

Analyse von Kritikalitätsbedingungen im BE- Lagerbecken

R. Dagan¹, M. Behler²

¹ Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Institute for Neutron Physics and Reactor Technology, P.O. Box 3640, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany

² GRS, Nuclear Fuel Department, 85748 Garching, Germany

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology





KIT – University of the State of Baden-Wuerttemberg and National Research Center of the Helmholtz Association

www.kit.edu



Layout of unit 4 SFP



Layout of representative Rack



- Conservative approach:
 - reflective boundary conditions
 - water at bottom and top of the fuel pins
- Reference case: Fresh BWR fuel

111 111	111 111	111 111			111'''11	11111

Layout of fuel element



- # 4wt % U235 enrichment (yellow pins)
- 3.4wt % U235 enrichment and 5 wt% in Gadolinium (green) pins
- Clad Zircaloy 4
- Stainless Steel type 1.4568

(Norm DIN EN10027-1/2 (X7 CrNIAI 17-7)





Between the steel walls of the rack is empty space, which is filled with water (8.5 mm in outer walls (13.5 mm total wall thickness) and 35 mm in long inner walls (40 mm total wall thickness).

Impact of Racks steel walls on criticality

All calculations with reflective boundaries

- ❀ 4 longitudinal walls: Keff=0.7707
- ❀ 2 Longitudinal walls: Keff =0.78638
- No inner longitudinal walls:Keff =0.80234

 $\sigma = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ for all calculations





Impact of void with reflection at the boundary (I)



Reference calculations with fresh fuel were done
 without inner longitudinal walls: Keff: 0.8023

 With 94% void in the spaces between the fuel pins and normal density within the pin: Keff=0.91107

94% void over all the rack, including the fuel elements

Keff : 0.5632



Impact of void without reflection at the boundary (II)

- The reference calculations without inner longitudinal walls:
 (with reflection) Keff: 0.8023
- Void only in the inner spaces between the rows of the fuel elements without reflection: Keff=0.7875

(less by : $\Delta k_{eff} \approx 0.13$ for the full reflection case) (former page)



Change of criticality due to burn up of Gd loaded BWR fuel element





Fuel Element of about 14GWd/MTU exhibit up to $\Delta k_{eff} \approx 0.15$



Geometrical model of fuel assembly and rack

Two geometrical models analyzed (2d + 3d):

- Infinite lattice of single fuel assemblies (simplified model)
- Infinite lattice of fuel racks (still simplified but more realistic)

Two different fuels considered:

- Fresh fuel
- Burn up of 13 GWd/tHM

(considered Nuclides: ^{234, 235, 236, 238}U, ^{238, 239, 240, 241, 242}Pu, ²³⁷Np, ^{241, 243}Am, ¹⁰⁹Ag, ¹³³Cs, ¹⁵³Eu, ^{155, 157}Gd, ⁹⁵Mo, ^{143, 145}Nd, ¹⁰³Rh, ¹⁰¹Ru, ^{147, 149, 150, 151, 152}Sm, ⁹⁹Tc, ¹⁶O)





Geometrical model of fuel assembly and rack

- Different enrichments per fuel pin considered
- Assumed distance between racks: 10cm in x and 6 cm in y
- Reflective boundary conditions





model "BE"



\mathbf{k}_{eff} calculations

Neutron multiplication factor k_{eff} of considered models:

	k _{ef}	f,BE	k _{eff,rack}		
	2d	3d	2d	3d	
Fresh fuel	0.8504	0.8481	0.8014	0.7994	
13 GWD/tHM	0.9797	0.9773	0.9232	0.9212	

- Reactivity increases with burnup, maximum at reactor conditions at about 13 GWd/tHM, increase in k_{eff}: Δk_{eff} ≈ 0.12 (from OECD/NEA Expert Group BUC Phase IIIc Benchmark)
- Realistic model "rack" results in a k_{eff} well below the administrative limit of 0.95
- Model "BE" more conservative \Rightarrow structure of the rack important to keep k_{eff} below 0.95



k_{eff} calculations

Variations of water density between 0.05 g/cm³ and 1.0 g/cm³:



\mathbf{k}_{eff} calculations

Variations of the rack separation in y between 0.0 cm and 20.0 cm:

- Scenario: steel looses its stability due to heating up, legs and spacers between racks deform and racks "topple down" ("domino effect"):
- Approximation: reducing the distance between racks









k_{eff} calculations

Variations of the fuel assembly separation in y inside the racks between 0.0 cm and 3.5 cm:



¹⁴C Production



Physical formation of ¹⁴C in fuel assemblies by

- neutron capture reactions
- ternary fission in the fuel

during reactor operation



ternary fission in LWR fuel



[[1] Neeb (1997) The radiochemistry of nuclear power plants with light water reactors. de Gruyter, Berlin. // Nucl. Engineering International (2003) vol. 48, no. 590, Fuel design data.

Results: inventory analysis



- experimentally obtained results for ¹⁴C, ⁵⁵Fe and ¹²⁵Sb are in good agreement with calculations
- The build up of C14 was linear to the N14 concentration about 1000 Bq/gr per 1ppm N14.
- C/E ¹³⁷Cs inventory is different by factor 117
 - \rightarrow The precipitation of volatile (light blue) ¹³⁷Cs on

the inner cladding surface during operation

can not be taken into account in the MCNP calculations.



radionuclide	¹⁴ C	⁵⁵ Fe	¹³⁷ Cs	¹²⁵ Sb		
		[Bq/(g Zyr-4)]				
Experimental	$3.7(\pm 0.4) \times 10^4$	1.5(±0.2)×10 ⁵	$3.4(\pm 0.3) \times 10^{6}$	2.4(±0.2)×10 ⁵		
calculated	3.2×10 ⁴	1.3×10 ⁵	2.9×10 ⁴	2.6×10 ⁵		

Conclusions



- With the conservative consideration it is seen that the sub criticality is well below the limit of 0.95 (~0.7-0.80)
- Expected void should in principle decrease the sub criticality due to lack of moderation.
- The Gd impact is worth about 0.15 in criticality, at maximal conservative condition.
- Only fuel elements , all of which, with the maximal Gd worth combined with (unrealistic)
 - * with dedicated location of void between the fuel elements
 - or compaction of the racks to a "reactor like" configuration might lead to super criticality.
- Release of Activated nuclides is unavoidable and should be considered for any fuel deformation scenario.

Acknowledgment



this project has received funding from the Euratom 7th FP under Grant agreement N° 604965".