National Organization of Test, Research, and Training Reactors



# Thermal Hydraulic Analysis Update

2015 TRTR Conference

Patrick G. Boyle Nuclear Engineer Research and Test Reactors Licensing

October 6, 2015

#### **Relevance to Operations**



- Existing inventory of fuel is much more varied than when General Atomics started supplying TRIGA reactors
- Department of Energy is looking for additional sources of replacement fuel including utilization of "lightly" burned fuel currently on inventory
- Fuel management for improved shuffle without peak channel penalty
- General Atomics was not able to provide a threshold power per element for safe operations
- HEU to LEU conversion experience
- Over power event at a facility with a highly tilted flux profile following addition of a fresh element
- Desire to use modern tools for research reactors

## **Code Enhancements**



- TRACE Update
  - Revision (minor release) coming soon (end of CY2015)
  - Updated Groeneveld correlation table
  - Corrected Groeneveld calculation
- TRACE Code availability
  - Must have non-disclosure agreement (agreement to not redistribute) on file with NRC office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
  - Free to Universities

## **Code Enhancements**



- RELAP5 Update
  - Updated Groeneveld correlation tables (2006 version)
  - Code is available
  - Must have non-disclosure agreement (agreement to not redistribute) on file with NRC office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
  - Free to Universities



## **Code Enhancements**



- Interfacial drag (bundle) model versus PIPE model in TRACE and RELAP5
  - Classical pipe slug flow does not occur in rod bundles
  - Rod bundle interfacial drag model does not have the bubbly to slug flow transition that the pipe interfacial drag model has

#### **Common Issues**



- Conflicting information for grid plate and fuel dimensions
  - Inconsistent inlet and outlet flow loss coefficients
  - Inconsistent channel flow area and hydraulic diameter determination
- Need to search for limiting sub-channel
  - Limiting channel may not be highest power rod, need to consider all parameters
  - Limiting channel based on power and flow, especially with circular lattice (irregular pin pitch)

### **Result Challenges**



- Using technical specification (TS) values for input parameters can create artificial conditions that may never exist
- Bounding core designs may result in limitations to bulk pool (core inlet) temperature, power level, or fuel placement constraints
- Code results show density wave oscillations
  - Driven by power to flow area ratio
  - Stability limit may be more restrictive than CHF

### Potential Items Under Consideration



- Measurement of actual inlet temperatures instead of assuming bulk limit
- Determination of cross-flow and utilization of core models that can apply appropriate cross-flow values
  - More accurate representation of physical phenomena
  - Increased margin to critical heat flux (reduced DNBR) and flow stability boundary

#### Potential Items Under Consideration



- Increased range in test series in sub-cooled boiling models
  - Model improvements needed to address irregular quality of predicting void fractions at low pressure and low flow
  - Validate against existing data
  - Expect to update both codes

#### **Future Plans**



10

- Consideration for more testing to further assess and enhance the models
  - Understand flow stability limits in TRIGA lattice geometries
  - Plate fuel creates unique power distribution issues (edge peaked) that complicates 1D flow modeling. The existing plate fuel CHF and flow stability thermal hydraulic data has uniform power distributions



#### Thermal Hydraulic Analysis Update

# Questions

