivity feedback, Figure 10 shows a series of LAPUR6 simulations where the reactivity feedback coefficient value was increased from nominal to 500% of nominal. We observe that as the reactivity feedback magnitude is reduced, the ~0.8 Hz peak becomes less and less dominant.

All the above LAPUR6 results are consistent with the published GENESIS experimental findings, which show an oscillation frequency of 0.1 to 0.2 Hz without feedback and oscillations of 0.6 to 1 Hz with feedback. These findings support the conclusion that the chimney dynamics play a minor role in density wave instabilities in a nuclear reactor.




Figure 11. Comparison between measured and calculated decay ratios




Figure 12. Comparison between measured and calculated frequencies of oscillation

A different set of experimental values was analyzed to evaluate the decay ratio and oscillation frequency. These experimental points are those documented by Rohde [4].

Figure 11 shows a comparison between the measured and calculated decay ratios. Overall we observe good agreement, but a larger bias is observed at larger subcooling values (lower temperatures). Figure 12 shows a comparison between the LAPUR6 and measured frequencies. For these GENESIS runs, LAPUR6 predicts two frequencies of oscillations (see for example the green line in **Error! Reference source not found.**) and the automated algorithm to find the peak oscillation frequency “jumps” from one to the other. For this reason, the frequency benchmark for the GENESIS runs shows a large scatter about the measured frequency. For real reactors, only one frequency is present and the LAPUR6 frequency finding algorithm has shown significant consistency on frequency estimation.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The LAPUR6 code has been benchmarked against experimental data from the GENESIS natural circulation facility. The GENESIS experimental data was collected using Freon R134a as a coolant, and scaled to water-equivalent conditions using the methodology described by Marcel [3] and Rohde [4]. The following are the major conclusions from this benchmarking exercise:

1. The steady state void fractions and qualities calculated by LAPUR6 compare favorably with those measured at the GENESIS facility. This benchmark validates the LAPUR6 void models.
2. The pressure drops calculated by LAPUR6 compare favorably with those measured at the GENESIS facility. This benchmark validates the capability of LAPUR6 to calculate natural circulation conditions.

3. LAPUR6 predicts that the oscillation frequencies in GENESIS should be of the order of 0.1 to 0.2 Hz when the reactivity feedback is not enabled. The actual frequency depends on the operating conditions. This is the range of oscillation frequencies observed in the GENESIS facility.
4. LAPUR6 predicts that, when the reactivity feedback is enabled, the oscillation frequency increases to the 0.6 to 1.0 Hz range and that the 0.1 to 0.2 Hz thermal-hydraulic oscillation is not present. The change in frequency was observed experimentally in the GENESIS facility.
5. The decay ratios calculated by LAPUR6 compare favorably against the measured data in the GENESIS facility.

Notice: This manuscript has been authored by UT-Battelle, LLC, under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes.

REFERENCES

1. J. A. March-Leuba, P. J. Otaduy, "A Comparison of BWR Stability Measurements with Calculations Using the Code LAPUR-IV," NUREG/CR2998, ORNL/TM 8546 (1983).
2. A. Escrivá, José Luis Muñoz Cobo, José Melara San Roman, Manuel Albendea Darriba, José March-Leuba, "LAPUR 6.0 User's Manual," NUREG/CR-6958, ORNL/TM 2007/233 (2007).
3. C. P. Marcel, M. Rohde, and T. H. J. J. Van Der Hagen, "Experimental Investigations On The ESBWR Stability Performance," Nucl Tech, **164**, pp. 232-244 (2008).
4. M. Rohde, C.P. Marcel, A. Manerab, T.H.J.J. Van der Hagen, B. Shiralkar, "Investigating the ESBWR stability with experimental and numerical tools: A comparative study," Nucl Eng and Design, **240**, pp. 375–384 (2010).