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A Through analysis of the Test L2-2 loss-of-coolant experiment (LOCE) in the Loss-of-Fluid Test (LOFT) program was made by the THYDE-P code. LOFT Test L2-2 was the first test in the Power Ascension Test Series (Test Series L2) of nuclear full double-ended cold leg break tests. THYDE-P is a computer code to analyze both blowdown and refill-reflood phases of loss-of-coolant accidents (LOCAs) of pressurized water reactors (PWRs) and is now under verification study and modifications. Therefore, the LOFT experimental data play an important role at the present stage of the THYDE-P code. The present analysis was performed by best estimate (BE) options as sample calculation Run 30, which is a portion of a series of THYDE-P sample calculations. In this report, the calculated results are compared with the experimental data and discussed. In the present calculation, the core nodes were completely submerged with subcooled water at 55 sec. after the test initiation. It showed a good agreement with the experimental result.
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THYDE-PコードによるLOFT L2-2の一貫解析II
（サンプル計算 Run 30）

日本原子力研究所東海研究所安全解析部
平野雅司・朝日義郎

（1981年5月27日受理）

LOFT計画の冷却材喪失実験L2-2の一貫解析をTHYDE-Pコードを用いて行った。L2-2実験は、核炉心、カールドレグ両端破断の出力上昇実験シリーズ（シリーズL2）の最初のものである。THYDE-Pは、加圧水型機冷炉の冷却材喪失事故のブローウダウン、および再閉水過程を解析する計算コードであり、現在、検証計算、および修正を行っている。それゆえ、LOFT実験の結果は、難解解のTHYDE-Pコードにとって有用である。本解析は、最適評価オプションを用い、サンプル計算 Run 30として行ったものであり、一連のTHYDE-Pサンプル計算の一部を成すものである。本報告では、解析結果を実験結果と比較し、検討した。本計算では実験開始後55秒で炉心ノードは、完全に未飽和水下に没した。それは、実験結果との良い一致を示している。
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1. Introduction

A thorough calculation of LOFT loss-of-coolant experiment (LOCE) L2-2\(^{(1)}\) was made by the THYDE-P code\(^{(2),(3)}\) not only to verify the system performance of the THYDE-P code but also to obtain better understandings of the experiment. The thermal-hydraulic calculation in THYDE-P at first is based on a homogeneous equilibrium model. In the course of the work, however, a time delay model for density change, which takes non-equilibrium effects into account, was used to analyze the refill-reflood phase of the experiment. One of the major purposes of the present analysis was to accumulate experiences on needs for upgrading of the simple non-equilibrium model as well as for code modifications. The present analysis was performed as sample calculation Run 30, which is a portion of a series of THYDE-P sample calculations.

Test L2-2 was the first test in the Power Ascension Test Series (test Series L2) of nuclear double-ended cold leg break tests and was conducted at 50% power (25 MW, 26.38 kW/m). In this test, emergency core cooling (ECC) water was injected into the intact loop cold leg to provide data on the effects of ECC on system thermal-hydraulic response. The core volume reflood time was reported to be 55 sec. after the test initiation\(^{(4)}\).

In the present analysis, the LOFT system was nodalized into 43 nodes and 37 junctions. The active core was nodalized into 6 nodes. A hot channel analysis was not performed but only an average channel analysis was done. The discharge coefficient for the Moody correlation\(^{(6)}\) was set to be 0.8. The two-phase pump model to treat the LOFT two-phase pump data\(^{(17)}\) was newly implemented and was used.

Sensitivity studies for the heat transfer model in the core are now being performed. Therefore, the heat transfer model in the present analysis should be regarded as tentative. For example, a pool boiling curve and transition boiling were taken into consideration in the present analysis.

The calculation proceeded until the core nodes were completely submerged with subcooled water, i.e. 55 sec. after the break, without any calculation mode change during the entire process. At the early stage of the blowdown phase, one or several peaks of the cladding surface temperature were also calculated as were observed in the experiment. The departure from nucleate boiling (DNB) was calculated under the pool flow condition. Prior to quenching, the rapid decrease of the cladding surface temperature from the
peak, however, was calculated due to transition boiling under the forced
convection condition and quenching was calculated at all core nodes.

After the accumulator (ACC) injection was calculated to start, i.e. about
17 sec. after the rupture, the non-equilibrium model was introduced to avoid
unrealistically large pressure decreases due to rapid condensation processes.
The non-equilibrium model made the present through analysis possible although
its physical basis should be scrutinized.

2. Description of LOFT L2-2

The LOFT program is conducted by EG & G Idaho, Inc., for the U.S. Nuclear
Regulatory Commission and administered by the Department of Energy. Test
L2-2 was conducted on December 9, 1978 as the first test of the Power Ascension
Test Series (Test Series L2). This test was designed to provide data for a
200% double-ended offset shear in the pump discharge line in the cold leg of
a four-loop, large PWR. The detailed information on Test L2-2 is presented
in Ref. (1). It would be convenient to depict some parts of the reference in
this section.

2.1 Primary Objectives

The primary objectives of Test L2-2 were to:

(1) Provide a test in which the hottest fuel rods are predicted to
    encounter departure from nucleate boiling and not immediately reenter
    the nucleate boiling heat transfer regime to allow assessment of fuel
    rod-to-coolant heat transfer in the postcritical heat flux regime

(2) Determine LOFT fuel rod temperature response during a 26.25 kW/m
    maximum linear heat generation rate double-ended cold leg break LOCE

(3) Determine blowdown thermal-hydraulic response at a 67% nominal hot-
    leg-to-cold-leg temperature difference of 23.8 k

(4) Determine if any cladding perforation occurs in a 26.25 kW/m maximum
    linear heat generation rate, double-ended cold leg break LOCE by
peak, however, was calculated due to transition boiling under the forced convection condition and quenching was calculated at all core nodes.

After the accumulator (ACC) injection was calculated to start, i.e. about 17 sec. after the rupture, the non-equilibrium model was introduced to avoid unrealistically large pressure decreases due to rapid condensation processes. The non-equilibrium model made the present through analysis possible although its physical basis should be scrutinized.

2. Description of LOFT L2-2

The LOFT program is conducted by EG & G Idaho, Inc., for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and administered by the Department of Energy. Test L2-2 was conducted on December 9, 1978 as the first test of the Power Ascension Test Series (Test Series L2). This test was designed to provide data for a 200% double-ended offset shear in the pump discharge line in the cold leg of a four-loop, large PWR. The detailed information on Test L2-2 is presented in Ref. (1). It would be convenient to depict some parts of the reference in this section.

2.1 Primary Objectives

The primary objectives of Test L2-2 were to:

1) Provide a test in which the hottest fuel rods are predicted to encounter departure from nucleate boiling and not immediately reenter the nucleate boiling heat transfer regime to allow assessment of fuel rod-to-coolant heat transfer in the postcritical heat flux regime.

2) Determine LOFT fuel rod temperature response during a 26.25 kW/m maximum linear heat generation rate double-ended cold leg break LOCE.

3) Determine blowdown thermal-hydraulic response at a 67% nominal hot-leg-to-cold-leg temperature difference of 23.8 k.

4) Determine if any cladding perforation occurs in a 26.25 kW/m maximum linear heat generation rate, double-ended cold leg break LOCE by
monitoring fission product concentration in the coolant

(5) Provide integral nuclear system code verification data on a low-to-intermediate power double-ended cold leg break

(6) Provide continued data to evaluate LOFT ECCS scaling techniques

(7) Determine LOFT reflood characteristics at 26.25 kW/m maximum linear heat generation rate initial conditions.

2.2 LOFT System Description

The LOFT system configuration for Test L2-2 are shown in Fig. 1. The LOFT reactor vessel has an annular downcomer, a lower plenum, lower core support plates, a nuclear core and an upper plenum. The core contains 1300 nuclear fuel rods arranged in five square and four triangular (corner) fuel modules, shown in Fig. 2. The fuel rods have an active length of 167.64 cm and an outside diameter of 1.07 cm. The intact loop simulates the three unbroken loops of a large PWR and contains a steam generator, two circulating coolant pumps connected in parallel, a pressurizer, a venturi flowmeter, and connecting piping. The broken loop consists of a hot leg and a cold leg that are connected to the reactor vessel and the blowdown suppression tank header. Each leg consists of a break plane orifice which determines the break size to be simulated, a quick-opening blowdown valve (QOBV) which simulates a pipe break, a recirculation line, an isolation valve, and connecting piping. The broken loop hot leg also contained a simulated steam generator and a simulated pump. These simulators have hydraulic orifice plate assemblies which have similar (passive) flow resistances as a real steam generator and a free-rotating pump. The break flow area (break plane orifice area) in this configuration is 0.0084 m² in each line which is 100% of the possible break flow area of each line. The LOFT ECCS simulates the ECCS of a large PWR. The accumulator (ACC), the high-pressure injection system (HPIS), and the low-pressure injection system (LPIS) were used during this experiment. Each system was arranged to inject scaled flow rates of ECC directly into the primary coolant system cold leg.

The initial conditions for Test L2-2 are listed in Table 1 along with those used in the present analysis by the THYDE-P code.
Fig. 1 LOFT major components
Fig. 2 LOFT Core 1 configuration showing rod designations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Input Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Coolant System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intact Loop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>15.64 MPa</td>
<td>15.6 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow Rate</td>
<td>194.2 kgm/sec</td>
<td>194 kgm/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Leg Temperature</td>
<td>284.7 °c</td>
<td>283 °c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Leg Temperature</td>
<td>307.4 °c</td>
<td>307 °c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Loop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Leg Temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Vessel</td>
<td>282 °c</td>
<td>283 °c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Break</td>
<td>265.3 °c</td>
<td>283 °c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Leg Temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Vessel</td>
<td>288.2 °c</td>
<td>307 °c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Break</td>
<td>269.6 °c</td>
<td>307 °c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Level</td>
<td>24.88 MW</td>
<td>24.9 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pressurizer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>15.62 MPa</td>
<td>15.6 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Volume</td>
<td>0.353 m$^3$</td>
<td>0.355 m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Volume</td>
<td>0.607 m$^3$</td>
<td>0.605 m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Temperature</td>
<td>346 °c</td>
<td>343 °c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Level</td>
<td>1.089 m</td>
<td>1.00 m$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steam Generator Secondary Side</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>6.35 MPa</td>
<td>6.35 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Volume</td>
<td>3.74 m$^3$</td>
<td>1.01 m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Level</td>
<td>3.14 m</td>
<td>0.6 m$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow Rate</td>
<td>12.67 kgm/sec</td>
<td>12.67 kgm/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>4.11 MPa</td>
<td>4.11 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Volume</td>
<td>1.05 m$^3$</td>
<td>1.05 m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Temperature</td>
<td>27.8 °c</td>
<td>27.8 °c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a), (b): Initial water levels in THYDE-P are subcooled water level
3. Brief Description of THYDE-P

The models and the methods of the THYDE-P code are presented in detail in Ref. (2), some of which have been revised. In this section, some of them are briefly reviewed along with the newly implemented models.

3.1 Characteristic Features of THYDE-P

In the THYDE-P code, a PWR plant is regarded hydraulically as a network of various coolant components which may be classified into nodes and junctions. The one-dimensional mass, momentum and energy equations are suitably integrated in each node and junction. In integrating the resulting equations with respect to time, a non-linear implicit method is used on the basis of the Newton method. The Jacobian matrix of the basic equations can be reduced to a simple form by the network theory, which is one of the characteristics of THYDE-P. To solve the basic equations by the non-linear implicit method, various smoothing functions with respect to time are introduced for mode changes such as phase change and flow reversal.

New models for a steam generator and a pressurizer are implemented, about which reference should be made to Ref. (2).

A calculation by THYDE-P is started by steady state adjustment, where the basic equations are exactly solved without time derivatives. THYDE-P is able to calculate through both blowdown and refill-reflood phases without any change of models and physical conditions of the coolant. A model which takes non-equilibrium effects into account is newly implemented and is presented in Subsec. 4.4.

3.2 Nodes and Junctions in THYDE-P

Nodes are classified into normal nodes, linkage nodes and special nodes. The linkage node is a node which branches off a loop and does not form a loop. The coolant in the linkage node is assumed to be stagnant at the steady state. The special nodes include a steam generator secondary system, a pressurizer and an accumulator. The other nodes are called normal nodes which are components of loops in the hydraulic network. In the normal and linkage nodes, physical parameters such as mass flux \( \dot{G} \), pressure \( p \) and enthalpy \( h \) are assigned.
at both the inlet and the outlet of each node, which we call point A and E, respectively, as shown in Fig. 3(a). In the present version of THYDE-P, $q^A$, $p^A$, $q^E$ and $p^E$ are included in the implicit scheme but $h^A$ and $h^E$ are integrated explicitly.

There are two types of junctions. One is called a normal junction which does not have volume and connects two adjacent nodes. The other type of junctions is called a mixing junction which has volume and connects more than three normal or linkage nodes. These two types of junctions are schematically shown in Fig. 3(b) and (c).

Fig. 3  Nodes and Junctions in THYDE-P
3.3 Heat Transfer Model

3.3.1 CHF Correlations

In the present analysis, the Biasi(14) and modified Zuber(20), (21) correlations were used to predict CHF values for \( G > G_{\text{min}} \) and \( G \leq G_{\text{min}} \), respectively.

(1) Biasi Correlation\(^{(14)}\)

\[
\phi_{\text{CHF}} = \frac{1.833 \times 10^3}{G_b^{1/6} D_b^m} \left( \frac{Y(p_b)}{G_b^{1/6}} - x_{\text{out}} \right) / J_c \times 10^{-1}
\]

for low quality \( (1) \)

\[
\phi_{\text{CHF}} = \frac{3.78 \times 10^3}{G_b^{0.6} D_b^m} H(p_b) \left( 1 - x_{\text{out}} \right) / J_c \times 10^{-1}
\]

for high quality \( (2) \)

where

\[
m = \begin{cases} 
    0.4 & \text{for } D_b > 1 \text{ cm} \\
    0.6 & \text{for } D_b < 1 \text{ cm} 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
Y(p_b) = 0.7249 + 0.099 p_b \exp(-0.032 p_b) \tag{3}
\]

and

\[
H(p_b) = -1.159 + 0.149 p_b \exp(-0.019 p_b) \tag{4}
\]

The range of validity of the correlation is the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
0.3 & \text{ cm} < D_b < 3.75 \text{ cm} \\
20 & \text{ cm} < L_b < 600 \text{ cm} \\
2.7 & \text{ ata} < p_b < 140 \text{ ata} \\
10 & \text{ g/cm}^2 \text{ sec} < G_b < 600 \text{ g/cm}^2 \text{ sec} \\
0.0 & < x_{\text{in}} < 1.0 \\
1/(1 + \rho_i/\rho_g) & < x_{\text{out}} < 1.0
\end{align*}
\]
(2) Modified Zuber Correlation \((20), (21)\)

The Zuber pool CHF correlation \((20)\) is

\[
\phi_{\text{CHF}} = (1 - \alpha) 0.131 \rho^* g h_{fg} \frac{\sigma g (\rho_1 - \rho_2)}{\rho^*_g}^{1/4}
\]

(5)

where the factor \((1 - \alpha)\) was recommended by Griffith \((21)\) for low flow and counter-current flow conditions.

3.3.2 Heat Transfer Correlations

The heat transfer correlations applied in the present analysis were summarized in Tables 2.1 and 2.2. Newly applied correlations in the present analysis are briefly described in this section.

(1) Thom Correlation \((22)\) (mode 1)

\[
\phi^* = \left( \frac{\Delta T^* \exp\left( \frac{p^*}{1260} \right)}{0.072} \right)^2
\]

(6)

vertical up flow of water
Round tube: 0.5 inch diameter, 60 inch length
Annulus: 0.7 inch I.D., 0.9 inch O.D. and 12 inch length
Mass flux: \(0.77 \times 10^6\) lbm/ft²hr to \(2.80 \times 10^6\) lbm/ft²hr
Heat flux: to \(0.5 \times 10^6\) Btu/ft²hr

(2) McDonough, Milich and King Correlation \((18)\) (mode 4-1)

\[
\phi^* = \phi^*_{\text{CHF}} - h_t^*(p^*) (T_w^* - T_w^*, \text{CHF})
\]

(7)

where \(h_t^*\) is a function of \(p^*\) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(p^*)</th>
<th>(h_t^<em>(p^</em>))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1101.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1180.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>1501.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.1 Heat Transfer Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>Coolant Condition</th>
<th>Other conditions</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Subcooled water</td>
<td>$T_{\text{wall}} &lt; T_{\text{sat}}$</td>
<td>Dittus-Boelter(^{(10)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Subcooled water</td>
<td>$T_{\text{wall}} &gt; T_{\text{sat}}$</td>
<td>Interpolation between D-B and Thom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saturated state</td>
<td>$\phi &lt; \phi_{\text{CHF}}$</td>
<td>Thom(^{(22)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saturated state</td>
<td>$\phi &gt; \phi_{\text{CHF}}$</td>
<td>(see Table 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Superheated steam</td>
<td>$\text{Re} &lt; 3000$</td>
<td>McEligot(^{(13)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Superheated steam</td>
<td>$3000 &lt; \text{Re} &lt; 5000$</td>
<td>McEligot(^{(13)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Superheated steam</td>
<td>$\text{Re} &gt; 5000$</td>
<td>McEligot(^{(13)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Saturated state</td>
<td>$T_{\text{cooler}} &gt; T_{\text{wall}}$</td>
<td>Condensation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.2 Heat Transfer Correlations in Mode 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>$G &gt; G_{\text{min}}$, $\phi_{4-1} &gt; \phi_{4-2}$</td>
<td>McDonough, Milich and King(^{(18)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>$G &gt; G_{\text{min}}$, $\phi_{4-1} &lt; \phi_{4-2}$</td>
<td>Groenevelt(^{(12)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>$G &lt; G_{\text{min}}$, $\Delta T_s^* &lt; \Delta T_{\text{min}}^*$</td>
<td>Pool transition boiling correlation(^{(19)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>$G &lt; G_{\text{min}}$, $\Delta T_s^* &gt; \Delta T_{\text{min}}^*$</td>
<td>Berenson(^{(23)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>$G &lt; G_{\text{min}}$, $x_{\text{cooler}} &lt; x_c$</td>
<td>Pool transition boiling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vertical up flow
Diameter : 0.152 inch
Mass flux : \(0.2 \times 10^6\) to \(1.4 \times 10^6\) lbm/ft\(^2\)hr
Wall temperature : \(T_w^* = 1030\) °F
Pressure : 800, 1200 and 2000 psia

\[ \phi^* = 20,000 \left( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{min}}^*}{\Delta T_s^*} \right)^{1.504} \ln \left( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{min}}^*}{20} \right) \tag{8} \]

where
\[ \Delta T_{\text{min}}^* = \left( \frac{20,000}{F(p^*)} \right)^{4/3} \tag{9} \]

and \(F(p^*)\) is shown in Table 3. However, if \(\Delta T_s^* < 20\), then \(\phi^*\) is set to 90,000 Btu/ft\(^2\)hr.

(4) Berenson Correlation \(\text{(23)}\) (mode 4-4)

\[ h_{tr} = 0.425 \left( \frac{k_g \rho_g (\rho_l - \rho_g) g h_{fg}}{\mu_g \Delta T_s \lambda c/2\pi} \right)^{1/4} \tag{10} \]

where
\[ \lambda c/2\pi = \left\{ \frac{g_c \sigma}{g(\rho_l - \rho_g)} \right\} \tag{11} \]

Carbon tetrachloride, n-pentane
Horizontal flat tube facing upwards
Pressure : atmospheric

The equation is approximated \(\text{(19)}\) in the coding by

\[ \phi^* = F(p^*) \Delta T_s^* 3/4 \tag{12} \]

where \(F(p^*)\) is dependent on pressure as shown in Table 3.
Table 3  Function $F(p^*)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$p^*$</th>
<th>$F(p^*)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5)  Pool Transition Boiling (mode 4-5)

In the post CHF calculation, it is assumed that film boiling could not exist when the coolant quality is small enough, i.e. less than $x_c$. Then pool transition boiling may be assumed in this region. For simplicity in the present analysis, the heat flux value is set to be constant $\phi_c$, which should exist between the upper limit and the lower limit of the pool transition boiling correlation (mode 4-3), which is shown in Eq. (8). In the present calculation, $x_c$ and $\phi_c$ are assumed as follows:

\[
x_c = 0.05 \\
\phi_c = 50 \text{kcal/m}^2\text{sec} (64,000 \text{Btu/ft}^2\text{hr})
\]

(13)

3.4  Critical Flow Calculation

A slightly modified (2) Zaloudek's equation (5) and the Moody correlation (6) are implemented for a subcooled condition and a saturated condition, respectively. To avoid the discontinuity of the break flow with mode change, the calculated critical flows by these correlations are connected continuously. Therefore, the discharge coefficients for these correlations are not independent and only one of the two is to be given as an input. In the present version of the THYDE-P code, the critical flow calculation in a duct is not implemented.
3.5 Two-Phase Pump Model

The two-phase pump model in THYDE-P was modified to treat the LOFT two-phase pump data (17) as follows:

\[ h_{\text{head}} = h_{\text{head}}^1 - m_h(\alpha) (h_{\text{head}}^1 - h_{\text{head}}^2) \]  \hspace{1cm} (14)

\[ b = b^1 - m_b(\alpha) (b^1 - b^2) \]  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where

- \( h_{\text{head}} \): normalized pump head
- \( b \): normalized pump hydraulic torque
- \( m_h \): head multiplier as a function of void fraction
- \( m_b \): torque multiplier as a function of void fraction

The single-phase head and torque homologous curves are shown in Fig. 4. The head difference homologous curves (single-phase minus two-phase head) are shown in Fig. 5. The head and torque multipliers as functions of void fraction are shown in Fig. 6. These curves were given as inputs. The single-phase homologous torque data for the LOFT pumps are also used for the torque difference curve with the normalized torque \( b^1 \) for the two-phase pump operation being calculated as

\[ b = b^1 \{1 - m_b(\alpha)\} \]  \hspace{1cm} (16)

3.6 Loss Coefficient \( k \)

There are two kinds of loss coefficients in THYDE-P. The loss coefficients of one kind are so called "residual k-factors", which are to be calculated for normal nodes as a result of steady state adjustment. For a linkage node, however, coolant is stagnant at the steady state so that the loss coefficient is to be given as an input. The loss coefficients of the other kind, which take into account irreversible pressure drops due to area change, bending of ducts etc., are assigned at both points A and E of the normal and linkage nodes. Since the loss coefficients of the latter kind is newly
Fig. 5. Head difference homologous curves.

Fig. 4. Single-phase homologous head and torque curves.

\[ \frac{\Delta H}{H} = \frac{\Delta T}{T} \]

\[ \Delta H = \text{Head Difference} \]
\[ H = \text{Total Head} \]
\[ \Delta T = \text{Torque Difference} \]
\[ T = \text{Total Torque} \]
Fig. 6  Head and torque multiplier curves
implemented, they are described in some detail in this subsection.

The pressure drops at junction j, which is located between point A of node n and point E of node n', for forward and reverse flows may be expressed as follows:

\[
\Delta p_j = k_{n}^{Ed} \frac{G_{n, n'}^{E}}{2 \rho_{n'}} + k_{n}^{Ad} \frac{G_{n, n'}^{A}}{2 \rho_{n}}
\]  

\(17\)

where

\[
d = \begin{cases} 
  f & \text{for forward flow} \\
  r & \text{for reverse flow}
\end{cases}
\]

and

\[
k_{n}^{Af} : \text{loss coefficient at point A of node n for forward flow} \\

k_{n}^{Ar} : \text{loss coefficient at point A of node n for reverse flow} \\

k_{n'}^{Ef} : \text{loss coefficient at point E of node n' for forward flow} \\

k_{n'}^{Er} : \text{loss coefficient at point E of node n' for reverse flow}
\]

which are inputs.

In THYDE-P, there is another option. When at least one of these four loss coefficients concerning a normal junction j is given to be 0, \(k_{n}^{Ef}\) and \(k_{n'}^{Er}\) are set equal to zero and \(k_{n}^{Af}\) and \(k_{n}^{Ar}\) are calculated by the following empirical correlations (3) for sudden area changes.

\[
k_{n}^{Af \text{ or } r} = \begin{cases} 
  0.45 \left(1 - \beta \right) & \text{for sudden contraction} \\
  \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 1\right)^{2} & \text{for sudden expansion}
\end{cases}
\]  

\(18\)

where

\[
\beta = \frac{\text{smaller cross sectional area}}{\text{larger cross sectional area}}.
\]

The loss coefficients \(k_{n}^{Af}\), \(k_{n}^{Ar}\), \(k_{n}^{Ef}\) and \(k_{n}^{Er}\) are given in the last four items of each node data in the data block number 8806 as shown in the input data list in App. A.
3.7 Needs for Further Code Modifications

In Ref. (3), needs for modifications for the present version of THYDE-P are summarized. Some models have been modified or newly implemented till now but there still exist lots of needs for further modifications and upgradings. Two major deficiencies which were thought to be important as a result of the present analysis are reviewed.

(1) A discharge tank model is not implemented.

(2) Heat transfer between coolant and structures is not able to be taken into account.

In the present analysis, heat transfer between coolant and structures was neglected. The treatment of the discharge tank in the present analysis will be shown in Subsec. 4.2. As will be shown in Sec. 6, there exist several discrepancies between the calculated results and the experimental data which might be caused mainly by these deficiencies.

4. Models Specifically Used in Analysis of LOFT L2-2

4.1 Steady State Adjustment

The THYDE-P code is designed to analyze large scale commercial PWR LOCA's so that special treatments were needed to simulate the LOFT facility. In the LOFT program, two broken legs are separated and do not form a loop and the coolants in these legs were stagnant prior to the break. In the case of a postulated PWR LOCA, however, generally normal operational conditions are assumed prior to the break. Therefore, such a stagnant coolant condition in a primary loop need not be assumed for actual PWR plants.

In the present analysis of Test L2-2, the broken loop hot and cold legs were supposed to be connected and forming a loop with a very small amount of mass flow at the initial steady state. In order to obtain the desired initial conditions as a result of steady state adjustment (2), a dummy pump with a dummy heat sink was placed at the break junction 6, prior to the break and it was made to vanish after the break. The pressure rise and the enthalpy drop at the dummy pump were assumed to be as follows:
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\[ \Delta p = 0.05 \text{ MPa} \]
\[ \Delta h = -31 \text{ kcal/kgm} \]

where
\[ \Delta p = p_8^A - p_7^E \]
\[ \Delta h = h_8^A - h_7^E \]

In the present version of the THYDE-P code, heat transfer between coolant and structures is not taken into consideration, as was mentioned in Subsec. 3.7, so that the coolant temperatures near the vessel and near the break point were calculated to be nearly equal as a result of steady state adjustment without heat transfer between coolant structures. On the other hand, in the experiment a considerably large difference between these temperatures existed. This situation is clearly shown in Table 1. As will be discussed in the following sections, the differences in the initial temperature distributions in the broken legs may lead to considerably large differences in the hydraulic behaviors between the analysis and the experiment at the early stage of the blowdown.

4.2 Break Flow and Discharge Tank Simulation

Discharge coefficient was set to be 0.8 for the Moody correlation \(^{(6)}\) in the present analysis. The containment pressure was set to be:

\[ p = 5 \text{ atm} \]

and the time constant to specify the decrease of the break pressure to the containment pressure just after the break was set to be 0.1 sec. When a reverse flow was calculated at the break point, the enthalpy of the coolant, which flowed into the system, could not be determined realistically because of a lack of the discharge tank model. In the present analysis, the coolant enthalpy for the reverse flow was set to be the value which had been calculated at the preceding time step. This approximation might be suitable for the case when the period of the reverse flow was short but might not be suitable when the reverse flow continued for a considerably long time. To avoid a
large amount of mass flow into the system through the break point, the loss coefficient for the reverse flow at the break node was assumed to be a large value:

$$k_E^R = 50.0$$ (19)

A reverse flow at a break point, in general, may be calculated in a reflooding phase as a result of depressurization due to low enthalpy ECC water. Therefore, a discharge tank model and the loss coefficient at the break point for the reverse flow play an important role at the latest stage of the reflooding phase.

4.3 Mass Conservation Equation

When this analysis was started out, the mass conservation equation for normal node n took the following form:

$$f_{n1} = G_n^A - G_n^E - \frac{L_n}{\Delta t} \{a_1(p_n^{new} - p_n^{old}) + a_2(h_n^{new} - h_n^{old})\} = 0$$ (20)

where

$$a_1 = \left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial h}\right)_p = h_n^{new} \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 = \left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial h}\right)_p = h_n^{new} \quad \text{and} \quad p = p_n^{new} \quad \text{and} \quad p = p_n^{new} \quad \text{and} \quad p = p_n^{new}$$ (21)

But the applicability of this type of the mass conservation equation to the low pressure and low quality region was found to be questionable. Because the non-linearity of coolant density with respect to pressure and enthalpy becomes considerably high, the first order approximation to the density change in Eq. (20) gives a large truncation error at low pressure and low quality. Therefore, the mass conservation equation in the refill-reflood phase in the present analysis was revised as follows:

$$f_{n1} = G_n^A - G_n^E - \frac{L_n}{\Delta t} (\rho_n^{new} - \rho_n^{old}) = 0$$ (22)

where

$$\rho_n^{new} = \rho(p_n^{new}, h_n^{new}) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_n^{old} = \rho(p_n^{old}, h_n^{old}) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_n^{old} = \rho(p_n^{old}, h_n^{old}) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_n^{old} = \rho(p_n^{old}, h_n^{old}) \quad \text{and}$$ (23)
4.4 Non-Equilibrium Model

After ECC water was injected into the intact loop cold leg, thermal non-equilibrium effects due to low enthalpy ECC water became considerably large. Generally speaking, in the analyses by homogeneous equilibrium models, unrealistically large pressure decreases may be calculated due to very rapid condensation processes calculated in the nodes where high enthalpy primary coolant encounters with low enthalpy ECC water. Such a situation is prominent especially at top pressure. In the refill-reflood phase of Test L2-2, the enthalpy of ECC water was as low as 30 kcal/kgm whereas it was more than 700 kcal/kgm for the core nodes, so that such a situation was thought to be beyond the scope of the equilibrium models. In the present analysis, a simple non-equilibrium model was introduced, where the change of an average density had a time delay from that determined by the equilibrium model according to the following equations.

\[
\frac{d \rho^*}{d t} = \frac{\rho - \rho^*}{\tau_\alpha}
\]

\[
\rho^* = \alpha^* \rho_{gs} + (1 - \alpha^*) \rho_{fs}
\]

\[
\rho = \alpha \rho_{gs} + (1 - \alpha) \rho_{fs}
\]

where

- \( \rho \) equilibrium density
- \( \rho^* \) non-equilibrium density
- \( \alpha \) equilibrium void fraction
- \( \alpha^* \) non-equilibrium void fraction

and \( \tau_\alpha \) was called a delay parameter which specifies the time delay of the average density of a node. It should be noted that when \( \tau_\alpha \) asymptotically approached to be zero, the model reduces to the equilibrium model, i.e. \( \rho = \rho^* \).

In this model, what

\[\text{Fig. 7 Delay parameter } \tau_\alpha \text{ in present analysis.}\]
is the most difficult is to determine the delay parameter $\tau_\alpha$, which may depend on flow regimes, node geometries, pressure etc. In the present analysis, to evaluate the performance of this model, a simple formulation was assumed, where the parameter was assumed as a function of node volume and equilibrium quality $x$, which is related to the equilibrium void fraction $\alpha$ such that

$$x = \alpha \rho_{gs} / \{ \alpha \rho_{gs} + (1 - \alpha) \rho_{fs} \}.$$  

When the quality is high in some node even at low pressure, rapid hydraulic transients are not calculated, so that $\tau_\alpha$ can be assumed zero for a high quality region. The assumed function for $\tau_\alpha$ in the present analysis, which is schematically shown in Fig. 4, is as follows:

$$\tau_\alpha^n = \begin{cases} 0 & x > x_0 \\ c_n / 2 \{ \cos(\pi x / x_0) + 1 \} & 0 \leq x \leq x_0 \\ c_n & x < 0 \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

where the constant $c_n$ is so given as to be proportional to the volume of each node with $c = 2$ sec. for the core nodes. Since there is no physical basis to determine $\tau_\alpha$ until now, the value of the constant $c$ was given, for the sake of convenience, by the following manner in the present analysis.

Equation (24) was differentiated for node $n$ as follows:

$$\rho^n_{n, \text{new}} = \rho^n_{n, \text{old}} + (\rho^n_{n, \text{new}} - \rho^n_{n, \text{old}}) \Delta t / \tau^n_\alpha \tag{27}$$

where it should be noted that when $\tau^n_\alpha = \Delta t$, any time delay is not calculated, i.e. $\rho^n_{n, \text{new}} = \rho^n_{n, \text{old}}$. On the other hand, the mass conservation equation for node $n$, i.e. Eq. (22), is expressed by using Eq. (27) as

$$W^n_E - W^n_A = (\rho^n_{n, \text{new}} - \rho^n_{n, \text{old}}) / \tau^n_\alpha \tag{28}$$

which can be approximated as follows:

$$W^n_A - W^n_A \approx V_n (\rho^n_{fs} - \rho^n_{gs}) (\alpha^n_{n, \text{new}} - \alpha^n_{n, \text{old}}) / \tau^n_\alpha \tag{29}$$

where the dependences of $\rho^n_{fs}$ and $\rho^n_{gs}$ on $\rho_n$ are neglected. Equation (29) shows that $|W^n_A - W^n_E|$ is bounded by that in the extreme cases when $\alpha^n_{n, \text{new}} = 1$ and $\alpha^n_{n, \text{old}} = 0$, or $\alpha^n_{n, \text{new}} = 0$ and $\alpha^n_{n, \text{old}} = 1$, namely,

$$|W^n_E - W^n_A| < V_n (\rho^n_{fs} - \rho^n_{gs}) / \tau^n_\alpha \tag{30}$$
These idealized extreme cases are schematically shown in Fig. 8(a). Now we assume

\[ |W_n^A - W_n^E| < W_{ECC} \]  \hspace{1cm} (31)

which means that the mass flow rate into the node where a condensation process is being calculated, for example, does not exceed that supplied by the ECCS. If Eq. (31) is not satisfied, unrealistic situation may be calculated due to a large amount of mass flowed into one node as is often experienced in the analyses by equilibrium models.

By comparing Eq. (30) with Eq. (31), \( \tau_n^\alpha \) has to satisfy the following equation.

\[ \tau_n^\alpha > V_n \left( \rho_{sf}^n - \rho_{gs}^n \right) / W_{ECC} \]  \hspace{1cm} (32)

In the extreme cases, here we can approximately obtain at low pressure

\[ \rho_{sf}^n - \rho_{gs}^n \approx 10 \hspace{1cm} (\text{kg/m}^3) \]

\[ W_{ECC} \approx 50 \hspace{1cm} (\text{kg/m/sec}). \]

Then, Eq. (32) gives

\[ \tau_n^\alpha > 20 V_n \hspace{1cm} (\text{sec}). \]

In the present analysis, since \( V_n \)'s for core nodes are 0.063, we assume \( c_n \) for core nodes as follows:

\[ \tau_n^\alpha \approx c_c \hspace{1cm} \text{at low pressure} \]

\[ = 2 \hspace{1cm} (\text{sec}). \]

Because \( c_n \) is assumed to be proportional to node volume, it means

\[ c_n = 2 V_n^\alpha \hspace{1cm} (\text{sec}) \]

where
\[ v_n^* = \frac{v_n}{v_{\text{core}}} \] (33)

In Fig. 8, the typical changes of the equilibrium and non-equilibrium void fractions are shown for the condensation and flashing cases.

(a) Extreme cases

(b) Typical cases

Fig. 8 Schematic explanation for non-equilibrium model
5. Input Data and Results of Steady State Adjustment

The nodalization scheme in the present analysis is shown in Fig. 9(a), where numbering is made separately for nodes and junctions. Nodes from 1 to 7 and nodes from 8 to 10 form the broken loop hot and cold legs, respectively. Nodes from 11 to 21 are the components in the intact loop. The pressure vessel is expressed by an assembly of nodes from 22 to 33. The downcomer was simulated by a single node whose number was 22. The active core is nodalized into 6 nodes, i.e. nodes from 25 to 30, in which nodes 25 and 30 simulated the non-heated parts of the fuel rods. In these core nodes, the fuel and cladding are nodalized into 5 and 2 nodes radially, respectively, as shown in Fig. 9 (b). The upperhead was simulated by linkage node 33. Linkage nodes 34 and 35 are the reflood assist lines and 36 and 37 form the pressurizer surge line. Also linkage nodes 38, 39 and 40 are the ECCS pipings. The pressurizer, steam generator and accumulator are nodalized into special nodes 41, 42 and 43, respectively.

The input data used in the present analysis are listed in App. A. The major parts of them are summarized in this section with the results of steady state adjustment. The geometrical data and loss coefficients for each node are shown in Table 4 and 5, respectively.

(1) Break Data

The double-ended break was assumed to occur at junction 6 at 0.085 sec. after the test initiation. The flow areas of nodes 7 and 8, which are the same as the break flow areas after the break, were set to be 0.0084 m².

(2) Initial Mass Flux, Enthalpy and Pressure Distribution

The initial mass flux and enthalpy at point A of node 1 were

\[ \dot{m}_1^A = 3.0644 \quad \text{(kgm/m}^2\text{sec)} \]
\[ h_1^A = 329.2 \quad \text{(kcal/kgm)} \]

Some of the initial values as a result of steady state adjustment are shown in Table 1 with the experimental data and the initial pressure distribution along the intact loop is shown in Fig. 10.
(3) Core Data

The axial profile of the linear heat generation rate is shown in Fig. 8 with some of the experimental data. Input data for the core nodes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial power level</th>
<th>24.5 (MWt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial heat flux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node No</td>
<td>Heat flux (kcal/m²s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>non-heated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>124.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>non-heated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of fuel rods 1300
Clad outer diameter $1.072 \times 10^{-2}$ (m)
Clad thickness $6.172 \times 10^{-4}$ (m)
Fuel pelet diameter $8.934 \times 10^{-3}$ (m)
Rod pitch $1.430 \times 10^{-2}$ (m)

(4) Steam Generator Data

The primary and secondary systems of the steam generator were simulated by nodes from 13 to 16 and node 42, respectively. Nodes 13 and 16 are the inlet and outlet plenums, respectively. Nodes 14 and 15 simulated the primary coolant in the U-tubes. The input data for these nodes were:

Plenums
- Volume 0.353 (m³)
- Hydraulic diameter 0.908 (m)
- Height 0.518 (m)

U-tubes
- Number of U-tubes 1845
Outer diameter \(1.021 \times 10^{-2}\) (m)
Height 2.483 (m)
Pitch \(1.905 \times 10^{-2}\) (m)

Secondary system
Pressure 62.7 (atm)
Feed water enthalpy 196 (kcal/kgm)
Feed water mass flow rate 12.7 (kgm/sec)
Volume 6.66 (m³)
Height 4.188 (m)
Hydraulic diameter 1.42 (m)
Water volume 1.01 (m³)
Steam volume 5.65 (m³)
Subcooled water level 0.6 (m)
Void fraction of saturated region 0.99

Initial heat flux

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node No.</th>
<th>Heat flux (kcal/m²/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The time for feed water shutdown was 0.002 sec. after the test initiation. In the present analysis, the effects by the electric heaters were neglected.

(5) Pressurizer Data

The initial pressure of the pressurizer was obtained as a result of steady state adjustment to be

\[P_{pzr} = 15.6\ (MPa)\]

Input data for the pressurizer were:

Total volume 0.96 (m³)
Water volume 0.605 (m³)
Steam volume \( 0.355 \) (m³)
Subcooled water level \( 1.0 \) (m)
Void fraction of saturated region \( 0.88 \)

The loss coefficients for the surge line are schematically shown in Fig.12(a).

(6) Pump Data

The pump data were:

- Rated speed \( 3530 \) (rpm)
- Rated flow \( 0.3155 \) (m³/sec)
- Rated head \( 108.1 \) (m)
- Rated torque \( 500.24 \) (J/rad)
- Rated density \( 613.73 \) (kgm/m³)
- Moment of inertia \( 1.4382 \) (kgm m²/rad²)
- Steady speed \( 1270 \) (rpm)

In Test L2-2, the pump power was on and the pump speed was almost constant throughout the experiment. Therefore, the constant pump speed option was used as follows:

\[ a = a_0 \]

where

- \( a_0 \): initial normalized pump speed.

(7) ECCS Data

ECC water was assumed to be injected into mixing junction 26. The input data for ECCS were:

- Accumulator
  - Liquid volume \( 2.63 \) (m³)
  - Gas volume \( 1.05 \) (m³)
  - Liquid enthalpy \( 27.8 \) (kcal/kgm)
Pressure

40.56 (atm)

HPIS and LPIS
Liquid enthalpy

24.0 (kcal/kgm)

HPI and LP1 were assumed to start at 12 and 29 sec. after the test initiation, respectively, and the mass flow rates were given by inputs as time tables consistent to the experimental data.

(B) Steam Generator and Pump Simulators

The simulated SG and pump in the broken loop hot leg were nodalized into nodes from 3 to 7. The loss coefficients in these nodes are schematically shown in Fig. 12(b).

Fig. 9 Nodalization for LOFT LOCE L2-2

(b) Within fuel rod
Fig. 10 Initial pressure distribution along intact loop

Fig. 11 Initial linear heat generation rate
(a) Pressurizer surge line

\[ k_{E4} = 189.0 \]

\[ k_{Er} = 189.0 \]

(b) Simulated SG and pump

Fig. 12 Loss coefficients
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Flow Area $A$ ($m^2$)</th>
<th>Node Length $L$ ($m$)</th>
<th>Node Height $H_L$ ($m$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broken loop hot leg</td>
<td>0.06344</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Broken loop hot leg</td>
<td>0.06344</td>
<td>0.6965</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Broken loop hot leg</td>
<td>0.00836</td>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>0.7174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Broken loop hot leg</td>
<td>0.09539</td>
<td>3.228</td>
<td>2.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Broken loop hot leg</td>
<td>0.09539</td>
<td>3.228</td>
<td>-2.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Broken loop hot leg</td>
<td>0.01271</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>-2.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Broken loop hot leg</td>
<td>0.008365</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>1.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Broken loop cold leg</td>
<td>0.008365</td>
<td>0.4877</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Broken loop cold leg</td>
<td>0.06344</td>
<td>0.6965</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Broken loop cold leg</td>
<td>0.06344</td>
<td>0.9510</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Intact loop hot leg</td>
<td>0.08344</td>
<td>2.6160</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Intact loop hot leg</td>
<td>0.06299</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.2423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SG inlet plenum</td>
<td>0.6481</td>
<td>0.5175</td>
<td>0.5175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SG U-tube</td>
<td>8.187 E-5</td>
<td>2.568</td>
<td>2.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SG U-tube</td>
<td>8.187 E-5</td>
<td>2.568</td>
<td>-2.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SG outlet plenum</td>
<td>0.6481</td>
<td>0.5175</td>
<td>-0.5175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Crossover leg</td>
<td>0.06793</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>-1.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pump</td>
<td>0.09446</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>1.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pump</td>
<td>0.07273</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>1.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Intact loop cold leg</td>
<td>0.0597</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Intact loop cold leg</td>
<td>0.06343</td>
<td>0.5313</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Downcomer</td>
<td>0.1604</td>
<td>4.256</td>
<td>-4.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lower plenum</td>
<td>0.7917</td>
<td>0.7318</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mixing box</td>
<td>0.1532</td>
<td>0.4285</td>
<td>0.4285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Active core</td>
<td>1.143 E-4</td>
<td>0.09423</td>
<td>0.09423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Active core</td>
<td>1.143 E-4</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Active core</td>
<td>1.143 E-4</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Active core</td>
<td>1.143 E-4</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Active core</td>
<td>1.143 E-4</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Active core</td>
<td>1.143 E-4</td>
<td>0.01753</td>
<td>0.01753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Upper core structures</td>
<td>0.2387</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>1.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Core bypass</td>
<td>4.766 E-3</td>
<td>4.146</td>
<td>4.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Upper head</td>
<td>0.2306</td>
<td>0.9144</td>
<td>0.9144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Reflood assist line</td>
<td>0.03871</td>
<td>4.048</td>
<td>0.8620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Reflood assist line</td>
<td>0.03871</td>
<td>4.840</td>
<td>0.6075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pressurizer surge line</td>
<td>1.452 E-3</td>
<td>4.592</td>
<td>0.4255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Pressurizer surge line</td>
<td>1.452 E-3</td>
<td>4.767</td>
<td>0.7678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>ECCS piping</td>
<td>6.221 E-3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ECCS piping</td>
<td>6.221 E-3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ECCS piping</td>
<td>6.221 E-3</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node No.</td>
<td>$k$</td>
<td>$k_{AF}$</td>
<td>$k_{AR}$</td>
<td>$k_{EF}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>189.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>142.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.18E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>9.34E-4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Calculated Results and Discussion

In a postulated LOCA, it has been conventional to divide the whole process into three phases, i.e. blowdown, refill and reflood phases. In Test L2-2, however, it seems difficult to distinguish these phases. As for the end of blowdown, it may be said to occur at 36 sec. after the break in the present analysis, since it is often defines as the time when the system pressure has almost decreased to the containment pressure. Therefore, we call the period before 36 sec. the blowdown phase and the period after that refill-reflood phase for convenience' sake. As will be shown in this section, in the refill-reflood phase, the effects of ECC water on thermal-hydraulics became apparent and rapid condensation processes were calculated.

The chronology of events is shown in Table 6. Detailed discussions about the events will be made in the following subsections.

6.1 Cladding Surface Temperature and Thermal-Hydraulic Behavior in Core

The calculated cladding surface temperatures at nodes 27 and 28 are shown in Figs. 13(a) and (b), respectively, along with the experimental data. In those figures, the heights of the measurement points from the bottom of the core are nearly equal to those of the calculated results, but their horizontal locations in the core are arbitrarily chosen.

The calculated heat transfer coefficients at nodes 27 and 28 are shown in Figs. 14(a) and (b), respectively, with the heat transfer modes. The mass flux and coolant quality calculated at node 28 are shown in Figs. 15 and 16, respectively. The experimental core flow data are not available due to the failure of the instrumentation. When Fig. 13(b) is compared with Figs. 15 and 16, we can understand that the calculation clarified the fact that the cladding surface temperature was closely coupled with the thermal-hydraulic behavior of coolant.

As shown in Figs. 13(a) and (b), the trends of the calculated cladding surface temperatures at nodes 27 and 28 were very similar to those observed in the experiment in the sense that a peak was calculated at the very early stage of the blowdown and the final quenching was calculated at about 50 sec. after the rupture. The time when the quenching was calculated in the blowdown, however, was earlier than that observed. And the calculated results
### Table 6  Chronology of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Time after Test Initiation (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcooled blowdown ended (a)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactor SCRAM</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earliest departure of cladding temperature</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from liquid saturation temperature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcooled blowdown ended (b)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum cladding temperature attained</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earliest return of cladding temperature to fluid</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saturation temperature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPIS injection initiated</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC injection initiated</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPIS injection initiated</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower plenum filled with liquid</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated blowdown ended</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC liquid flow ended</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core volume reflood</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) End of subcooled blowdown is defined as the occurrence of the first phase transition in the system other than at the pipe break location.

(b) End of subcooled blowdown is defined as the completion of subcooled fluid discharge from the break (hot and cold legs) in the broken loop.

* indicates that the value was set by an input.
showed about 10 sec. delay for the final quenching as compared with the experimental data.

First of all, the calculated results of thermal-hydraulic behavior in the core region is discussed for the blowdown and refill-reflood phases, separately in the following.

(1) Blowdown Phase

The calculated cladding surface temperatures, heat transfer coefficients, mass fluxes and coolant qualities at the heated core nodes at the early stage of the blowdown are shown in in Figs. 17, 18, 19 and 20, respectively. As shown in Fig. 19, the absolute values of the mass fluxes decreased from 0.5 sec. and the flows became stagnant at about 2 sec. Accompanied by the decreases of the flows, the coolant qualities increased as shown in Fig. 20. At node 27, the first DNB was calculated at about 1 sec., when the CHF value was predicted by the modified Zuber pool CHF correlation (20), (21). Just after the DNB was calculated, heat transfer modes changed from mode 4-3 (pool transition boiling) to mode 4-4 (pool film boiling) as shown in Fig. 18. After about 2 sec., the mass flux started to increase and the coolant quality decreased since relatively low enthalpy coolant flowed into the core through the downcomer and lower plenum. At about 3.4 sec., the mass flux exceeded Gmin (= 300kgm/m² sec) and the heat transfer mode changed from mode 4-4 to mode 4-1 (forced-convection transition boiling). Once mode 4-1 was assumed, the cladding surface temperature rapidly decreased to almost the coolant saturation temperature and finally the heat transfer mode changed to mode 3 (nucleate boiling), when the CHF value was calculated by the Biasi correlation.

Cladding surface temperature behavior such as the occurrence of the peaks is closely related to hydraulics. In this sense, the reason why the quenching was calculated to occur earlier than the experiment might be attributed to hydraulics. For example, the calculated mass fluxes at the core nodes might be overestimated from 4 to 6 sec.

As shown in Fig. 15, the calculated mass flux at core node 28 became less than Gmin at about 10 sec. and coolant became almost stagnant at about 16 sec. In accordance with the decrease of the flow, the calculated coolant quality again increased and the second DNB was calculated at 16 sec. under the pool flow condition.
(2) Refill-Reflood Phase

The calculated cladding temperatures at nodes 27 and 28, which are shown in Figs. 13(a) and (b), respectively, started to increase again at about 30 sec. That was because the coolant became superheated and the calculated heat transfer coefficients suddenly decreased as shown in Figs. 14(a) and (b). After about 40 sec., ECC water began to flow into the core nodes and coolant returned to be saturated. At about 50 sec., the coolant quality became below 5% and therefore the heat transfer mode changed to mode 4-5 (pool transition boiling). Then the cladding surface temperature suddenly decreased and finally the mode returned to mode 3 (nucleate boiling). The result showed about 10 sec. delay for the final quenching as compared with the experimental data. The delay parameters assigned to the nodes along the path of ECC water have large effects on the time during which condensation processes proceeded, so that the final quenching time is hoped to be improved by introducing a realistic model to estimate the delay parameters. It should be noted about the observed cladding surface temperature that the thermocouples are attached on the outside surface of the cladding so that they tend to indicate much faster quenching time, i.e. more than 10 sec.\(^{(15)}\).

6.2 ECC Water penetration through Core

The calculated mass fluxes and coolant enthalpies at the inlet and outlet points of nodes 27 and 28 in the refill-reflood phase are shown in Figs. 21 and 22, respectively. It is clearly shown in these figures that the rapid condensation processes were successively calculated at nodes 27 and 28. The rapid condensation process first started at node 27 at about 50 sec. and mass flow into the node suddenly increased until \(|G^A_{27} - G^E_{27}| \approx 180 \text{ kgm/mol/\text{sec.}}\) if the non-equilibrium model were not to be used it might become much more larger and the calculation might surely fail. After the maximum value was reached, it was gradually decreased to zero. In this period, the equilibrium void fraction \(\alpha^E_{27}\) was already zero, but the non-equilibrium void fraction \(\alpha^*_{27}\) was still not zero and was decreasing obeying Eq. (24). Next the rapid condensation started at node 28 at about 53 sec.

The maximum value of \(|G^A - G^E|\) and the time during which the condensation proceeds are strongly dependent on the delay parameter. For example,
if the delay parameters were assumed to be infinitely large, ECC water might
go through the downcomer, lower plenum and core rapidly. It is because no
mass accumulation is calculated, i.e. \( \frac{dN}{dt} = 0 \). Therefore, it is an impor-
tant problem to develop a model to evaluate the delay parameters. The
experimental results such as those in the LOFT program are hoped to give some
important information to improve or upgrade the THYDE-P code concerning the
non-equilibrium model.

6.3 Broken Loop Hot Leg

The calculated mass flow rate and coolant density at the broken loop hot leg are shown in Figs. 23 and 24, respectively. The calculated mass flow rate, which is identical with the break flow, was overestimated from 4 to 12 sec. in comparison with the experimental data. In this period, the flow was calculated by the Moody correlation (6) with the discharge coefficient \( c_d = 0.8 \). It could be said that the overestimation of the flow might be brought about by relatively low enthalpy coolant from the core region. In fact the calculated coolant density in this period was larger than the experimental density as shown in Fig. 24. In the calculation, the core flow from 4 to 8 sec. was very large and the coolant quality became low as mentioned in Subsec. 6.1.

After about 40 sec. in the experiment, ECC water was considered to be
entrained in the steam flow and to increase the mass flow and coolant density
at the broken loop hot leg as shown in the figures. On the other hand in the
analysis, such phenomena were not calculated.

6.4 Broken Loop Cold Leg

The calculated mass flow rate and coolant density at the broken loop cold leg are compared with the experimental data in Figs. 25 and 26, respectively. A critical flow was calculated at the break point until 3.9 sec. by the modified Zaloudek correlation (5) and from 3.9 to 18 sec. by the Moody correlation (6). After 18 sec., an inertial flow calculation (2) was made.

There are two prominent differences between the calculated and experimental
results as follows:
(1) The calculated mass flow rate was underestimated at the early stage of the blowdown.

(2) After about 30 sec., in the analysis, the coolant in the leg became subcooled, but in the experiment it still remained saturated.

One of the reason for (1) is thought to come from the discharge coefficients. The method to connect the critical flows calculated by these two correlations at the transition quality 0.02\(^2\) should be modified since the discharge coefficient for the modified Zaloudek correlation\(^5\) seems larger than the present values when the calculated results are compared with the experimental data. This underestimation of the mass flow rate in the broken loop cold leg and the overestimation of the mass flow rate in the intact loop cold leg, which will be discussed later, may have brought about the overestimated core flow in the blowdown phase.

As to the difference mentioned in (2), the nodalization of the downcomer region might be relevant. In the present nodalization, where the downcomer was simulated by a single node, bypassing water to the broken loop cold leg had to become subcooled soon after ECC water reached the downcomer top. The fact implies that two-dimensional effects in the downcomer flow have to be taken into consideration in some way. If the downcomer is nodalized into more than two nodes azimuthally, a reverse flow from the core, which has high enthalpy and warmer bypassing water, is able to be simulated even in the downcomer penetration period whereas the bypassing flow might become saturated. Such a situation was calculated in an analysis made not for Test L2-2 but for a large scale PWR LOCA with split downcomer nodalization as shown in Fig. 27.

Concerning the difference (2), heat transfer between coolant and structures might also be relevant. After 30 sec. in both the experiment and analysis, the coolant in the broken loop cold leg tended to be almost stagnant. Therefore the heat addition to the coolant from ducts might not be negligibly small. Another reason for (2) also existed in the present break flow calculation when a reverse flow was calculated. After 40 sec., reverse flow was calculated for a considerably long time, during which subcooled water flowed into the system according to the present break flow model. In the experiment, however, steam or air-steam mixture might flow into the duct from the
supression tank header when reverse flow occured. In the present analysis, the effects of subcooled water flowed into the system was made small in comparison with those of ECC water by a large loss coefficient at the break node for a reverse flow. It is desired, therefore, to implement a discharge tank model.

6.5 Intact Loop Hot Leg and Pressurizer

The calculated mass flow rate and coolant density at intact loop hot leg (node 11) are shown in Figs. 28 and 29, respectively, along with the experimental data. The calculated mass flow rate did not agree well with the experimental data at the blowdown phase. The reason is not clear because of lack of the experimental data. In spite of the fact that the hydraulic behavior in the intact loop hot leg is highly dependent on the pressurizer, no qualified engineering units data (QEUD) is available for the pressurizer and its surge line. The overestimation of the mass flow rate in the intact loop hot leg until 4 sec. seems to be due to large outsurge flow from the pressurizer. Therefore, one of the reasons for the overestimation may exist in the loss coefficients in the surge line, whose values are shown in Fig. 12. The calculated results of ressure and water level at the pressurizer are shown in Fig. 30. It should be noted that the definition of the water level in THYDE-P is different from so called "mixture or collapsed level".

6.6 Intact Loop Cold Leg and Primary Coolant Pumps

The calculated mass flow rate and coolant density in the intact loop cold leg at node 20, which is located between the ECC injection point and primary coolant pumps, are shown in Figs. 31 and 32, respectively, along with the experimental data. Both the mass flow rate and coolant density are over-estimated at the blowdown phase. The reasons are not understood but the pump performance might be relevant. As shown in Fig. 31, the calculated flow was almost stagnant in the refill-reflood phase, while in the experiment, many sharp peaks for flow and density were observed as shown in Figs. 31 and 32. It implies existence of drops or slugs of subcooled water in this region in the experiment.

In the refill-reflood phase, the coolant behavior in the intact loop
cold leg played an important role. The calculated mass fluxes and coolant enthalpies at the inlet and outlet points of node 20 in the refill-reflood phase are shown in Figs. 33 and 34, respectively. There are two prominent negative and positive peaks in the calculated mass flux at the outlet point of node 20 as shown in Fig. 33. These two peaks were calculated according to the following sequence.

(1) At about 33 sec. at the outlet point of node 20, flow reversal was calculated to occur and subcooled ECC water started to flow into the node, which was filled with superheated steam at the time.

(2) Once the flow reversal was calculated, a large amount of ECC water flowed into the node until the node was completely filled with subcooled water. In conjunction with this condensation process, an unrealistically large pressure drop might surely be calculated without the non-equilibrium model.

(3) At about 41 sec. also in node 20, boiling was calculated to start due to high enthalpy steam from the steam generator through the pump nodes until about 44 sec., when the coolant at the outlet point of node 20 became again superheated.

During the period when ECC water flowed into node 20, the mass flow to the core nodes considerably decreased. The phenomena had an effect to delay the core reflooding time. One the other hand, the boiling calculated at node 20 supplied much water into the core region so that it had the opposite effect. These processes described in (1), (2) and (3) are clearly shown in the density change in Fig. 32, which shows coolant from about 33 to 41 sec. were subcooled. In the experiment, however, such distinct over-all condensation and boiling were not observed but existence of drops or slugs were implied. These facts imply that non-homogeneous and non-equilibrium effects might play an important role in this period in the experiment.

The calculated normalized pump speed is shown in Fig. 35 along with the experimental data. In the present analysis, the pump speed is assumed to be constant throughout the analysis. The calculated pump head is shown in Fig. 36. The calculated normalized pump volumetric flow rate and coolant quality
at pump node 18 are shown in Fig. 37. Since the pump speed was assumed to be constant, the pump head was calculated as a function of the pump flow and void fraction only according to the homologous head curves. From about 40 to 44 sec., the coolant at the pump node became superheated, so that the two-phase head multiplier \( m_h \) was calculated to be zero as shown in Fig. 6. In this period, the normalized pump flow is, as shown in Fig. 37, as follows:

\[
w \approx 20
\]

Then

\[
a/w \approx \frac{0.36}{2.0} = 0.18
\]

The homologous head curve indicated by HWN in Fig. 4 shows that

\[
\frac{h_{\text{head}}}{w^2} \approx -0.6
\]

which gives

\[
h_{\text{head}} \approx -2.4 \quad (-260 \text{ m})
\]

This is the reason why the calculated pump head was negative and very large in this period.

6.7 ECC Water Penetration through Downcomer

The calculated mass fluxes and coolant enthalpies at the inlet and outlet points of downcomer node 22 are shown in Fig. 38 and 39, respectively. The calculated mass fluxes indicate that the first flashing started at about 4.5 sec. at the early stage of the blowdown and the increase of the void fraction continued until about 20 sec. Then effects of ECC water appeared in the following way. Low enthalpy ECC water prematurely penetrated into the downcomer node but was again pushed out due to a boiling process caused by a high enthalpy flow from the core nodes. As shown in Fig. 39, such processes repeated from 20 to 36 sec. Finally, at about 36 sec., a constantly forward flow was established at the inlet and the final condensation process was calculated to start. Therefore, we can define that the initiation of refill
was about 36 sec., in the present analysis.

6.8 Steam Generator

The calculated coolant temperatures at the inlet plenum and outlet plenum of the steam generator are shown in Fig. 40. The qualified engineering units data for these properties are not available. The calculated results concerning the steam generator primary system were as follows:

(1) Flashing started at the inlet plenum just after the break,

(2) In the outlet plenum, the flashing started at about 3.7 sec., after which the coolant temperatures at both inlet and outlet plenums became nearly equal,

(3) At about 30 sec., the outlet plenum became filled with superheated steam due to the heat addition from the secondary system, so that the coolant temperature departed from the coolant saturation temperature.

The calculated pressure at the SG secondary and primary systems are shown in Fig. 41. The secondary system behaved like a heat reservoir since feed and outsurge flow were shut off just after the break. In the present analysis, the calculated pressure at the secondary system first increased due to the heat addition from the primary system, and then gradually decreased from about 4 sec. due to the heat removal to the primary system. After the SG secondary system changed from heat sink to heat source, the DNB was calculated at the primary side wall. Therefore, the pressure difference between the secondary and primary systems was calculated to be large in the refill-reflood phase as shown in Fig. 41.

6.9 Accumulator

The calculated mass flow rate and pressure at the accumulator are shown in Figs. 42 and 43, respectively, along with the experimental data. Negative values of the mass flow rate data indicate injection. The experimental mass flow rate were calculated from the experimental volumetric flow rate data.
assuming the coolant density constant.

The time when the injection was calculated to start was a little earlier than the experimental data. The fact implies that the pressure at the injection point, i.e., mixing junction 26, was well simulated but a little underestimated in comparison with the experiment. The calculated enthalpies at the accumulator, the inlet and outlet points of node 40 are shown in Fig. 44. It took about 10 sec. for the enthalpy of node 40 (ACC side) to become equal to the accumulator enthalpy (40 kcal/kgm).

6.10 Temporal Behavior of Pressure

Generally speaking, the calculated pressures at nodes in the hydraulic network were in good agreement with the experimental data. The calculated pressure at just above the active core, i.e., node 31, is shown in Fig. 45 along with the experimental data. A good agreement was obtained.

6.11 Time Step Width and CPU Time

The CPU time required for the present calculation by a FACOM M200 computer was about 2 hours. The maximum time step width allowed in the present calculation was given as inputs as follows:

\[
\Delta t = \begin{cases} 
0.001 \text{ sec.} & \text{for } 0.0 < t < 0.3 \text{ sec.} \\
0.004 \text{ sec.} & \text{for } 0.3 < t
\end{cases}
\]

The whole calculation proceeded by the maximum time step width except when rapid transients were calculated.
(a) Comparison of calculated cladding surface temperature at node 27 with experimental data

(b) Comparison of calculated cladding surface temperature at node 28 with experimental data

Fig. 13 Cladding surface temperatures
Fig. 14  Calculated heat transfer coefficient
Fig. 15  Calculated mass flux at core node 28

Fig. 16  Calculated coolant quality at core node 28
Fig. 17  Calculated cladding surface temperatures at core nodes at early stage of blowdown

Fig. 18  Calculated heat transfer coefficients at core nodes at early stage of blowdown
Fig. 19 Calculated mass fluxes at core nodes at early stage of blowdown

Fig. 20 Calculated coolant qualities at core nodes at early stage of blowdown
Fig. 21 Calculated mass fluxes at inlet and outlet points of core nodes 27 and 28 in refill-reflood phase

Fig. 22 Calculated enthalpies at inlet and outlet points of core nodes 27 and 28 in refill-reflood phase
Fig. 23  Mass flow rate at broken loop hot leg

Fig. 24  Coolant density at broken loop hot leg
Fig. 25  Mass flow rate at broken loop cold leg

Fig. 26  Coolant density at broken loop cold leg
(a) Present analysis  
(b) Example for split downcomer

Fig. 27  Nodalization for downcomer region
Fig. 28 Mass flow rate at intact loop hot leg

Fig. 29 Coolant density at intact loop hot leg
Fig. 30 Calculated pressure and water level at pressurizer

Fig. 31 Mass flow rate at intact loop cold leg
Fig. 32  Coolant density at intact loop cold leg

Fig. 33  Calculated mass fluxes at intact loop cold leg (node 20) in refill-reflood phase
Fig. 34 Calculated enthalpies at intact loop cold leg (node 20) in refill-reflood phase

Fig. 35 Normalized pump speed
Fig. 36  Calculated pump head at pump node 18

Fig. 37  Calculated normalized pump volumetric flow rate and coolant quality at pump node 18
Fig. 38  Calculated mass fluxes at downcomer node 22

Fig. 39  Calculated enthalpies at downcomer node 22
Fig. 40  Calculated coolant temperatures at inlet and outlet plenums of SG (nodes 13 and 16)

Fig. 41  Calculated pressures at SG secondary and primary systems
Fig. 42  Mass flow rate at accumulator

Fig. 43  Accumulator pressure
Fig. 44  Enthalpy at accumulator

Fig. 45  Pressure above active core
7. Conclusion

Major problems pointed out in the preceding sections are summarized as follows:

(1) The calculated break flows were not in good agreement with the experimental data especially at the early stage of the blowdown,

(2) The calculated core flow was overestimated due to the underestimated break flow at the broken loop cold leg in the blowdown phase,

(3) The calculated results in the refill-reflood phase might be strongly dependent on the nodalization along the path of ECC water,

(4) Coolant bypassing to the broken loop cold leg was subcooled in the analysis, but was saturated in the experiment,

(5) Most of fuel rods have quenched at about 40 sec. in the experiment, but about 50 sec. in the analysis,

(6) The present non-equilibrium model was very simple. Since the delay parameter had strong effects on the core reflood time, the physical models to estimate the delay parameter are yet to be developed.

In spite of these facts, the major purposes of the present analysis were thought to be successfully obtained. Much efforts, however, are needed to be made in conjunction with the non-equilibrium model.
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Appendix A  Input Data List

-- LOFT L2-2 ANALISYS BY THYDE-P CODE -- L2P04  80.07.24
/  **** DIMENSION DATA ****
BB01  0  0  9  3  17  43  37  9  2  2  1  1  2  6  5  3
/  **** MINOR EDIT DATA ****
BB02  PRE-30 PRA-08 PRA-07 GLA-21 GLE-07 GLA-08 GLE-35 GLA-23 GLA-23
/  **** TIME STEP CONTROL DATA ****
BB03  0.2  0.2  100.
SB0301  30  3  50  0  1.0E-3  1.0E-6  0.3  0.1
SB0305  30  3  50  0  4.0E-3  1.0E-6  90.0  0.1
SB0308  40  1  1  0  4.0E-3  1.0E-6  2000.0  0.1
/  **** TRIP CONTROLL DATA ****
BB04  SB0480  1  0  1  0  1000.0  0.0
SB0481  5  42  1  0  0.002  0.0
SB0482  2  18  1  0  1000.0  0.0
SB0483  2  19  1  0  1000.0  0.0
SB0484  3  30  1  0  0.085  0.0
SB0485  4  1  1  0  12.0  0.0
SB0486  4  2  1  0  29.0  0.0
SB0487  -4  1  1  0  1000.0  0.0
SB0488  -4  2  1  0  1000.0  0.0
SB0489  6  1  -3  1  240.0  0.005
SB0490  6  2  -3  1  250.0  0.0
SB0491  6  3  -3  1  360.0  0.0
SB0492  -6  1  3  1  350.0  0.0
SB0493  00000100
| SB0494 | -6 2 3 1 | 305.0 | 0.0 |
| SB0495 | -6 3 3 1 | 380.0 | 0.0 |
| SB0496 | -6 2 2 1 | 190.0 | 0.0 |

/  *** FLOW ADJUST DATA  ***
BB05  1  3.0644  329.2
/
/  *** NODE DATA  ***
BB06
SB0601  1 1 22 29 0 154.526047915  0.2842  0.0  1.332  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
SB0602  2 1 29 1 0 154.380793779  0.2842  0.0  0.6965  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
SB0603  3 1 1 2 0 154.380788629 -1.0  -1.0  1.52  1.09  0.7174  1.0  0.0  0.0
SB0604  4 1 2 3 0 154.333420869  0.3485  0.0  3.228  2.705  189.0  189.0  189.0  0.0
SB0605  5 1 3 4 0 154.145289469  0.3485  0.0  3.228  2.705  189.0  189.0  189.0  0.0
SB0606  6 1 4 5 0 154.331409722  0.1272  0.0  2.423  2.0394  20.0  20.0  20.0  0.0
SB0607  7 1 5 6 0 154.471707114  0.1032  0.0  1.883  1.322  0.0  118626.588  0.0  0.0
SB0608  8 1 6 7 0 154.825070056  0.1032  0.0  0.4877  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
SB0609  9 1 7 30 0 154.825070402  0.2842  0.0  0.6965  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
SB0610 10 1 30 27 0 154.825070395  0.2842  0.0  0.9510  0.0  0.0  3.58  10.0  0.0
SB0611 11 1 22 23 0 154.14454  0.2842  0.0  2.616  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
SB0612 12 1 23 8 0 154.28418  0.2832  0.0  2.643  0.2432  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
SB0613 13 1 8 9 0 154.27422  0.9084  0.0  0.5175  0.5175  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
SB0614 14 7 9 10 1 154.22380  0.01021  0.0  2.568  2.483  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
SB0615 15 7 10 11 1 153.99431  0.01021  0.0  2.568  2.483  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S80616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 11 12</td>
<td>0 154.13590</td>
<td>0.9084</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5175</td>
<td>-0.5175</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 12 24</td>
<td>0 154.09992</td>
<td>0.2941</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.426</td>
<td>-1.523</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8 24 25</td>
<td>0 154.25687</td>
<td>0.3468</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>1.2807</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8 24 25</td>
<td>0 154.24707</td>
<td>0.3043</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>1.2807</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 25 26</td>
<td>0 154.97917</td>
<td>0.2757</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 26 27</td>
<td>0 154.98447</td>
<td>0.2842</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5313</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4 27 13</td>
<td>0 154.80960</td>
<td>0.45190</td>
<td>0.0426</td>
<td>4.256</td>
<td>-4.256</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5 13 28</td>
<td>0 155.0864</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7318</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 28 14</td>
<td>0 155.0770</td>
<td>0.4417</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4285</td>
<td>0.4285</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2 14 15</td>
<td>0 154.9449</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.09423</td>
<td>0.09423</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2 15 16</td>
<td>1 154.9022</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2 16 17</td>
<td>1 154.8312</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2 17 18</td>
<td>1 154.7579</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2 18 19</td>
<td>1 154.6882</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.4191</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 19 20</td>
<td>0 154.6167</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.01753</td>
<td>0.01753</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1 20 22</td>
<td>0 154.5833</td>
<td>0.5513</td>
<td>0.05486</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 22 22</td>
<td>0 155.0770</td>
<td>0.0779</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.164</td>
<td>4.164</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>13 22 37</td>
<td>0 0.1</td>
<td>0.5419</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9144</td>
<td>0.9144</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>13 29 35</td>
<td>0 0.1</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.048</td>
<td>0.8620</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>13 30 36</td>
<td>0 0.1</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.840</td>
<td>0.6075</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>13 23 21</td>
<td>0 10.0</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.592</td>
<td>0.4255</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-R-----8
SB0637 37 13 21 34 0 10.0 0.043 0.0 4.767 0.7678 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
SB0638 38 13 26 31 0 10.0 0.089 0.0 5.5 0.0 0.4 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
SB0639 39 13 26 32 0 10.0 0.089 0.0 5.5 0.0 0.4 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
SB0640 40 13 26 33 0 20.0 0.089 0.0 58.0 0.0 0.4 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
/
/ **** JUNCTION DATA ****
BB07 1 1 0.0
2 1 0.0
3 1 0.0
4 1 0.0
5 1 0.0
6 1 0.0
7 1 0.0
8 1 0.0
9 1 0.0
10 1 0.0
11 1 0.0
12 1 0.0
13 1 0.0
14 1 0.0
15 1 0.0
16 1 0.0
17 1 0.0
18 1 0.0
19 1 0.0
20 1 0.0
21 1 0.0
22 4 0.1937
23 4 0.04169
24 4 0.05040
25 4 0.04664
26 4 0.08948
27 4 0.18
28 4 0.064
29 4 0.04474
30 4 0.04474
31 7 0.0
32 7 0.0
33 5 0.0
34 6 0.0
35 8 0.0
36 8 0.0
37 8 0.0
/
/ **** MIXING JUNCTION DATA ****
BB08
SB0801 22 3 1 11 33 0 0.001 0.999 0. 0.
SB0802 23 2 12 36 0 0 1.0 0.0 0.0 0.
SB0803 24 2 18 19 0 0 0.5 0.5 0.0 0.
SB0804 25 1 20 0 0 0 1.0 0.0 0.0 0.
- 70 -
| SB0805  | 00022800 | 00022900 | 00023000 | 00023100 | 00023200 | 00023300 | 00023400 | 00023500 | 00023600 | 00023700 | 00023800 | 00023900 | 00024000 | 00024100 | 00024200 | 00024300 | 00024400 | 00024500 | 00024600 | 00024700 | 00024800 | 00024900 | 00025000 | 00025100 | 00025200 | 00025300 | 00025400 | 00025500 | 00025600 | 00025700 | 00025800 | 00025900 | 00026000 | 00026100 | 00026200 | 00026300 | 00026400 | 00026500 | 00026600 | 00026700 | 00026800 | 00026900 | 00027000 | 00027100 | 00027200 | 00027300 | 00027400 | 00027500 | 00027600 | 00027700 | 00027800 | 00027900 | 00028000 | 00028100 | 00028200 | 00028300 | 00028400 | 00028500 | 00028600 |
|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| SB0806  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| SB0807  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| SB0808  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| SB0808  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| SB0901  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| SB0902  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| SB1001  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| SB1002  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| BB111   |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| SB1101  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |

---

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.025</th>
<th>0.15</th>
<th>0.075</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0650E-5</td>
<td>7.7239E-5</td>
<td>1.3263E-4</td>
<td>1.9460E-4</td>
<td>2.6207E-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.8660E-5</td>
<td>1.2281E-4</td>
<td>2.1033E-4</td>
<td>3.0996E-4</td>
<td>4.1602E-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3760E-5</td>
<td>1.6066E-4</td>
<td>2.7587E-4</td>
<td>4.0485E-4</td>
<td>5.4514E-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7239E-5</td>
<td>1.9460E-4</td>
<td>3.3419E-4</td>
<td>4.9044E-4</td>
<td>6.6037E-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.9628E-5</td>
<td>2.2585E-4</td>
<td>3.8780E-4</td>
<td>5.6910E-4</td>
<td>7.6631E-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ACCUMULATOR DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BB12</th>
<th>SB1201</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>2.63</th>
<th>1.05</th>
<th>28.7</th>
<th>40.562</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>0.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**BREAK POINT DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BB13</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2.0E-3</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**PRESSURIZER DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BB14</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.557</th>
<th>1.7235</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.88</th>
<th>0.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**STEAM GENERATOR DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BB15</th>
<th>SB1501</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>1845</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.589</th>
<th>4.188</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>0.01905</th>
<th>0.005105</th>
<th>4.469</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>196.0</th>
<th>12.67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**CORE DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BB16</th>
<th>1300</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>9000.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.359E-3</th>
<th>6.172E-4</th>
<th>4.647E-3</th>
<th>1.43E-2</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>19.52E-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.0124</th>
<th>2.395E-4</th>
<th>0.0305</th>
<th>1.5897E-3</th>
<th>0.111</th>
<th>1.423E-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.301</th>
<th>2.869E-3</th>
<th>1.14</th>
<th>8.347E-4</th>
<th>3.01</th>
<th>3.048E-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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**** SG RELIEF VALVE DATA ****
BB17
6
0.0 0.0 0.1 -14. 0.18 -32. 0.34 -62. 0.5 -94. 0.58 -179.
45.0 -0.00030 380. -0.00022 1200. -0.00015 2280. -0.00008
9
0.0 0.0 0.2 -0.2 0.4 -0.4 0.6 -1.4 0.8 -2.4 1.0 -5.6 1.2 -12.6 1.4 -15.4 200.0 -15.6
/
****
BB18
1.54E-03 0.775E-04 2.29E-04
/
**** FUEL GAP DATA ****
BB19
5.7E-4 0.0 5.493E-6 0.0 0.0
0.0 0.0 0.0 0.9 0.75 0.0
0.087 0.0355 0.0063 0.0 0.0712
0.0 0.0
/
****
BB21
2 2 5.00E-7 6.96E-08 2.87E-4 2.86E-03 1.15E0 1.528E0
1.49E-07 2.0E-08 1.25E-16 1.85E-01 8.0E09 3.3E-03
/
**** OTHER DATA ****
BB22
0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
BEND
5
END
END
LIST
HIGHEST SEVERITY CODE=00
- END

STATISTICS: HIGHEST SEVERITY CODE=00
### Appendix B  Function Codes of Experimental Data in Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No</th>
<th>System Detector</th>
<th>Function Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13(a)</td>
<td>TE-2H14-028</td>
<td>TECTD215</td>
<td>Cladding on Fuel Assembly 2, Row H, Column 14 at 0.71m above bottom of fuel rod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13(b)</td>
<td>TE-2H15-041</td>
<td>TECTD218</td>
<td>Cladding on Fuel Assembly 2, Row H, Column 15 at 1.04m above bottom of fuel rod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FR-BL-216</td>
<td>FRBKD216</td>
<td>Broken loop hot leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>DE-BL-002B</td>
<td>DEBTG006</td>
<td>Broken loop hot leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>FR-BL-116</td>
<td>FRBKD116</td>
<td>Broken loop cold leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>DE-BL-105</td>
<td>DEBKD105</td>
<td>Broken loop cold leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>FR-PC-202</td>
<td>FRPKD202</td>
<td>Intact loop hot leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>DE-PC-205</td>
<td>DEPKD205</td>
<td>Intact loop hot leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>FR-PC-102</td>
<td>FRPKD102</td>
<td>Intact loop cold leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>DE-PC-105</td>
<td>DEPKD105</td>
<td>Intact loop cold leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>RPE-PC-002</td>
<td>SRPTD498</td>
<td>Pump speed-primary coolant pump 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>FT-P102-36-1</td>
<td>FVFTD016</td>
<td>Accumulator A in 6-in. line downstream of orifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>PT-P102-043</td>
<td>PAFTD115</td>
<td>Accumulator A, 0.69m above water outlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>PE-lup-001A</td>
<td>PAUTD103</td>
<td>Above Fuel Assembly 1 upper end box, high range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C  Nomenclature

C.1  Alphabetic Symbols

a  Normalized pump speed
\( a_0 \)  Normalized initial pump speed
\( a_1, a_2 \)  Quantities defined in Eq. (21), \( s^2/m^2 \) and \( kgm^2/m^3 \) kcal
A  Flow area, \( m^2 \)

b  Normalized pump hydraulic torque

c  Quantity defined in Eq. (26), \( s \)

D  Diameter, \( m \)

D_b  Diameter, \( cm \)

f_n1  Function defined in Eq. (20)

F  Function defined in Table 4

g  Gravitational acceleration, \( m/s^2 \)

\( g_c \)  Dimensional conversion ratio, \( kgm/kgf \ m/s^2 \)

G  Mass flux, \( kgm/m^2s \)

\( G_b \)  Mass flux, \( gm/cm^2s \)

G_{min}  Minimum mass flux for forced convection condition, \( kgm/m^2s \)

h  Enthalpy, \( kcal/kgm \)

\( h_{fg} \)  Latent heat, \( kcal/kgm \)

\( h_{head} \)  Normalized pump head

h_t  Function defined in Eq. (7)

\( h_{tr} \)  Heat transfer coefficient, \( kcal/m^2s{\degree}c \)

\( \Delta h \)  Enthalpy difference, \( kcal/kgm \)

H  Function defined in Eq. (4)

H_L  Node length, \( m \)

J_c  Dimensional conversion ratio, \( J/cal \)

k  Loss coefficient

\( k_g, k_l \)  Thermal conductivities of gas and liquid phases, respectively, \( kcal/m \ s \ {\degree}c \)

L  Node length, \( m \)

L_b  Length, \( m \)

\( m_b, m_h \)  Two-phase pump torque and head multipliers, respectively

p  Pressure, \( Pa \)

P_b  Pressure, \( ata \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Pressure, psia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δp</td>
<td>Pressure difference, Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>Reynolds number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Time, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δt</td>
<td>Time step width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Temperature, °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_w</td>
<td>Wall temperature, °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_w^°F</td>
<td>Wall temperature, °F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔT_s</td>
<td>Wall superheat, °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔT_s^°F</td>
<td>Wall superheat, °F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔT_s^min</td>
<td>Quantity defined in Eq. (9), °F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Node volume, m^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V*</td>
<td>Dimensionless node volume defined in Eq. (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>Normalized pump volumetric flow rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Mass flow rate, kgm/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Equilibrium quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x_0</td>
<td>Quantity defined in Eq. (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x_c</td>
<td>Quantity defined in Eq. (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x_in</td>
<td>Inlet quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x_out</td>
<td>Outlet quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>Function defined in Eq. (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C.2 Greek Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>Equilibrium void fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α*</td>
<td>Non-equilibrium void fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>Quantity defined in Eq. (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>Equilibrium density, kgm/m^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ*</td>
<td>Non-equilibrium density, kgm/m^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>Heat flux, kcal/m^2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ*</td>
<td>Heat flux, Btu/ft^2/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>Surface tension, kgf/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ_0</td>
<td>Delay parameter, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ_c</td>
<td>Quantity defined in Eq. (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.3 Subscripts and Superscripts

Subscripts

 coolant  Coolant
core  Core nodes
CHF  Critical heat flux
ECC  Emergency core cooling water
fs  Saturated fluid
gs  Saturated steam
g  Gas phase
l  Liquid phase
n  Node number
pjr  Pressurizer
sat  Saturated property
4-1  Evaluated in heat transfer mode 4-1
4-2  Evaluated in heat transfer mode 4-2

Superscripts

A  Inlet point of node
E  Outlet point of node
f  Forward flow
j  Junction number
n  Node number
new  Present time
old  Time which is one time step past
r  Reverse flow
1φ  Single-phase
2φ  Two-phase