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SUMMARY

At the Savannah River Site (SRS), approximately 7 MTHM of aluminum-clad spent nuclear fuel is currently in wet storage at L-Basin. Current baseline planning is to process the spent nuclear fuel at H-Canyon. A potential alternative to H-Canyon processing is to dry the fuel and package in a road ready configuration using a multi-purpose canister, such as the DOE standard canister. To understand the potential for gas generation in the canisters, first the thermal and dose rate profiles need to be resolved. A computational fluid dynamics model is built to resolve the 50-year trend for the thermal profile, and MCNP is used to resolve the decay heat and surface dose rate of the fuel. This report will focus on a few fuel types, which should bound all other fuel stored at SRS. These consist of the reference fuel assembly, the MURR fuel and the HFIR fuel. These bound a hypothetical maximum scenario for MTR box fuel, a maximum for decay heat in an assembly, and a maximum for the aluminum surface area, respectively. The geometry for the packages was created from DOE specifications for storage of each of the fuels. As long as the minimum time from reactor discharge to sealed storage is 3 years, then the highest temperatures which occur within the sealed canisters do not exceed 100° C for all scenarios considered here. If the minimum time from reactor discharge to sealed storage is 10 years, the maximum temperature does not exceed 50° C for all the scenarios considered. In the geometry considered, while the HFIR fuel has a large surface area, the packaging configuration leaves large void areas, such that the aluminum surface to free volume ratio is about 30% less than an ATR or MURR packaging configuration. Due to the highest surface area to volume ratio for a loaded DOE standard canister, and a high maximum temperature for the aluminum surface, the MURR loaded DOE standard canister should provide a bounding case for all aluminum-clad fuel currently stored at SRS.
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<thead>
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<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASNF</td>
<td>Aluminum-clad Spent Nuclear Fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFBR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIR</td>
<td>High Flux Isotope Reactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFSF</td>
<td>Irradiated Fuel Storage Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INL</td>
<td>Idaho National Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Materials Test Reactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURR</td>
<td>Missouri University Research Reactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA</td>
<td>Reference Fuel Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRNL</td>
<td>Savannah River National Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS</td>
<td>Savannah River Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNF</td>
<td>Spent Nuclear Fuel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Modeling of SRS Aluminum-clad Spent Nuclear Fuel in Standard DOE Sealed Canisters

1. INTRODUCTION

The Savannah River Site’s L Area Material Storage Facility (known as L Basin) is used by DOE for the storage of domestic and foreign research reactor spent fuel. The fuel consists primarily of highly enriched uranium in metal, oxide of silicide form. By volume, over 30% of the DOE stored fuel is aluminum clad (though only 10% by MTHM) (SNFWG, 2017). The Savannah River Site (SRS) has approximately 7 MTHM of aluminum-clad material (SNFWG 2017). In this study, the inventory of the aluminum-clad spent nuclear fuel (ASNF) stored in L-Basin at SRS is studied for its thermal profiles and dose rates over a 50-year period of storage time within a sealed DOE standard canister. One disposition path for the fuel is packaging and shipping in DOE standard canisters which are “road-ready” storage when dried and backfilled with helium. The fuel is removed from wet storage, dried to remove residual water then placed in packing configurations inside DOE standard canisters which are backfilled with helium and sealed.

By the year 2035, there will be ~2500 MTHM of SNF that will require geologic repository disposal that is managed by DOE. Approximately 400 MHTM of this is currently not packaged. Previous studies in support of geologic disposal divided the DOE SNF inventory into 34 groups based on fuel matrix, cladding, cladding condition and enrichment. The six aluminum clad fuel types are of interest as aluminum is significantly less corrosion resistant than stainless steel and zircaloy clad fuel, and the aluminum cladding contains a hydrated oxide layer that can potentially contain bound, both physisorbed and chemisorbed, water. While there is a wide range of enrichment and burnup profiles across the DOE spent fuel inventory, the focus herein is on potential bounding cases of the SRS stored ASNF fuel.

The modeling will consist of three different fuel types which should bound the ASNF inventory at SRS. The first is the Missouri University Research Reactor (MURR) fuel. This fuel is the hottest – in terms of decay heat and dosage – that is contained within L Basin. The second is the Reference Fuel Assembly (RFA) – this is a hypothetical assembly that should bound all MTR-type fuel in L Basin. The third fuel is the High Flux Isotope Reactor (HFIR) fuel, this fuel contains the largest surface area per assembly, so it has the potential to also contain the largest mass of oxide for radiolytic generation of hydrogen. The specifications for the storage of the HFIR assembly are to separate the inner and outer annulus to be placed in separate canisters. The modeling here solves for the thermal fields using a computational fluid dynamics (CFD) model of these storage configurations, which should bound all potential scenarios for the ASNF inventory at SRS.

The flow in storage containers of spent nuclear fuel is primary driven through natural convection as air is heated from the central fuel and cooled by the outer air (Nishimura et al. 1996; Lee et al. 2000; Lee 2013; Heng et al. 2002). Several experimental studies have characterized the flow field and temperatures for commercial fuel storage casks (Bang et. al 2015; Jeong et al 2016; Smith 2016; Takeda 2008). Prior modeling of thermal fields and convective patterns with computational fluid dynamics (CFD) have focused on steady state simulations with conditions set for either early or late into the storage cycle (Lee et al. 2000; Li 2016 et al.; Yoo 2010 et al.; Lee 2009 et al.; Povskas 2017 et al.; Brewster 2012 et al.; Kim 2014 et al.; Tseng 2011 et al.; Herranz 2015 et al., Wu et al. 2018). Sensitivities to the parameters of the SNF storage have been studied in these systems for peak cladding temperature to ensure no melting of the plating occurs under the steady state conditions examined (Herranz et al. 2015; Kim 2014 et al.). Improvements to basic models have used commercial packages to fully resolve the fuel configurations in lieu of coarse-resolution porous media models (Brewster et al. 2012). However, many past CFD models have not coupled the thermal and convective fields with the harmful chemical species which occur due to the radiolytic breakdown of water vapor, nitrogen, oxygen and carbon dioxide that is present within vented canisters (Wittman and Hanson 2015; Arkhipov 2007; Atkinson 2004). In addition, the past CFD
models have not looked at the transient evolution of the thermal fields inside canisters, opting for steady state solutions. The transient solution allows for the model to track the amount species, such as nitric acid and hydrogen, that can form inside the canister over time.

This study resolves the thermal state of RFA, MURR, and HFIR fuels stored in sealed standard DOE canisters over a 50-year evolution. Dose rates for the fuel cladding surface over the 50-year period are also calculated, for eventual use in coupling with the radiolytic hydrogen yield from the oxide surface layer. This data will be coupled with a Cantera model to solve for the full radiolytic chemistry associated with sealed DOE canisters of SRS ASNF when the G-value for hydrogen from the surface layer is finalized.

2. THEORY AND MODEL DESCRIPTION

The CAD models were built according to available reference drawings and reports. The decay heat for RFA and HFIR fuel elements were available through previous calculations. Christ Verst at SRNL contributed calculations for the decay heat of the MURR and HFIR assemblies. Primary sources consisted of:

- Drawings: DWG-409406, 409407, 507692.

2.1 Thermal-Fluid Model

The commercial multiphysics modeling platform STAR-CCM+ is used for modeling the canister (Siemens, 2019). The numerical solver implemented here is a finite-volume approach with second-order implicit time stepping and a second-order discretization scheme. The segregated flow solver for the Navier-Stokes equations is used, which is applicable to constant density or mildly compressible flows, with a predictor-corrector approach that couples the momentum and continuity equations. A collocated variable arrangement with a Rhie-Chow scheme for pressure-velocity coupling is implemented in a SIMPLE-type algorithm (Siemens, 2019). In the canister scale models, the Reynolds is low enough, so laminar flow is assumed. The momentum equation is then given by
\[
\frac{\partial (\rho \mathbf{v})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v}) = -\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{I}) + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{f}_b
\]  

(1)

Where \( \mathbf{v} \) is the velocity vector, \( \mathbf{T} \), is the stress tensor, and \( \rho \) is the density. The \( \mathbf{f}_b \) term is the body force, solely occurring due to the buoyancy driven flow in this case. The viscous stress tensor is

\[
\mathbf{T} = \mu (\nabla \mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T) - \frac{2}{3} \mu (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{I}
\]  

(2)

Where \( \mu \) is the air viscosity. The mass conservation is expressed through the continuity equation

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0
\]  

(3)

The conservation of energy gives an equation in terms of the total energy, \( E \), as

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho E)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho E \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{f}_b \cdot \mathbf{v} + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} \cdot \sigma) - \nabla \cdot q + S_{\text{E}}
\]  

(4)

Where in the solid phases, the terms with \( \mathbf{v} \) are equal to 0, \( q \) is the conductive heat flux, the energy source term \( S_{\text{E}} \) is due to the chemical reactions in the fluid phase, and is from the specified heat source for the fuel plates in that solid region. The implicit solver in STAR-CCM+ can typically adapt up to a Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) condition of nearly 50.

The properties for the materials used for each of the solid regions are shown in Table 1, it is assumed maximum temperatures are low enough to use constant thermal properties for solids.

Table 1. Physical properties of the components for a DOE Sealed canister.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-6061 (siding/back plates)</td>
<td>2702</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Polkinhorne, 1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainless Steel 304</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>0.22 (clean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incropera et al. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70 (oxidized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainless Steel 316</td>
<td>8238</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>0.22 (clean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incropera et al. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70 (oxidized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Steel</td>
<td>7854</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incropera et al. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR Fuel Plates</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0.82 (assumed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ilum 1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3
2.2 Model Geometry

The descriptions for loaded canister configurations have been specified in DOE/SNF/REP-90, with some modifications for tolerance included in DOE/REP/DSN-19. These geometries have been adapted for canister loading here. While no height for the basket internals is included, the spacing is assumed to be 1 ¾” higher than the cropped fuel element heights – the same spacing that is used for the ATR basket design. The first geometry considered is the MURR fuel. This is loaded with 10 fuel elements into a modified Type1a basket, 3 of these baskets are then placed into a 10-foot-tall 18” diameter DOE standard canister. The CAD model for the packaged canister is shown in Figure 1a, only half-symmetry is modeled for computational efficiency. The Type 1a basket is shown in Figure 1b, and the MURR fuel assembly is shown in Figure 1c. A slice of the domain mesh is shown in Figure 1d, where dark grey is the canister, grey is the basket, light grey is the side plates, red is the fuel plates, and blue shows the free volume air.

The second case of interest is for the RFA fuel. As this is a hypothetical situation, no exact drawing exists for the RFA fuel, though a typical MTR design is used for reference. This fuel is cropped to 25 inches. Due to the availability of design drawings, the HFBR fuel assembly was used as the reference geometry for the RFA fuel. As with the MURR fuel, this is packed with 10 assemblies in a Type-1a basket then stacked with 3 baskets into a 10-foot-tall 18” DOE standard canister, this is the same basket as Figure 1b. This geometry is shown in Figure 2a. In addition, a hypothetical case for storing a higher packing density is considered. SRNL developed a 14-slot canister design for the RFA to be used within a 10-foot-tall 24” diameter standard canister (Adams et al. 2013). The geometry for this packaged design is shown in Figure 2b, with the basket shown in Figure 2c. The resolved fuel assembly used in both models is shown in in Figure 2d. A slice of the meshed domain is shown in Figure 2e for the Type-1a basket case, and in Figure 2f for the modified 14-slot basket case.

Figure 1. CAD model for (a) loaded MURR canister, (b) modified Type 1a basket, (c) MURR fuel assembly, and (d) domain mesh slice.

Figure 2. CAD model for (a) RFA fuel packs in a Type-1a basket, (b) RFA fuel packs in a 14-slot basket, (c) RFA fuel pack, (d) resolved fuel assembly, (e) mesh slice for Type-1a basket, and (f) mesh slice for 14-slot basket.
The last case of interest is the HFIR fuel assemblies, which contain an inner and outer annulus. For loading these assemblies, the two annuli are separated. Unlike other fuel with layered baskets, the sleeve for the HFIR extends through the entire length of the canister (Snow 2008), and spacers are used between fuel elements. The modified Type 6a/6b geometries are utilized for this model. No drawings for spacers exist, though the DOE/DSN-19 report states simply having two $\frac{1}{2}$” thick 12” diameter plates attached with an 8” pipe attaching them is sufficient for HFIR inner assembly, this is adapted here. For the HFIR outer assembly a 17” diameter spacer plate is used. The HFIR-inner assembly is stacked 3 high in a 10-foot-tall 18” diameter DOE standard canister, using 2 spacers between assemblies. The HFIR-outer assembly is stacked 3 high in a 10-foot-tall 24” diameter DOE standard canister, using 2 spacers between assemblies. The CAD model for the packaged HFIR inner assembly storage is shown in Figure 3a, with the basket in Figure 3b, the inner HFIR assembly in Figure 3c and a slice of the domain mesh in Figure 3d. The CAD model for the packaged HFIR outer assembly storage is shown in Figure 4a, with the basket in Figure 4b, the outer HFIR assembly in Figure 4c and a slice of the domain mesh in Figure 4d. While
for the previous ATR study, and the above RFA and MURR geometries, a symmetry plane is used, this is not the case for the HFIR, as convergence issues were caused cutting through the middle of the fuel plates, so the full geometry is used.

Figure 3. CAD model for (a) loaded HFIR-inner canister, (b) modified Type 6a basket, (c) HFIR-inner fuel assembly, and (d) domain mesh slice.
As part of the preparation for the future chemical modeling, the free volume within each of the canister configurations, as well as the surface area of the aluminum-cladding and side walls is calculated. This free volume takes into account the fuel internals, including the baskets and impact plates present. The previously loaded configuration for the ATF fuel is included for reference. To maintain conservatism, the surface areas include the side plates for ATR/MURR/RFA, and the inner/outer rings of the HFIR. While HFIR outer assembly has the most surface area in terms of the cases considered here, the storage configuration maintains a large amount of free volume due to the large void inside of the HFIR assemblies and between the support pipes of the basket design.

Table 2. DOE standard canister free volume and surface area for various fuel assembly configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Total Surface Area</th>
<th>Free Volume</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATR 15 foot 18” D (reference)</td>
<td>120 m$^2$</td>
<td>450 L</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURR 10 foot 18” D</td>
<td>78.8 m$^2$</td>
<td>284 L</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 10 foot 18” D</td>
<td>50.8 m$^2$</td>
<td>297 L</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA-14 10 foot 24” D</td>
<td>71.2 m$^2$</td>
<td>547 L</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIR-inner 10 foot 18” D</td>
<td>56.9 m$^2$</td>
<td>296 L</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIR outer 10 foot 24” D</td>
<td>108.4 m$^2$</td>
<td>548 L</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Thermal Decay Heat and Ambient Conditions

As with the prior reports, an assumption is made that yearly temperatures for a 50-year storage scenario would mimic the conditions seen in the IFSF facility (Abboud and Huang, 2019). Ambient temperatures for the INL INTEC CPP-603 facility are described in Christensen (2003a, b). A plot of the ambient temperature conditions measured when the facility had working thermocouples in 2011 is shown in Figure 4, with 9 thermocouples, these are recorded once per hour. These are recorded over a year-long period, for longer term simulations, this data is considered periodic in nature. The thermocouple data is broken down further showing the trend over a single week and showing the whole data set in weeklong
The ambient temperature within the facility itself has a very small variation within it compared to the exterior climate due to the large amount of mass of spent fuel stored within it. The largest temperature difference in a 12-hour span is only 1.5°C, and largest temperature difference in a week-long span is 4.4°C. The difference from the average for the minimum and maximum temperatures recorded is also shown in Figure 4c.

Following previous sensitivity studies, the primary driver for thermal history is the initial decay heat of the fuel. From the limit specified in Sindelar et al. 2012, it was assumed that the RFA and MURR would only be loaded at a maximum of 25 W. This occurs approximately 3 years after reactor discharge for the RFA, it was assumed to use this same period of time for the discharge for the maximum decay heat of the HFIR assembly. Descriptions of the HFIR fuel (Ilas et al. 2015; Freels et al. 2011) list 2.6 and 6.8 kg U\textsuperscript{235} for the inner and outer assemblies, respectively, these sections are split for storage, so decay heats are calculated for each assembly. Rather than using a Cs-137 decay rate – which is conservative for these fuels during early storage years, the decay heat values were calculated directly. The decay heat for upper, nominal and lower bound cases for the various fuel elements over a 50-year period is shown in Table 3. Decay heat values after reactor discharge for MURR and HFIR fuels were provided by Chris Verst and included in Appendix A.

Table 3. Fuel assembly decay heats for the simulations of RFA, MURR, and HFIR storage configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years after Sealed Storage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFA High [W]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURR High [W]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIR Outer High [W]</td>
<td>141.05</td>
<td>37.04</td>
<td>29.21</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>17.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIR Inner High [W]</td>
<td>75.95</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA Nominal [W]</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURR Nominal [W]</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIR Outer Nominal [W]</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>35.47</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>16.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIR Inner Nominal [W]</td>
<td>60.31</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>9.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA Low [W]</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURR Low [W]</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIR Outer Low [W]</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>15.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIR Inner Low [W]</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For quick reference, the maximum temperatures for the fuel elements are shown in Table 4. The highest temperature across all cases that were run was 97°C, for the hypothetical RFA-14 slot basket loaded after 3 years of discharge from reactor. For the more realistic case, the maximum is 86°C for MURR assemblies loaded into a canister. The maximum for HFIR outer and inner is 64°C and 55°C, respectively. These values roughly correlate to packaged fuel 3, 5 and 10 years after reactor discharge.

Table 4. Maximum fuel element temperatures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>RFA</th>
<th>RFA-14</th>
<th>MURR</th>
<th>HFIR-outer</th>
<th>HFIR-inner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper bounds</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower bounds</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Thermal Profiles

3.1.1 RFA

The temperature profile for the RFA configurations is shown in Figure 6a-i for the 18” canister with the Type-1a loading configuration for slices in the lower middle and upper basket. The hottest region is in the center, and the central basket is a few degrees hotter than the upper and lower baskets. The modified 14-slot basket temperature profiles are shown in Figure 6j-r for the 24” canister configuration. The modified 14-slot basket shows temperatures which are higher than the 10-slot basket from the increased fuel loading. For the hottest case, the average fuel temperature is about 10° C below the maximum. The corresponding velocity profiles for these cases are shown with streamlines in Figure 7a-c for the Type 1a basket, and in Figure 7d-f for the modified 14-slot basket, with increasing recirculation at higher decay heats. In the Type-1a basket case, most recirculation is around the outside slots of the basket, and the interior is rather stagnant. The 14-slot basket shows better overall recirculation patterns due to the central hole.
Figure 6. Temperature contours of RFA for bottom, middle and top bucket for (a-c) Low Q, 18” (d-f) Base Q 18”, (g-i) High Q 18”, (j-l) Low Q 24”, (m-o) Base Q 24”, (p-r) High Q 24”.
Figure 7. Velocity streamlines of RFA loaded canister for (a) Low Q 18”, (b) base 18”, (c) High Q 18”, (d) Low Q 24”, (e) Base 24” and (f) High Q 24”.

3.1.2 MURR

The temperature profile for the MURR loading configuration is shown in Figure 8a-i for the 18” diameter canister with the Type-1a loading configuration for slices in the lower, middle, and upper basket. The hottest region is in the center, and the central basket is a few degrees hotter than the upper and lower baskets. The MURR loading configuration is very similar in temperatures to the RFA Type-1a basket case, but has slightly lower peak temperatures. The corresponding velocity profiles for these cases are shown with streamlines in Figure 9a-c, with increasing recirculation at higher decay heats.
Figure 8. Temperature contours of MURR loaded canister for bottom, middle and top bucket for (a-c) Low Q, 18” (d-f) Base Q 18”, (g-i) High Q 18”.

The velocity profiles for the MURR stored fuel are shown in Figure 9. The flow is mostly compartmentalized by the three baskets having their own recirculating region. The largest recirculation occurs in the head above the baskets, as there is about 12” of free space above the 3rd basket. However, this recirculation is rather weak in the low decay heat case.

Figure 9. Velocity streamlines of a MURR loaded canister for (a-c) Low Q, 18” (d-f) Base Q 18”, (g-i) High Q 18”.
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3.1.3 HFIR

The temperature profiles for the HFIR inner bucket are shown in Figure 10. The total decay heat in this loading configuration is significantly lower than the other fuels, so the temperature is much lower. As before the hottest region occurs in the center. Unlike the fuel loaded in the Type-1a baskets, the fuel temperatures are nearly uniform horizontally in this case. The uniform heat creates a hot region of gas inside the annulus, though this hot air can escape somewhat in the annulus at the top of the canister. The velocity profiles for the HFIR inner loading are shown in Figure 11. Due to a singular basket design here, the recirculation in both HFIR loaded canisters is much more than in the RFA or MURR packaging configuration.

Figure 10. Temperature contours of HFIR-inner for bottom, middle and top assembly for (a-c) Low Q, 18” (d-f) Base Q 18”, (g-i) High Q 18”.

Figure 11. Velocity magnitude of HFIR-inner for different Q levels.
Figure 11. Velocity streamlines for the HFIR inner loaded canister (a) Low Q, (b) Base Q, and (c) High Q.

The temperature profiles for the HFIR outer assembly are shown in Figure 12. This configuration is slightly hotter than that of the inner annulus but is still much cooler than the RFA or MURR loaded configurations. As with the HFIR inner configuration, the fuel temperature is nearly uniform horizontally, and the gas inside the annulus is kept at a hot temperature, with the exception of the upper fuel assembly. The corresponding streamlines of the velocity are shown in Figure 13.

Figure 12. Temperature contours of HFIR-outer for bottom, middle and top assembly for (a-c) Low Q, 18” (d-f) Base Q 18”, (g-i) High Q 18”.
Figure 13. Streamlines of the velocity in the HFIR-outer loaded canister for (a-c) Low Q, 18” (d-f) Base Q 18”, (g-i) High Q 18”.

3.1.4 50-year Temperatures

The average air temperatures for the canisters over a 50-year period for each of the fuels is shown in Figure 14. For the higher decay heat fuel assumptions used, there is a more rapid decay in the temperature profile over the first several years, as many of the shorter half-life radionuclides decay. The temperature fluctuations are from the seasonal temperatures that the canister could see. For lower decay heat fuel, the temperature fluctuations from seasonal effects are greater than the change that occurs from initial packing temperatures to 50-year temperatures. With much less physical mass of fuel present, the canisters loaded with HFIR fuel have more seasonal fluctuations than the rest. Similarly, the RFA-14 loaded canister has less fluctuation seasonally due to the larger amount of physical mass present.
Figure 14. 50-year average temperatures, for (a) RFA in Type-1a basket, (b) RFA in modified 14-slot basket, (c) MURR in Type 1a basket, (d) HFIR inner in Type 6a basket and (e) HFIR outer in Type 6b basket.

3.2 Dose Rates

3.2.1 RFA

The RFA is a hypothetical fuel assembly, so no exact radionuclide inventory is specified. Sindelar et al. 2012 lists a material inventory which bounds the radiological hazard. This material inventory activity was bound from selecting the maximum activity of all radioisotopes from a range of fuels. This provides a set of radioisotopes to design basis accident scenarios. However, as this considers the worst case for every isotope, rather than a generalized worst case, the total material content in Curries is $2.31 \times 10^5$. This value is an order of magnitude higher than the calculated value of $1.86 \times 10^4$ for an ATR assembly rated for a decay heat of 100W. As such, using this value in a calculation for dose rate would far overestimate radiolytic hydrogen generation by orders of magnitude.

Due to this, the dose rates to be used for the RFA chemical model will be equivalent to the decay of the MURR.

3.2.2 MURR

A 2D MCNP model was setup for MURR assemblies within a modified Type-1a canister. This model was set up with one-quarter symmetry for the storage configuration for computational speed. Figure 15 shows the spatial dose rate of the MURR packed in the canister. Table 5 shows the average dose rate to the cladding over 100 year after reactor removal. Due to the differences in burnup, the dose rates to the
cladding of the MURR are approximately 2 times greater than the dose rates of the ATR stored fuel - 0.5278 vs 0.2403 Gy/s at 2 years decay.

Based on the maximum ratio of dose rate/decay heat, the dose rate over time in the chemical model for MURR can be estimated [in Gy/s] by

\[ d = 0.0347Q \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

### 3.2.3 HFIR

A 2D MCNP model was setup for HFIR assemblies within a modified Type-6a/b canister for the inner/outer assemblies, respectively. Table 7 shows the average dose rate over time for the cladding for both the inner and outer fuel assembly configurations. The representation of the MCNP homogenized model of the dose rate is shown in Figure 16 for both the HFIR inner and HFIR outer storage configurations. Due to the different burnups of inner/outer assemblies, the dose rates on the cladding are roughly similar between the two. After the initial year of decay, the dose rates for the HFIR are lower than that of the MURR, so using the MURR dose rates for the RFA chemical model will be a more conservative approach.

The dose rate to the cladding for the HFIR assemblies after initial decay can be estimated as a function of the decay heat [in Gy/s] by

\[ d = 0.00404Q \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

For the inner assembly, and

\[ d = 0.00216Q \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

For the outer assembly.

### 4. CONCLUSIONS

The hypothetical RFA fuel packing shows the highest possible maximum temperatures, but only up to 97°C, which is much lower than previous considerations for packaged ATR fuel. The actual fuel maximum temperatures are 87, 64, and 55°C for the MURR, HFIR outer and HFIR inner assemblies. The dose rates for the MURR and HFIR fuels were calculated over a 50-year decay period. Both types of assemblies have slightly higher dose rates than calculated for ATR fuel assemblies. The MURR fuel assemblies have higher dose rates than the HFIR and those values will be used for the RFA geometry.

While, the HFIR assemblies have high fuel element surface areas, the packaging configuration contains a large amount of free volume. Due to the highest surface area to volume ratio for a loaded DOE standard canister, and a high maximum temperature for the aluminum surface, the MURR loaded DOE standard canister should provide a bounding case for all aluminum-clad fuel currently stored at SRS.

As with the simulations that were ran for the ATR fuel stored in a DOE sealed canister, coupled radiolytic chemistry calculations will be done on the storage configurations here. However, the set of simulations will contain updated G-values for the hydrogen generation of the aluminum oxide layer. These updated values will depend upon ongoing experiments for radiolysis tests in helium rather than argon, for dried versus undried samples, and for early versus late time periods.
REFERENCES


**DRAWING LIST**

INL DWG-507692 DOE Sealed Standard Canister
INL DWG-409406 MURR Fuel Plate
INL DWG-409407 MURR Fuel Assembly
Appendix A
MURR and HFIR Decay Heat and Dose Rate Calculations

Chirst Verst of SRNL provided the following decay heat and dose rate calculations for the MURR fuel assemblies and the HFIR fuel assemblies.

Table 5. Dose rate for MURR fuel in storage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years after reactor discharge</th>
<th>Dose Rate [krad/hr]</th>
<th>Dose Rate [Gy/s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.5278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.2361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.05833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.01944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Decay heat for MURR fuel in storage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decay [d]</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>341.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>198.0652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>131.0835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>93.06986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>70.50916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>55.34472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>46.72079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>39.84821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>34.62737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>30.46896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>27.05758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>23.75411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>21.73718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>19.63724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>17.81952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>16.2508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>14.88129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095</td>
<td>13.41219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140</td>
<td>12.64859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>7.481056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2191</td>
<td>5.882525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2739</td>
<td>5.160475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Dose rate for HFIR fuel in storage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years after reactor discharge</th>
<th>Inner - Dose Rate [krad/hr]</th>
<th>Inner - Dose Rate [Gy/s]</th>
<th>Outer - Dose Rate [krad/hr]</th>
<th>Outer - Dose Rate [Gy/s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1.7639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15. Dose rate contour profile for standard DOE canister with MURR fuel loaded.
Table 8. Decay Heat for HFIR fuel in storage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years after reactor discharge</th>
<th>HFIR Inner</th>
<th>HFIR outer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>837.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>280.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16. (a) Homogenized profile for DOE canister with HFIR inner assembly and (b) profile for HFIR outer assembly.