N94- 34190

A REVIEW OF VIBRATION PROBLEMS **IN** POWER STATION BOILER FEED PuMPs

David France Weir Pumps Limited Glasgow, Scotland

/ /

SYNOPSIS *f*

k **Boiler** Feed **Pump reliability and availability is recognised as important** to **the overall efficiency of power generation. Vibration** monitoring **is often used as part of planned** maintenance. **This paper reviews a number of different** types **of boiler feed pump vibration problems describing some** methods **of solution in** the **process. It is hoped** that this **review may** assist **both designers and users fac_ with similar problems.**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The reliability **of** the **boiler feed pump** in **modem power stations** is **seen** as essential to ensure the overall availability of the power generating plant and is often included in the rotating machinery vibration monitoring **programme** practised by many power station **maintenance** departments. The vibration characteristics of a boiler **feed** pump earl be complex and difficult to understand **and** it is the purpose of this paper to describe typical vibration mechanisms at work to assist those engaged in the diagnosis of problems. Case studies are **presented** which demonstrate the following types of vibration responses:-

- **1. Forced**
- 2. **Resonant**
- 3. Self excited
- 4. Transient
- 5. **Cavitation**

Some solutions to these are **described** in **the** hope that **these** may assist both **designers** and users faced with similar problems.

2.0 **FORCED VIBRATIONS**

Forced vibrations **-** vibrations which **are produced by** the application of an external set of oscillatory forces.

Centrifugal pump vibrations **are often described** as being **either synchronous or nonsynchronous** with respect to its operating **speed.** Usually **synchronous** is taken to mean the vibration component at the **pump's** operating speed although it is often taken to include any harmonic of this. Nonsynchronous covers all other frequency components. **Synchronous** forcing influences may arise from either mechanical or hydraulic **sources** of unbalance. Mechanical sources are fairly well understood because of the general similarity in other types of rotating equipment. Hydraulic sources may result from either casting asymmetries or partial **blockage** of impeller **passageways by,** for example, ingress of foreign matter. Generally speaking the magnitude of hydraulic unbalance generated by an impeller is greater than the residual mass unbalance component. A Japanese investigator, ref. 1, measured the hydraulic force as a function of flowrate, fig. 1. The maximum value of unbalance qualities of G2.5 - G6.3. **Practical** experience **suggests** that **precision** castings **for** the **impellers** of high **speed feed** pumps could offer a hydraulic reduction of possibly an order of magnitude. Nonsynchronous forced responses usually arise at part load operations where hydraulic forces, **generated** by recirculating flows within the impeller or diffuser, may give **rise** to irregular or cyclic low frequency excitations. These have been discussed previously by a number of authors, ref.2, 3. A typical example of this can be seen in fig.2, where the shaft displacement increased threefold between the design flowrate and the recirculation flow quantity.

Substantial forces may be generated due to interaction of the impeller **blades** with guide **vanes** in either the upstream or downstream flow fields. These forces manifest themselves as vibration at the impeller blade number and blade number harmonics. The main area of concern to any maintenance engineer is undoubtedly the effect that high blade vibration levels may have on the reliability of the pump. Understandably the worry is whether or not this may result in a fatigue failure of impeller or diffuser. General machinery vibration guidelines offer little help in this regard except to suggest that vibration monitoring may help to identify deterioration. Data from the field serve to illustrate the difficulties of interpretation further. For example, blade vibration levels of 15mm/see rms are not untypical on **some** of our boiler feed pumps yet these pumps have given many years of trouble free operation. On the other hand, impeller blade or impeller shroud failures have occurred after some 6 months to 2 years into operation yet external levels of blade vibration have been less than 2mm/see rms. Clearly, therefore, there is not necessarily a one - one relationship between vibration level and the stress levels within the working components. Insight into generation of vibration at blade frequency and blade frequency harmonies results from the studies by *Zotov,* ref.4, this theory shows that it is possible to select impeller and diffuser blade number combinations to **suppress** the vibration at the fundamental blade frequency, or if required, at a higher blade frequency harmonic. This is indicated by the values shown in Table I. The table shows the radial vibration force frequency components relative to a unit magnitude radial interaction force between each of the impeller and diffuser blades. It is significant that the vibration of the pump casing can be minimised in this way, but care is needed to ensure that certain blade combinations do not give rise to reinforced pressure fluctuations in the fluid as could be the case with 6×9 , and 8×12 blade combinations. Experimental data obtained from **pumps** with 7 x 12 and 7 x 13 blade combinations **show** encouraging correlation with theory, these also are **given** inTable I. Although blade numbers can have a powerful effect on the distribution of the harmonic content of the resultant blade interaction forces, the stresses induced on the individual blades are not significantly modified by the number of blades between the impeller and diffuser. The magnitude of the interaction forces are influenced by the hydraulic design, the stage power, the impeller to diffuser gap, the **operating** point relative to the best efficiency point and possibly the inlet guide vane geometry and upstream flow field. It seems fairly well accepted that a minimum tip **gap** of 3% of impeller radius, (derived empirically by Makay, ref.5.), is sensible to avoid highly stressed components. Some results of research by Weir Pumps Limited into blade combinations and tip **gaps** give interesting insight into **such** effects, fig.3a, 3b.

In 1985 an **unusual blade** vibration **phenomenon** was identified **on** a **number** of boiler feed pumps destined for an East European power station. The pumps are 4 stage boiler feed driven by steam turbines. Pump design duty is 0.36m3/sec at 2461m head at 5454 rpm, impeller blade number is 7 and diffuser number is 12. Tip gap is 3%. This should have resulted in low

blade rate vibration levels, **yet high** vibration levels were **experienced on some of the pumps** on **the drive end bearing** housing **only. The** vibration **was only experienced over** a *narrow* **range of flow.** A typical **blade** frequency **vibration** characteristic is shown **in fig.4. Each** pump showed similar characteristics **but** the **vibration level on** some **of** the pumps **was only** about 2.0 **- 3.0mm/sec rms. Despite** *many* hours **of** tests and subsequent **examinations of** components **from** a number **of** pumps, **it** was not possible to ascertain any **difference** which **might explain** the **variation in vibration level.** The **only modification** done was **to eliminate the upstream inlet** guide **vanes to** the first stage impeller, this had no **effect on** the **magnitude of** the vibration. **The** problem source has never properly **been identified,** yet the **vibration levels** would appear not **to be detrimental to reliability** as **the** pumps have **been operating** satisfactorily for **more** than six years.

3.0. RESONANT VIBRATIONS

Resonance **-** a phenomenon evident **when** the frequency of the **disturbing** force equals a natural frequency of the system.

In **1982 a resonance problem was** experienced **on a** four turbine **driven** variable **speed boiler** feed pump, **installed** at Huntly Power Station, (4 x 250MW), New **Zealand.** The area **is** seismically active and the **design of** the **pump** and turbine support structure **reflected** the selsm_c **requirements. The** pump **was** centre hne **mounted on** a **baseplate which** was secured to **a large** steel table **onto which** the turbine **was** also **mounted.** The steel table **was** supported **from** the **floor level by** a number **of** tall **vertical** metal columns, **ensuring** a **low** frequency **mounting** system **for** the equipment. A schematic **is** shown **if** fig.5. **High vibration levels, in** excess **of** 20mm/sec peak, at pump shaft **frequency, were obtained** at generator **loading of** 200- 220MW, corresponding **to** a pump speed in the **range** 5300 **rpm-5500rpm. Examination of** the amplitude phase **relationship** suggested a **resonance was responsible. Excitation tests were** carried **out with** the **pump stationary using** an air **driven rotary out of balance exciter to** stimulate the structure into **vibration** and **to examine** the mode shape. **These tests** confirmed there was a **natural** frequency **of the** pump, but the mode shape was complcx shossing **motion involving the** pump and **turbine** support structure. Surprisingly, **thcrc was little or** no **deformation of** the pump casing and pump supporting **baseplate, the** whole body appeared **to bc moving on** the flexibility **of the** steel supports beneath the **base** plate. A comparison **of** the **on load vibration** characteristic compared with the **vibration obtained** from the air **driven exciter is** shown **in** fig.6a. **Exciter** tests were then carried **out** with **one of the pumps** and **its baseplate** secured **to** a concrete foundation. **No** evidence **of** any natural frequencies **in** the **range 3000emp -** 6000epm **were found indicating that** the steel support structure **was** important in terms **of the** mode **of** *vibration* **of concern.** A comparison **of** the **responses on** the steelwork and **on** the concrete floor are shown **in** fig.6b. The next stage **of this investigation was to** consider how **detuning** the **resonant** frequency could **be** achieved **on** site. Clearly a solid support for the pump bedplate would have solved the problem **but** it was impractical to stiffen the support steelwork sufficiently. It was decided **to introduce** compliance **between** the pump casing and the **bedplate** at the pump support feet. As **designed** the support **feed** slide **relative** to the pump **baseplate on** greased **brass pads to** accommodate thermal **expansion.** A modification was *made* as shown in fig.7, this **introduced** horizontal **flexibility but** still allowed the **pump** support **feet to** slide. On site a series **of** exciter **experiments was** carried **out to optimise** the flexibility **of** the **detuning** element. Once an **optimum** was found the **pump** was **run** up **to** fidl **load to demonstrate** the modification. The **vibration levels** were found **to be** a maximum **of** 5ram/see peak. A comparison before and after modification **is** shown in fig.8.

4.0 **SELF EXCITED VIBRATIONS**

 $\tilde{=}$

Self excitation - **vibrations which** are caused by disturbing **forces** which **result from** feedback **from the motion of the** *vibrating* **object** itself.

A **review of** self excited vibrations **in** centrifugal **pumps** has been **presented in** ref.6. **This** paper **discusses** a wide *variety* **of** types including the "near **running** speed" nonsynchronous *vibrations* **reported** by a number **of** authors. **There** have **been only** a few **reported examples** with **boiler feed** pumps, and then mainly **outside** the **UK.**

In the **late** sixties a **0.8 x** running speed vibration **problem was** found **on** starting and standby **boiler feed** pumps at **Longannct** Power Station, Scotland. The high *vibrations* **were** seen **over** a **range of operating** speed from **3500 rpm -** 6000 **rpm** as shown in **fig.9. The** pump was found **to** undergo an almost **instantaneous** progression from **low level** synchronous vibration **to** "foundation shaking" nonsynchronous **vibration** as pump speed was **increased; typical of** a classical self **excited** vibration **phenomenon.** The problem was **related** to premature wear **out of** the pumps internal clearances **caused by** intermittent **low flow opcration** and consequential **reduction in rotor** stiffness. The problem was **eliminated by increasing** the minimum rceirculating flow **to eliminate** the wear **out** problem; no further **research was done** at this **time on** xshat **was believed to a** "one **off"** phenomenon.

In 1978 serious **problems** were **experienced during** works **testing** of **three pumps.** Performance **tests were conducted** at full power and **fixed** speed and near **running** speed subsynchronous **vibration** was **experienced.** These pumps were **7** stage pumps absorbing **2230Kw** at 5850 **rpm.** The problem was **first** noticed as flowrate was increased from the minimum **recirculation** quantity to the **design flow.** Shaft probes were **fitted** as standard and the transition from **synchronous to** nonsynchronous **vibration was** abrupt. It **was** also **established that reducing flowrate** could **once** again stabilise the pump. Shaft **displacement levels were 751am** pk-pk at a frequency **of 80Hz-g4Hz** giving a whirl frequency **ratio of** 0.82-0.86. A typical average spectrum **is** shown in **fig.** 10. A 24 hour **endurance test on** the **test bed** confirmed the severity **of** the problem **when balance drum leakage flowrates doubled** and **bearing** housing vibrations **increased fourfold.** Initially it was assumed that the problem was a classical **rotor instability, i.e.** unstable **eigenvalue.** It was **believed** that negative stiffness and forward **driving** cross coupling could arise **due to** an **impcUer/diffuscr interaction of the type described** in **(11).** However, it seemed unlikely that the **problem was due to** an unstable **cigenvahie** as **rotordynamic** analysis **predicted well damped eigenvalues even** with generous allowances for **impeller/diffuser interaction** forces. Nevertheless, **both** aspects **of** the problem were **examined, the** formcr **by** a specially **instrumented** single stage **test rig** and the **latter by** conducting **variable** speed tests **on one of** the pumps with clearances **set** at **design values** (0.5mm) and then **twice design (lmm). To** assist the problem **diagnosis** a pair **of displacement** probes were **installed to view** the shaft *motion* at the **balance drum** as **well** as the **bearings of** the pump. The **results of** these tests are summarised in fig. 1**la** and **fig. 1** lb. **Tracking of** the amplitude and phase **of** the synchronous **component of** shaft vibration **over** a speed **range from** 4000 **rpm -** 6500 **rpm** showed no significant phase **or** amplitude change **which would indicate even** a near proximity **to** a natural frequency. A similar **result** was **obtained** for **both** the **design** and twice **design** clearances **build** configurations. **Rotordynamic** calculations confirmed **the** shaft **motion** and phase measurements at the **balance drum** and **bearings** and absence **of** unstable **eigenvalues.** Of **cnormous** significance was the **fact** that the subsynchronous component **of** vibration **bore** an almost **fixed ratio** with **respect to** speed **(.85)** for **both** clearance cases tested. The subsynchronous component was **discernible down to** the *minimum* speed tested. The test rig

comprised **a single** impeller **and diffuser stage** mid **was instrumentedwith shaft motion probes and dynamic pressuretransducersto examine** distributions **of pressurein the diffuser** inlet, **impeller shroud** to **easing** gaps **and** near **to thc impcller eye. Tcsts were carried out to approximately 80% pump designspeed. Sum** and **difference** measurements **of two pressuresat - 180° at impeller eye showed a nonsynchronous**frequency **componentwhich was out of phase implying a net** resultant **force on the impeller. This correlated extremely well with the resultant shaft motion** as **shown in fig.12a and fig.12b and was very similar to that obtained from** the, **pump, fig. 10. Tests subsequently confirmed that** this **was an impeller inlet stall which appeared to rotate relative to** the **impeller at a frequency equal to** the **difference of the synchronous** and **subsynehronous frequencies. The forces involved were quite small and** the **feedback** element **which was** evidently **present with** the **7 stage pump was never repreduccd on** the **test** rig. In the **final event no design changes** were **made** to the **pumps,** although an **impeller** with **revised inlet geometry** had **been tested** successfully in the single stage **test rig. There** were however, significant **improvements made to the build** concentricity **of the** pump **cartridge** and a change **to** the shaft **material. Tests** confirmed that subsynchronous **vibrations were** still present but a factor of ten below synchronous amplitude levels. No change in vibration was obtained **over a 48** hour **endurance** test at full **load. The** pumps have **been in service** for **over** twelve years and have given **trouble free operation.**

During proving tests on the **prototype of** a **new frame size of barrel casing pump in** 1987, the **opportunity was taken for** an **in-depth examination of the effects of annular clearance wear and the influence of inlet swirl** at the **balance drum upon rotor dynamics and, in particular, subsynehronous vibration.** The **device used to control inlet swirl was similar to** that **described in (7). The prototype was a six** stage **pump with radial diffusers** and **a balance drum** with **a design maximum running** speed **of J000 rpm. The design parameters of this barrel easing pump are** set **out in** Appendix I. The materials chosen **for the renewable wearing rings were chosen** for their **high wear resistance** and **freedom from galling. To** maintain **optimum efficiency** the **recommended renewal** clearances **are set at 1.5 times the new design clearances. It was decided to** study the **effects of wear** up **to** a maximum **of twice** the **renewable limits.** The **tests were carried out** in the **production test facilities** and the **pump was installed on** a **temporary, but substantial, support structure.** The **prime mover gave** a **variable** speed capability **from 3600-5500 rpm, representing 10%** above **pump design speed. Instrumentation was fitted to** the **pump to measure, head,** flow, **speed, loop temperature, bearing** metal and **oil temperatures, axial thrust, balance return line flow. Dynamic measurements taken were bearing housing vibration, (seismic), shaft to casing radial displacement** and **pressure fluctuations in** the **suction,** and **discharge** and **balance return lines. The dynamic signals were** taped **recorded** for subsequent analysis **off line. During each test discrete points** were **taken over the** performance **envelope of** the pump **together with data** from coutroll_ **runs var).ing one parameter** at a **time** and **keeping others** constant, **e.g. varying speed** at constant **discharge control** *valve* setting. The tests carried **out** are summarised in **Table il** and the incidenec **of** subsynchronous vibration during the tests is summarised in Table III. The pump was stable **when** clearances **were within the recommended limits, but became** unstable **with 2 x design** clearances. In contrast **inlet** flow **swirl** control **delayed** unstable **behaviour until clearances** approached twice the **renewable** *values.* **When** the subsynehronous **vibration occurred** it had a **well defined** character. **Figure** 13 shows a **time** history and a spectrum **of** the shaft **motion taken during Test 3. The** time history shows the **typical beating resulting from** the presence **of** two **strong** vibration **signals** with frequencies close **together. The spectrum shows** not **only** the running speed vibration and the subsynchronous **vibration** but also the sidebands associated **with** these frequencies. **This spectrum** with **its strong difference** frequency, **(running speed** subsynehronous speed), and the similarly **displaced** sidebands is **typical of this** phenomenon.

Thevibration**locked** in and **dropped out** as the speed was varied. **On** fig. **14 a** waterfall **plot of** the **sha_** vibration on a run up highlights this **characteristic.** The waterfall was taken by varying the speed against a constant throttle valve **setting, approximately equivalent** to the best **efficiency** point **at** any speed. At **this** setting the subsynchronous vibration drops out at 3600 rpm. On fig. 15 a waterfall plot of **shaft** vibration on a run down **shows** that the **subsynchronous** vibration dropped out **at** 3600 rpm. The waterfall plots also **show** that the subsynchronous vibration did not occur **at** a fixed frequency but varied as a constant proportion of running speed. In Test 3 the **subsynchronous** whirl frequency ratio 0.84 irrespective of the actual running **speed** of the pump. This is particularly well illustrated on the run down **characteristic.** At speeds, where the **subsynchronous** vibration was well **established,** the variation of flow had little **effect** on the **character** of the vibration. However, at speeds around the stability boundary of the subsynchronous vibration a **change** of flow **caused** the phenomenon **to** 'lock in' or ';drop out'. In general reducing the flow brought on the onset subsynchronous vibration. The **effect** of **flow** on the **subsynchronous** was noticeably less powerful than the **effect** of speed. Throttling the balance return line to increase the back pressure on the balance drum **also** delayed the onset of the subsynchronous vibration. Where the subsynchronous motion was well **established** the **shaft** vibration appeared to **take** up virtually the full beating **clearance.** Not unsurprisingly this imposed an upper bound to the amplitude of the vibration. The general **character** of the bearing housing vibration was the same as the character of the shaft vibration. The vibration levels in the frequency range 10-200Hz, were of order 2mm/sec when running normally and up to 7mm/sec when the subsynchronous vibration was **present.** The vibration at blade rate and twice blade rate showed **some** modulation at the difference frequency. The pressure fluctuations in the **suction** and **discharge** were largely random in **character** with some contribution **at** blade rate and twice blade rate but nothing **evident** at the **subsynchronous** frequency. The balance **return** line pressure pulsed **strongly** at **shaft** rate and, when **present,** at the subsynchronous frequency. Impulse tests on the beating housings showed that the natural frequencies were well away from running speed. The pump rigid body natural frequencies, (on the temporary supports), were about 2500 **cpm** whilst the **characteristics** natural frequencies of the pump body and bearing housings were much higher, above 500Hz. The dynamic characteristics obtained during Test 5, i.e. with **swirl control, showed stable** operation over the **complete** range of flow and speed available. With clearance opened out to 3x, Test 6, the pump became unstable at a speed of about **4800** rpm and the whirl ratio remained the same as before **at** 0.84, fig.16. The frequency of **the subsynchronous** vibration maintained the same relationship to **speed** up to the test maximum of 5500rpm as had been obtained before (Test 3).

Ī

To summarise, the characteristics **of** the **subsynchronous vibration obtained on** this **pump** were:-

- . the vibration appeared at a constant proportion **of** running speed, whirl ratios being **typically** 0.85 and was independent of annular seal **clearance** or actual pump speed.
- 2. the vibration **'locked** in' and **'dropped out'** with speed and to **a** lesser **extent flowrate** and there was a very rapid growth in amplitude to a limit cycle; typical of a classical self **excited** oscillation.
- 3_ the Vibration **contained** not only the subsynehronous frequency but also the **difference** frequency and sidebands.
- **. the** shaft **vibration** at **the subsynchronous** frequency **indicated** a forward **processing whirl,** again **typical of** a self **excited oscillation.**
- **.** thcrc **was no evidence to prove that the** subsynchronous **vibration** rcsponse **was due to** a **rotor** natural **frequency (i.e. not** an **unstable** cigcnvaluc). .
- **.** control of inlet swirl to the **balance drum** delayed the **onset** of **subsynchronous** vibration.

Since **the mid 1980's there** have been **reported** several more **instances** of the "near **running** speed" nonsynchronous vibration problem, ref **7,** 8, 9. In some cases **major redesign of** the pump has been necessary to solve **the** problem. Opinions **differ regarding** the source **of** the problem, some **believe it** is the excitation **of the** natural frequency **of** the **rotor** but **others believe that** hydraulic **destabilising** forces in the **impeller** may be the source. **Further research** and **investigation** will no **doubt** ultimately **give more insight into** such problems.

5.0 TRANSIENT VIBRATIONS

Transicnt **vibrations** - **vibrations which result** from rapidly changing **operating** conditions and which **dccay** with increasing **time.**

Transient vibrations **in boiler feed** pump **installations are** fairly rare although most **modem** power stations have probably experienced pipework **vibration resulting from** either **rapid loading or** unloading **of** the pump **or** from the rapid **opening** and closing **of** flow control **valves. Disturbed** suction conditions can also **lead** to pipework **vibration** and vapour **locking** within the pump causing the pump **to** eventually **run dry. However,** there are few **documented** examples **of** pump **rotor** vibrations **which result** from **transient operations.** One such problem arose **in 1987 on** boiler **feed** pumps **installed** in a **large** modern **fossil** fired power station in South Africa. **The incident** occurred each **time** a pump was **restarted following** a shut **down** from hot **operation. These** pumps **were** fitted with eddy current shaft monitoring equipment and a **vibration trip** occasionally occurred **due to** high **level** shat_ **displacement during** the restart. Normal steady state **levels of** shaft *vibration* **were typically 30** *pm* **to 50 gm** pk-pk **raising to** 150 μ m to 175 μ m during restart. The problem was caused by a thermally induced bow in the pump shaft induced by a temperature differential in the area of the mechanical seal. A typical shaft **displacement record is** shown **in fig. !**7, **where it** can **bc** seen **that it took** between **40** - 50 seconds **before** the **displacement levels** have **returned to** normal following the **restart of** the pump. **From a** comprehensive series **of tests on** site, it **was** possible **to establish** the characteristics **of** the phenomenon **in** terms **of** some **of the dependent variables.** Thcse **were:-**

- 1. **length of** time **the pump remained stationary following hot** shut **down**
- **2.** acceleration **rate during run up**
- **3. feed** temperature
- **4.** journal **bearing** loading.

In **this** particular case the **'solution'** was **simply to operate** a vibration inhibit **during start** up, **it being argued** from past **experience** and **detailed** analysis **of** the shaft bending forces **involved**

that the pump **would** not suffer accelerated **wear.** It is believed that this phenomenon occurs in most boiler feed pumps **fitted with** mechanical seals. A review of Weir feed pump installations carried out 1988 showed 127 fully operational pumps with over 1.6 million hours operation. None of these were fitted with shaft displacement monitoring with alarm **and** trip function. In the absence of shaft monitoring the **phenomenon** has gone unnoticed with, it would appear, no adverse effect on long term integrity.

6.0 **CAVITATION RELATED** VIBRATIONS

Cavitation related **phenomena are** associated with the first stage impeller suction region **and** may be responsible for many unusual **dynamic phenomena** in pump and **piping** systems, ref. 10.

The **suction stage feed pumps** designed by Weir **Pumps in** the 1970's for CEGB incorporated inducers so that they **could** cope with the low NPSH transients associated with sudden loss of load. One **concern** was the susceptibility of these designs to promote surging in the suction **pipework** in the boiler feed system. Works test are generally unrepresentative of **pipework** installations on site, **particularly** as the suction pipework often incorporates a throttle device to **control** the suction pressure at inlet. *This* **provides considerable** damping to the suction pipework, effectively inhibiting the **propensity to** surge. A series of special **tests** were **carried** out in the Weir test facilities to **examine** the boundary of the surge **phenomenon** at various flowrates and over a wide range of NPSH values. For these tests a **free** surface was introduced between the throttle valve **and** the **pump** suction. A summary of the **cavitation** surge band is shown in fig. 18. It was comforting to find that although a well defined surge **envelope** could be defined it occurred at NPSH values below that available during loss of **load** transient.

In **1988 a** cavitation **related problem** was seen **during works testing** of pressure **stage feed** pumps for a **Nuclear** Power Station. **These tests** were carried **out** at **rated** speed **of 5610** rpm and **over the** full range **of flow. Tests** however, **were** carried **out without the booster** stage pump and the **NPSH** was **less** than a half **of the** site **NPSH** at **rated duty** falling to **less** than a third **of** the site NPSH at 40% rated flow. Although this **was** considered acceptable for the hydraulic performance measurements **it was found to give** unsatisfactory **vibration levels** as measured **on** the pump **bearing** housings compared with the **vibration** targets. On site the pumps were **to meet** a **vibration level of** 2.Smm/sec **rms** (10Hz-IKHz) at **duty** flow, 4.5mm/sec rms **down to** 40% flow and 7. lmm/sec **rms** at **30%,** the **recirculation flow** quantity. It **was desirable** to **demonstrate** these **levels during** the **works** test. **The** measured **vibrations** were higher than target as characterised in **terms of broad band** excitation, **impeller blade** frequency **excitation** and **general** unsteady/erratic **readings.** Figure **19** shows **the** highest **vibration recorded during** test at **80m** NPSH in terms **of** the **overall level, once** per **revolution** and **bladc rate** frequency components compared **with** the **target. It was** suspected **that** cavitation **was responsible** for the problem. A **review of** some **visual** cavitation tests **done on** a ½ scale model impeller **in our Research Laboratory indicated** that sizeable **bubble** formation could **exist 80m NPSH despite** the **fact that** no **loss** in head had occurred. **Typical bubble** size **data** are shown in **fig20 where it** can **be** seen that **bubble size** in **excess of 30mm** would **be expected** at **the** NPSH used **during** the **test. The** NPSH **was** increased **to 145m,** still **only 50% of the** site NPSH at **duty flow** and 50% at 40% **rated flow. The vibration levels were** found to **be very** close to **the vibration** targets as can **been** seen in **fig.21.** Clearly **this** underlines the need **to** consider carefully **before** agreeing **to** meet **tight vibration limits during tests designed** primarily **to demonstrate** hydraulic performance.

7.0 **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

 \bar{z}

The **paper** has **provided examples of** different types **of vibration** experienced **in** boiler feed pumps for Power Station duties. It is likely that other manufacturers can cite similar problems but different solutions may have been adopted. The task of the methods of the pump designer is **to** try and eliminate the problems in any new designs and, preferably, before site installation. This process is helped if manufacturers and users are encouraged to report on problem areas.

Clearly there are generic problem areas. The subsynchronous vibration problcm has generated more interest in the US **than** in **Europe** and there are many **research** projects directed toward investigation of hydraulic destabilising forces and fine clearance seal dynamics. Cavitation and **NPSH** related dynamic effects offer considerable scope for investigation relating to system and pump rotor stability. Impeller blade frequency vibrations are not completely understood and further research into areas of concern would seem desirable.

8.0 **REFERENCES**

- **. UCHIDA, N.** Radial **Force on** the Impeller **of** a **Centrifugal Pump.** Bulletin of **the** ISME, Vol 14, No.76, 1971.
- . HERGT, P., KREIGER, P. Radial **Forces** in **Centrifugal** Pumps with Guide Vanes. *Conference* on *Advanced* Class Pumps. I.Mecb.E., 1970.
- **.** BROWN, **R.D., FRANCE, D.** Vibration Response of Large boiler **Feed** Pumps. Worthington European Technical *Award* 1974, Vol III, Hoepli, Milan, 1974.
- **. ZOTOV,** B.N Selection **of Number** of Runner and Guide Mechanism Blades for *Centrifugal* Pumps. Russian Engineering Journal, Vol LII, No. 11.
- 5. MAKAY, E., SZAMODY, O. Survey **of Feed** Pump Outages. EPRI Report **-** 754, **1978.**
- . FRANCE, **D. Rotor Instability** in **Centrifugal** Pumps. Shock **and** Vibration Digest, Vol. 18, No.l, 1986.
- **7_** MASSEY, **I.** Subsynchronous Vibration **Problems** in High Speed Multi Stage Pumps. Proc. 14th Turbomachinery Symposium, Texas A&M University, 1985.
- . MARSCHER, W.D. Subsyncrhonous Vibration in Boiler Feed **Pumps due** to Stable Response to Hydraulic Forces at Part Load. l.Mech.E Conference 'Part Load Pumping, Operation, **Control** and Behaviour', 1988.
- **. FRANCE, D.,** TAYLOR, **P.W. Near Running Speed Subsynchronous** Vibration in *Centrifugal* Pumps. Conference on Vibrations in *Centrifugal* Pumps, l.Mech.E., London, 1990.
- 10. NG, S.L. and BRENNEN, **C. Experiments** on the **Dynamic** Behaviour **of** Cavitating Pumps. ASME Fluids Engineering, 1978.
- 11. BLACK, H.F. **Lateral** Stability and Vibrations **of** High Speed **Centrifugal** Pump Rotors. Symposium on the Dynamic of Rotors, Lyngby, Denmark

TABLE I

RADIAL VIBRATION FORCES

N.B. * Measured Normalised Radial Force Values for 7 • 12 and 7 • **13 blade combinations**

 $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$

TABLE **II**

Test Conditions Prototype Pump

 $\left\langle \mathbf{r} \right\rangle$, a consequence

 \overline{a}

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim ω

 $\bar{\gamma}$

TABLE III

Incidence **of Subsynchronous Vibration**

% Duty Flow

FIG.5 ARRANGEMENT OF MAIN FEED.PUMP AND SUPPORTING STEELWORK

FIG60 ON LOAD VIBRATION OF PUMP COMPARED WITH VIBRATION OF PUMP EXCITED BY AIR DRIVEN ROTARY OUT OF BALANCE DEVICE

Fig.7 - Detuning Element at Pump Support Feet

mm/sec. Peak BEARING HOUSING VIBRATION LEVEL

 \bar{z}

FIG.10 - Frequency Spectrum taken at Drive End Bearing for 7 Stage

FIG. Hb.- Frequency of Non-synchronous Vibration versus Pump Speed for a 7 Stage Pump

Fig.14 - Waterfall Plot of Shaft Motion during controlled speed increase.
(Pump Clearances at Twice Design Values)

 $\bar{\tau}$.

Fig.15 - Waterfall Plot of Shaft Motion during controlled speed reduction. (Pump Clearances at Twice Design Values)

