

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD **INATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD
Investigative Hearing**

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Metrorail train 302 that encountered heavy smoke in the tunnel between the L'Enfant Plaza Station and the Potomac River Bridge on January 12, 2015

Agency / Organization

WMATA WMATA

Title

Tunnel Ventilation Project Report Tunnel Ventilation Project Report Phase II Phase II July 1991 July 1991

PROPERTY OF WILLIAM D. KENNEDY

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

PHASE-II

TUNNEL VENTILATION PROJECT REPORT

WNATA

Results of Prototype Development and Test Program

Prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff/TEMA

July 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

- 1. TEST OBJECTIVES
- 1.1 Prototype Concepts Barriers Jet Fans
- 1.2 Ventilation Concept
- 1.3 Ventilation Test Parameters Basic Tests Barrier Tests Jet Fan Tests Double-Track Tests
- 1.4 Data Reduction
- 2. TEST PROGRAM
- 2.1 Evolution of Decisions Leadinq to Final Test Proqram Criteria for Ventilation Strateqies Phase I Report Hiqhliqhts
- 2.2 Test Site Locations
- 2.3 Modifications to Testinq Schedule and Sites Oriqinal Test Site New Test Sites $\overline{}$

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continue4)

- 2.4 Equipment Involved in the Ventilation Tests Existing Fan Shaft Fans WMATA Clearance car Temporary Power Supply for Jet Fans Dampers Jet Fan Equipment **Barriers**
- 2.5 Barrier Equipment Tests
Functional and Physical Characteristics Test Requirements and Methodology Design Development Deployment Tests
- 2.6 Ventilation Tests Basic Tests Barrier Tests Jet Fan Tests Data Acquisition System
- 2.7 Software Design Application Software Description Software Inputs Software Outputs (Reports) Software Real-Time Calculations Raw Data Files User Interface
- 3. TEST RESULTS
- 3.1 Barrier Deployment Tests

Test Locations Factory Tests Results Field Tests Results

3.2 Ventilation Tests and Analyses 'Tunnel Friction Factor Tests Barrier Tests Jet Fan Mounting Head Loss Tests Jet Fan Pressure Efficiency Tests Barriers vs. Jet Fans: A Comparison

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued) ·

4. COMPUTER PROGRAMS

- 4.1 Subway Environmental Simulation Computer Program
- 4.2 Computer-Based Estimate of Fire Heat Release Rate Modification of COMPF2 Results Fire Development Scenarios Recommendation of a Desiqn Heat Release Rate
- 4.2 SES Analyses Simulation Elements Key Simulations Results of Similations Estimated Quantities of Equipment Needed to Upgrade the Metrorail Tunnel Ventilation System

5. COST ESTIMATE POR SYSTBKWIDB RBTROPIT

Barriers 20-Inch Diameter Jet Fans 48-Inch Diameter Jet Fans Conversion of Existing Fans to 90 Percent Reversibility Ventilation Equipment Monitoring and Central Control Installationeter Jet Fans Non-Equipment Costs Systemwide Cost Estimate for a 69.7 MBtu/hf Fire Systemwide Cost Estimate for a 42.4 MBtu/hf Fire Traditional Approach

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 Train Fire Heat Release Rate
- 6.2 Barriers
- 6.3 Jet Fans
- 6.4 Equipment Recommended to Upqrade the Metrorail Tunnel Ventilation System

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

- ^ADescription of Subway Environment Simulation Computer Proqram
- B Data Reduction
- ^cInvestiqation of a Post-Flashover Computer Model for Subway Trains
- D Data Acquisition Hardware
- E Test Nomenclature
- F Test Descriptions Initial Tests at Metro Center Tunnel Friction Factor Tests Jet Fan Tests Barrier Tests Jet Fan Mountinq Head Loss Coefficient Tests

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents the second phase of a ventilation
program for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's Metrorail subway system. The purpose of this Prototype Development and Test Proqram was to evaluate ways to improve the ability of the Metrorail ventilation system to control the direction of smoke movement durinq a fire emerqency.

Recommendations

On the basis of the results of the testing program, barriers
are recommended as the preferred means of redirecting tunnel airflows in the Metrorail system during fire emergencies because they were found to be:

- o Capable of redirectinq tunnel airflows
- o Operationally reliable
- o Operable without motor power
- o In need of fewer modifications to the central control system than jet fans
- o Less expensive than jet fans.

It is also recommended that a pre-production or production
barrier be installed in the Metrorail system for an "in service" test lasting approximately 24 months with deployments after 12 and 24 months.

Jet fans are recommended as alternatives to barriers only where tunnel qeometries preclude the installation of barriers.

Tests showed that both systems meet the qoal of the proqram in that they supply resistance to airflow sufficient to direct smoke and heat in a fire emerqency. Furthermore, both systems satisfy the criteria established for acceptable systems in that they:

- o Require no additional fan shafts
- o Involve minimal civil/structural. modifications
- o Have minimal impact on transit system operations
- o Are cost effective.

Background

At its inception, the Metrorail system met or exceeded the state-of-the-art ventilation criteria for transit systems and was constructed with an absolute minimum of combustible materials. In recent years, however, greater attention has
been given to "life safety" throughout the industry. Therefore, the Authority decided to initiate a program to understand the available options more fully and learn what the alternatives might involve to achieve directional smoke control.

^Aprimary concern is that the existing ventilation system does not make adequate provision for removal of hot smoke in the event of a large train fire. Two systems for redirecting the tunnel airflows, barriers and jet fans, were recommended for analysis in the report on Phase I of this program, the Ventilation System Analysis. Both of the systems described here were evaluated and tested in the Phase II study.

Barriers have not been used in vehicle tunnels before, but canvas barriers called "brattices" have been used in mining ventilation quite extensively. The barriers proposed for transit tunnels differ from those used in mining applications in that they are similar to parachutes held in ^place along the tunnel perimeter by air-inflated toruses and are repidly deployed on command in response to an emergency situation. Jet fans have been used in vehicle tunnels and subway systems for over forty years because they are especially suitable for the longitudinal ventilation of these spaces. The jet fans proposed for tunnel use are axial-flow fans attached to the tunnel walls.

Testing Program

The evaluation program consisted of field measurements of airflows and pressures in the tunnel. The data collected provided the aerodynamic characteristics needed to
generalize the performance of the barrier and fan prototypes in typical Metrorail tunnels with steel ribbing and concrete wall linings. The findings of the current study will be used in Phase III of the Tunnel Ventilation Program as input to the design of modifications to the Metrorail system.

INTRODUCTION

Phase II of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Tunnel Ventilation Program (Prototype of the Phase I Tunnel Ventilation Study (Ventilation System Analysis). The Phase I study recommended that two strategies -- barriers and jet fans -- be tested to determine whether they could be used to direct additional quantities of air past a stopped Metrorail train during an emergency. The test results indicate that barriers and/or jet fans are usable for the purpose intended. Therefore, this report is a valuable future reference for retrofit design at specific fan shaft locations.

In this program, tests were conducted to:

- o Determine whether barriers and jet fans can function safely and reliably in the Metrorail
- o Obtain the functional data required for final design of the Metrorail systemwide upgrade, for the design of the equipment (barriers and jet fans), and for the calibration or modification of the Subway Environment Simulation (SES) computer program which will become the basis for subsequent evaluation of the required ventilation modifications throughout the Metrorail.

The report includes the following sections and appendices that contain supporting data and documents:

Section 1. describes the tests conducted, including the ventilation concepts and test parameters established as the bases for these tests.

Section 2. describes the evolution of the test program and the details of actual tests conducted.

Section 3. describes the test results.

Section 4. describes the computer programs used, a separate analysis to develop the train fire heat release rate: a typical application of the results to the Metrorail: and the estimated quantities of barriers and jet fans required for the systemwide retrofit of the Metrorail.

Section 5. contains the systemwide retrofit cost estimate and the recommendations.

section 6. contains the conclusions and the recommendations.

Appendix A includes a description of the the SES computer program.

Appendix B deals with data reduction.

Appendix C is the report on the investigation of a post-flashover model for subway trains.

Appendix D describes the data acquisition hardware.

Appendix B lists test nomenclature.

Appendix P includes test descriptions.

1. TEST OBJECTIVES

1.1 PROTOTYPE CONCEPT

Barriers

Barriers would be used, in conjunction with the existing or slightly increased tunnel ventilation fan capacity, to direct the airflows to the involved tunnel section and achieve the airflow rates necessary to control the direction of spread of smoke. The barrier test program included both a performance/deployment test series and ventilation tests.

The prototype barrier (Figure 1-1) is the outgrowth of an air inflated blockage device used in mines known as a "Brattice". Once inflated, the barrier has the appearance of a parachute and will have a vertical slot in the center fabric that will provide patron egress. The Sheldahl Corporation has been the principal developer of this type of device, using fabrics and films currently used in a variety of aerospace and defense products. (Sheldahl has developed a number of other tunnel blockage devices including the Inflatable Air Block for WMATA in 1985.)

The Phase I Report [14] stated that three barriers would be required for a test since three barriers would be deployed during a typical fire emergency. However, the more detailed evaluation done during Phase II provided an assurance that a test could be accomplished with one barrier rather than three. This arrangement allowed the tests to include the effects of barriers being deployed in the other trackways without installing them, thus reducing the number of barriers required for a test by two-thirds, as well as the test instrumentation and the work effort required. The one barrier was located in the same trackway as the stopped train but on the opposite side of the fan shaft (Figure 1- 4). Temporary dampers were installed in the fan shaft to restrict the flow of air into the fan shaft from the tunnel legs for the other track. The tests were performed in some instances with and without dampers to extend the range of information gathered.

Only one barrier was used for the tests. Four or more barriers would be installed permanently in the event that barriers turn out to be the best alternative for a tunnel section.

Jet Pans

Jet fans were used to achieve results similar to those achieved by the barriers by directing sufficient airflow to

السنة

 $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$

J

in
Pa

 \sim

FIGURE 1-1 PROTOTYPE BARRIER

1-2

BARRIER DEPLOYED

BARRIER STORED

Service Control

 \rightarrow

المستوفي المستوفي المستوفي المستوفي

the affected tunnel. During a typical fire emergency, at least three sets of jet fans would be expected to operate.

Jet fans have been installed in approximately 50 highway tunnels world-wide in the last 40 years. They were installed in two sections of the Pittsburgh Light Rail Transit System in 1985 and in the Singapore Mass Rapid Transit System in 1987. Questions concerning equipment safety and reliability have been resolved. Therefore, these issues would be addressed during final design by using proven specifications and conducting factory and start-up tests.

The Phase I Report suggested that the test program would require three sets of jet fans, each set having six 16-inch diameter jet fans. However, during Phase II, a more detailed evaluation indicated that the tests could be accomplished with only one set of jet fans (Figure 1-2). This set was comprised of four 24-inch diameter jet fans delivering 21,000 cubic feet per minute (cfm).

One set of jet fans could be used because dampers were installed in the fan shaft to restrict the flow of air into the fan shaft from the tunnel legs on the other trackway without installing two sets of fans on the other track. This· arrangement reduced the number of jet fans required for a test by three-quarters, as well as the test instrumentation and the work effort required.

The four 24-inch diameter jet fans were used only for the tests. Smaller jet fans would be installed permanently in the event that jet fans turn out to be the best alternative for a particular tunnel configuration. The number of jet fans and their size would be determined during final design based on the differential between the existing air tunnel airflows and those to be achieved.

1.2 VENTILATIOH COHCEPT

The current configuration (Figure 1-3) shows the anticipated airflow pattern in the tunnels adjacent to a fan shaft when 250,000 cfm of air is being exhausted through the fan shaft and a train is stopped in the tunnel. Since the unaffected tunnels are open, the quantity of air is being directed past the train is estimated to be 25,000 cfm, which provides an approximate tunnel air velocity of 125 feet per minute (fpm) - less than desired.

Figure 1-4 shows the anticipated airflow pattern in the tunnels adjacent to a fan shaft when 250,000 cfm of air is being exhausted through the fan shaft, a train is stopped in a tunnel, and barriers are deployed in the other, unaffected, tunnels. The barriers increase the resistance to airflow in their tunnels. The net effect is more airflow

the control of the control of the control of

FIGURE 1-2 JET FAN

MECH

 \sim

1599

المستوا المستوا المرسية المستو

Typical Tunnel Airflows without Barriers

 $FIGURE 1-3$

 $-1-6$

Typical Tunnel Airflows with Barriers

المتعا

directed past the train. The airflow past the train is, therefore, estimated to be loo,ooo cfm, which provides an estimated tunnel air velocity of 500 fpm - approximately what is desired. It is anticipated that barriers would be installed in all the tunnels adjacent to the ventilation shaft, but the barrier in the affected tunnel would not be deployed since it would then reduce airflow past the incident train.

Jet fans would be used to accomplish objectives similar to those achieved by the barriers. They would increase the resistance to airflow in specific tunnel segments by discharging a high velocity jet of air against the tunnel airflow. For the tunnels shown in Figure 1-4, jet fans instead of barriers would be installed in each tunnel. For the circumstance shown, the jet fans in the unaffected tunnels would be operated with their discharge directed away from the fan shaft against the tunnel airflow. The net effect, as in the case of the barriers, is more airflow directed past the train.

1.3 **VENTILATION TEST PARAMETERS**

The Phase II test program confirmed that barriers and/or jet fans are suitable for forcing additional quantities of air
past a stopped Metrorail train during an emergency. In addition, the test program involved the accurate collection of airflow and static pressure measurements for the barriers and jet fans. These measurements provide the basis for inputs to the Subway Environment Simulation (SES) computer program that will allow subsequent evaluation of the required ventilation throughout the Metrorail.

Two series of tests were involved primarily: basic tests that provided a number of measurement factors that form the basis for the remainder of the test program, and individual airflow and static pressure measurements involving the actual equipment. The air velocities and pressures were measured with an accuracy of plus or minus five percent.

Basic Tests

The purpose of the basic tests was to determine:

- o The single point measurement factors for the ribbed wall tunnel and the smooth wall tunnel in the tunnel and the ventilation shafts.
- o The friction factors for the ribbed wall tunnel and the smooth wall tunnel. These include the effects of ribs, fire lines, conduits and signaling devices.

o The pressure loss coefficient of the jet fan supports.

The basic tests also provided experience for the remaininq tests in the areas of logistics; instrumentation and communication. The sinqle point measurement factor and the friction factor are mathematically defined in Appendix B.

Barrier Tests

The barrier tests determined the relationship between the static pressure differential across the barrier and the airflow throuqh it. For a riqid barrier havinq an openinq of known size, theory and previous experiments have shown the relationship is a constant times the airflow velocity
pressure. However, the barrier tested is not rigid and the size of the opening may vary with the airflow. Furthermore, the air leakaqe throuqh the borders of the barrier is different for a circular tunnel than for a rectanqular tunnel. Therefore, full-scale experimental tests were necessary for both types of tunnels to determine the static pressure-airflow relationship, which is mathematically described in Appendix B.

Jet Pan Tests

Experiments in vehicular tunnels (8] have shown that the jet fan pressure efficiency varies as a function of:

- o The distance from the center line of the jet fan to the tunnel wall
- o The tunnel wall rouqhness smooth and ribbed
- o The lonqitudinal spacinq of the jet fans alonq the tunnel.

Unfortunately, experimental data does not exist for the ranges of these parameters that exist in the Metrorail. Therefore, the jet fan pressure efficiency had to be measured so that it can be input into the desiqn process accurately. To study the effect of the tunnel wall rouqhness on the jet fan pressure efficiency, two qeneral qroups of tests were performed: ribbed wall tunnel tests and smooth wall tunnel tests.

Double-Track Tests

The purpose of the double-track tunnel tests is to measure the effect columns have on the distribution of airflow between two adjacent trackways, one of these containing a stopped train. Previous scale model tests [1] were made for a double-track tunnel having no columns. These tests showed that the air velocity on each side of the train was essentially the same even if the train was eccentrically located in the tunnel. For example, the tests showed that for a 30-foot-wide tunnel having a 10-foot-wide train, the air velocity on each side of a train 3 feet from one wall and 17 feet from the other was about the same. The doubletrack tests would confirm this effect in full scale.

1.4 DATA REDUCTION

Data reduction is the process used to transform the raw test data into data for input to subsequent tests or to the SES computer program during implementation. The specialty computer programs developed for this purpose are described below and their mathematical development are presented in Appendix B.

The input to each computer program was a raw test data file or the output of a previous program. The output of each computer program was a file for input to a subsequent computer program, and/or for printing or plotting into a table or fiqure used in this report, or eventually for SES input. The calculations included the effects of ambient pressure, temperature and humidity on air density and viscosity.

The friction factor proqram used the field-measured friction factors and air velocities to develop the equivalent relative roughness of the tunnel by a least-squares curve fit using Colebrook's Formula. The resulting equivalent relative roughness was then input to the remaining computer programs.

The barrier proqram used the equivalent relative roughness and the field-measured air velocities and pressure changes across the barrier to compute the barrier head loss coefficients. The output was the barrier bead loss coefficient as a function of the tunnel air velocity.

The jet fan mountinq proqram used the equivalent relative roughness and the field-measured air velocity and pressure change across the jet fan mountings to compute its output, the jet fan mounting head loss coefficient. The results were organized in file, table and figure form as a function of the distance between jet fan mounting spacings.

The jet fan pressure efficiency program used the equivalent
relative roughness, the jet fan airflow and discharge velocity, the jet fan mounting head loss coefficients, and the field-measured air velocity and pressure change to compute the jet fan pressure efficiency. These results were organized in file, table and figure form as ^afunction of the spacing between jet fans and the distance from the centerline of the jet fans to the tunnel wall.

 $\mathbf{k} \mathbf{Z}$, where $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$

MECH

2. TEST PROGRAM

The Test Program included two types of tests:

- o Equipment Testa. These tests demonstrated that the equipment related to the alternative ventilation systems had structural, functional, mechanical and electrical integrity, and that it would function as intended in the subway system in accordance with WMATA's safety, reliability, maintainability and operating requirements.
- o Ventilation Testa. These tests involved the accumulation of data on airflow and air pressure measurements sufficient for the design of a tunnel ventilation system that would meet the ultimate objective of increasing the fire safety of the system.

2.1 EVOLUTION OP DECISIONS LEADING TO PINAL TEST PROGRAM

This program grew out of studies, field tests, and site investigations commissioned by WMATA. The aim of the investigations was to evaluate the ability of the Metrorail ventilation systems to control the movement of smoke during a fire emergency. The conclusions led to a three-phase program.

Phase I, the study phase of the program, included:

- o Review of prior studies
- o Development of ventilation strategies (or concepts) and assessment of their anticipated effectiveness
- o The identification of locations in the Metrorail where field test of viable concepts could be conducted.

Phase II, the analytical phase of the program was based on the results of the Phase I work, and it included:

- o Design of the field test program and related system modifications
- o Implementation of the testing program

Phase III, the implementation phase, will include the design of modifications predicated upon the findings of the Phase II program. These modifications will then be implemented throughout the Metrorail system to achieve desired ventilation performance objectives.

Criteria for ventilation Strategies

The ventilation strategies considered in the Phase I Report [14] for improving smoke control in the running tunnels had to satisfy the following criteria:

- o No additional fan shafts
- o Minimal civil/structural modifications
- o Minimal construction impact on transit system operations
- o Cost-effective solutions.

Phase I Report Highlights

The highlights of the Phase I findings and recommendations are summarized below.

Airflows. Earlier studies had identified the airflows required to meet the ventilation criteria for controlling the movement of smoke and heat in a fire emergency. In Phase I (report pages 12-13), these airflows were determined to be less than previously suggested.

Beat Release Rates. A need was identified to develop a more detailed approach to estimate the train fire heat release rate.

Blockage Devices. The deployment of blockage devices -- used to direct ventilation airflow to the fire site -- appeared to provide a cost-effective solution to the problem of achieving effective control of smoke and heat in a fire emergency. The Phase I report suggested that further consideration be given to the following issues before making a firm commitment to the application of such barriers:

- o The technical feasibility of using them
- o Their compatability with overall operational safety and maintenance requirements.

Jet Pans. Jet fans appeared to approach the performance capability of blockage devices for smoke control in a fire situation and thus were considered to be a viable alternative. Jet fans, however, were thought to be more costly to implement than blockage devices.

Test Sites. The tunnel section between McPherson Square and Metro Center Stations was recommended as the location for performing both the single-track and double-track test program, based on the analyses performed during Phase I. The prototype tests to be conducted at this site were intended to:

- o Demonstrate the viability of the recommended ventilation strategies and their required physical modifications.
- ^oPermit "fine-tuning calibration" of the SES computer program. The test results would allow the SES computer program to be applied to all other existing or future sections of the Metrorail to determine the required modifications, if any, necessary to achieve the emergency ventilation objectives.

2.2 TEST SITE LOCATIONS

The Phase I Report recommended that Phase II testing be conducted in the revenue service tunnel section between Metro Center and McPherson Square stations on the Blue/Orange lines because this site represented the need for significant attention to fire life safety. The initial test program was developed around this tunnel section.

Subsequently, as the schedule for testing was finalized, WMATA made additional locations available in tunnel sections not yet in revenue service. Testing in these tunnels provided longer, more time-efficient test periods. The tests that were eventually conducted at three sites are listed below.

At 7th and I Streets SW Fan Shaft (Figure 2-1)

At N.Y. Avenue Fan Shaft (Figure 2-2)

At Blueridge Avenue Fan Shaft (Figure 2-3)

- Ribbed Wall Tunnel Friction Factor
- Jet Fan Tests-Ribbed Wall Tunnel
- Jet Fan Equipment Drag Tests Ribbed Wall Tunnel
- Barrier Ventilation Tests
- Ribbed Wall Friction Factor Tests
- Single Point Measurement Factor ·. experiment Smooth Wall Tunnel
- Friction Factor Tests
- Jet Fan Tests-Smooth Wall Tunnel

 \sim

7TH & I ST. S.W.

FIGURE 2-1

1610

METRO CENTER / McPHERSON SQUARE

 $FIGURE 2-2$

MECH

 $\frac{5}{2}$

თ

GLENMONT

-

i st

FIGURE $2-3$

- 20

Jet Fan Equipment Drag Tests-Smooth Wall Tunnel

2.3 MODIFICATIONS TO TESTING SCHEDULE AND SITES

Original Test Site

The recommended site -- the tunnels between Metro Center and McPherson Square Stations and the New York Avenue fan shaft -- was used only for the initial tests because it became apparent that testing in a revenue service tunnel was not cost effective. Furthermore, the restricted window of availability in this revenue tunnel meant that there was not enough time to set up and check out the instrumentation and equipment, perform the tests, and then remove the entire system.

New Test Sites

Fortunately, when the test schedule was being worked out and test site alternatives were being reviewed, WMATA was able to make available the three test sites referred to previously and shown.in Figures 2-1, 2-2 and 2-3. Therefore, changes were made in the program to adapt to these sites which offered two advantages.

- o The test schedule was greatly simplified by the elimination of the requirement to remove the instrumentation and equipment after each night's test and set up again the next night.
- o The use of the fan anemometer "rakes" instead of single point measurement (see Appendix D, Section 0.6.) became less of an inconvenience because the rakes had to be set qp only once at each test site for the entire test series.

The reasons and objectives for recommending the Metro Center Station/New York Avenue test site in the Phase I Report were not in any way compromised by the site change. In fact, better repeatability of test results occurred. As a result of the site shift:

- o The use of the 7th and I Streets fan shaft test site was found to be an acceptable substitute for the Metro Center Station/New York Avenue fan shaft test site for ribbed-tunnel tests.
- o The smooth-wall modified-horseshoe tunnel adjacent to the Blueridge Avenue fan shaft was selected as a

substitute for the smooth-wall box tunnel East of McPherson Square Station.

o The double-track tests were cancelled. More detailed analyses determined the output of the double track tests was not necessary for determining if barriers or jet fans could be used to re-direct tunnel airflow during Metrorail emergencies.

2.4 BQUIPMENT INVOLVED IN THE VENTILATION TESTS

Bxiatinq Fan Shaft Fans

The tests used the existing tunnel ventilation fan shaft fans at each test locations, described below. (Typical fan shaft fans are shown in Figure 2-4.)

- ⁰The Blueridge Avenue and 7th and I Streets SW fan shafts each have four fans. Each location has ^a combined capacity of 200,000 cfm when operating in the exhaust mode.
- o The New York Avenue fan shaft has five fans with a combined compacity of 250,000 cfm operated in the exhaust mode. These fans are operated in exhaust to reduce tunnel temperatures during normal summer operations and in either exhaust or supply during emergency operations.

WKATA Clearance car

The ventilation tests involve measuring air flow past ^a transit train. The WMATA Department of Rail Service provided its clearance car for the ventilation tests.

Use of this car had the added advantage of providing space for the data acquisition center and for storage of test equipment between tests (Figure 2-5).

Temporary Power supply for Jet Fans

Temporary power for the jet fans was provided by leasing ^a generator, cable and load center. This flexible arrangemen^t allowed the Jet Fan Tests to be performed at more than one location with minimal installation work (Figure 2-6).

IīĪ π

2

FIGURE 2-4 TYPICAL FAN SHAFT FANS

2-9

and the state

المسار المستدرات المستان

 \sim

COMPUTER CENTER INSIDE CLEARANCE CAR

.CLEARANCE CAR IN POSITION FOR AIR FLOW MEASUREMENTS

FIGURE 2-5 WMATA CLEARANCE CAR

300KW GENERATOR

LOAD CENTER

FIGURE 2-6 POWER SUPPLY TO JET FANS

Dampers

As detailed in other sections of this report, dampers were temporarily installed at the New York Avenue and 7th and ^I Streets fan shafts (Figure 2-7). Use of these dampers
minimized the quantity of barriers and jet fans needed to do
the testing. The end of the tunnel at the Blueridge Avenue
fan shaft fulfilled the same requirement as the

Jet Pan Equipment

Rehabilitated rail buggies were used to allow for mobility in the testing of the jet fans. A lift table was installed on top of the buggies and the jet fans were mounted on top of the lift tables (Figure 2-8). This strategy enhanced the entire jet fan test program because it enabled the jet fans to be tested in a variety of positions.

Barrier

Sheldahl, Inc. designed the barrier using information and
criteria developed from the design of air blocking devices
for underground mine shafts. The barrier was designed to
deploy fully within two minutes, at a very low t velocity. When deployed, the barrier is designed to conform to the general shape of the tunnel with special features for the third rail and the walkway.

2.5 BARRIER EQUIPMENT TESTS

Functional and Physical Characteristics

The barrier must be bi-directional (capable of throttling
airflow in either direction), because the fan shaft fans may
have to operate in either the exhaust or the supply mode
during an emergency. No metal or hard objectiv barrier containment in the stored condition. The barrier must conform to the National Fire Protection Association's standard 130, Fixed Guideway Transit System, 1990 Edition as accepted by the local WMATA fire protection jurisdictions.

The barrier shall conform to the following requirements:

- ^ocontainment. It must clear the subway car dynamic outline in its stored condition.
- o Deployment. It must be fully deployed within two minutes after activation.

MECH

WOOD DAMPER AT N₁Y. AVE FAN SHAFT

TARPAULIN DAMPER AT 7th & I ST. SW FAN SHAFT

FIGURE 2-7 DAMPERS

II

FIGURE 2-8 JET FAN MOBILE MOUNTING

المساء السنة المسترد المستور

a k

Contract Contract

1625

 $\overline{\mu}$

المستل المستعدد المستقدمة المستق

MECH

- o Bqress. It must have a personnel eqress passage in accordance with NFPA requirements described above.
- o Abrasion. It must withstand being deployed and rubbing against a variety of tunnel fittings without damage, and also withstand considerable passenger egress through it without damage.
- o Pire Resistance. It must meet the tests required by NFPA 130.
- o Electric Resistivity. It must have a resistance at 750 volts direct current of a minimum of 10 megaohms per inch.

Test Requirements and Methodology

Eight types of barrier equipment tests were conducted. They included:

- o Deployment time and geometry
- o Third Rail
- o Release mechanism reliability (two tests)
- o Storage latch reliability
- o Abrasion
- o Fire resistance
- o Electrical resistivity
- o In-service monitoring of the system

The criteria, configurations and procedures for these tests are shown in Table 2-1.

Desiqn Development

oriqinal concept --360-Deqree Torus. During earlier experiments with the parachute type air block, the barrier collapsed when an egress passage was opened. Therefore, Sheldahl's original concept was to combine the parachute type air block with a 360-degree air-inflated torus that would hold the barrier in position whether or not air was flowing through the tunnel. The torus represented the least complicated means of providing enough rigidity to the barrier under the various deployment conditions.

Teat Barrler Deployment
Time and Geometry **Third Rail Tests** Release Mechanism Reliability - A Release Mechanism Reliability • B **Storage Latch** Reliability **Criteria** The barrier release mechanism shall function on command and the barrier fully deploy within two minutes. A value judgment on how well the barrier is to conform to the third and running rails in the tunnel. The barrier release mechanism shall function on command and drop free of the container within one minute of the release command. The barrier and its container shall remain attached to the tunnel wall during the ventilation test. The barrier shall not deploy prior to the ventilation test. The barrier shall deploy on command. The barrier and its container remain attached to the tunnel wall during the test. The barrier shall not deploy during the test. Configuration Package the barrier in its storage container and close the storage latch. Install the barrier storage container with the storage latch and barrier in an overhead position. Place a restriction in the general shape of the WMATA third rail and two running rails in the apptopriate position. Package the barrier in its storage container and close the storage latch. Install the barrier storage container with the storage latch and barrier in an overhead position. Repackage all four test barriers In their respective containers and recharge torus gas cylinder pressure for each test configuration specified for ventilation testing. Package the barrier in its storage container and close the storage latch. Install the barrier storage container with the storage latch and barrier in an overhead position. Package the barrier in its storage container and close the storage latch. Install the barrier storage container with the storage latch and barrier in an overhead position. Teal Time the deployment of the barrier with zero airflow and maximum airflow with torus deflated. Photograph the conformity of the barrier to the simulated third raiVrunnlng rail restrictions with legible scales in each view. Exercise the release mechanism on three separate release mechanisms, six times each, without gas Introduced to the torus, and repeat with gas Introduced to the torus for a total of 36 tests. Determine that the barrier and its container remain attached to the tunnel wall prior to and during the ventilation test and that the barrier shall not deploy prior to the ventilation tests. Release the barrier at the initiation of each ventilation test in accordance with requirements in the ventilation testing. Expose the barrier to an external pressure of 3 Inches water gage (in. wg) for 30 seconds. Release the pressure within 0.1 second.Repeat 30 times for each of three barrier units. Expose the barrier to an external vacuum

Table 2·1 Barrier Equipment Tests

of 2 ln. wg for 30 seconds. Release the pressure within 0.1 second. Repeat 30 times for each of three barrier units.

MECH 1628

 $2 - 17$

 \sim

 ~ 12

 \sim

Table 2·1 Barrier Equipment Tests (Continued)

ے اس سے س

 \sim

 $\langle \sigma_{\rm c} \rangle$

Table 2·1 Barrier Equipment Tests

 \sim

 \sim $^{-1}$ $^{-1}$ $^{-1}$ $^{-1}$ $^{-1}$ $^{-1}$ $^{-1}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

والمستورد والمستعار المستعمل المستحقق

Sheldahl's in-plant tests, using a mock-up of a circular tunnel cross-section, showed that the initial designs involving the 360-degree torus were not successful. The torus would not align with the tunnel wall and there were entanglements of the shroud lines. To solve this problem a significantly larger volume of air and a higher air pressure would be required. These options were not considered practical.

Design Refinement -- 180-Degree Torus. This design refinement became the solution. The lower half of the barrier adhered to the sides of the tunnel by gravity. The upper half of the torus adhered to the upper half to the tunnel (Figure 2-9). With minor modifications to the shrouds, the barrier was considered ready for the next step -- deployment testing prior to advancing the design to an operational prototype.

Deployment Tests

The barrier deployment tests conducted at the 7th and ^I Streets sw Fan Shaft were intended as proof-of-concept tests of the barrier design. As shown in the barrier deployment sequence (Figures 2-10 and 2-11), the deployment is assisted by the air torus on the upper perimeter of the air block canopy.

The tests -- conducted in zero airflow or worst-case deployment conditions -- demonstrated the barrier's release and deployment and showed the percent of tunnel cross section blockage. The prototype was judged to be very close to final design based on the following results:

Criteria

Results

- 1. Release to full deployment in 3 minutes with no release mechanism failure. Full deployment in ⁴⁵ sec.: no release failure. Minor shroud line entanglement in one trial.
- 2. Shrouds, canopy & torus resistant to damage from tunnel appurtenances. No damage observed after two deployments.

The success of these tests led to the decision to test the barrier performance with the fan shaft fan operating (Figure 2-12) and the design was shown to be self-supporting (without the torus). The barrier filled over 90 percen^t (estimated) of the tunnel cross-section with the fans operating in exhaust mode and the other three tunnel approaches to the fan shaft open. The torus was needed, however, to obtain the initial deployment shape.

FIGURE 2-9 SHOP TEST OF BARRIER

the state of t

FIGURE 2-10 BARRIER DEPLOYMENT SEQUENCE

 $\lambda_{\rm c}$

MECH

г

FIGURE 2-11 BARRIER DEPLOYMENT SEQUENCE

 \mathcal{R}

ò.

 $2 - 22$

FIGURE 2-12 BARRIER WITH FAN SHAFT FANS IN OPERATION

2.6 **VENTILATION TESTS**

The ventilation tests used to accumulate accurate airflow and static pressure measurements for the barriers and jet fans involved three series of tests:

- o Basic Tests
- o Barrier Tests
- ^oJet Fan Tests.

Basic Tests

The basic tests were used to determine:

- o The single point measurement factors for the ribbed wall tunnel and the smooth wall tunnel
- o The single point measurement factors for the ventilation shafts
- o The friction factors for the ribbed wall tunnel and the smooth wall tunnel, including the effects of ribs, fire lines, conduits, signaling devices, etc.
- o The jet fan mounting head loss coefficient.

These basic tests also provided experience for the remaining tests in the areas of logistics, instrumentation, communication, etc. The single point measurement factor and the friction factor are mathematically defined in Appendix B.

Barrier Testa

The barrier tests were used to determine the relationship between the static pressure differential across the barrier and the airflow through it. For a rigid barrier having an opening of known size, theory and previous experiments have shown the relationship is a constant times the airflow velocity pressure. In this test, however, the barrier was not rigid and the size of the opening varied with the airflow. Therefore, full-scale experimental tests were necessary to determine the static pressure-airflow relationship (mathematically described in Appendix B). If it was decided to implement barriers for tunnels having shapes other than round or horse shoe (such as square or double box) then additional ventilation tests for these barriers would be required. The need for these, if any, would be determined during the site specific designs in Phase III.

Jet Fan Tests

Experiments in vehicular tunnels have shown that the jet fan pressure efficiency varies as a function of the following:

- o The distance from the center line of the jet fan to the tunnel wall
- o The tunnel wall rouqhness smooth and ribbinq
- o The lonqitudinal spacinq of the jet fans alonq the tunnel.

Unfortunately, experimental data did not exist for the Therefore, the jet fan pressure efficiency had to be measured so that it could be input into the design process accurately. To study the effect of the tunnel wall rouqhness on the jet fan pressure efficiency, two qeneral qroups of tests were performed: ribbed wall tunnel tests and smooth wall tunnel tests.

The efficiency also varies as a function of the jet fan discharqe air velocity. However, the discharqe air velocity selected for these tests is similar to that of the jet fans that would be installed.

Data Acquisition System

Durinq the selection process of the data collection equipment, it quickly became apparent that a real-time data acquisition system (DAS) would be necessary to:

- o Simplify and expedite the collection of data
- o Provide real-time calculation capabilities
- o Determine the quality of the collected data immediately
- o Simplify analysis of the results.

The followinq brief review of DAS concepts is presented below to show the applicability of real-time DAS to the testinq proqram. These concepts form the basis for the desiqn and implementation of the KLD Labs' DAS, the system that .is discussed in detail in the sections to follow.

Data acquisition systems are used to measure and record ^a wide ranqe of real-world phenomena. The overall system consists of transducers/sensors, siqnal conditioninq modules and a data loqqinq device (Fiqure 2-13).

o Tranducers/Sensors

MECH

1642

FIGURE 2-13

The transducers are the means by which the physical ^phenomena are sensed and converted into electrical signals. The basic electrical signals generated by transducers are scmetimes quite small and often transgress the range appropriate for diqitization by the OAS. In such cases, it is necessary to incorporate a signal conditioninq module into the system.

o Signal Conditioning Modules

The signal conditioninq module can amplify and/or linearize the transducer output to provide compatibility with the data loqqinq device. In addition, the siqnal conditioner filters out unwanted signal fluctuations and electrical noise.

o Data Logging Devices

Once the siqnal has been appropriately conditioned, it can be transmitted directly to one of a variety of different output devices, either using an analog storage media or a
digital storage device. Digitizing the signals converts the conditioned output into a format that is readily analyzed by computer. For this reason, a real-time, microprocessor-based system was chosen for the test proqram. The microcomputer has the advantaqe of providinq both data loqqinq and on-line analysis capabilities.

The system supports the collection of numerous data channels whose output can be directly input into appropriate equations allowinq for real-time viewinq of results. This capability provides the means for immediate system verification.

one of the most beneficial elements of real-time processinq is the ability of the operator to have instant access to the results of a test series. This feedback is especially siqnificant in that the results of one test series often become input parameters for a followinq test series. For example, tests conducted to determine the friction factor of ^aparticular tunnel section will provide an important parameter for all future tests of that tunnel.

Hardware. Fiqures 2-14 and 2-15 indicate the variety of instrumentation and equipment utilized in conductinq the tests. The DAS is capable of measurinq the followinq in real time:

- o Air Velocity
- o Static Pressure
- o Temperature

MECH

FIGURE 2-14 MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS

FIGURE 2-15 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTATION

5
27
29

o Humidity

o Barometric Pressure.

Detailed descriptions of the hardware used by the system to measure these factors are included in Appendix D.

Software. The software provides a stand-alone and selfsufficient means of capturing and analyzing real-time data for a wide variety of ventilation tests, when executed on the PC and combined with custom airflow, temperature and pressure instrument configurations.

The software was entirely custom developed since no
commercially available packages had the right mix of functionality and performance. Instrument configurations, real-time calculations, on-line displays and off-line reports based upon changing analysis requirements also had to be customized. In short, the software was written to provide a large degree of flexibility as an up-front requirement.

The capability of making in-field modifications to the software was essential. The few modifications the were necessary were made by KLD.

2.7 SOFTWARE DESIGN

The executable software, "pw_daq.exe" was designed as ^a real-time program. That is, it has the ability to process data acquisition input data, perform specified calculations, update the real-time display, and monitor the keyboard for user input simultaneously.

The software is also set up/controlled by test-specific inputs that are described in detail in the section on software inputs below. In order to provide maximum flexibility, the mapping of these inputs to the actual processing relies to a large extent on a table crossreference. For example, the data channels and instrument types that are collected on a test-by-test basis are specified by tables rather than by in-line code. This feature proves invaluable for making "on-site" modifications to the configuration in a short period of time.

The application software executes under PC/MSDOS 3.3. It was developed in Microsoft "C" 5.1. Version control is maintained through the Microsoft "Make" utility.

Application Software Description

The application software was written to produce two separate executables--"debug" and "real". The debug executable:

- o Provides known inputs as channel data
- ^oAllows intermediate outputs to be analyzed through the use of a debug data file that is created in real-time
- Allows all calculations to be broken down into intermediate results.

The debug executable is used for validating real- time processing and calculations based on known inputs. It is invaluable as ^acheck-out of any software additions/modifications prior to the actual test.

For purposes of increasing speed, the real executable eliminates any intermediate debug outputs. The final outputs are those produced in the report and raw data files to be described in following sections. The debug output, raw data and report files are written to random access memory disk files, also for speed reasons. After each round of testing, the files that must be saved are off-loaded to the hard drive and/or floppy disk for safe storage.

The software is organized to require user selection of the test to be run. The test in question has a one-to-one mapping to those indicated by the program requirements. The output file names are encoded with the name of the test for ease of reference.

Software Inputs

The user is required to specify inputs which will control both the test to be executed and the individual controls that can be variable within a particular test. A certain number of inputs are required to control the specifics of the data acquisition process. The user is presented with ^a screen as shown in Figure 2-16. All parameters in the screen can be changed by the user.

The user is also required to select the test location, type and airflow characteristics. This information (Figure 2-16) not only controls the mapping of the output file name, but also determines the exact data acquisition configuration, valid channels to capture data, and calculations that are to be made in real time.

The following is a mapping of Blueridge Avenue, 7th and ^I Streets, and New York Avenue test types:

Select Test Name [Y]?

TA TULIT SU

FIGURE 2-16

 \mathfrak{D}^{\pm}

Test Categories: Single Point Tunnel Single Point Fan Shaft Tunnel Friction Jet Fan Mounting Head Loss Jet Fan (100-foot spacing) Jet Fan (75-foot spacing) Jet Fan (50-foot spacing)

Associated with each of these categories is the selection of an individual test which specifies the actual flow characteristics and other unique setup constraints. For example, after selecting a given test such as "Jet Fan (50 ft.)," another select menu would be presented to the operator. In this mode the operator will select the test name that was specified for that test. The pertinent information would be the number of tunnel ventilation fans, with or without a train, and with or without dampers. The software was designed such that by selecting the appropriate test name, all channel setup information and formulas would
be configured automatically. This design provided a key benefit by reducing the amount of work required of the user, thus reducing the potential for operator error and the time between tests.

Certain tests require "interpolated" inputs to complete calculations. These inputs are obtained through files which reside on the hard disk and are built by the user. They
provide the ability to construct a mapping, for example, between the bulk flow or Reynolds number and the friction factor that allows a calculation to be based upon an interpolated value obtained from the input file. The calculation that is obtained is used as a variable in follow-on calculations.

In order to construct these tests, the software provides ^a means of automatically collecting the actual data that can provide "points" in the interpolation file across the entire range of executed tests. This output is collected in ^asingle file. In constructing the input file, the user is free to use the real-world data that best fits the application.

Software outputs (Reports)

The outputs of the software consist of:

- ^oChannel data
- o Real-time calculations
- o Raw acquisition data

Each test has valid channels that are configured according to the test definition. The channel output report presents only those channels that are actually used in the given configuration. This setup is controlled automatically by the software after the test is selected. This report is used to see the lowest level inputs, the actual channel data, and to verify the calculations.

All required channel values are reported for each time interval in which the acquisition is performed (normally once per second). The header describes the particulars of the test.

sortware Real-Time Calculations

^Aseparate report file contains all the calculations that are made based upon the channel data and the interpolated input values where required. The mapping of the calculations performed is controlled by the software via the selected test.

All required calculations are reported for each time
interval the acquisition is performed (normally once per second). The header describes the particulars of the test. In addition, the software maintains "running totals" for key calculations. The "test-wide" average for each is shown after the test has been completed.

Raw Data Piles

The raw data that is produced by the AT-MI0-16 board is also saved to disk in real time. This allows the user to rerun valid field-collected data with modified calculations.

User Interface

The user interface was created to provide a great deal of flexibility in terms of real time operation. Key elements of this interface are described in the following sections.

Real-Time control. The interface allows the user the following real-time controls activated by pressing the associated PC function key. This control includes starting and ending sampling, the ability to view any channel output or the review of the result of a calculation, and to exit the theory of the second control of the second

Display or Calculations and Channel Data. The user has the ability to display calculations that are being performed in real time. Up to five concurrent calculations and/or data channel outputs may be displayed at any one time in the five
$\sim 10^{-10}$

scrolling windows. This allows the user to validate the correct operation of channels and output of calculations while the test is running instead of after the test is complete. This can save tremendous amounts of critical test time when, for example, the test configuration is being checked-out.

The specifics of the test program for which the KLD Labs' data acquisition system was designed are provided in Appendix D.

3. TBST RBSULTS

3.1 BARRIER DEPLOYMENT TESTS

Test Locations

Barrier deployment tests were conducted at the following locations:

- ^oIn mock-ups at the Sheldahl plant
- o Without ventilation in the tunnel adjacent to the 7th and I Streets sw fan shaft
- o As part of the ventilation tests in the tunnel between Metro Center Station and the New York Avenue fan shaft
- o As part of the ventilation tests in the tunnel adjacent to the 7th and I Streets fan shaft.

Factory Test Results

A variety of barrier configurations were tested in a mock-up at the Sehldahl Plant with unsuccessful results until the version with the 180-degree inflatable air torus was found to deploy successfully. Initial testing as part of the development process was concerned primarily with the barrier configuration that, when deployed, would fill a major portion of the tunnel cross section. These tests are discussed in Section 2.5.

Field Test Results

The barrier deployment with the 180-degree inflatable air torus was tested successfully in the tunnel adjacent to the 7th and I Streets fan shaft without ventilation and in the tunnel between Metro Center Station and New York Avenue fan shaft as part of the initial ventilation tests. The strategy of barrier development precluded attempting: to answer all the environmental and operating criteria in the initial phase of development. The basic concept of barrier deployment and blockage was the first concern.

As the result of the initial successful tests, Sheldahl was directed to continue with the development of the barrier to include the entire design criteria presented in Section 2.5. The resulting operational prototype barrier was then successfully deployed in the tunnel adjacent to the 7th & ^I Streets fan shaft during the ventilation tests with representatives from the fire department present.

3.2 **VENTILATION TESTS AND ANALYSES**

Tunnel Friction Factor Tests

smooth Wall TUnnel - Blueri4qe Avenue. Table 3~1 shows the Reynolds numbers and friction factors measured in the tunnel adjacent to the Blueridge Avenue fan shaft. These values were obtained using the data reduction methodology described in Appendix B and the procedure outlined in Section B.l9. The equivalent relative roughness of the tunnel was determined by a least-squares curve fit using Colebrook's formula (Equation 36, Appendix B).

The results were as follows:

- ^oEquivalent relative roughness 0.00122
- o Friction factor for fully-developed turbulent flow -0.021, a value that compared favorably with the range of data provide by various handbooks.

Figure 3-1 is a Moody Chart depicting the field measured values of the friction factor and the friction factor versus Reynolds number for a relative roughness of 0.00122. This relative roughness was used for all Blueridge Avenue tunnel data reduction.

Ribbed Wall TUnnel - Metro Center. Table 3-2 shows the Reynolds number and friction factors measured in the tunnel between Metro Center Station and the New York Avenue Fan Shaft, values obtained using the methodology and procedure referenced in the previous section. The results were as follows:

- ^oEquivalent relative roughness 0.05190
- o Friction factor for fully-developed turbulent flow -0.073.

This value was compared with that predicted by the methodology of the Subway Environmental Design Handbook (SEDH)[6] for a 15.1-foot diameter pipe having six-inch high ribs on 30-inch centers. The SEDH nomograph (page 3-27)

TABLE 3-1

TEST DATE: JUNE 23,1990

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS TEST DATE: AUGUST 22, 1990 FRICTION FACTOR TESTS AT BLUERIDGE AVENUE SMOOTH WALL TUNNEL

TABLE 3-2

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS FRICTION FACTOR TESTS AT METRO CENTER RIBBED WALL TUNNEL

TABLE 3-3

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS FRICTION FACTOR TESTS AT 7TH & I STREETS RIBBED WALL TUNNEL

TEST DATE: SEPTEMBER 6,1990

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS

FRICTION FACTOR TEST AT BLUERIDGE AVENUE

TEST DATE: AUGUST 22, 1990

 $FIGURE 3-1$

 $\frac{2}{4}$

predicted a friction factor of 0.09 at a Reynolds number of 2E+05 (200,000).

The following two effects would decrease the measured friction factor, therefore the comparison is good.

- o Friction factors decrease with increasing Reynolds number and the test Reynolds numbers range from about 3E+05 (300,000) to about 1E+06 (1,000,000).
- o Because of the trackbed detail, the ribs are not exposed for the full perimeter of the tunnel.

Figure 3-2 is a Moody Chart depicting the field-measured values of the friction factor and the friction factor versus Reynolds number curve for a relative roughness of 0.05190. This relative roughness was used for all Metro Center tunnel data reduction.

Ribbed Wall Tunnel - 7th and *z* streets. Table 3-3 shows the Reynolds number and friction factors measured in the tunnel adjacent to the 7th and I Streets fan shaft in September 1990. These values were obtained using the data reduction methodology and procedure referenced previously for the
Blueridge Avenue tunnel. The results were as follows:

- o Equivalent relative roughness 0.05705
- o Friction factor for fully developed turbulent flow 0.075

Use of the approach discussed above for the Metro Center tunnels showed that these results compared favorably with that of other predictions.

Figure 3-3 is a Moody Chart depicting the field-measured values of the friction factor and the friction factor versus Reynolds number curve for a relative roughness of 0.05705. This relative roughness was used for all 7th and I Streets tunnel data reduction.

The words "not used" are entered in the fourth row of the Comments column in Table 3-3. After each series of tests, the data for each test were reviewed, often on a second-bysecond basis, to determine if an isolated problem had affected the viability of the test adversely. For example, it was found the domain of influence of nighttime train movement in the system was such that a train movement a great distance from the test site could affect a test adversely. Tests adversely affected were labelled "not used".

Table 3-4 shows the Reynolds number and friction factors measured in the tunnel adjacent to the 7th and I streets fan **MECH**

 $\frac{6}{6}$

a series and the series of the series of the

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS

FRICTION FACTOR TESTS AT METRO CENTER

TEST DATE: JUNE 23, 1990

 $FIGURE 3-2$

1659

 $\frac{c}{4}$

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS

FRICTION FACTOR TESTS AT 7TH & I STREETS

TEST DATES: SEPTEMBER 6, 1990 & FEBRUARY 24, 1991

TABLE 3-4

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS FRICTION FACTOR TESTS AT 7TH & I STREETS RIBBED WALL TUNNEL

TEST DATE: FEBRUARY 24,1991

TABLE 3-5

TEST DATE: JUNE 24,1990

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS BARRIER TESTS AT METRO CENTER *PIRBED WALL TUNNEL*

shaft in February 1991. These values were obtained using the data reduction methodology and procedure referenced previously. These tests repeated the September 1990 tests:

- o To provide assurance that the on-going construction had not changed the tunnel friction factor
- o To confirm the repeatability of the measurements.

The difference between these tests and the September 1990 tests was less than the manufacturer's accuracy of the instruments. The results are plotted on Figure 3-3 to show this comparison.

Commentary on Priction Pactor Tests. The results of the friction factor tests agreed well with those predicted by handbooks. The handbook values were developed by accurate scale-model laboratory tests that have been found to accurately predict full-scale phenomena.

The ribbed tunnel friction factors for the 7th and I Street and Metro Center tunnels differed by 0.002 or about three percent. This was much less than the specified error of the
instrumentation and may have been caused by differences in fire lines and electrical conduits mounted along the tunnel walls. From a design viewpoint, a tunnel relative roughness of 0.057 and a fully-developed turbulent flow friction factor of 0.075 can be used.

The smooth wall friction factor results provide data suitable for design with a relative roughness of 0.012 and a fully-developed turbulent flow friction factor of 0.021 being appropriate.

To sum up, the results of the friction factor tests were suitable for Metrorail design and as inputs to the remaining tests. For any future tests that may be required, it appears necessary to measure the friction factor for the individual tunnel in order to reduce the error in the test results.

Barrier Tests

Barrier Tests - Metro Center. Table 3-5 shows the results obtained for a barrier tested in the tunnel between Metro Center Station and the New York Avenue fan shaft in June 1990. These values were obtained using the data reduction methodology described in Appendix B. The procedure was that outlined in Section B.22. Two air velocities are tabulated:

- o In the tunnel having the barrier
- o In the same tunnel but on the other side of the fan shaft.

These air velocities show that the barrier redirected the airflow from its tunnel to the other tunnel.

Figure 3-4 shows the barrier head loss coefficient, K, as a
function of the tunnel air velocity. These results were indicative, pendinq tests of the next desiqn configuration of the barrier.

The results show the barrier head loss coefficient decreasinq from about 100 for low tunnel air velocities to about 50 for hiqher tunnel air velocities. This effect was consistent with desiqn of the personnel eqress openinq in the middle of the barrier. The increased pressure difference across the barrier deflects the barrier in such a manner that the personal eqress openinq is bowed open further, thus allowinq more air to pass throuqh it and reducinq K.

The scatter of the data was most likely caused by variations in the barrier torus internal air pressure.

Figure 3-4 also shows the equivalent flat plate K for various percentaqes of blockaqe - the head loss coefficients that would occur if the tunnel was blocked to these
percentages with an orifice plate. It shows an equivalent flat plate blockage of between 80 and 85 percent. However, it should be noted that the barrier may be actually blockinq the tunnel and that streamlininq or draq effects may be decreasinq or increasinq its actual K. Equation 25 in Appendix B provides the flat plate K as a function of the blockage. The numerical values are tabulated following Equation 27.

An estimate was made as to the ability of a barrier with known constant head loss coefficient to redirect the tunnel airflow. The results indicated that:

- o A sinqle barrier per tunnel leq would suffice for the case of a train stopped in a smooth wall tunnel.
- o Two barriers per tunnel leg would probably be required for the case of a train stoppinq in a ribbed wall tunnel.

As discussed in Section 4.3, these preliminary estimates were then evaluated in detail usinq the SES computer proqram after the test results for the final desiqn configuration barriers were available. They provided early confirmation, however, that the barriers would function as needed.

Barrier Testa - 7th and I Streets. Table 3-6 shows the results obtained for an improved barrier tested in the tunnel adjacent to the 7th and I Streets fan shaft in February 1991. These values were obtained usinq the

BARRIER LOSS COEFFICIENT, K

TABLE 3-6

TEST DATE: FEBRUARY 25,1991

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS BARRIER TESTS AT 7 & I STREETS RIBBED WALL TUNNEL

methodology and procedure referenced in the previous section. Two air velocities are tabulated:

- o In the tunnel having the barrier
- o In the same tunnel but on the other side of the fan shaft.

These air velocities show the barrier redirected the airflow from its tunnel to the other tunnel.

Figures 3-5, 3-6, 3-7 and 3-8 show the barrier head loss coefficient, K, as a function of the tunnel air velocity for the egress closed and open with the tunnel ventilation fans operating in exhaust and supply. The figures show:

- o K decreasing with air velocity as discussed above
- o K being decreased by the egress being opened, an expected phenomena since the opening of the egress allowed the barrier to pass more air
- o K in the fan exhaust mode being much greater than K in the supply mode.

A close examination of the deployed barrier during the ventilation tests concluded the following:

- o The supply performance could be made more similar to the exhaust performance by shifting the attachment between the barrier and the torus from the side edge of the torus to center edge of the torus. This shift would make the barrier truly bi-axial.
- o Although the barrier fit the tunnel satisfactorily, some localized improvement in the fit of the barrier to the sidewalk and third rail corners of the tunnel could be achieved. This improvement would serve to increase the barrier head loss coefficient and hence its ability to re-direct tunnel airflow.

The production barriers will have these improvements so it was concluded that the exhaust data should be used for design.

Figure 3-9 presents the barrier ventilation performance data. The test results were curve fitted with exponential curves passing through their extreme values. The formula is:

 $K = C_1 + C_2e^{-3V}$

The numerical values of the C coefficients are:

Egress

BARRIER HEAD LOSS COEFFICIENT,

BARRIER HEAD LOSS COEFFICIENT,

 $\frac{3-15}{5}$

MECH

1669

Commentary on Barrier Tests. The tests demonstrated that inflatable barriers can be used to direct sufficient quantities of air past a stopped train during an emergency. The ventilation performance data in the form of the barrier head loss coefficients can be directly used for SES computer program input and/or modification during final design.

Jet Fan xountinq Bead Loss Tests

smooth Wall Tunnel. Table 3-7 and Figure 3-10 show the results of the jet fan mounting tests in the tunnel adjacent to the Blueridge Avenue fan shaft. These values were obtained in preliminary form using the data reduction methodology described in Appendix B. The procedure was that outlined in Section B.20.

Actual site logistics made it necessary to obtain the pressure loss data with the jet fans mounted in their position on top of the jet fan mountings for one tunnel airflow. To obtain the loss caused by the jet fan mounting, it was then necessary to manually estimate and subtract out the loss caused by the jet fan only. The procedure raised some concern because the clearance between the top of the jet fan and the smooth tunnel wall was only about five inches. However, the results are reasonable.

As the distance between the jet fans decreases, the head loss coefficient increases slightly and then decreases slightly. The initial increase is most likely caused by the trailing jet fan mountings beginning to encounter the increased turbulence of the upstream jet _fan mountings. The subsequent decrease is most likely caused by the trailing jet fan mountings becoming entrained in the wake of the upstream jet fans and encountering reduced air velocities.

Ribbed Wall Tunnel. Table 3-8 and Figure 3-11 show the results of the jet fan mounting tests in the tunnel adjacent to the 7th and I Streets fan shaft. These values were obtained in preliminary form using the methodology and procedure referenced in the previous section.

As was the case in the smooth wall tunnel, actual site logistics made it necessary to obtain the pressure loss data with the jet fans mounted in their position on top of the jet fan mountings for one tunnel airflow, and manually estimate and subtract out the loss caused by the jet fan only to obtain the loss caused by the jet fan mounting only.

TABLE 3-7

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS TEST DATES: AUGUST 22-24, 1990 JET FAN MOUNTING HEAD LOSS COEFFICIENT TESTS AT BLUEREIDGE AVE. SMOOTH WALL TUNNEL

TABLE 3-8

WMATA VENTILATION TESTS TEST DATES: AUG. 30-SEP. 6, 1990 JET FAN MOUNTING HEAD LOSS COEFFICIENT TESTS AT 7TH & I STREETS RIBBED WALL TUNNEL

This procedure also raised some concern because the clearance between the top of the jet fan and the ribbed tunnel wall was only about five inches.

This concern appeared to be justified by the difference between the results for the smooth and ribbed wall tunnels. The jet fan mounting head loss coefficient for the ribbed wall tunnel is about twice that for the smooth-wall tunnel. An extrapolation of previous experiments [2] predicted the wall roughness should only have a slight effect on the jet fan mounting head loss coefficient. It appeared that the turbulence in the five-inch gap between the ribs and the top of the jet fans increased the drag of the jet fans beyond that predicted by manual calculation.

It was therefore decided to test the jet fan mountings without the jet fans during the final design barrier tests. The results of these February 1991 tests - which used the only two jet fan mountings available - are shown in Figure 3-11. Manually accounting for the effect of the jet fans being in place rather than directly testing without them was demonstrated to be an acceptable procedure.

The differences between the smooth and ribbed wall jet fan mounting head loss coefficient tests were then reviewed with a Cal Tech/JPL experimenter who had previously done scale model ,.tests for ribbed wall tunnels but who was not available during the earlier tests. He was not surprised by the differences between the smooth and ribbed wall tests. It was therefore concluded that the results of the ribbed wall jet fan mounting head loss coefficients tests were appropriate to use in the jet fan pressure efficiency tests.

commentary on the Jet Pan Mounting Baa4 Loss coefficient Tests. The results were deemed appropriate for use in the jet fan pressure efficiency tests.

Jet Fan Pressure Efficiency Tests

smooth Wall Tunnel. Table 3-9 shows the results of the jet fan tests in the tunnel adjacent to the Blueridge Avenue fan shaft for jet fan spacings of 100, 75 and 50 feet. These values were obtained using the data reduction methodology described in Appendix B. The procedure was that outlined in Section B.21.

The table shows some air measurements of zero. This is caused by the range of the test anemometers. The calibrated operating range of the fan anemometer is limited to 50 fpm. Since a linear response below 50 fpm could not be assured, the software was designed to assign any velocity less than 50 fpm to o fpm. The resulting output is a zero. A sensitivity study was done to determine the importance of

 $3 - 24$

X=JET FAN SPACING.

Z= DISTANCE FROM TUNNEL WALL TO JET FAN CENTER LINE.

DT= TUNNEL HYDRAULIC DIAMETER, 14.2174 FT.

DF= JET FAN DISCHARGE DIAMETER, 24 IN. (2 FT.)

QT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIRFLOW (CFM).

QF= AVERAGE JET FAN AIRFLOW CAPACITY (CFM)= -21477.

VT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIR VELOCITY (FPM).

VF= AVERAGE JET FAN DISCHARGE VELOCITY (FPM)= -6836.34.

MECH 1678

X=JET FAN SPACING.

Z= DISTANCE FROM TUNNEL WALL TO JET FAN CENTER LINE.

DT= TUNNEL HYDRAULIC DIAMETER, 14.2174 FT.

DF= JET FAN DISCHARGE DIAMETER, 24 IN. (2 FT.)

QT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIRFLOW (CFM).

QF= AVERAGE JET FAN AIRFLOW CAPACITY (CFM)= -21477.

VT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIR VELOCITY (FPM).

VF= AVERAGE JET FAN DISCHARGE VELOCITY (FPM)= -6836.34.

µ
ს
ს

 $3 - 26$

X=JET FAN SPACING.

Z= DISTANCE FROM TUNNEL WALL TO JET FAN CENTER LINE.

- DT= TUNNEL HYDRAULIC DIAMETER, 14.2174 FT.
- DF= JET FAN DISCHARGE DIAMETER, 24 IN. (2 FT.)

QT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIRFLOW (CFM).

QF= AVERAGE JET FAN AIRFLOW CAPACITY (CFM)= -21477.

VT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIR VELOCITY (FPM).

VF= AVERAGE JET FAN DISCHARGE VELOCITY (FPM)= -6836.34.

this result and it was concluded that the test program recommendations were not affected. Table 3-9 defines DF, DT, QF, QT, VF, VT, X, Z, and β .

A comparison was made between the results of these tests and those previously reported by Ohashi [8]. The comparison is:

Z/DF <u> Jet Fan Pressure Efficiency - β </u>

Number of Tunnel Ventilation Fans Running* Ref. [8] 4 Fans 3 Fans 2 Fans 1 Fan o Fan 0.833 0.857 0.927 0.870 0.785 0.706 0.601 1.083 0.876 0.945 0.887 0.800 0.726 0.602 1.333 0.895 0.966 0.929 0.824 0.747 0.642

* The comparison was made using the test results at 100 foot spacing.

The Reference [8] does not provide the direction of tunnel airflow. However, the jet fan pressure efficiencies for positive airflows (i.e., the results for four and three tunnel ventilation fans operating in exhaust) compare favorably. These are the most likely range of tunnel air velocities that would be encountered in the actual application of the jet fan test results to the Metrorail.

The jet fan pressure efficiency, β , varied greatly with the tunnel airflow, a phenomenon not documented in previous tests [8,9,13]. The values of QT/QF, VT/VF, X/DT, X/DF and Z/DF were computed as part of the effort to gain insight into this variation. Since most of the references expressed the jet fan pressure efficiency as a function of VT/VF, it was decided to plot the jet fan pressure efficiency as ^a function of this ratio.

Figures 3-12, 3-13 and 3-14 show the behavior of the jet fan pressure efficiency as a function of VT/VF for jet fan spacings of 100, 75 and 50 feet. The three plots per figure show the effect of varying the distance from the tunnel ceiling to the centerline of the jet fan. The plots show β increasing as z is increased.

Figures 3-15, 3-16, and 3-17 show the behavior of β as a function of VT/VF for Z values of 20, 26 and 32 inches. The three plots per figure show the effect of varying the distance between jet fans, X. The plots should show *P* increasing as X increases but sometimes they do not. However, the differences are small and for the most par^t

 $FIGURE 3-12$

82-
RESSUR

 \vdash

ซ
ซี [i: LL w 62–1
RESSUR Z
⊾

 $\overline{}$

~ $\tilde{\Xi}$ EFFICI E
An

 \vdash

 ϖ

 $FIGURE 3-15$

1-31
2-31

 \mathfrak{G}

JET FAN PRESSURE EFFICIENCY,

EFFICIEN
E F
A
Z

 \vdash

less than the estimated experimental error (plus or minus five percent).

In addition to the standard jet fan equation [8,10,13] both Meidinger [10] and Reale [11] have published jet fan
equations. Meidinger's equation is Eq.38 in Appendix B and Reale's is Eq.39. Both have additional minor terms. Using these equations, the values of β for 100-foot jet fan spacing were recalculated to confirm that these minor terms were not affecting the results. The using of Meidinger's equation affected β by less than one percent. The use of Reale's equation affected β by less than five percent.

Figures 3-18, 3-19 and 3-20 show the smoothing of the reduced test data. This process used judgment to transform the point data to line data and to recognize that some tests were inherently more accurate than others.

Figure 3-21 assembles Figures 3-18, 3-19 and 3-21 into a graph that provides data suitable for SES computer program input and/or modifications for simulation of jet fans in smooth wall tunnels.

Ribbed Wall TUnnel. Table 3-10 shows the results of the jet fan tests in the tunnel adjacent to the 7th and I Streets fan shaft for jet fan spacings of 100, 75 and 50 feet, values obtained using the methodelogy and procedure referenced in the previous section.

The table shows some measurements of zero. As previously stated, the DAS assigns any value below 50 fpm to 0 fpm. A sensitivity study was done to determine the importance of this value and it was concluded that the test program recommendations were not affected.

The jet fan performance, β , varied greatly with the tunnel airflow, a phenomenon not documented in previous tests [8,9,10]. The values of QT/QF, VT/VF, X/DT, X/DF and Z/DF were computed as part of the effort to gain insight into this behavior. Since most of the references expressed the jet fan performance as a function of VT/VF, it was decided to plot the jet fan pressure efficiency as a function of this ratio.

Figures 3-22, 3-23 and 3-24 show the behavior of the jet fan pressure efficiency as a function of VT/VF for jet fan spacing of 100, 75 and 50 feet. The three plots per figure show the effect of varying the distance from the tunnel ceiling to the centerline of the jet fan. The plots show β increasing as Z is increased.

Figures 3-25, 3-26 and 3-27 show the behavior of β as a function of VT/VF for Z values of 20, 26 and 32 inches. The three plots per figure show the effect of varying the

 $FIGURE 3-18$

MECH 1688

~ w EFFICI E
A
N

 \vdash

 \mathscr{A}

 $FIGURE 3-19$

 \mathscr{B}

 \circ \sim

u
U [L LL w

Z
E
L

 $\overline{\mathbb{L}}$

15-S
2-3
2-3
2-3

FIGURE 3-20

FIG¹ JRE 3-21

8E-E
Ressure

 \mathcal{C}

w u [i: LL w

Z
←
L

 $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$

MECH 1692

X=JET FAN SPACING.

Z= DISTANCE FROM TUNNEL WALL TO JET FAN CENTER LINE.

DT= TUNNEL HYDRAULIC DIAMETER, 15.1019 FT.

DF= JET FAN DISCHARGE DIAMETER, 24 IN. (2 FT.)

OT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIRFLOW (CFM).

OF= AVERAGE JET FAN AIRFLOW CAPACITY (CFM)= -21477.

VT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIR VELOCITY (FPM).

VF= AVERAGE JET FAN DISCHARGE VELOCITY (FPM)= -6836.34.

ت
6 - ع
9

0 + – 3

X=JET FAN SPACING.

Z= DISTANCE FROM TUNNEL WALL TO JET FAN CENTER LINE.

DT= TUNNEL HYDRAULIC DIAMETER, 15.1019 FT.

DF= JET FAN DISCHARGE DIAMETER, 24 IN. (2 FT.)

QT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIRFLOW (CFM).

OF= AVERAGE JET FAN AIRFLOW CAPACITY (CFM)= -21477.

VT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIR VELOCITY (FPM).

VF= AVERAGE JET FAN DISCHARGE VELOCITY (FPM)= -6836.34.

 $3 - 41$

X=JET FAN SPACING.

Z= DISTANCE FROM TUNNEL WALL TO JET FAN CENTER LINE.

DT= TUNNEL HYDRAULIC DIAMETER, 15.1019 FT.

OF= JET FAN DISCHARGE DIAMETER, 24 IN. (2 FT.)

QT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIRFLOW (CFM).

QF= AVERAGE JET FAN AIRFLOW CAPACITY (CFM)= -21477.

VT= AVERAGE TUNNEL AIR VELOCITY (FPM).

VF= AVERAGE JET FAN DISCHARGE VELOCITY (FPM)= -6836.34.

 $FIGURE 3-22$

FIGURE 3-23

EPHESSURE
Pressure

 \mathfrak{D}

u z w u [L

w

z

 l_{\perp} \mathbb{F}_\pm

 \mathscr{A}

FICIENC

Шī

lL 1- w *J*

 $FIGURE 3-24$

 \mathfrak{D}

u z w

 $\frac{{\mathsf C}}{{\mathsf L}}$

w

z

 \perp ly
y

 $FIGURE 3-25$

SD_{Pressure}
Pressure

99-6
Pressure z

 $FIGURE 3-27$

MECH 1700

distance between jet fans, X. The plots should show β increasinq as X increases but sometimes they do not. However, the differences are small and for the most par^t less than the estimated experimental error (plus or minus five percent).

Fiqures 3-28, 3-29 and 3-30 show the smoothinq of the reduced test data. This process used judqment to transform the point data to line data and to recoqnize that some tests were inherently more accurate than others.

Fiqure 3-31 assembles Fiqures 3-28, 3-29 and 3-30 into a qraph that provides data suitable for SES computer proqram input and/or modifications for simulations of jet fans in ribbed wall tunnels.

Barriers va. Jet Pans: A coaparison

It is possible to estimate the number of jet fans that are equivalent to one barrier. The following data were used for
the estimates:

- o Tunnel areas 180, 240 and 300 sq ft
- o Tunnel air velocity 200 fpm
- o Jet fan discharge velocity 6000 fpm
- ^oJet fan diameters 20 and 48 in.
- ^oBarrier K ⁸⁶(eqress closed) and 40 (eqress open)
- ρ ρ 0.9 (smooth) and 0.7 (ribbed wall tunnel)

The followinq shows the estimated equivalents.

 \mathscr{A}

u z w u \overline{L}

w

z

LL f-- w *--:>*

 $FIGURE 3-28$

 $FIGURE 3-29$

w w I 0::: U1 :::::>

 \mathscr{B}

ICIENC'

 $\overline{\mathbf{\omega}}$

PRES:

ㄴ
닝
닝

FIGURE 3-30

 \mathbb{R}^n . \mathbb{R}^n ÷.

 $\sim 10^7$

FIGURE 3-31

ษ ⊔
บ
บ่
บ่

 \sim

These estimates indicate that:

- o Jet fans are not at all appropriate for tight, ribbedwall tunnels having limited clearances such us those between Metro Center and McPherson Square Stations.
- o Jet fans are a solution for a large smooth wall tunnel having a shape that is too irregular for a barrier

It should be noted that these estimates are only ^a comparison for illustrative purposes and not indicative of any final-design requirement.

commentary on Jet ~an **Tests.** The tests demonstrated that jet fans can be used to direct sufficient quantities of air pas^t ^astopped train during an emergency provided that space is available for their installation. The numerical range of design data developed indicates that jet fans would provide acceptable performance. The ventilation performance data in the form of the jet fan pressure efficiencies can be directly used for SES computer program input and/or modification during final design. ·

 \mathcal{L}^{\prime}

 ϵ

 \mathcal{C}

4. COMPUTER MODELING OF TUNNEL VENTILATION SYSTEMS

-

4.1 SUBWAY ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM SIMULATION COMPUTER

The performance of the emerqency ventilation system durinq a tunnel fire is judqed based on the ability of the ventilation system to produce forced air movement past the
fire incident. The magnitude of the air velocity in the train annulus indicates whether the spread of smoke can be confined downstream of the fire site, thus protectinq the upstream evacuation route, or whether the potential exists for smoke spreadinq into the upstream evacuation route, contrary to the forced ventilation (a phenomenon called back-layerinq).

 Version 3 of the Subway Environment Simulation (SES) computer proqram [7] has been used to predict the tunnel airflows durinq fire conditions. This computer model, described in Appendix A, accounts for the "throttling" effects of a fire (i.e., increased pressure losses), the buoyant effects of the hot smoke which tends to flow "uphill", heat transfer to the tunnel walls by convection and radiation, and chanqes in fan performance while handlinq hot (i.e., less dense) qases.

The user's manual for the SES computer proqram [15] indicates that to prevent back-layerinq, the annular air velocity must be qreater than a "critical" value. The maqnitude of the critical value depends on various grade, the tunnel height, and the annular area. For the WMATA system, the critical velocity ranqes from about 500 to about 650 fpm.

The SES computer proqram inputs include:

- o The ventilation performance data for the inflatable barriers
- o The ventilation performance data for the jet fans
- o The fire heat release rate.

Section 3 of this report documents the field tests that were conducted to establish the effectiveness of the barriers and the jet fans under varyinq tunnel conditions and the resultinq ventilation data input to the SES computer proqram. Therefore, the next discussion focuses on the

analysis used to estimate the peak heat release produced by ^aWMATA train fire. The results of this analysis are as follows:

- o A peak heat release rate of 69.7 MBtu/hr is recommended based on the current vehicle configuration which includes polycarbonate windows.
- o A peak heat release rate of 42.4 MBtu/hr would be recommended if all WMATA vehicles are retrofitted so that all windows are made from safety glass.

4.2 COMPUTER-BASED ESTIMATE OF FIRE HEAT RELEASE RATB

A computer-based study was conducted to estimate the heat release rate produced by a fire within a WMATA subway vehicle. This study, made under the direction of Parsons Brinckerhoff by Dr. Jonathan Barnett from the Center for Firesafety Studies at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, is presented in full in Appendix C.

The computer model used for this study was a slightly modified version of the COMPF2 computer program, developed by the Center for Fire Research, National Institute for standards and Technology (formerly the National Bureau of standards). The COMPF2 program is considered to be the most appropriate computer program for analyzing the peak heat release rate from a compartmentalized car fire because:

- o COMPF2 is the only post-flashover model available in the public domain. The peak heat release rate occurs during the post-flashover stage of burning when all of the interior combustibles are involved.
- ^oCOMPF2 has been validated by comparison with experimental data.
- o The COMPF2 program has been shown to predict results comparable to the results from other computer programs.

Field models, such as TUNFIRE or JASMINE, may provide ^a reasonable approximation of fire parameters such as flame plume length within an enclosed environment and car-to-car flame transmission. However, they do not model the fire development within the compartment.

The physical characteristics of the Breda vehicle (i.e., the basic dimensions of the car and the thermal properties of the walls and ceiling) were used for the program input. A complete version of the inventory of combustible materials was not available, however for the Breda car. Therefore, the combustible data of the Rohr vehicle [16] was used.

Based on a combustible content of 59.25 MBtu for the abovefloor materials only, the following results were predicted by the COMPF2 program for an above-floor fire involving a single WMATA vehicle:

- o Assuming a 65 percent burning pyrolysates fraction (BPF), a net heat of combustion of 9130 Btu/lb, and all windows open, a peak heat release rate of 34.3 MBtu/hr and a fire duration of 63 minutes were predicted.
- o Assuming a BPF of 65 percent, a net heat of combustion of 7420 Btujlb, and all windows open, a peak heat release rate of 27.3 MBtu/hr and a fire duration of 78 minutes were predicted.
- o Assuming a BPF of 80 percent, a net heat of combustion of 7420 Btu/lb, and all windows open, a peak heat release rate of 33.7 MBtu/hr and a fire duration of 78 minutes were predicted.

It has been assumed that all windows are open because it is expected that the maximum fire temperature will result in failure of the polycarbonate windows.

Use of the heat release rate of 33.7 MBtu/hr was suggested by Barnett to account for the predictive accuracy of the COMPF2 program even though it was concluded that the heat The suggested value is based on the heat content of the above-floor combustibles for a single WMATA vehicle. Therefore, the value needs to be adjusted to account for the heat content of the vehicle components located at floor level and below floor level, possible multiple car involvement, and a suitable factor of safety.

Modification of COKPP2 Results

Parsons Brinckerhoff has revised the results of the COMPF2 computer study in order to reflect historical observations of subway vehicle fires, advancements in the design and construction of subway vehicles, and specific physical characteristics of the Rohr and Breda vehicles used on the WMATA system. The following factors were considered:

Pire Hardening Activities. The total combustible content for the Rohr vehicle was slightly modified to reflect firehardening activities. Based on the Kaiser Engineers document "Metrorail Ventilation System Improvements and Vehicle Fire Hardening" [16] the revised breakout of material heat contents is as follows:

Observations of Earlier Pires. Observations of BART and Toronto subway systems' fires (January 1979 and October 1976, respectively) indicated that:

- o Multiple cars were involved in both fire incidents.
- o Approximately 20 minutes after flashover the fire was transmitted to the adjacent car.
- o All combustibles above and below the car floor and less than one-half of the floor material were burned in the first car.
- o The fire was generally limited to the above-floor combustibles in the second and succeeding cars.

Advancement in Design and constructions. The results of floor-assembly factory tests for vehicles such as the Miami/Baltimore car indicate that it is conservative to assume that about one-quarter of the floor combustibles would be consumed during a vehicle fire. This reduction in floor combustion may be attributed to the development of NFPA 130 in the early 1980's that led to the use of design and construction standards which limit the flammability and smoke emission characteristics for transit vehicle materials. All vehicles built to meet the NFPA 130 requirements or retrofitted as part of a vehicle firehardening program (including the WMATA vehicles) are much more resistant to the development and transmission of fire.

Direct Transmission of Pire. According to WMATA personnel, the ends of the WMATA vehicle consist of the following elements:

- o The cab end has an aluminum shell covered by a fiberglass cap plus windows made of safety glass.
- o The fiberglass itself does not support combustion: instead, the epoxy resin breaks down leaving the glass fibers in place.

 $4 - 4$

o The butt-end of the cars is an aluminum shell (no fiberglass cap), and the only window is in the connecting door and is currently made of 3/8-inch polycarbonate.

Based on the above, direct transmission of the fire would be inhibited by the vehicle ends, and the most likely method of direct transmission would be through the butt-end polycarbonate window.

Indirect Transmission of Pire. The windows in the two types of cars using the WMATA system are made of different materials [17]. The original windows in the Rohr car are constructed of safety glass on the inside and ABS acrylic plastic on the outside. However, dual panel windows, consisting of clear tufax plastic on the outside and tinted polycarbonate on the inside, are being used as replacement windows for the Rohr cars. The Breda cars have polycarbonate side windows.

It is expected that the polycarbonate windows in the vehicles downstream of the fire site will fail when exposed to a temperature of about 600°F. This is the nominal air temperature in the vicinity of the first vehicle downstream of the fire site based on a heat release rate of about 37 MBtu/hr. Therefore, the interior of the downstream vehicles would be exposed to the hot combustion gases, leading to potential ignition of these vehicles.

However, a vehicle retrofit program is currently being proposed to replace all of the polycarbonate windows with 1/4-inch safety glass. This retrofit would reduce the likelihood of indirect and direct fire transmission to the point where a vehicle fire should be contained within the compartment of origin.

Modification to Include Ploor and Below Ploor Combustibles. The COMPF2 results were first modified to reflect the revised inventory of combustibles and to account for the floor and below floor combustibles. Table 4-1 indicates the estimated peak heat release rate for the Breda Metro Red Line vehicle as a function of various burning percentage rates:

- o Columns 1 through 3 give the results predicted by the COMPF2 computer program based on the combustible content of the above-floor materials only.
- o Columns 4 through 9 show the basis for the estimated heat release rates for the floor and below-floor materials,
- o Column 10 shows the total overall peak heat release rate.

 H and the contract of the c

Table 4-1: WMATA - Vehicle Peak Heat Release Rate Modification of COMPF2 Computer Results

Floor Combustible Load: 12.245 MBtu Below Floor Combustible Load: 8.342 MBtu

Note: COMPF2 results are based on the combustible content of the above-floor materials only (48.009 MBtu).

 $4 - 6$

Note that the duration of burning (Column 3) has been reduced to reflect the reduction in the above-floor combustible content (i.e., the burning rate would remain about the same but the fuel would be consumed more quickly) and that the BPF for the floor materials is adjusted to reflect the observation from factory tests that about onequarter of floor assembly would be consumed during a vehicle fire.

As stated earlier, the COMPF2 heat release rate of 27.3 MBtu/hr is considered to be the "most probable" value, but a heat release rate of 33.7 MBtu/hr was selected to provide a conservative basis of design. Case 3 was adopted as the scenario that most closely matches observed conditions of vehicle burning. A peak heat release rate of 42.4 MBtu/hr is estimated for a fire involving only one WMATA vehicle.

Fire Development Scenarios

To address the possibility of multiple car involvement, two scenarios were developed:

Scenario COMPF2-A:

Flashover Burning within a Sinqle WMATA Vehicle - No Transmission to Adjacent Vehicles.

- o The fire originates below the car floor, and after about 30 minutes it penetrates through the floor into the interior of the car, leading to flashover.
- o At flashover, the fire burns at a constant rate until approximately so percent of the combustibles are consumed (see Appendix C). During this period, all combustibles above and below the car floor and onequarter of the floor material are burned. The duration of this post-flashover period is based on a combination of the COMPF2 BPF's and on observations of the assumed burning percentage factor.

For this scenario, it has been assumed that the fire is not transmitted to the adjacent vehicles. This scenario would be recommended for the WMATA system if the polycarbonate windows were replaced by safety glass.

Flashover to succeeding cars should not occur if the amount of heat transmitted through the walls of the vehicle downstream of the fire is insufficient to cause ignition of the interior materials. This assumption should be justified by an analysis which accounts for the thermal resistance of the vehicle shell and the temperature of the smoke and hot gases in the vicinity of the first downstream vehicle.

scenario COMPP2-B:

Plashover Burning within Multiple WMATA Vehicles - 30 Minute Flashover and Transmission to Adjacent Vehicles

This scenario is similar to the first scenario except that it is assumed that the fire is transmitted from car to car in approximately thirty-minute intervals. This scenario would be recommended for the design of the WMATA emergency ventilation system if the polycarbonate vehicle windows are not replaced.

Fiqures 4-1 and 4-2 show the profiles of the heat release rate as ^afunction of time for Scenarios COMPF2-A and COMPF2-B respectively. Note that for Scenario COMPF2-B, the assumed values for flashover and car-to-car transmission have been modified slightly to eliminate spikes in the profiles which were considered unrealistic.

The peak heat release rate for each of these scenarios is as follows:

Scenario COMPF2-A (Single car Fire):

$$
Q_{\text{max}} = 42.4 \text{ Mbtu/hr}
$$

Scenario COMPF2-B (Multiple Car Fire, 30 Minute Flashover and Transmission Rate):

 $Q_{\text{max}} = 69.7 \text{ MHz}$

Recommendation of a Design Beat Release Rate

As discussed above, the design and construction details of the WMATA vehicle have been reviewed in order to classify the vehicle according to the risk of flashover and car-tocar transmission. Observing that the fire-hardening efforts
have produced vehicles which meet the NFPA-130 recommendations, the primary concern regarding fire development is the polycarbonate windows.

Given the current uncertainty regarding the potential replacement of the polycarbonate windows with safety glass, the two fire heat release rates, noted earlier, are recommended:

o A heat release rate of 69.7 MBtu/hr is recommended if the window replacement program is not pursued

WMATA Heat Release Rate Study
Heat Release Rate vs. Time Profile

Flashover Time = 30 Minutes No Car-to-Car Transmission

Figure 4-1: Scenario COMPF2-A

4-9

WMATA Heat Release Rate Study Heat Release Rate vs. Time Profile

Flashover & Transmission Times = 31.5 Minutes

Figure 4-2: Scenario COMPF2-B

4.3 SES ANALYSES

The SES computer program was used to predict emergency ventilation requirements in the tunnels between Metro Center and McPherson Square Stations. The simulations:

- o Demonstrated the results of the ventilation test program on a typical portion of the system
- o Developed sufficient data to enable a preliminary systemwide count of barriers and jet fans of sufficient accuracy for an input to a construction cost estimate for their implementation.

Simulation Elements

Critical Air Velocities. The train fire heat release rates of 42.4 and 69.7 MBtu/hr were used in the computer runs and in the calculation of the critical air velocities. The following critical air velocities were calculated using the data for the ribbed tunnel adjacent to the New York Avenue fan shaft.

Barriers. The simulations analyzed only barriers since they are preferred over jet fans. The numbers of jet fans, where required, can be estimated from the output of a barrier simulation. The input assumed the following:

o The barrier in the tunnel occupied by the train (but on the opposite side of the ventilation shaft) had its egress opening open.

o The barriers in the unaffected, empty tunnel parallel to the affected tunnel had their eqress openinqs closed.

These assumptions were consistent with the assumption that eqress would occur alonq the tunnel to the station past the fan shaft or up the fan shaft. The head loss coefficients input to the SES computer proqram were 40 for the open barrier and 86 for the closed barriers.

Simulation. Prior to the simulations the fan curve for the New York Avenue fan shaft was adjusted to produce SESpredicted "no fire" airflows which agreed with the June 1990 field measurements. This provided an assurance that the "asbuilt" conditions were beinq accurately simulated.

The simulations were made for the tunnel ventilation fans runninq in both supply (reverse direction) and exhaust (forward direction) modes. The results of each simulation were compared with the critical velocity to determine if the simulation was predictinq the control of the direction of smoke spread or not. If the air velocity predicted durinq ^a fire was qreater than the calculated critical air velocity, then it was concluded that the direction of smoke spread was· beinq controlled.

Key Simulations

The followinq key simulations were made for the tunnels between Metro Center to McPherson Square Stations:

Results of Simulations

It was concluded that:

- o Each of the tunnels adjacent to the New York Avenue fan shaft would have to have two barriers if the Metrorail trains were to remain as they currently are. However, if the trains were to be changed to glass windows, each of the tunnels would have to have only one barrier. Suitable locations for the barriers would be 50 feet for the first barrier and 150 feet for the second barrier measured from the edge of the fan shaft inlet to the tunnel.
- o The fans in the New York Avenue fan shaft would have to be converted from 70 percent reversibility to 90 percent reversibility if the Metrorail trains were to remain as they are. However, the fans would not have to be changed if the trains were to be changed to glass windows.

It was recognized that the effects of the wall roughness and the tunnel grade were a near worst case at the New York Avenue Fan Shaft. It was therefore decided to use the same SES input data file to study the sensitivity of the above results in the wall roughness and the tunnel grade. A series of simulations produced the following results:

The simulations assumed that increasing the number of barriers per tunnel from one to two was less expensive than converting the tunnel ventilation fans from 70 to 90 percent reversibility.

Estimated Quantities of Bquipment Beaded to Upgrade the Ketrorail TUnnel ventilation system

The objective of the emergency ventilation system is to direct sufficient quantities of air past a stopped train during a fire emergency so that the direction of spread of smoke is controlled and a relatively smoke-free path of evacuation is maintained. Table 4-2 presents the estimated number of barriers and jet fans and the estimated number of tunnel ventilation fans that have to be 90 percen^t reversible to achieve this objective in the Metrorail System. These estimates were based on a train fire heat release rate of 69.7 MBtu/hr.

If the trains were retrofitted with glass windows, the fire heat release rate would decrease to 42.4 MBtu/hr and the estimated equipment quantities presented in Table 4-2 would be reduced by about 21 percent as presented in Table 4-3.

 $4 - 14$

4-15

 ζ as

============ :=================================== -----------------------· -----------------------.------------ ------------------ ---------------------------- ----------------------

 $\langle \sigma \rangle$

I

 $4 - 16$

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$

 $4 - 17$

×

 \sim

 \sim

NOTE: ALL FAN SHAFT FANS WILL REMAIN 70 PERCENT REVERSIBLE, EXCEPT FOR THOSE THAT ARE MARKED IN THIS TABULATION AS BEING CONVERTED TO 90 PERCENT REVERSIBLE.

 \sim

 $\overline{\Box} = \overline{\mathbb{R}}$:

: : :

 $4 - 18$

 μ

ò.

 \sim

 $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow 0$

- 22

ALL FAN SHAFT FANS WILL REMAIN 70 PERCENT REVERSIBLE, EXCEPT
FOR THOSE THAT ARE MARKED IN THIS TABULATION AS BEING CONVERTED
TO 90 PERCENT REVERSIBLE. NOTE:

5. COST ESTIMATES FOR SYSTEMWIDE RETROFIT

The following estimates were made:

- o Barriers and jet fans for a: - 42.4 MBtu/hr fire - \$15,800,000 - 69.7 MBtujhr fire - \$18,900,000
- o Traditional approach modification of existing station ventilation shafts - \$585,000,000

Barriers

Each barrier assembly includes the fabric center with ^a closeable egress slit, a fabric inflatable torus, shroud lines extending about 20 feet in either direction mounted to the tunnel ceiling, a flexible casing mounted against the tunnel ceiling suitable for barrier storage, a pressurized nitrogen bottle for inflating the barrier and the barrier activation and release mechanisms. The cost of a barrier shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$12,500. The cost of the barrier fabric alone is estimated to be \$5,000 per barrier. It is recommended that ^a production configuration barrier be given a two-year service test. The cost of manufacturing and installing the service test barrier is estimated to be \$100,000.

20-Inch Diameter Jet Fans

Each 20-inch diameter jet fan assembly includes a 100 percent reversible, 15 hp, axial-flow fan rated for 300°F for one hour and a sound attenuator at each end. The cost of each 20-inch diameter jet fan shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$5,000. This includes the routine factory testing that is done for all fans but does not include the manufacturer's shop drawing and calculation submittals, and the noise and performance testing that
accompany the first fan. This effort is a one-time cost of \$35,000. Each 20-inch diameter jet fan will require a 15 hp
high-temperature reversing starter. The cost of these shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$2,000 each. Each 20-inch diameter jet fan will require approximately 200 feet of high-temperature smokeless cable. The cost of this shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$14.00 per foot or about \$2,800 per jet fan. Each ventilation shaft modified for jet fans will require an additional 480 volt power supply. The cost of this shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$35,000.

48-Inch Diameter Jet Fans

Each 48-inch diameter jet fan assembly includes a 100 percent reversible, 75 hp, axial-flow fan rated for 300°F for one hour and a sound attenuator at each end. The cost of each 48-inch diameter jet fan shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$25,000. This includes the routine factory testing that is done for all fans but does not include the manufacturer's shop drawing submittals and special factory testing that accompany the first fan. This effort is a one-time cost of \$35,000. Each 48-inch diameter jet fan will require a 75 hp high-temperature reversing starter. The cost of these shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$4,000 each. Each 48-inch diameter jet fan will require approximately 200 feet of high-temperature smokeless cable. The cost of this shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$18.00 per foot or about \$3,600 per jet fan. Each ventilation shaft modified for jet fans will require an additional 480 volt power supply. The cost of this shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$35,000.

Conversion of Bxistinq Pans to 90 Percent Reversibility Discussions with manufacturers led to the conclusion it is appropriate to assume for the purposes of this estimate that the existing fans are replaced with 50,000 cfm, 90-percent reversible, axial-flow fans rated at 300°F for at least one hour. The cost of these shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$35,000 each.

ventilation Equipment Monitoring and central Control A programmable logic controller (PLC) for the deployment of the barriers and/or the operation of the jet fans would have to be added to each ventilation shaft. The cost of each PLC shipped to site, but not installed, is estimated to be \$4,000. It is further estimated that 10 subway station remote terminal units (RTUs) would have to be expanded. The cost of this is estimated at \$60,000 each.

Installation

Installation is estimated to be 25 percent of all equipment costs, not including spares. This is deemed appropriate because it is imperative not to interfere with revenue service and very little, if any, structural modifications are required.

estado de 1730 de 1740, en 1740 de 1750 de 1760 de 1770 de 1770 de 1770 de 1770 de 1773 de 1773 de 1773 de 17
1770 de 1770 d

Bon-Equipment Costs

Site adaption engineering including construction managemen^t services is estimated to be 20 percent of the equipment and installation costs, not including spares. An overall contingency of 10 percent has been estimated.

systemwide cost Estimate for a 69.7 Killion Btu/hr Pire

Item

TOTAL - Items 1 through 26

18,862,910

18,900,000 **Say**

Systemwide Cost Estimate for a 42.4 Million Btu/hr Fire **Estimate Item** 2,150,000 Barriers - 172 @ 12,500 1. 187,500 Spare Barriers - 15 e 12,500 (Optional) $\mathbf{2}$. Spare Barriers (Fabric Only) $3.$ - 15 @ 5,000 (Optional) 75,000 $4.$ Barrier Installation - 0.25 x Item 1 537,500 Service Test Barrier - 100,000 LS 100,000 5. 20-inch Diameter Jet Fans - 505 @ 5,000 2,525,000 6. Starters for Item $6 - 505$ @ 2,000 1,010,000 7. Cabling for Item $6 - 505$ e^{2} , 800 1,414,000 8. Special Testing for Item 6 - 35,000 LS 35,000 9. 10. 20-inch Diameter Jet Fan Installation 0.25 x Items 6, 7 and 8 1,237,250 Spare 20-inch Diameter Jet Fans 11. 25,000 -5 6 5,000 (Optional) 225,000 48-inch Diameter Jet Fans - 9 @ 25,000 12. 36,000 Starters for Item $12 - 904,000$ 13. Cabling for Item $12 - 903,600$ 32,400 14. Special Testing for Item 12 - 35,000 LS 35,000 15. 48-inch Diameter Jet Fan Installation 16. 0.25 x Items 12, 13, 14 73,350 Spare 48-inch Diameter Jet Fans 17. -2 $0.25,000$ (Optional) 50,000 18. 90 Percent Reversing Fans - $0 \text{ } 0$ 35,000 $\mathbf 0$ 19. 90 Percent Reversing Fans Installation 0.25 x Item 18 \mathbf{o} Additional 480 Volt Power Supplies 20. 980,000 -28 $035,000$ 245,000 Power Supply Installation - 0.25 x Item 20 21. $22.$ PLCs - 76 Ventilation Shafts 304,000 **@ 4,000 each** Installation of PLCs - 0.25 x Item 22 76,000 $23.$ Additional RTUs 10 @ 60,000 600,000 $24.$ Site Specific Engineering and CM Costs $25.$ $-0.20 \times$ Items 1, 4 through 16 and 18 through $24 - 0.20 \times 11,640,500$ 2,328,100 Contingency - 0.10 Items 1 through 25 26.

Traditional Approach

An alternate approach to barriers and jet fans would be replacing the existing ventilation shafts at both ends of each station with fan ventilation shafts, dampered so that either one tunnel or the other is ventilated during emergency conditions. Each shaft would have a bypass damper for normal ventilation, two fans having a total capacity of about 250,000 to 350,000 cfm, a total fan horsepower of 250 to 500 and the necessary electrical power facilities. Each fan would have a shutoff damper and some sound attenuation depending on the location of the fan chamber. The space
requirement would cause considerable structural modifications of the existing ventilation shafts at the station ends. It is estimated that each mid-tunnel ventilation shaft would require a fan shaft at the station ends: therefore, it appears that 152 modified ventilation shafts would be required.

Ventilation shafts similar to these are being installed in the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority's Red Line in Boston. The Red Line does not have mid-tunnel ventilation shafts and most of the tunnel geometry precludes the use of barriers similar to those tested in this study. The May 1991 low bid for Red Line shafts R13, R14 and R15 was \$9,243,092. Adding 25 percent for engineering design and construction management results in a three shaft price of \$11,553,865 or about \$3,850,000 per shaft. Extrapolating this to 152 shafts provides an estimated cost of about \$585,000,000.

end and the contract of the co

MECH

R

i.

 ϵ

Y2 $\ddot{}$

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 TRAIN FIRE HEAT RELEASE RATE

The analysis demonstrated that a train fire heat release rate of 69.7 MBtu/hr is appropriate for the currentlyconfigured WMATA train which has polycarbonate windows. If the windows were changed to glass, then a reduction to 42.4 MBtu/hr is justified.

The following train fire heat release rates are recommended for design analysis:

o 69.7 MBtujhr for trains having polycarbonate windows

o 42.4 MBtu/hr for trains having glass windows

A retrofit program is being proposed which would replace all the polycarbonate windows with safety glass. If it is decided to implement this proposal, the value of 42.4 MBtu/hr may be used. Otherwise, the more conservative value of 69.7 MBtu/hr should be used.

6.2 BARRIERS

The barrier deployment tests answered two fundamental questions about performance. The addition of the 180-degree air torus provided necessary stiffness to provide contact with the tunnel wall. The shrouds provided vertical alignment with airflow directed towards the shroud side of the barrier. Other design criteria - related to containment in the stored position, deployment time and geometry, release mechanism and storage latch reliability - were tested and found to be satisfactory. Some minor enhancements will be included in the production design.

The resistance to airflow caused by barriers is sufficient to redirect the tunnel airflows during emergencies, including fire, in the Metrorail. Figure 3-9, repeated here as Figure 6-1, provides the necessary data for the final design implementation SES analyses.

Barriers are recommended as the preferred means of redirectinq tunnel airflows durinq emerqencies, includinq fire, in the Metrorail. The functional and ventilation tests support this recommendation.

6.3 JET FANS

The resistance to airflow caused by jet fans is sufficient to redirect the tunnel airflows durinq emerqencies, includinq fire, in the Metrorail. Fiqures 3-21 and 3-31, repeated here as Fiqures 6-2 and 6-3, provide the necessary .data for the final desiqn implementation SES analyses.

Jet fans are recommended as an alternative means of redirectinq tunnel airflows durinq emerqencies, includinq fire, in the Metrorail. The ventilation tests support this recommendation.

It is further recommended that jet fans only be used in ^a portion of the system where the barrier cannot be installed · because of space limitations. This recommendation is supported by the barriers beinq less expensive, not requirinq power other than for control, and requirinq fewer modifications to the central control system, etc.

6.4 EQUIPMENT RECOMMENDED TO UPGRADE THE METRORAIL TUNNEL VENTILATION SYSTEM

The estimate of the equipment was based on the followinq preferences:

- o Barriers are preferred over jet fans, except in portions of the system where barriers cannot be installed because of space limitations
- o Barriers are preferred over changing the current fan shaft capacities and/or reversibilities. A change in the fan shaft capacities and/or reversibilities is considered as the last alternative only when three or more barriers per tunnel adjacent to a fan shaft are required
- o The estimate was put together for two fire heat release rates - 69.7 MBtu/hr if the Metrorail trains were to remain as they currently are and 42.4 MBtu/hr if the

 $FIGURE 6-2$

1737

÷.

 \mathfrak{a}

 $\overline{1}$

 $0.9 =$

 $0.8 -$

 $0.7 -$

 $0.6 =$

 $0.5 =$

 0.4

 0.3

 $0.2 +$

┯

 $-0.06 -0.04 -0.02$

T

 -1

1738

 0.14

 VT/VF

 0.12

 $FIGURE 6-3$

 0.06

 0.08

 0.1

 0.04

 0.02

 \overline{O}

Metrorail trains were to be retrofitted to qlass windows.

Based on these parameters, the final equipment count and cost is presented in a summary form below.

Estimated Cost

\$15,800,000 \$18,900,000

REFERENCES

J.

1740

 $\begin{array}{cc} \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} & & \\ \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} & & \\ \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} & & \end{array}$ \approx $_{\odot}$ ò.

- 1. Double Track Porosity Testing. Developmental Sciences, Inc. City of Industry, 1975. Technical Report No. UMTA-DC-06-0010-75-4.
- 2. I.E. Idel'Chik. Handbook of Hydraulic Resistance, Coefficients of Local Resistance and of Friction. Gosudarstvennoe Energeticheskoe Izdatel'stvo: Moskva-Leningard, 1960. Translated from Russian by Israel Program for Scientific Translations. Jerusalem: 1966. Technical Report No. AEC-TR-6630.
- 3. 1989 ASHRAE Handbook, Fundamentals, I-P Edition. American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers, Inc., pp. 6.1-6.15.
- 4. V.L. streeter. Fluid Mechanics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1962, p. 534.
- 5. Streeter, p. 112.
- 6. Subway Environmental Design Handbook. Volume I. Principles and Applications. 2nd Edition, 1976. Associated Engineers, National Information Service Number PB-254-788.
- 7. Subway Environment Design Handbook. Volume II. Subway Environment Simulation (SES) Computer Program Version 3. Prepared in draft for the U.S. Department of Transportation. Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., November 1980.
- 8. "A Study on ^aLongitudinal Ventilation System Using the Enlarged Jet Fans." H. Ohashi, T. Kawamura and T. Baba. BHRA Fluid Engineering, Cranfield, Bedford, UK, Second International.Symposium on the Aerodynamics and Ventilation of Vehicle Tunnels, 23-24 March 1976, pp. D2-19 to D2-44.
- 9. "Characteristics of Longitudinal Ventilation Systems Using Normal Size Jet Fans." T. Baba, Y. Hattori and T. Seki. BHRA Fluid Engineering. Cranfield, Bedford, UK, Third International Symposium on the Aerodynamics and Ventilation of Vehicle Tunnels, 19-21 March 1979, pp. 71-96.
- 10. "Fundamentals and Applications of Induction Ventilation of Vehicle Tunnels." F. Reale. BHRA Fluid Engineering, Cranfield, Bedford, UK, First International Symposium on the Aerodynamics and Ventilation of Vehicle Tunnels, 10-12 April 1973, pp. H1-1 to H1-16.
- 11. u. Meidinger. "Longitudinal Ventilation of Vehicle Tunnels with Axial Fans" ("Langsluftung von Autotunneln

mit Strahlgeblasen"). Schweizensche Bauzeitung, November 28, 9 July 1964, pp. 498-501 (in German).

- 12. F. Reale. "Induction Ventilation of Vehicle Tunnels by Means of Axial Fans" ("Veritilazione ad Induzione di Gallerie Stradali Mediante Ventilatori Assiali"). Ingegneri, No. 51, November-December 1968, pp. 45-52 (in Italian).
- 13. B.B. Daly. Woods Practical Guide to Fan Engineering. Woods of Colchester, Ltd., June 1985, pp. 305-311 (in English).
- 14. Ventilation System Analysis Report Phase I. Prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. for WMATA, April 1988.
- 15 Subway Environment Design Handbook. Volume II. Subway Environment Simulation (SES) Computer Program Version 3, Part 1: User's Manual. Prepared in draft for the u.s. Department of Transportation, Associated Engineers, November 1980.
- 16. "Metrorail Ventilation System Improvements and Vehicle Fire Hardening", Raymond (Kaiser Engineers) Inc., Contract No. X91012, December 1983
- 17. "Emergency Services Training Manual", Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Metrorail document, Revision 2, March 14, 1989.

ò.

 \sim

 $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$

<u>APPENDIX A</u>

DESCRIPTION OF

SUBWAY ENVIRONMENT SIMULATION

(SES)

COMPUTER PROGRAM

Ú.

MECH

SUBWAY ENVIRONMENT SIMULATION COMPUTER PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION AND APPLICATION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Subway Environment Simulation (SES) Computer Program is a designer-oriented tool which provides estimates of airflows, temperatures, and humidity, as well as air conditioning requirements, for both operating and proposed multiple-track subway systems.

The capabilities of the SES program are comprehensive, permitting the user to simulate a variety of train propulsion and braking systems: various systems of environmental control (including forced air ventilation, station air conditioning, and trackway exhaust); airflows in any given network of interconnected tunnels, stations and underground walkways: any desired sequence of train operation (including the mixing of trains with different operating characteristics and schedules) *:* various steadystate and non-steady-state heat sources: emergency situations with trains stopped in tunnels and air movement solely by mechanical ventilation and buoyant forces; and a special feature to simulate the long-range thermal impact of the possible reduction in the heat-absorbing capacity of tunnel walls after many years of system operation.

The SES program was developed by Parsons Brinckerhoff under the aegis of the Transportation Systems Center of the United States Department of Transportation. The SES was field validated in Montreal and Toronto and has been applied to transit systems in Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Caracas, Chicago, Dallas, Hong Kong, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Montreal, New Jersey, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Shanghai,

Singapore, Taipei, and washington, as well as to two rail systems in British Columbia and Amtrak's New York tunnels. Its tropical climate applications include Hong Kong and Singapore.

1.2 Design Applications

As indicated above, the SES program has been validated in model tests and in actual practice. It is applicable to ^a variety of subway operating and design configurations and has been demonstrated to be a cost-effective tool for evaluating the performance of all types of environmental control strategies. Examples of situations in which the program can provide important design information include the following engineering questions:

- o What is the most effective size, configuration, spacing and location for ventilation shafts and/or fan shafts in the system in terms of overall system environmental conditions (temperatures, humidities, air velocities and the movement of smoke and gases during a fire emergency) and power requirements for environmental control?
- o What are the impacts of various operating schedules, vehicle headways, vehicle velocities, and train sizes on system temperatures and vehicle power demand?
- o What is the impact of vehicle air conditioning on overall heat rejection in the system and on the temperatures and humidities in stations and tunnels?
- o What are the comparative impacts of various vehicle propulsion and braking systems on overall system temperature?

- o What is the effect of track vertical alignment on system temperatures and power consumption? What are the long-term trade-offs between lowering track sections between stations and the costs of power for propulsion and environmental control?
- o What are the energy consumption implications of vehicle air conditioning alone versus air conditioning the entire system?
- o What are the long-term and short-term effects of heatsink?
- o What effect does evaporation from wetted walls have on the overall system temperatures and humidities?
- o What are the effects of operating fans for mechanical ventilation simultaneously with scheduled train operation?
- o What are the acceleration profiles of vehicles at various parts of the system? How much time is required for a vehicle to traverse the length of the system? What headways between vehicles are required to accommodate a given level of rider demand?
- o What is the effect of emergency control procedures on subway environment? (For example, what are the purge times for smoke in the system?)
- o What effect does the heat release from an emergency fire in the system have on the overall environmental conditions?
- o What are the dynamic temperature and air flow conditions that prevail during a fire emergency?

endo de la construcción de la const
En la construcción de la construcc

o What ventilation system capacity is adequate to control the spread of smoke and heat during a fire emergency?

The above noted examples of program applications are by no means exhaustive. Indeed, the program is capable of estimating the environmental effects and implications of varying any or virtually all of the design parameters of ^a multi-track subway system.

2.0 SES DESCRIPTION

The SES computer model provides a dynamic simulation of the _operation of multiple bi-directional trains in a multi-track subway and permits continuous reading of the air velocity, temperature, and humidity throughout any arrangement of stations, tunnels, ventilation shafts, and fan shafts. In addition, the program has been designed to provide readings of the maximum, minimum, and average values for system air velocities, temperatures, and humidities during any prese^t time interval. The program computes estimates of the station cooling and heating capacities necessary to satisfy any given environmental criteria, as well as the percentage of time during which any specified environmental criteria are exceeded. Although a simulation can extend over any period of subway operations, the primary focus of the SES is on short-term simulations, such as the peak rush hours, when there is often an extreme deterioration of the subway environment. Both the input/information required by the program and the output produced are tailored for the use of design engineers concerned with practical environmental problems.

2.1 Computation Sequences

The SES program comprises four interdependent computation sequences: a train performance subprogram, an aerodynamic subprogram, a temperature/humidity subprogram, and a heat sink/environmental control subprogram. In addition, a special option of the program enables the simulation of the aerodynamic and thermodynamic effects of a fire. Figure 1 provides an overview of the program organization. These subprograms use a mutually shared set of system descriptive parameters, and operating together they provide a continuous simulation of the dynamic phenomena which govern the quality of subway environment. The train performance subprogram determines the velocity, acceleration, position, and heat rejection of all trains in the system on a continuous basis. The aerodynamic subprogram uses these computed train parameters, coupled with the ventilation performance data, to compute continuous values for the air velocity in all stations, tunnels, and ventilation shafts. In turn, the temperature/humidity subprogram uses these computed airflow parameters together with the train heat release data generated in the train performance subprogram to compute the convective dispersal of sensible and latent heat throughout the system. It is thereby able to determine continuously the temperature and humidity at all locations. Finally, the air velocities computed in the aerodynamic subprogram are used by the train performance subprogram to determine the airflows adjacent to the trains, providing means to compute the vehicle aerodynamic drag. The subway ventilation and heat load data from these subprograms, together with information on daily and annual changes in outside conditions, are used by the heat sink/environmental control subprogram to compute the long-term conduction of heat between the subway air and the structure and soil surrounding the subway as well as the heating or cooling capacities required to satisfy design conditions in

PARAMETERS AND ORGANIZATION OF SUBWAY ENVIRONMENT SIMULATION (SES) COMPUTER PROGRAM

specified areas of the subway. This integrated calculation procedure makes possible continuous simulation of the complex interactions among the dynamic phenomena operative in a subway system. In the following sections, the theoretical basis for each of the subprogram models is outlined and the fundamental logic for each of the four subprograms is described.

2.1.1 Train Performance Subprogram

The operation of trains provides a forcing function for the air movement *in* an underground transit system, and the heat dissipation from transit vehicles may account for as much as 90 percent of the heat released to the system. Consequently, a knowledge of the location, speed and acceleration of the trains within the subway system is essential to determine the rate and location of subway heat release as well as the system airflow regime.

The SES train performance subprogram provides the engineer with several options for simulating the operation of trains within a subway of which the most comprehensive is the implicit train performance. This option provides the engineer with a complete simulation of all aspects of train operation in the system. This option represents both the highest level of sophistication *in* the SES train performance computations and the greatest flexibility *in* evaluating trade-offs between train operations (headway, speed, etc.) and subway environment. The SES implicit train performance option differs from most conventional train performance computations *in* two important respects: (1) the SES subprogram has been designed specifically to accommodate accurate, continuous computation of the total heat released by trains, passengers and ancillary equipment such as air conditioning, and (2) the SES program permits the direct computation of the aerodynamic drag acting on each of the

eration of the contract of the
The contract of the contract o

trains in the system, using continuously computed aerodynamic parameters. Conventional train performance programs are not ordinarily concerned with the continuous evaluation of vehicle heat release, and in evaluating vehicle aerodynamic drag these programs ordinarily settle for a semi-empirical relationship based on train velocity and blockage ratio (the ratio of the train frontal area to that of the tunnel cross section). The actual aerodynamic drag on a train fluctuates continuously as it encounters variable annular airflows resulting from changes in tunnel diameter, ventilation shaft location, mechanical ventilation, and the pressure caused by other trains.

The basic logic governing the computation of train acceleration capability requires computation of the train resistance, the available tractive effort, and the acceleration resistance. The train resistance is defined as the arithmetic sum of all the external forces which must be overcome in order to start, accelerate, and maintain the operating speed of a subway vehicle and consists of mechanical resistance, grade resistance, curve resistance, and air resistance. Train mechanical resistance is a summation of the journal friction (a function of train weight) and rolling friction (a function of speed and weight). Grade resistance (which may be either positive or negative) is determined from the slope of the track using an expression which includes the grade angle with the horizontal. curve resistance is an additional friction term which represents the increased effort required to negotiate turns resulting from the increase in friction between the wheel flanges and the rails, and this term is computed as a function of track radius of curvature. The air resistance or aerodynamic drag is a function of the air velocity in the tunnel relative to the train, the train blockage ratio, tunnel wall friction, and the configuration of the cars. The available tractive effort for a given transit vehicle

MECH

and the resulting acceleration and maximum velocity capability depends almost entirely upon the performance characteristics of the motor employed. Manufacturers of motors for rapid transit vehicles ordinarily provide standardized motor characteristic curves in which the tractive effort and speed are related to motor current for various values of motor field strength. Using data from these curves, the SES computes the precise tractive effort capabilities of vehicles powered by these motors as they travel through the system. The acceleration resistance is a combination of the forces required to accelerate the mass of the train and its equivalent mass of rotating parts, including wheels, axles, gears, and motor armatures. The implicit SES train performance option continuously computes values for the train resistance, the tractive effort, and the acceleration resistance of each vehicle in the system and from this determines the rate at which each train can accelerate, assuming no slippage at the wheel/rail interface.

The most important train-related heat release to the system can be traced to the vehicle braking cycle. For a train using a dynamic braking system, the speed reduction of the vehicles is brought about by using the motors as generators to produce electrical power which may be regenerated back into the traction power supply system, used to create stored energy (flywheels) or dissipated to a grid of undercar resistors. The rate at which energy is dissipated to these dynamic-braking resistor grids is approximately equal to the net rate of decrease in kinetic and potential energy of the braking train, corrected for the proportion that can be regenerated or absorbed by flywheels. This energy loss can be computed directly from the vehicle deceleration rate, velocity, total mass and the regeneration effectiveness or the flywheel characteristics. The implicit SES train performance option computes the instantaneous power

dissipation to the braking resistors and the manner in which the resistors warm up and subsequently transfer the heat to the subway air. This computation directly accounts for the thermal inertia of the braking resistors, relating the heat storage and heat release to the surrounding air to the resistor thermal properties, weight and configuration, air turbulence and velocity, and resistor temperature.

In operation, the implicit train performance option first checks to see whether or not trains should be added or removed from the system (according to the train operating schedule specified by the user), after which it computes the individual train resistance for each train. The program then determines whether the train should accelerate, coast, decelerate, or maintain speed, using a brief computation which extrapolates the current operating mode of each train to determine if continuation of the train's current course will cause it to overrun a speed restriction or approach a stop too rapidly. If continued acceleration is indicated, the program computes the velocity-dependent tractive effort capabilities of the train and then calculates the acceleration which will occur over the preselected computation time interval.

Should a reduction in train speed be found necessary, the program computes a deceleration rate based on the userspecified braking rate. Finally, if the speed of the train exactly matches a system speed restriction, no acceleration occurs and the train uses only the power necessary to maintain this speed. When the train is on a downhill grade, the speed restriction is maintained by braking when necessary. The program next computes the heat energy being dissipated by the individual motors of each vehicle. For the case of a cam-controlled train, this consists of the motor current squared times the sum of the internal motor resistance and the external acceleration grid resistance.

For the case of a thyristor-controlled train this consists of the motor current squared times the internal resistance, plus the line current squared times the thyristor inefficiencies. The program provides a summation of traction and auxiliary energy requirements on a substation basis, which can be used for the preliminary design of the traction power supply system.

During the braking mode, energy is dissipated from both the change in train kinetic energy and the change in train potential energy (due to elevation). If regeneration or flywheels is being simulated, the energy dissipation is reduced accordingly. During station stops the SES continues the computation of heat release to the system from the passengers, equipment, and the warmed resistor grids. The program also computes the change in passenger loading at each station stop, thereby accounting for changes in total train weight and the corresponding effects in acceleration and braking energy dissipation, as well as changes in vehicle energy consumption and heat release from on board auxiliaries and passengers.

The computed values for the position, speed, and acceleration of all trains in the system as well as their individual rates of heat rejection are necessary for the operation of the aerodynamic and temperature/humidity subprograms. However, the train performance subprogram can also be operated independently to evaluate the comparative performance of transit vehicles, or propulsion motors, or both, by suppression of the computation and printing of environmentally related information. The airflows and air velocities of the aerodynamic subprogram would still be computed, of course, as these data would be necessary to compute aerodynamic drag for the train performance subprogram.

2.1.2 Aerodynamic Subprogram

The airflow through a subway system affects the comfort of subway patrons both directly and indirectly. Air movement is directly responsible for the convective transfer of heat and humidity through the system, and the cooling effects of moving air can directly influence the comfort of persons in non air-conditioned vehicles and in station areas. Furthermore, the buildup of excessive air pressures in stations from train piston effect has been known to constitute a separate operating problem, sometimes causing doors at entranceways to swing hazardously or become difficult to open. Airflow indirectly influences the heat -content of subway air in two respects: (1) the aerodynamic drag on vehicles resulting from air motion relative to the trains affects the power consumption (and heat rejection) of the vehicle motors, and (2) the rate of heat transfer into the surrounding deep-heat sink is dependent upon the air velocity at the air-wall interface.

Airflow in a subway is generated by two primary sources: the piston effect of trains moving through confined tunnels and mechanical ventilation by fans. The mathematical model which has been developed to describe this flow for a subway assumes the flow to be unsteady, turbulent, incompressible, and effectively one-dimensional. The unsteady nature of airflow in subways precludes the use of approximate analyses based on the assumption of steady-state flow, because the air velocities generated by trains with arbitrary operating schedules moving through tunnels of varying shape and size must fluctuate continuously. Steady-state flows may only develop in the absence of train movements.

The present model includes consideration both of near-field phenomena (flow in the immediate vicinity of the train) and far field effects (flow at a distance far enough from the

train that no transverse perturbations are present other than those ordinarily associated with normal turbulent inertial flow). Far-field flow is mathematically similar to typical inertia flows, whereas near-field flow must be described using formulations which include the aerodynamic drag acting on trains and the localized pressure rise which accompanies fan operation. As noted earlier, the computation of aerodynamic drag is an essential component of the subway simulation, because this factor determines both the air resistance that trains must overcome in order to accelerate and the amount of energy that is imparted by the moving trains to the surrounding air. In general, the drag experienced by a train in a single-track tunnel increases with train speed and decreases with frequency of train operation (shorter headway).

Using information describing the position, acceleration, and velocity of trains provided by the train performance subprogram, the location of each of the trains with respec^t to the subway is determined. The train operation information is then used to compute the net forcing function on the system airflows - the difference between energy added to the flow from train drag and fans and that removed due to the friction and minor losses. In this computation, the ^piston effect of each train is independently computed by evaluating the piston effect components on the system from the front, side, and rear of the train. The aerodynamic differential equations are then integrated forward in time using a modified version of the Runge-Kutta numerical integration technique. The standard output for the aerodynamic subprogram provides continuous readings for the aerodynamic drag on each train and for the air velocity (in feet per minute) and flow rates (in cubic feet per minute) in all tunnels, stations and ventilation shafts. Using the summary option, the subprogram can also provide output in

endo de la construcción de la const
En la construcción de la construcc
the form of peak and average values of air velocity and total reading for airflow over any specified time interval.

2.1.3 Temperature/Humidity Subprogram

The temperature and humidity of the air throughout a subway system reflect the heat added or removed by underground equipment, trains, and patrons, as well as by the rate of heat exchange across the system walls and by mixing with external ambient air. An analytical treatment of this dynamic heat regime must provide a means to describe these phenomena mathematically in an operating system. The acceleration and braking of trains produces the main source of sensible heat in an operating subway system, but sensible and latent heat are also added by electrical equipment, patrons, and in certain instances, the surrounding earth. Heat is removed from the system mainly by the expulsion of warm system air through ventilation shafts and by heat conduction across the tunnel walls into the surrounding heat sink. Heat may also be added or removed by mechanical means such as heating and air conditioning.

In developing an analytical description of the heat regime, it was concluded that the system could be treated as onedimensional, meaning that the air temperature and humidity can be considered uniform over any cross section. Axial conduction heat transfer in the system air was assumed to be negligibly small in comparison with the heat convected by moving air. The heat contributed by viscous dissipation resulting from air friction against the system walls, while usually small, can optionally be considered as a variable heat source.

Three fundamental processes can occur to alter the temperature and humidity in each of the subsegments: (1) sensible and latent heat can be directly added or removed by

A-14

sources and sinks within the subsegment: (2) heat can be exchanged across the tunnel walls: and (3) there can be ^a net difference in the heat content between air flowing into the subsegment and air flowing out. An equation for the rate of change in temperature and humidity of each subsegment is therefore a combination of the analytical expressions for these three processes. The quantity of air flowing into each subsegment at any given time is computed by the aerodynamic subprogram and this airflow is used by the temperature/humidity subprogram together with values for subsegment temperature and humidity to compute the net difference between heat content of the air entering and leaving the subsegment. Rejection of heat from moving trains, computed simultaneously in the train performance program, is proportioned over the subsegments containing trains. Next the temperature/humidity subprogram sums the quantities of sensible and latent heat removed or added in each subsegment by patrons, auxiliary equipment, and station heating or air conditioning. Latent heat can be removed from or added to the system by condensation on, or evaporation from, system walls. In the case of simple condensation or evaporation, an equivalent amount of sensible heat is added to or removed from the system by the program. The heat transfer across the walls of the system is computed using the wall temperature and convective heat transfer coefficient which is a function of the subsegment air velocity, density, viscosity, thermal conductivity, and tunnel diameter. The value for subsegment wall temperature is computed in a separate operation using an analytical technique based on the diurnal and annual variation in outside ambient temperature, the deep heat sink temperature, and the degree of subway utilization. This analytical approach provides the wall surface temperature as a function of the time of the day and the time of the year. The heat transfer across the system walls has been found to have

end and the contract of the co

significant effect on the air temperature throughout the system.

The train locations, which were computed by the train performance subprogram, are used to determine the specific subsegments which contain some portion of each train. Each subsegment is then analyzed in detail, computing the rate of heat transfer to the tunnel walls, and, if trains are present, the amount of sensible or latent heat released into the subsegment by the trains. The airflows computed in the aerodynamic subprogram are used to determine those in each of the tunnel, station, and ventilation shaft subsegments. The values for heat flow across each subsegment boundary, for the sources and sinks of heat in each subsegment, and for the velocity-dependent coefficient of heat transfer across the system walls form a separate differential equation describing the rate of change of sensible and latent heat in each subsegment. These differential equations for the rate of change in air sensible and latent heat content are developed for each subsegment in the system, thus forming a system of equations which is integrated using a modified Runge-Kutta numerical integration technique resembling that used for the aerodynamic equations. This provides the time-dependent values for temperature and humidity throughout the stations, tunnels, and ventilation shafts of the system.

2.1.4 Heat Sink/Environmental Control Subprogram

There are three key independent factors which influence subway air temperature: system ventilation as determined by geometrical configuration, train operations and mechanical systems; system heat load, which relates directly to utilization of the subway; and outside ambient temperature. A fourth factor affecting subway air temperature is the heat transfer between the air and the surrounding structure and

 $A-16$

earth. In contrast with the first three factors, an interdependence exists between this heat transfer (commonly referred to as a "heat sink" effect) and the air temperature: the subway air temperatures directly influence the heat conduction history of the surroundinq earth, since the rate of heat flux between the subway air and the walls is dependent on the convective heat transfer coefficient and the temperature difference between the air and the wall surfaces. One purpose of the heat sink/environmental control subproqram is the evaluation of this interdependent behavior.

Durinq the relatively short-term simulation periods of the SES aerodynamic and temperature/humidity subproqrams, the surface temperature of the subway structures is essentially constant. However, subway wall temperatures ordinarily experience daily and annual fluctuations because of variations in outside conditions and subway operatinq schedules. There may also occur a qradual increase in the averaqe wall surface temperature over a period of years either as a result of prolonqed internal temperatures above outside ambient conditions or because of increases in system utilization. Thus, to accomplish its purpose, the heat sink/environmental control subproqram must address not only the air-wall temperature interdependence, but also the conduction of heat in the earth as influenced by the daily, annual, and lonq-term variations in the subway air temperature. Whereas the short-term simulation evaluates subway airflows and temperature on a second-by-second basis, the heat/sink environmental control subproqram evaluates a phenomenon which is measured in terms of hours, days and years. Thus, this subproqram involves a shift in time scales and the link with the short-term simulation is accomplished throuqh a process involvinq the averaqinq of short-term simulation results.

endo de la construcción de la const
En la construcción de la construcc

The heat sink computation scheme in this subprogram is geared to produce as output the wall surface temperature for each of the geometrical subseqments into which the subway tunnels and stations are partitioned, corresponding to the time of the day and year that the short-term simulation is intended. To perform this computation, the subprogram requires data on structure and earth thermal properties, earth temperature at a point far removed from the subway, and daily and annual variations in outside conditions. In addition, the subprogram requires detailed information on subway ventilation, heat loads, and areas of the system which are maintained at specified design temperatures with environmental control equipment. Thus, the use of the heat sink/environmental control subprogram requires that the aerodynamic and temperature/humidity subprograms first be applied in a short-term simulation. The SES is organized so that the required data transfer is accomplished internally in the program. The user can specify that the program execute a short-term simulation, transfer the required ventilation and heat load data to the heat sink/environmental control subprogram for the detailed wall surface temperature computations, and then transfer the calculated wall surface temperatures back to the short-term simulation portion of the program to continue the analysis.

The computation of the heating or cooling loads required to maintain design temperature and humidity conditions in specified areas of the system (such as stations) is an integral part of the heat sink/environmental control subprogram. The relationship between the heat sink and environmental control computation schemes is two-fold: first, many of the data requirements in terms of averaged short term SES computations of subway ventilation and heat loads are shared: and second, an interdependence exists because of the exchange of air between the controlled and uncontrolled areas of the system.

A-18

For user-specified areas within the subway where the temperature and humidity are to be maintained at design conditions, the environmental control computation scheme evaluates the heat which must be added or removed to achieve the desired conditions, on the average, during the design point operation addressed by the short-term simulation. This evaluation is performed for each of the geometrical subseqments into which the controlled area is partitioned, and includes calculations of sensible and latent heat gains from trains, sensible and latent heat gains from stationary sources (such as lighting, patrons, third rails, etc.), sensible heat transfer between the air and the structures (heat sink), and sensible and latent heat gains or losses attributable to the exchange of air between the subseqment and adjacent areas such as tunnels and stairways (convective load).

The interdependence with the heat sink computation for uncontrolled areas of the system is reflected by the evaluation of the convective load. The subprogram analyzes this interdependence by assuming that the airflow from controlled to uncontrolled areas of the system are at desiqn temperature and humidity conditions. The heat sink computation scheme uses these airflow, temperature and humidity data in assessing the behavior of the heat sink in the uncontrolled areas of the system. In turn, the environmental control computation scheme is provided with a temperature for the air entering the controlled area from the uncontrolled area which reflects the estimated effects of the overall convective air and heat exchange process.

The SES organization is such that the computed heating or cooling load requirements can be transferred internally to the short-term simulation portion of the program to continue the analysis. By continuing the short-term simulation, the

A-19

user can determine whether the computed loads satisfactorily achieve the desired design conditions in the controlled areas. A continuation of the simulation also provides data on the transient temperature and humidity excursions from the average design conditions caused by the unsteady nature of the airflows and heat loads throughout the subway.

2.2 Pire Model

The SES Program has the ability to model the effects of a subway fire. When the fire model is "turned on" as described below, the following aerodynamic and thermodynamic factors are considered by the program:

A fire in a tunnel has the effect of throttling the ventilating airflow. This effect is caused by the rapid expansion of the air flowing past the fire site. Also, as a consequence of the law of conservation of mass, the velocity of the hot gases downstream of the fire increases inversely proportional to the density (or equivalently, directly proportional to the absolute temperature of the gases), hence increasing the viscous pressure losses in this section of the tunnel. These pressure changes will reduce the tunnel airflow. The density differences between the hot gases and the ambient air give rise to pressure differentials which can either augment or retard the tunnel airflows, depending on the direction of ventilation (uphill or downhill). The elevated air temperatures produced by a fire cause the tunnel walls to heat up. This transient heating of the wall surface is an important factor in determining the conditions downwind of the fire. Allowing the wall surface temperature to respond properly improves the accuracy of the predicted air temperatures which are subsequently used to calculate the buoyant pressure differential.

The model treats the wall as a one-dimensional concrete slab of infinite thickness with uniform thermal properties and an arbitrary time-dependent heat flux at the wall surface. This approach is appropriate because (1) temperature changes resulting from heating at the wall surface will be confined to within a short distance of the wall surface, and (2) the wall surface temperature is of interest rather than the temperature at some depth below the surface.

The heat conduction equation is solved by using an approximate integral method. This method was chosen because it requires relatively little computation time and provides good accuracy (results range from three percent to nine percent of the theoretical value).

Heat is transferred to the wall by convection and radiation. Radiation will be the dominant mode of heat transfer at the fire site, while downwind of the fire, both modes will be nearly the same order of magnitude. At the site of the fire, heat is radiated uniformly from the interior of the burning vehicle through the windows and opened doors directly to the tunnel wall. The interior temperature of the vehicle is assumed to be at an "effective fire temperature". Both the effective fire temperature and the total area of the openings are input items. Downward of the fire site, the hot smoke is assumed to be radiating to the tunnel wall as a "black body" at a temperature equivalent to the "bulk" subsegment air temperature. Only radiation effects in the transverse direction from smoke to tunnel wall are considered.

The changes in air density associated with elevated temperatures degrade the performance characteristics (pressure vs. volume flow curve) of the exhaust fans. These effects have been accounted for in the model.

ende and the contract of the c
The contract of the contract of

2.2.1 Application of Fire Model

The fire model is intended for use in a trial-and-error fashion to select the emergency ventilation system capacities. The interactions are between the tunnel air velocity (past the fire site) predicted by the SES Fire Model and a design air velocity criterion which precludes the backing of smoke against the ventilating air stream (back-layering). The air velocity criterion is a function of the fire heat release rate, the tunnel width, the average tunnel grade, and the temperature of the hot gases leaving the fire. A typical application of the fire model consists of the following steps:

1. Perform an SES simulation to predict the tunnel air velocity and the hot air temperature.

2. Determine the required air velocity using the methodology given in the users manual. (see Chapter 16)

3. If the predicted air velocity exceeds the required air velocity, the ventilation system is considered adequate.

4. If the predicted air velocity is less than the criterion, change the system and repeat the process.

Note that the SES is essentially a one-dimensional, incompressible, turbulent, slug-flow model. The throttling and buoyancy effects which are primarily caused by changes in density are conveniently accounted for by noting that changes in density are inversely proportional to changes in the absolute temperature of the gas (air), a quantity which is computed by the program. Therefore, the effects of density changes have been accounted for in the computations without actually converting computations in the program from an incompressible to a compressible flow model. As a

A-22

result, the airflow quantities printed out by the program are "referenced" to the ambient air density. This notion of basing the computations on a reference air density has been used in mining ventilation computer programs and most recently in a program prepared at Michigan Tech for the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

The SES Fire Model has been designed with the ability to simulate the "overall" effects of a tunnel fire on the ventilation system. This level of detail is considered sufficient for evaluating the adequacy of an emergency ventilation system and is consistent with the state-of-theart in mining ventilation programs with the capability of simulating fires. However, the model does have its limitations. As previously mentioned, the SES is a onedimensional model. Therefore, the results of a fire simulation will indicate whether or not the ventilation air flows are sufficient to prevent back-layering, but not the extent of back-layering (a two-dimensional phenomena) if it is predicted to occur. In addition, the early stage of a fire, before the ventilation system is activated, generally cannot be simulated since this period is dominated by buoyant recirculating two-dimensional airflows.

essa kuningas kansas kuningas kansas kuningas kansas kuningas kansas kuningas kansas kuningas kuningas kuninga
Tanggal sa kansas kansas kuningas kansas kansas

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}}$

 \cdot

the common

the control of the control of

المستور المستور المستور والمستور المستور

 $\mathcal{N}=\{0\}$

APPENDIX B

 \mathcal{L}^{\bullet}

 $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{A}$

DATA REDUCTION

 ~ 100

 ~ 100

1773

B.1 MATHEMATICAL NOMENCLATURE

B-1

 $\bar{\epsilon}$ = The relative roughness of the tunnel wall, ϵ/d

B-2

- λ = Conversion factor to convert lb_f/sqft to inches of water gage (in. wg), 5.2 (lbf/sqft)/in. wg.
- ⁼The absolute viscosity of air in pound force-second per μ square foot ($(lb_f-sec)/sqrt$)
- ρ = The air mass density in slugs per cubic foot
- *^v*= The specific volume of moist air in cubic feet per pound mass of dry air

 Φ = The relative humidity of the air expressed as a percentage

B.2 AIR DENSITY

The air density can be calculated using the following procedure [3]:

Calculate the saturation pressure. over liquid water for the temperature range of 32^{O} F to 392^{O} F with the following equations:

$$
Ta = 1.8T+32+459.67
$$
 Eq. 1
ln (P_{WS}) = C₁(Ta)⁻¹+C₂+C₃(Ta)+C₄(Ta)²
+C₅(Ta)³+C₆[ln(Ta)]
Eq. 2

where:

Calculate the partial pressure of water vapor with the equation:

$$
P_W = \frac{\Psi P_{WS}}{100}
$$
 Eq. 3

Calculate the humidity ratio with the equation:

$$
W = \begin{array}{c} 0.62198P_W \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ 0.4912P_a - P_W \end{array} \qquad \text{Eq. 4}
$$

Calculate the specific volume with the equation:

$$
v = \frac{\text{RT}_{a}(1-1.607W)}{70.7328P_{a}}
$$
 Eq.5

Calculate the air density with the equation:

$$
y = \frac{1+W}{v}
$$
 Eq. 6

Recalling that 1 slug = 32.174 lb_m, then

$$
\rho = \gamma/32.174 \quad (\text{slug/ft}^3) \qquad \text{Eq.7}
$$

Example:

v

For illustration purposes assume the following: $T =$ ambient dry bulb temperature = 26.666^oC Φ = relative humidity = 50% P_A = ambient pressure = 29.92671 inches of mercury (1 atmosphere) $T_a = 539.669(^OR)$ $R = 53.352$ Ft-lb_f/(lb_m-^OR) Then: $ln(P_{WS}) = C_1/T_a + C_2 + C_3 \cdot T_a + C_4 \cdot T_a^2 + C_5 \cdot T_a^3 + C_6 \cdot 1 n(T_a)$ $ln(P_{WS}) = -6.78546E-01$ $P_{WS} = e^{(-6.78546E-01)} = 5.073541E-01$ $P_w =$ ------ $= 2.53677E-01$ 100 $0.62198P$ w W = ------------ ⁼1.092195E-02 *v* = $0.4912P_a-P_w$ RT_a(1-1.607W)
-------------- = 1.336315E+01 (ft³/lb_m) 70.7328Pa $1+W$ γ = ----- = 7.564996E-02 (lb_m/ft³)

7.546996E-2 $p =$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{$ 32.174

B.3 **ABSOLUTB** VISCOSITY

The absolute viscosity of air is assumed to be a function of the ambient temperature of the air only. Linearly inter-polate the following table to solve for absolute viscosity [4]:

B.4 TUNNEL SINGLE POINT MEASUREMENT FACTOR

The air velocity is not constant across the tunnel cross section. It varies with:

- The distance from the center of the cross section to the wall, being a maximum at the center and near-zero close to the wall.
- The average air velocity at the cross section.
- The additional turbulence caused by the close proximity of ^a train, ventilation shaft or portal upstream of the cross section.

This variation of the air velocity across the section is often called the velocity profile. The effect of a train, ventilation shaft or portal upstream can often persist for 200 feet. The single point measurement factor for the ventilation shaft is also influenced by its internal beams and struts. The effect of the average air velocity is such that the single point measurement factor varies from about 0.50 (slow, laminar flow) to about 0.98 (fast, fully developed, symmetrical turbulent flow).

Hence, the single point measurement factors must be determined for both directions of airflow for a wide range of air velocities, with and without a train or a ventilation shaft upstream.

The single point measurement factor is defined to be:

where:
\n
$$
\alpha = \frac{Q}{-1} - \frac{Q}{A V_{m}}
$$
\n
$$
Q = \sum_{i=1}^{i=n} a_{i} V_{i}
$$
\nTherefore,
\n
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{i=n} a_{i} V_{i}
$$

Eq.lO

Eq.S

 $Eq. 9$

B.5 FAN SHAFT SINGLE POINT MEASUREMENT FACTOR

 $\alpha = -$

 $\texttt{AV}_{\textbf{m}}$

The fan shaft single point measurement factor correlates a single point velocity measurement with the actual airflow through the shaft. This factor is computed by measuring the airflow at the tunnel legs where the subscripts 1,2,3, and 4 represent the tunnel legs, and 5 the fan shaft.

$$
Q_{tt} = (A_1V_1 + A_2V_2 + A_3V_3 + A_4V_4)
$$
 Eq. 11

and dividing this quantity by the single point velocity measurement in the shaft:

$$
\delta = \frac{Q_{tt}}{v_{m5}}
$$
 Eq. 12

but, since the areas of the tunnel legs are the same:

$$
\delta = \frac{A(V_1+V_2+V_3+V_4)}{-}
$$

$$
V_{m5}
$$
 Eq. 13

where:

B-7

B.6 AVERAGE TUNNEL VELOCITY

once the tunnel single point measurement factor is computed, the average tunnel velocity is calculated by multiplying the single point measurement factor, α , by a single point velocity measurement V_m . V_m must be measured at the same tunnel cross section location as that of the V_m when computing the single point measurement factor.

$$
V = \alpha V_m \hspace{1.5cm} Eq. 14
$$

B.7 FAN SHAFT AIRFLOW

The fan shaft airflow is calculated by multiplying the single point velocity measurement in the shaft by the fan shaft single point measurement factor

$$
Q_{\text{fs}} = \delta V_{\text{m5}} \qquad \qquad Eq. 15
$$

B.S AVBRAGB TRAVBRSB VBLOCITY

When traversing a cross section, the cross section is divided into n sub-sections. Each subsection will have a fan anemometer close to its center point. The average traverse velocity is calculated as follows:

$$
V_{\mathbf{t}} = -\frac{Q}{A}
$$
 Eq. 16

Where:

$$
Q = \sum_{i=1}^{i=n} a_i V_i
$$
 Eq. 17

Therefore,

B.9 REYNOLDS NUMBER

The Reynolds number is defined by the following equation:

$$
N_{Re} = \frac{\rho Vd}{60\mu} Eq.19
$$

B.10 FRICTION FACTOR

The tunnel pressure change caused by wall friction is defined by the equation:

$$
\Delta P = - \frac{\rho f L |V| V}{7200 \lambda d} \qquad \qquad Eq. 20
$$

Therefore,

$$
f = - \frac{7200\text{d} \Delta P}{\rho L|V|V}
$$
 Eq. 21

Extensive experiments have shown that the friction factor, f, is a function of the Reynolds number, N_{Re} , and the relative roughness, ε/d .

B.11 JET FAN MOUNTING HEAD LOSS COEFFICIENT

When performing the jet fan ventilation tests there will be some losses due to the blockage of the jet fan mounting devices in addition to the friction losses due to the tunnel wall. **These**

losses lead to the following pressure change equation when the jet fans are not running:

$$
\Delta P = -\frac{\rho f L |V_t| V_t}{7200 \lambda d} - \frac{N \rho C_d |V_t| V_t}{7200 \lambda}
$$
 Eq. 22

After doing some rearrangement of the variables and solving for c_d , Eq.22 becomes:

$$
C_{d} = -\frac{7200\lambda\Delta P}{N_{D}|V_{+}|V_{+}} - \frac{fL}{N_{C}} \qquad \text{Eq. 23}
$$

B.12 BARRIER HEAD LOSS COEFFICIENT

The general equation to calculate the pressure change along ^a duct due to minor losses is:

$$
\Delta P = -\frac{K \rho |V| V}{7200 \lambda}
$$
 Eq. 24

Idelchik [2] has shown experimentally that, for a rigid, thin barrier in a duct,

$$
K = (A(1+[(A-A_B)/(2A)]^{1/2} -1)/A_B)^2
$$
 Eq. 25

The direct application of this equation to the Washington Metro barriers is made difficult by the following:

- A_B cannot be precisely measured for a barrier
- A_B varies as a function of the airflow through the barrier.

The barrier tends to balloon out parachute-style. The opening through the center of the barrier may increase as the air-flow increases; on the other hand, the edges of the barrier may be

S-10

pressed more tightly against the tunnel wall thus effectively reducing A_B. Unfortunately, experimental data of this nature does not exist for the types of barriers that are contemplated for the Washington Metro. Therefore, K must experimentally be determined so that it can be accurately input into the design process.

Since the pressure differential will be measured for 100-foot tunnel section, it is necessary to include the losses caused by the tunnel wall friction. This leads to the pressure change equation:

$$
\Delta P = -\frac{K \rho |V|V}{7200\lambda} - \frac{\rho f L |V|V}{7200\lambda}
$$
 Eq. 26

Solving for K:

$$
K = -
$$

\n
$$
-
$$

\n
$$
T200\lambda\Delta P
$$

$$
FL
$$

\n
$$
-
$$

\n
$$
-
$$

\n
$$
Fq.27
$$

\n
$$
Pq.27
$$

Equation 25 can be used to provide data for the discussion of barrier performance as follows:

B-11

where A_B/A is the fraction the duct is blocked.

B.13 JET FAN PRESSURE EFFICIENCY

The thrust equation for a jet fan is derived from the linear momentum equation. Assuming a frictionless and incompressible fluid under steady-state conditions [5]:

$$
F = \frac{\rho Q_f (V_f - V_t)}{3600} = \lambda A \Delta P
$$
 Eq. 28

or:

$$
\Delta P = \begin{array}{c} \n \rho Q_f (V_f - V_L) \\ \n - \rho Q_f (V_f - V_L) \\ \n 3600 \lambda \n \end{array} \n \qquad \qquad Eq. 29
$$

But, since there are losses in the system, the pressure change is multiplied by a factor, *p,* to account for them. Hence, Eq. 29, ΔP theoretical, becomes:

$$
\Delta P = \frac{\beta \rho Q_f (V_f - V_t)}{3600 \lambda A}
$$
 Eq. 30

 β is defined to be the overall jet fan pressure efficiency:

$$
\beta = \frac{\Delta P_{actual}}{\Delta P_{theoretical}}
$$
 Eq. 31

There will be N jet fans in the tunnel, therefore:

$$
\Delta P = \begin{matrix} \beta \rho & i=N \\ -\text{-}\text{-}\text{-}\text{-}\text{-}\text{-}\text{-}\text{-}\text{-}\text{-}\text{-} & \Sigma \ Q_{\text{f}t} (V_{\text{f}t} - V_{\text{t}}) & \text{Eq. 32} \\ 3600 \lambda \lambda & i=1 \end{matrix}
$$

Eq.32 does not include the losses due to the tunnel friction and the jet fan mounting devices. Including these losses, Eq.32 becomes:

$$
\Delta P_{total} = \Delta P_{eff} + \Delta P_{cd} + \Delta P_{f}
$$
 Eq. 33

or:

 $\chi_{\rm F}$

$$
\Delta P = \begin{matrix} \beta \rho & i = N \\ -\gamma \Delta P & \Delta P \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \Sigma & \Sigma \\ \Sigma & \Sigma \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \
$$

72001 72001d Eq.34

where Va is derived as follows:

Solving Eq.34 for β gives:

$$
\rho NC_{d} |V_{a}|V_{a} \qquad \rho f L |V_{t}|V_{t}
$$
\n
$$
\Delta P + \frac{1}{200\lambda} + \frac{1}{200\
$$

 β is composed of other β s due to the entrance effect of the tunnel, the distance between the wall and the jet fan center

line, and the distance separating the jet fans. It is also influenced by the tunnel wall roughness.

B.14 COLEBROOK'S FRICTION FACTOR EQUATION

once the friction factor tests are completed, the measured friction factors need to be curve fitted to a smooth curve as presented in the Moody Chart for duct flow. The Moody Chart is ^plotted using the Colebrook's friction factor equation, Eq.36.

$$
\frac{1}{f^{1/2}} = -2.0 \log_{10} (\frac{\epsilon/d}{3.7} + \frac{2.51}{N_{\text{Re}} f^{1/2}}) \text{ Eq. 41}
$$

This equation is valid for computing the friction factor for NRe higher than 2000, or in other words, for turbulent flow.

B.15 LAMINAR FLOW FRICTION FACTOR

When the value of N_{Re} falls in between about 2000 and 4000, the flow may be either turbulent or laminar. For this circumstance Colebrook's equation can be used to estimate the friction factor since the flow is either very unstable laminar flow or turbulent. However, when the value of N_{Re} becomes lower than 2000, the flow is said to be a laminar. Theory predicts for laminar flow the friction factor given by the equation

$$
f = \frac{64}{N_{\text{Re}}}
$$
 Eq. 42

B.l6 OTHER JBT PAR PRBSSURB EQUATIONS

There have been several engineers who have performed experiments with jet fans and who have derived expressions to estimate the jet fan pressure. Among them are Meidinger [11] and Reale [10] who have presented technical papers in longitudinal ventilation of vehicle tunnels. Their equations to estimate the jet fan pressure are as follows:

Meidinger's equation,

$$
\Delta P = \beta \rho \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} \frac{(V_{fi})^2}{2} (-2\varphi (1-\Psi_i) + (-2\varphi \Psi_i - \Psi_i^2))
$$
 Eq. 43

Reale's equation,

$$
\Delta P = \beta \rho \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} \frac{(V_{fi})^2 2\varphi (1 - \Psi_i)^2}{2 (1 - \varphi)}
$$
 Eq. 44

Where for both of the above equations,

$$
\Psi_{l} = \frac{V_{t}}{V_{fi}}
$$

$$
\varphi = \frac{A_{f}}{-1} - \frac{E_{q.45}}{A}
$$

E_{q.46}

B.17 TUNNEL SINGLE POINT MEASUREMENT FACTOR TEST DATA REDUCTION

Compute the air density, ρ , as described in section B.2.

Compute the tunnel single point measurement factor as described in section B.4.

B. 18 FAN SHAFT SINGLE POINT MEASUREMENT FACTOR DATA REDUCTION

- Compute the air density, *p,* as described in section B.2.
- Compute the fan shaft single point measurement factor as described in section B.S.

B.19 TUNNEL WALL FRICTION FACTOR TEST DATA REDUCTION

- Compute the air density, *p,* as described in section B.2.
- Compute, by linearly interpolating, the absolute viscosity, μ , as described in section B.3.
- Compute the average tunnel velocity, V, as described in section B.6.
- Compute the Reynolds number, N_{Re} , as described in section B.9.
- Measure the pressure change along the tunnel section.
- Compute the friction factor as described in section B.lO.

B.20 JET FAN MOUNTING HEAD LOSS TEST DATA REDUCTION

- Compute the air density, *p,* as described in section B.2.
- Compute the average tunnel velocity, V, as described in section B.6.
- Measure the pressure change along the tunnel section.
- Compute the head loss coefficient, c_d , as described in section B.11.

B-16

B.21 JBT PAR TBST DATA REDUCTION ·

- Compute the air density, ρ , as described in section B.2.
- Compute the average tunnel air velocity, V, as described in section B.6.
- Measure the pressure change along the tunnel section.
- Compute the overall jet fan pressure efficiency, β , as described in section B.l3.

B.22 CIRCULAR OR RBCTABGULAR BARRIER TEST DATA REDUCTION

- Compute the air density, ρ , as described in section B.2.
- Compute the average tunnel air velocity, V, as described in section B.6.
- Measure the pressure change across the barrier.
- Compute the barrier head loss coefficient, K, as described in section B.l2.

B.23 DOUBLB TRACK TBST DATA REDUCTION

Traverse the air velocity across the tunnel and compute the average air velocity as described in section B.S.

B-17

 \sim

 $\bar{\gamma}$ w

res.

 $\begin{array}{c} \displaystyle \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right] \\ \displaystyle \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right] \end{array}$

 $\tilde{\chi}$

APPENDIX C

 ~ 100 matrix

and the state of the state of the

 $-$ 10 $\,$ ks $-$

 $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{p}}$

لنا لنا لنه لنا لنا لند لانا لنا لنا لنا لم

 $\sim 10^{-11}$

INVESTIGATION OF A POST-FLASHOVER COMPUTER MODEL TO ESTIMATE THE HEAT RELEASE RATE FOR A WMATA SUBWAY VEHICLE

Prepared by

Dr. Jonathan R. Barnett Center For Firesafety studies Worcester Polytechnic Institute Worcester, Massachusetts

Prepared for

Parsons Brinckerhoff/TEMA Alexandria, Virginia

April 2, 1991

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The control of fires in the transit industry *is* an area of great interest and concern. This report focuses on fires in subway cars. There have been two major approaches to limiting damage and controlling fires in subway cars. The first is by limiting the amount and nature of combustible materials used *in* subway car construction. The other is through the successful operation of the emergency ventilation system to provide a smoke-free passenger evacuation route in the tunnel and to assist fire-fighting activities. A key parameter in the design of such systems is the magnitude of a post-flashover subway car fire. Fire magnitude, in this case, would be measured in terms of peak heat release rate (Btu/hour) which, in turn, governs the subway emergency ventilation system design.

The computer model used in this study is a slightly modified version of the computer program COMPF2, developed by the Center for Fire Research, National Institute for Standards and Technology (formerly the National Bureau of Standards). COMPF2 is a fire model which predicts the conditions in ^a space during a fully involved fire scenario. A fully involved fire is a fire which has spread to all of the combustibles in a space; this is also known as a postflashover fire. This period of fire growth is of grea^t concern as it is during this post-flashover period when the fire poses the greatest threat beyond the compartment of origin. It is also during this regime when the fire presents the greatest challenge to the emergency ventilation system.

This study involved the use of COMPF2 to predict the peak heat release rate in a subway car fire involving one rail car. The physical characteristics of the Breda vehicle

 $c - i$

(ie., the basic dimensions of the car and the thermal properties of the walls and ceiling) were used for the program input. However, a complete version of the inventory of combustible materials was not available for the Breda car. Therefore, the combustible data of the Rohr vehicle was used.

A sensitivity analysis of the impact of key parameters on the heat release rate of the fire was performed. The key parameters which were studied were the size of the openings in the car, the average net heat of combustion of the combustibles and the percent of volatiles which were actually burned in the fire. The model was used so that, for a given set of input parameters, the value of the rate of burning of the combustibles was internally adjusted by the model to predict the highest possible temperatures in the car. This fire scenario was assumed to be reasonably conservative for design purposes.

Based on a combustible content of 59,247,000 Btu for the above-floor materials only, the following results were predicted by the COMPF2 program for an above-floor fire involving a single WMATA vehicle:

- o Assuming a 65 percent burning efficiency (percent of volatiles burned), a net heat of combustion of 9130 Btujlb, and all windows are open, a peak heat release rate of 34.3 million Btu/hr and a fire duration of 63 minutes were predicted.
- o Assuming a BPF of 65 percent, a net heat of combustion of 7420 Btu/lb, and all windows are open, a peak heat release rate of 27.3 million Btu/hr and a fire duration of 78 minutes were predicted.

c - ii
^oAssuming a BPF of 80 percent, a net heat of combustion of 7420 Btu/lb, and all windows are open, a peak heat release rate of 33.7 million Btu/hr and a fire duration of 78 minutes were predicted.

Use of the heat release rate of 33.7 million Btu/hr is suggested to account for the predictive accuracy of the COMPF2 program even though 27.3 million Btu/hr is the most probable value. As indicated above, the suggested value is based on the heat content of the above-floor combustibles for a single WMATA vehicle. Therefore, this value needs to be adjusted to account for the heat content of the vehicle components located at floor level and below floor level, potential multiple car involvement, and a suitable factor of safety.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General

The control of fires in the transit industry has been an important element of design since the beginning of transit systems. There have been two major approaches to the task. The first is to control fires by the use of less combustible materials combined with fire resistant construction. The second is to provide an emergency ventilation system. The emergency ventilation system is needed to control smoke, to provide a smoke-free evacuation route for subway passengers, and to assist the fire department in their suppression activities.

1.2 Pre-Flashover Fire Hazard

The control of fires in limiting combustible materials is a very difficult task. As new materials such as plastics and second generation composites are used in the design of subway cars, unexpected fire hazards may be introduced. These hazards can be predicted through the use of small scale tests to determine the material properties of the combustibles, combined with the use of sophisticated preflashover computer models such as FIRST {Mitler 1987) or the specialized model developed at WPI {Barnett 1989a) or the approach developed by Smith {1981) at Ohio State University.

An alternative approach is by the use of full-scale or reduced scale testing. Reduced scale testing may give misleading results due to the difficulty in modeling both radiation heat transfer and air flow rates concurrently. Full-scale testing is much more reliable, but can test only one configuration at a time. In addition, full-scale testing is extremely expensive, particularly if several configurations need to be analyzed. Despite this, fullscale tests have been extensively used in the past. Their use has been to evaluate the hazards of specific furnishing constructions and arrangements. Examples of this include the studies conducted by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (formerly the National Bureau of Standards), studies conducted for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) in the late 1970's (Custer 1989) and the studies conducted by Williamson (Williamson, Fisher and Zickerman 1979).

Finally, although the pre-flashover fire is of concern in terms of time available for egress and time to flashover, the fire is still in its incipient stage and poses only a minor threat to spaces beyond the compartment of origin. Of greater concern is the fire's post-flashover regime.

1.3 Post-Flashover Fire Hazard

As described in Section 2.1 of this report, the postflashover regime is where the fire poses the greatest threat beyond the compartment of origin. It is during this regime when the subway emergency ventilation system will be required to operate at peak capacity.

Predicting the post-flashover fire hazard is often an easier task than predicting the pre-flashover fire hazard as the fire is usually ventilation-controlled during the postflashover regime. As a result, it is possible to model the post-flashover fire based on the current state-of-the-art in computer-based fire modeling (Barnett 1989b). This is the approach that has been taken in this study. The computer model COMPF2 has been used to model a fire in a subway car.

2.0 BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF COMPARTMENT FIRES

2.1 Introduction To A Compartment Fire

A natural, or "real" compartment fire, such as that which may occur in a subway car, may be divided into two regimes; the pre-flashover period and the post-flashover period. During the pre-flashover period, the fire proceeds from ignition to localized burning of one "fuel package". Toxic gas production is usually sufficient to render the environment uninhabitable. If sufficient fuel and ventilation are present, the end of this period is marked by ^asudden jump in temperature and a change from localized burning to the burning of all of the combustibles in the compartment. This usually sudden event is called flashover. After flashover, the fire progresses into a stage called sustained burning, followed by a decay period when the fire slowly dies out. If there is inadequate ventilation or not enough fuel, flashover will not occur. In this case the fire will continue to burn locally until the fuel is exhausted or the fire is extinguished by manual suppression activities.

2.1.1 Post-Flashover Fires

The major portion of the post-flashover stage of compartment fire growth is the stage of sustained burning. This is one of the most important stages in a compartment fire's growth, as it is during this stage when a structure is threatened by the fire and when the fire is most likely to spread beyond the compartment of origin. In the case of a subway car, it is during this time when the fire's impact on the tunnel ventilation system is at its peak. During this period, all combustibles in the compartment have ignited and are contributing to the fire. Typically, the fire's growth is limited by the oxygen available for combustion; the fire is

ventilation-controlled. The buoyant plumes rising above each of the burning objects interact with each other resulting in very turbulent air flows throughout the compartment. The swirling and mixing of the hot combustion gases result in a relatively homogeneous mixture throughout the compartment, although there is some evidence that more combustion occurs near openings where a greater supply of oxygen exists than elsewhere in the room (Harmathy 1972). The post-flashover period of the fire growth continues until the fire starts to decay due to a decrease in fuel contributing to the fire. Normally, at least eighty percen^t of a compartment's fuel is consumed prior to the decay period. During the start of the decay period, the fire often changes from the realm of ventilation-controlled to fuel-controlled (a fuel-controlled fire is limited by the availability of fuel rather than oxygen).

2.2 Gereral Model of A Post-Flashover Fire

^Abasic post-flashover model consists of a compartment with an opening in a wall. Heat is generated by a fire in the compartment. Heat flows through the boundaries and the opening. Fresh air also flows into the compartment through the opening. The opening may be a door, a window, cracks in the boundaries or any other passage which will permit air flow. Although only one opening is discussed, the compartment could have several openings. The atmosphere in the compartment consists of well-stirred combustion gases combined with fresh air entering the room. There are no individual plumes, per se. Instead, the plumes from each burning object are immediately dissipated into the swirling hot gases in the room. The following discussion, although general in nature, will focus on the description of a postflashover model as implemented in the computer program COMPF2 (Babrauskas 1979) and modified for this study by Barnett.

A first law description of the post-flashover fire *is* as follows. The heat accumulated in the compartment *is* equal to the energy released by combustion of the fuel *is* ^a function of the type of fuel, its arrangement, shape, size and quantity. The heat losses from the compartment are equal to the net heat flow into the compartment's boundaries, the heat absorbed *in* gasification of the fuel, the convective heat loss due to gas flows through openings and the radiative heat loss through openings.

The heat accumulated *in* the compartment *is* that which *is* stored *in* the gas volume *in* the compartment. Because this *is* very small compared to the other terms, it *is* ignored *in* COMPF2.

2.2.1 The Combustion Model

During the post-flashover realm, the pyrolysis of the fuel proceeds at an almost constant rate. A reasonably complete model of the post-flashover combustion process *is* known only for liquid pool fires and experimental wooden crib fires. In general, the heat release rate of the fire *is* directly proportional to the burning rate (mass loss rate). For fuel-controlled fires, the burning rate *is* very difficult to determine. However, if a fire *is* ventilation-controlled, the burning rate *is* simply a function of the oxygen available for combustion. The oxygen available for combustion *is* equal to that in the compartment plus that entering the compartment through openings; the latter being the most important variable. The amount of air (oxygen) entering the compartment through a given opening is a function of the opening size, shape and location, as well as the pressure difference between the compartment and the adjoining space. This pressure difference *is* a function of the fire's buoyant driven air flows. In the case of subway

c - 5

car, this pressure difference is also a function of the pressure profile around the car caused by the tunnel ventilation system. However, this component has been estimated to be less than 0.2 in. wg, leading to the conclusion that the excess oxygen introduced by the tunnel ventilation system should not significantly increase the estimated heat release rate.

There are two basic methods available for predicting ventilation controlled burning rates. The first is based on the pioneering work by Kawagoe (1958), Babrauskas (1976), Pettersson et al (1976) and Harmathy (1972). They have suggested that for the ventilation-controlled regime, the burning rate may be modeled as a constant over time and as a function of the ventilation parameter. Kawagoe was the first to recognize that the ventilation parameter was a function of a constant, the product of the area of an opening times the square ·root of the height of the opening (Kawagoe 1958).

The theoretical basis for this relationship has been presented by Drysdale (1985) and is based on the following assumptions:

- 1. The compartment is modeled as a well-stirred combustion chamber.
- 2. The flow of hot gas in and out of the compartment is through one rectangular opening and is driven by buoyancy-induced forces with hot gas exiting above a neutral plane and cold air entering below.
- 3. There is no interaction between the hot gas flowing out and the cold air flowing into compartment.

4. Stoichiometric compartment. burninq occurs within the

In reality, ventilation-controlled burninq is more complex than suqqested by this model. Ventilation-controlled burninq is also a function of the heat losses throuqh the compartment's boundary (Pettersson et al., 1976). However, it has been shown that the maximum compartment fire qas temperature occurs when the fire is just barely ventilationcontrolled (Drysdale 1985). This may be intuitively expected as air in excess of that required for stoichiometric burninq merely cools the fire compartment. Insufficient air prevents the complete combustion of the volatiles inside the compartment. As a result, not as much enerqy is released inside the compartment as when adequate air is provided.

A second approach to modelinq the burning rate is to use a computer model such as COMPF2 to continually adjust the burninq rate durinq each simulation so as to produce the maximum temperature in the fire compartment. This is the same result as predicted by Drysdale because the maximum temperature occurs during stoichiometric burning.

2.3 Heat Loss Terms

Of the heat losses described in Section 2.2, the heat absorbed in gasification of the fuel is iqnored in COMPF2 because it is often included in the referenced heat of combustion. When this is not the case, the heat of combustion should be modified to include this term. The other terms are important and are accounted for in COMPF2: the heat flow into the boundaries, the heat loss due to radiation through the compartment's openings, and the heat loss due to radiation through the openings.

c - 7

2.3.1 Heat Flow Into the Boundary

The simplest model for the heat transfer into the compartment's boundary assumes that the boundary is adiabatic. Of course, this is a very conservative approach and will result in predicted compartment post-flashover temperatures in excess of actual temperatures.

A more realistic approach is to assume that each of the bounding surfaces (the walls, floor and ceiling) are constructed of the same homogeneous material, with realistic values of conductivity, specific heat and density. The heat transfer through the boundary is still a very complex problem. A relatively simple solution may be obtained if one assumes that the heat flow is one-dimensional, normal to the inner surface (the surface of the boundary exposed to the fire), and that the boundary's thermal properties are constant with temperature. This last assumption is often used because of the lack of data for thermal properties of boundary materials as a function of temperature.

The solution of the one-dimensional heat equation as done in COMPF2 requires values of wall emissivity and convection coefficients. The differential equations are then solved using the Crank-Nicolson method.

2.3.2 Other Heat Loss Terms

COMPF2 calculates the radiant heat loss through the compartment's openings by modeling the compartment as a black body having a uniform gas temperature. The convective heat loss term is determined based on use of the chemical composition of the hot gas to calculate the enthalpy of the efflux. The value of the specific heat of the fire gas is assumed to be a constant, equal to the specific heat for the primary product of combustion $(0.32 \text{ Btu/lb}_m^{\text{O}})$. This

 $C - 8$

a.

assumption should not significantly affect the accuracy of the program results given the impact of the other assumptions and the modeling limitations inherent to this study.

the company's product and

the common committee of the com-

 \mathcal{Z}

 $\langle \hat{\mathbf{r}} \rangle$

3.0 USE OF COMPF2 IN THE ANALYSIS OF A FIRE ON A WMATA SUBWAY VEHICLE

3.1 Introduction To COMPF2

The focus of this study is on the post-flashover regime of burning. As discussed, this is the time period when the maximum heat release rate is reached and when the peak capacity of the subway emergency ventilation system is needed. COMPF2 is a computer model developed to predict the course of a post-flashover compartment fire (Babrauskas 1976). It is the only post-flashover computer model in the public domain. COMPF2 has been validated by comparison with experimental data (Babrauskas 1977) as indicated in the results shown in Figure 3. Barnett (1989b) showed that COMPF2 could be used to give comparable results with other computer models. The physical basis for the model is discussed in Section 2 of this report. An excellent derivation of the physical basis of the post-flashover fire regime is contained in Drysdale (1985). Appendix A contains a technical description of the COMPF2 program, including the program source code.

3.2 Use Of COMPF2

Successful use of COMPF2 is predicated upon the use of appropriate input variables. The input variables may be divided into three basic categories: geometric parameters, heat transfer properties and fuel parameters.

3.2.1 Geometric Parameters and Modifications to COMPF2

Only the surface area available for heat loss is of importance in defining the basic size of the compartment. Because the computer model can account for only one opening, multiple openings must be lumped together in such a way that

the airflows through them will be correctly modeled as airflow through one opening. This is a trivial exercise if the multiple openings are at the same elevation and have the same height. Otherwise, techniques such as that recommended by Pettersson et al (1976) must be used. For the purposes of this study, all of the windows are located at the same elevation and have the same height. All doors were assumed closed. For most of the computer analyses, the windows were assumed open. The latter assumption is made because the expected post-flashover fire temperatures are greater than the melting temperature of the glazing material.

The basic vehicle geometry used in the study is listed in Table 3.1. The data came from WMATA drawings for the Breda vehicle (see Appendix B).

Table 3.1: Geometric Parameters: Input to COMPF2

3.2.2 Heat Transfer Properties

A major method of heat loss from the compartment is by conduction through the walls. Thermal properties are strongly dependent upon temperature. However, since the temperature-dependent thermal properties for the walls of a subway car are not known, fixed values were used in the model. Although the partitions, doors and ceiling are constructed of different materials, each with a different

 $C - 12$

thickness, only one value could be used in COMPF2. The values used were for a one-half-inch thick Rohacell. This was chosen as an area-weighted average representation of the vehicle boundary. The values are listed in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Heat Transfer Properties of Vehicle Boundaries: Input to COMPF2

3.2.3 Fuel Parameters

For purposes of this study, the input fuel parameters used may be divided into two categories: those which were used for all computer runs, and those varied as a part of a sensitivity analysis.

3.2.3.1 Constant Fuel Properties

The COMPF2 program is not able to model more than one burning item. Therefore, the choice of material properties must account for the many different types of fuels present. The fire-resistant plastics typically specified within vehicle procurement contracts only act to retard preflashover burning. After vehicle flashover, the fireresistant plastics exhibit material properties similar to those of a generic polycarbonate plastic. Since this study focuses on the post-flashover phase of burning, the material

c - 13

properties of a generic polycarbonate were used. The input parameters for the plastic fuel are listed in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Fuel Parameters: Input to COMPF2

3.2.3.2 Variable Fuel Properties

The area of the largest uncertainty in COMPF2 is the prediction of the rate of combustion of fuel. COMPF2 has several modes available for modeling a post-flashover fire's rate of burning. The program will predict the rate of burning for experimental wood cribs or for liquid pool fires. Alternatively, the user may specify the rate of burning as a function of time. Finally, the program has the ability to continuously adjust the rate of burning so as to produce the maximum fire temperature in the compartment. This option is the feature that has been used in this study.

The other parameters which have been varied are the maximum fraction of pyrolysates burned, the heat of combustion of the fuel, and the total weight of the fuel.

The maximum fraction of pyrolysates burned was varied from 50 percent to 80 percent. Experimental evidence has

 $C - 14$

suggested that a value of 65 percent is most reasonable (Barnett 1989b).

Another parameter which was varied was the net heat of combustion. This was varied from 7,420 to 17,100 Btu/lb. The former is as suggested by Raymond K.E. (1983), the latter value for polystyrene. A value of 9,130 Btu/lb was also used, but unlike the 7,420 Btu/lb value, it was derived by calculating a weighted average for fuels which had a heat \degree of combustion greater than 5,000 Btu/lb. Of these three values, the 7,420 Btu/lb value is considered to be the most realistic. The 9,130 Btu/lb value overestimates the heat of combustion but is considered to be a reasonable upper limit, and 17,100 Btu/lb is unrealistic for an average value. In all cases, the mass of the fuel was adjusted so that the total heat content of the fuel was 59,247,000 Btu. This is the heat content of the WMATA Rohr vehicle for interior combustibles above the floor level (see Appendix C). The Rohr combustible data was used because ^acomplete inventory of combustible materials was not available for the WMATA Breda vehicle. It should be noted that a burning efficiency less than 1 means the fire within the subway car does not consume the theoretical amount of energy contained in the fuel. The left over energy content is typically in the form of either a residue char within the vehicle or as soot/smoke particles within the combustion gas stream.

3.3 Accuracy Of COMPF2

COMPF2 has been validated by comparison with experimental data and gives comparable results with other computer models. The best estimate of model reliability is based on the use of the model in predicting room fire behavior. For that purpose, the model is expected to be within 25 percent of reality. It is possible to modify the program so that additional factors, such as the relative location and type

à.

of different boundary materials, are internally modeled within the program. However, the most suitable means for improving the level of confidence in the calculated COMPF2 results appears to be through full-scale testing.

 $C - 16$

 \sim

MECH

4.0 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

4.1 General

The following is a basic analysis of the computer runs that were conducted as part of this study. Computer runs were conducted where the key variables which were varied as part of a sensitivity study were the burned pyrolysates fraction (BPF) and the heat of combustion of the fuel. Appendix D contains the computer input data and corresponding results for seven of the analyzed cases.

In addition to these computer runs, varying the amount of ventilation was also studied. For these runs, ·the fraction of pyrolysates burned was set equal to 0.65 and the heat of combustion was set equal to 17,100 Btu/lb.

4.2 Varying BPF and the Heat of Combustion

Table 4 summarizes the result for the values of the heat energy output of the fire (Q_{fire}) , the corresponding gas temperature (Gas Temp.), influx air velocity (Airflow), and the fire duration as functions of the heat of combustion (H_c) and the BPF. These values are shown for the period of steady burning during the major portion of the postflashover period. The results show that as the heat of combustion increases, the fire duration decreases. This is because the total heat content of the fuel was held constant at 59,247,000 Btu by adjusting the fuel's mass for the different values of the heat of combustion.

Table 4.: Summary of the Effect of Varying The Burned Pyrolysates Fraction and The Heat of Combustion

Of particular interest is the value for the maximum heat release rate of the fire. Figure 4.1 shows the value of the maximum heat release rate as a function of the BPF for the three different values of the heat of combustion. It should be recognized that the maximum heat release rate is a function of the heat of combustion of the fuel, the BPF, and most importantly, the available oxygen which is a function of the opening size and shape. Also, the calculated heat release rate is internally adjusted within the COMPF2 program to result in the maximum fire gas temperature possible for the given set of conditions. This is the same as the case of stoichiometric combustion.

A heat release rate of about 27.3 MBtu/hr (corresponding to $H_C = 7,420$ Btu/lb and BPF = 0.65) is considered to be the "most probable" value. However, given the predictive accuracy of the COMPF2 program, the heat release rate based on a heat of combustion of $7,420$ Btu/lb and a BPF of 0.8 is suggested to provide a conservative design value. This corresponds to a heat release rate of 33.7 MBtu/hr.

4.3 Varying the Number of Openings

Nine computer simulations were conducted where the only variable was the size of the opening. This was meant to simulate different conditions in a subway car. In order to do this correctly, the wall/ceiling area had to be adjusted as well as the area-weighted heat transfer properties of the wall/ceiling. The maximum heat release rate occurred with the maximum opening size. Figure 4.2 illustrates the relation between the heat release rate versus an opening parameter which is equal to the area of the opening multiplied by the square root of the height. Figure 4.3 illustrates the increase in maximum subway car fire gas temperature as a function of the opening parameter.

Based on the above results, it has been reasoned that the design fire propagates within the vehicle interior in the following manner:

- Initially, there is a localized fire which impinges on two nearby windows, leading to failure of these windows.
- At this point, sufficient oxygen is introduced into the compartment to produce flashover of the vehicle interior, resulting in the failure of the remaining windows.

MECH

Maximum Heat Release Rate As A Function of the Opening Parameter

Figure 4.3:

 $C - 22$

Additional air is then introduced into the compartment. It is at this point where the peak heat release rate occurs, and the fire continues to burn at this peak rate until all of the interior combustibles have been consumed.

5.0 CONCLUSION

A heat release rate of 27.3 MBtu/hr is estimated based on the "most probable" combination of input parameters. However, given the predictive accuracy of the COMPF2 program, a heat release rate of 33.7 MBtu/hr is suggested. Since this value is based on the combustible content of the above-floor combustibles for a single WMATA vehicle, this needs to be adjusted to account for the heat content of the vehicle components located at floor level and below floor level, potential multiple car involvement, and a suitable factor of safety.

 $C - 24$

REFERENCES

- 1. Babrauskas, v. 1976. Fire Endurance in Buildings. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Fire Research Group. Report No. UCB FRG 76-16.
- 2. Babrauskas, v. 1976. COMPF2 A Program for Calculation Post-Flashover Fire Temperatures. Washington, D.C: National Bureau of Standards, Center for Fire Research. NBS Technical Note 991.
- 3. Barnett, Jonathan R. 1989a. An Improved Single Room Fire Model. Unpublished report. Worcester, MA: Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Center for Firesafety Studies.
- 4. Barnett, Jonathan R. 1989b. The Development of An Analytical Methodology For The Design of Steel Framed structures Exposed to Fires. Doctoral Dissertation. Worcester, MA: Worcester Polytechnic Institute.
- 5. Custer, Richard L.P. 1989. Personal communication.
- 6. Drysdale, D.O. 1985. An Introduction to Fire Dynamics. London: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- 7. Harmathy, T.Z. 1972. A New Look at Compartment Fires, Part 1. Fire Technology, 8, No. 3:196-217.
- 8. Harmathy, T.Z. 1972. A New Look at Compartment Fires, Part 2. Fire Technology, 8, No. 4:326-51.
- 9. Kawagoe, K. 1958. Fire Behavior in Rooms. Tokyo: Building Research Institute. Report No. 27.

c - 25

- 10. Mitler, Henri E. and Rockett, John A. 1987. User's Guide to FIRST, A Comprehensive Single-Room Fire Model. Washington D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, Center for Fire Research. NBSIR 87-3595.
- 11. Pettersson, o., Magnusson, S.E., and Thor, J. 1976. Fire Engineering Design of Structures. Lund: Swedish Institute of Steel Construction. Publication 50.
- 12. Raymond K.E. (1983). Assessment of Metrorail Ventilation System, Appendix B, Report No. 83-017-R-MD.
- 13. Smith, E.E. and Satija, s. 1981. "Release Rate Model for Developing Fires". Paper presented at the 20th Joint ASME/AIChE National Heat Transfer Conference.
- 14. Williamson, R., Fisher, F. and Kestler, J. 1979. "Final Peport of Full Scale Fire Tests of BART Materials". California: UCB Fire Test lab. Report No. 79-3.

 $\tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}$

Appendix A

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS TECHNICAL NOTE 991

COMPF2 - A PROGRAM FOR CALCULATING POST-FLASHOVER FIRE TEMPERATURES

LU LU LU LU LU LU LU ILI

 \sim \sim

i in

COMPF2--A Program for Calculating Post-Flashover Fire Temperatures

Vytenis Babrauskas

Center for Fire Research National Engineering Laboratory National Bureau of Standards Washington, D.C. 20234

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Juanita M. Kreps, Secretary Jordan J. Baruch, Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS. Ernest Ambler, Director Issued June 1979

-.

National Bureau of Standards Technical Note 991 Nat. Bur. Stand. (U.S.), Tech. Note 991, 76 pages (June 1979) CODEN: NBTi'\AE

> U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE WASHINGTON: 1979

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 Stock No. 003-003-02080-0 Price 53.50 (Add 25 percent additional for other than U.S. mailing).

ιİ

J,

医中国 医中国中国中国中国中国中国中国

l Page i ^v \cdots $\ddot{}$ \mathcal{A} , and an anti-section of the contract of the contrac iv v \mathcal{L} , ABSTRACT . • ~ 20 \sim $\begin{array}{ccc} \texttt{1} & & \end{array}$ 1 . INTRODUCTION 14 \sim \sim 1 2. HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT \sim \sim $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccc} \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega \end{array}$ 2 3. THEORY • . $\ddot{}$ \sim \sim $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ \mathbf{r} \sim \sim \sim 5 4. PYROLYSIS RATES \sim \mathcal{D} $\overline{\omega}$ ∞ \mathbb{Z} \mathbf{r} - Sept. $\overline{}$ 5 4.1 Liquid or Thermoplastic Pools and way $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$ $\tilde{\bullet}$ \sim $\ddot{}$ ¥ 6 7 \sim $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ \sim \sim ò. 7 7 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}$ 7 ω ω ä, ω ÷. α 8 $\ddot{}$ 8 $\ddot{}$ 8 ÷. 8 $\ddot{}$ 8 ÷. ÷. ÷. ÷. ÷ II. \cdot . $\ddot{}$ 8 $\overline{\omega}$ Ý. Ý. $\overline{\mathbf{r}}$. ģ. $-2 - 2$ $\tilde{\omega}$ $\tilde{\omega}$ \mathcal{A} 9 $\overline{}$ 9 \mathbf{r} × ÷. × Ŷ. × ÷, -2 崔 $\ddot{}$ 9 $\overline{}$ 9 $\ddot{}$ 9 $\ddot{}$ ú. $\ddot{}$ 9 TRIDGF **Service Communication Communication** \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim 9 6. AGREEMENT WITH EXPERIMENT 9 7. INPUT INSTRUCTIONS \sim \mathbf{r} \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim 9 \cdot \cdot \cdot \sim \sim $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$ \sim \sim 10 \sim 10 7.3 Modes of Program Operation \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim $\ddot{}$ \sim 100 \sim 100 \sim \sim $-$ 11 8. FILES USED a management of a contract of a contract of the state of the stat 9. IMPLE~NTATIO~ 12 $31 - 31 - 31 - 30 + 30 = 1$ 10. LIST OF VARIABLES 12 2010/11/18 ~ 10 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$ \sim × - 12 \sim 11. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS WERE EXERCISE A RESISTENCE 12 - 20 - 12 - 24 \mathcal{L} **Service** w $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{m}}$ 35 ×. 12. REFE~NCES . .. 12 20 $APPENDIX B$ -- PROGRAM LISTING $\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$ 38

TABLE OF CONTENTS

 \sim

 \overline{a}

 \sim 10 \sim

 $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ \sim

 \sim \sim ÷. \sim ÷. ÷

 $\mathcal{C}_{\bullet}^{\pm 1}$ o. i. \mathbf{z} \mathbf{z} ¥.

 \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot

ä, i an \sim \sim \sim ä, i. ω Ξ.

 $\ddot{}$ \rightarrow

CONTRACTOR

 \cdots

s. J. $\ddot{}$

the commer-

 $\widetilde{\omega}_1 \cdot \widetilde{\omega}_2 \cdot \widetilde{\omega}_1^{\pm} \cdot \widetilde{\omega}_2^{\pm} \cdot \widetilde{\omega}_2^{\pm}$

 \mathbf{u} ä, $\ddot{}$

ä,

2012/03/2012 00:3

the con- \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r} J.

 $\ddot{}$ \sim \sim $\overline{\mathbf{z}}$

Ã. z. $\overline{}$ D. - 23

any tran-

 \sim $\ddot{}$

 \bullet

 \ddots .

 $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\omega = \omega$

LIST OF TABLES

4.2 Solid Fuels ..• 5. DETAILS OF SUBROUTINES

> \sim \sim

- 500 - 52

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r})$ $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z})$

28 22 24

in 1999.

 \bullet

 \sim

 $COMPF2$

ä.

CRIB DEQNS ECHOID . . . ICONDS . . .

OUTPUT PFLFIX . . POOL \ddots pp •• PVTFIX . RPFIX = = STFLOW ..

 \sim 100 \pm

7.1 Deck Set-up . 7.2 Namelist VARS

 \sim

 \sim

APPENDIX A $--$ SAMPLE PROBLEMS \therefore \therefore \therefore

.INC

TLU

LIST OF FIGURES

5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.7 5.8 5. 9 5.10 5.11 5.12 5.13 5.14 5.15

NOMENCLATURE

iii

.
..

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

 \vdots Contractor

Analysis and the second

 $\bar{\nu}$

Į.

They

v

and in the short of the company of the company of the company of the company

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{M}}))\leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{M}}))\leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{M}}))\leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{M}}))\leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\$

COMPF2--A PROGRAM FOR CALCULATING POST-FLASHOVER FIRE TEMPERATURES

Vytenis Babrauskas

COMPF2 *is* a computer program for calculating the characteristics of a post-flashover fire in a single building compartment, based on fire-induced ventilation through a single door or window. It *is* intended both for performing design calculations and for the analysis of experimental burn data. Wood, thermoplastic, and liquid fuels can be treated. In addition to the capability of performing calculations for compartments with completely determined properties, routines are included for calculating fire behavior by an innovative variable abstraction method. A comprehensive output format is provided which gives gas temperatures, heat flow terms, and flow variables. The documentation includes input instructions, sample problems, and a listing of the program. The program is written in Fortran and constitutes an improved version of an earlier program, COMPF.

Key words: Computer programs--fire protection; fire protection; fire resistance; fire tests; fire walls; safety engineering--fires.

1. INTRODUCTION

With increasing efforts $[1-4]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ towards rational methods of providing fire endurance for structural building components, it becomes highly desirable for both the designer and the researcher to have available computer
programs for calculating expected fire temperatures and heat transfer through the building components. A fire is not considered as becoming a threat to a structure and its fire barriers until it reaches the flashover stage. Flashover of ^aroom is defined as that fire stage when the bulk of the room volume becomes involved in flames. Operationally, this roughly coincides with flames coming out the door or window, or an upper gas space temperature of around 600° C, or a radiant heat flux at floor level of about 20 kW/m². For the purpose of designing for fire endurance, then, only post-flashover fires are
considered. The present report describes a computer program for calculating the expected temperatures, heat and mass flows and other variables in post-flashover building fires. Different routines are incorporated for
producing design time-temperature curves and for permitting comparative
theoretical curves to be generated based on experimental mass loss rates.

2. HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT

The first computer program for calculating post-flashover fire temperatures was developed by Kawagoe [5], in conjunction with his pioneering studies
leading to a theoretical room fire model. This model was an adaptation of an earlier graphical technique. The main limitations of both the computer program

¹Nurnbers *in* brackets refer to the literature references listed at the end of this paper.
and the theoretical model was the restriction to ventilation-limited fires.
Fuel-limited fires could only be expressed in terms of an empirical temperature change rate. Magnusson and Thelandersson [6] studied heat release rates
in more detail and produced a model. An unpublished computer program was
used to implement that model. The normalized shape of the fire time-temp typical measurements. Based on Magnusson and Thelandersson's theory, Fedock
[7] published a similar computer program with emphasis on prestressed concrete
structures. The first program to provide for theoretically based ca of both ventilation-limited and fuel-limited burning was written by Tsuchiya [8]. It was restricted to fires starting in ventilation control and to fuel consisting of sparsely-packed wood sticks.

The predecessor to the present program, COMPF [9], was issued in 1975
and incorporated several new advances, including the ability to treat entirely fuel-limited fires, to allow for temperature-dependent wall properties, to
permit the optional use of numerical input fuel weight loss rates, and to
perform certain variable abstraction ("pessimization") calculations as an deterministically.) Program COMPF2 is intended to replace program COMPF and differs from it in the following main ways:

- 1. A subroutine has been added to allow treatment of fires where
thermoplastic or liquid fuel exists in the form of a pool on the Floor. The routine implements the theory discussed in reference [10]
and outlined in section 4.1; examples of calculations are also given
and discussed in that reference.
- 2. The deterministic wood fuel burning model has been extended to include the possibility of densely-packed cribs.
- 3. Both pool fire and densely-packed crib options have been incorporated into the pessimization routines.
- *A.* In addition to performing transient calculations, the program can now also treat steady-state solutions, for both lossy and adiabatic walls.
- ⁵ . The program is now in S.I. units throughout.
- ⁶ . Certain corrections and improvements have been incorporated in the calculation routines. The method for the iterative solution of the heat ^b alance equation has especially been improved.

3. THEORY

The post-flashover compartment fire theory has been given in some detail in reference [11], thus, only a brief summary will be given here. The main assumptions are:

- The compartment represents a well-stirred reactor, i.e., spatial temperature variations in the hot fire gases are ignored.
- The model is quasi-steady. Time variations in fuel release rate and in conduction losses are fully included. However, time rate of change terms in gas phase mass and energy balance are dropped.
- Air supply and gas outflow is through a single window in a vertical wall and *is* the result of fire-induced convection.
- The thermal discontinuity away from the window region is at a level below the bottom of the window. The volume below the discontinuity *is* occupied

MECH

by cold incoming air. In a flashed-over fire this discontinuity is close to the floor. Its exact location below the window bottom is immaterial (12).

- Burning is limited by rates of air or fuel supply rather than by gas ^phase chemical kinetics.
- Walls (including the ceiling) are modeled as portions of a homogeneous solid of finite thickness. Temperature-dependent material properties are allowed for.

The heat balance equation is:

$$
h_{C} - m_{f} (h_{T_{f}} - h_{298}) - Q_{w} - Q_{r} - Q_{ep} = 0
$$
 (1)

where h denotes enthalpy and the definition of symbols is given in the Nomenclature section. The subscripts on the enthalpy terms denote the temperature at which they are evaluated. The window radiation loss is, simply

$$
Q_{r} = A_{v} \sigma (T_{f}^{\mu} - T_{o}^{\mu})
$$
 (2)

The wall loss term has a radiative and a convective component,

$$
Q_{\mathbf{w}} = A_{\mathbf{w}} \left[\sigma \frac{1}{1/\epsilon_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} + 1/\epsilon_{\mathbf{w}} - 1} \left(T_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}^{\mathbf{u}} - T_{\mathbf{w}}^{\mathbf{u}} \right) + h \left(T_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} - T_{\mathbf{w}}^{\mathbf{u}} \right) \right]
$$
(3)

The convective coefficient h above is not well known since the exact flow conditions at the wall and ceiling surfaces in a post-flashover fire are not known in detail. The convective fraction is much less than the radiative fraction, permitting a rather simplified treatment. For turbulent-free convection flow over flat plates the value for h should depend [13) on $(T_{\varepsilon} - T_{\varepsilon})^{1/3}$. A value of

$$
h = 5.0 \left(T_f - T_w \right)^{1/3} \tag{4}
$$

(5)

was selected as being in reasonable agreement with data.

The analysis in [11] shows that for compartments greater than about 2 ^m on a side, a flame emissivity of $\epsilon_f=0.9$ may be used.

of The enthalpy evolved from combustion, h_c , must be evaluated as the lesser

 $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbf p}$ a $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf c}$ b $_{\mathbf p}$

or

control of the

$$
\frac{\hbar}{\hbar} \text{air} \quad \frac{\Delta h_c}{r} \quad \frac{b}{r} \tag{6}
$$

The value of \dot{m}_{air} is obtained from the Bernoulli equation at the window and is

$$
\dot{m}_{\text{air}} = \frac{2}{3} C_{d} \rho_{\text{o}} \left[2g \frac{1 - W_{f} T_{\text{o}} / W_{\text{o}} T_{f}}{[1 + (W_{\text{o}} T_{f} / W_{f} T_{\text{o}} [1 + (\dot{m}_{p} / \dot{m}_{\text{air}})]^{2})^{1/3}]^{3}} \right]^{k_{2}} A_{v} \sqrt{h}_{v}. \quad (7)
$$

The discharge coefficient has been determined by Prahl and Emmons [14]
to be 0.68 for normal-shaped windows. This value does not hold in cases
where the window takes up almost an entire wall. For such windows the flow
pat

$$
\dot{m}_{air} \approx (0.45 \text{ to } 0.50) \text{ A.}
$$
 / \bar{h}

But this approximation has not been employed here.

a~r

 $\overline{1}$

Ventilation through multiple openings has not been provided for in this program. An approach for treating such problems is given in [ll].

The heat of combustion, Δh_c , is taken as the net value since the hot gas material; a tabulation of values is given in [15]. outflow is above 100° C. The stoichiometric ratio, r, is a constant for a pure

A discussion of available values is given in the next section. The rate of pyrolysis, \dot{m}_p , is one of the hardest quantities to determine.

The outflow mass rate, m_f , is by mass conservation the sum of m_{air} and m_p . The enthalpy of the outflow products, h_{T-} and h_{gas} is evaluated on the assumption that the combusted fuel goes to CO_2^F and h_{298} is evaluated on the combusted fuel goes to CO_2^F and H_2^0 . No account is taken of CO for two reasons: because the effect on a mass basis would be very s

The excess pyrolysate term Q_{ep}, is the heat required to vaporize the
excess pyrolysates. Note that with the conventional definition of heat of
combustion, the loss for vaporization of combusted pyrolysates is already included in Δh_c .

The second major equation to be solved is for heat conduction through the wall.

4

(8)

l

l

l

l

MECH

$$
{}_{P}C_{p} \frac{{}^{3}T_{w}}{{}^{3}E} = \frac{3}{3x}(k \frac{{}^{3}T_{w}}{{}^{3}x}) + q^{111}
$$
 (9)

The wall is initially at ambient temperature, T_{0} , and is subjected to boundary conditions at the fire side of:

$$
-k \frac{\partial^{T} w}{\partial x} = h \left[T_{f} - T_{w}(0) \right] + \epsilon \sigma \left[T_{f}^{4} - T_{w}^{4}(0) \right]
$$
 (10)

and on the unexposed side $(x = L)$,

$$
-k\frac{\partial T_w}{\partial x} = h \left[T_w(L) - T_0 \right] + \epsilon \sigma \left[T_w^4(L) - T_0^4 \right] \tag{11}
$$

For the fire side the convective coefficient has been given above. For the unexposed side a value of

$$
h = 1.87 \quad [\text{T}_e = \text{T}_e, (L)]^{1/3} \tag{12}
$$

was taken.

4. PYROLYSIS RATES

4.1 Liquid or Thermoplastic Pools

There is currently only one fuel arrangement where the pyrolysis rate may adequately be predicted from theory. It consists of a pool of thermoplastic or liquid fuel on the floor. The fuel is pyrolyzed solely by radiant flux and "sees" the compartment with a view factor of 1.0 and itself with a view factor of zero. In addition, the fuel must pyrolyze at a known surface temperature, T_b , and with a known heat of pyrolysis, Δh_a . Then:

$$
\dot{m}_{\rm p} = A_{\rm f} \frac{\epsilon \sigma (T_{\rm f}^4 - T_{\rm b}^4)}{\Delta h_{\rm p}}
$$
 (13)

Tewarson and Pion [16] have measured heats of pyrolysis for numerous thermoplastic materials.

The above simple model is fully adequate for steady-state solutions. At the start of the fire, however, the radiation feedback is small from the hot gas volume but may be larger from the local plume above the pool itself. Thus, a plume term should be added in to model the starting transient. Very limited experimental data by Burgess [17] and *py* Modak [18] can be used to derive an empirical relationship for the plume pyrolysis rate as:

$$
\tilde{m} = A_{f} \quad 0.0014 \frac{\Delta h_{c}}{\Delta h_{p}} \quad (kg/s)
$$
 (14)

This relationship does not take into account differences in flame emissivities for various materials; as a result, it only provides a crude measure. In the present application, however, the contribution of this term is minor; therefore, an approximate expression is adequate. Also, as the room radiation increases, the effect of plume radiation on pyrolyzing the

÷

fuel decreases. For a radiatively black room, at high temperature, the plume
term should properly be negligible. This interaction is crudely modeled by
multiplying the plume term by a proportionality factor before adding t

$$
\chi = 1.0 - \frac{T_{\rm f}^4 - T_{\rm b}^4}{1700^4 - T_{\rm b}}
$$
 (15)

with $x \geq 0$.

4:2 Solid Fuels

Empirical data are available for the mass loss rates of wood planks in
flashed-over fires. Because of the nature of wood combustion, these rates are
not especially sensitive to room radiation and can be specified [11] usi dimensions, the burning yet of large, still widely dimensions, yet still widely spaced, the following expression is suitable:

 $\frac{F}{C}$ ($\frac{m}{M_0}$) $1-1/F$ (16)

Here M_{\odot} is the original mass, m is the mass at a given time, and F is a oconstant equal to 2 for cylinders or rectangular sticks and equal to 3 for spheres or cubes. C is given by

 $c = \frac{D}{2v_p}$

with D being the smallest fuel dimension and v_p the regression velocity. For

 $\rm v_p$ $1.7 \times 10^{-6} \text{ D}^{-0.6} \text{ (m/s)}$ (17)

The final arrangement for wood fuel for which data are available is a
crib, or a regular stacked array. From the data of Nilsson [19] and Yamashika
[20], a set of simplified relationships has been evolved for the three cri

Fuel Surface Control

 $\dot{m}_p = \frac{4}{D} v_p (\frac{m}{M_o})^{\frac{1}{2}} M_o$ (kg/s) (18) $v_p = 1.7 \times 10^{-6} \text{ p}^{-0.6}$

6

 $"$ "

j.

Crib Porositv Control

$$
\dot{m}_p = 4.4 \times 10^{-4} \left({S /}_{h_c} \right) \frac{M_o}{D}
$$

 $\mathsf{s}_{/_{\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{c}}}}$ ratio o£ stick clear spacing to crib height

Room Ventilation Control

m p

In calculations, each of the three rates above are determined and the lowest rate taken as governing.

5. DETAILS OF SUBROUTINES

The program routines are written in Fortran language. A complete listing is given in appendix B. The following are brief descriptions of the operation of each subroutine.

5.1 COMPF2

COMPF2 is the main program. It calls most of the calculational routines. A flow chart of COMPF2 is given in figure 1. The program starts with the
initialization of certain constants and default values. The input title and
namelist are then read in. If tabular data are specified, subroutine INC

5.2 CRIB

Subroutine CRIB calculates the burning of wood crib fires. A trial gas temperature value is assumed for the first time step. This value is preset, but may be overridden by specifying a value of TINPT. The flow quantities a balance is then determined. If the normalized residue is greater than 0.002, the iteration continues. The new temperature is normally determined by the Newton method. If divergence results, a scanning technique is used ini and a splitting of differences once a bounded oscillation results. After successful convergence a new wall temperature profile is established by calling RSTA. The calculation then proceeds to the next time step. Computation is terminated at the end of time MTIME, or when gas temperature drops to 353 K, or if errors or convergence failure *is* detected.

5.3 DEQNS

Subroutine DEQNS computes wall heat conduction using the Crank-Nicolson
method [21]. DEQNS has two entry points: DESOLV and RSTA. The radiation
boundary condition is linearized; updating every iteration rather than every boundary condition is linearized; iteration rather than every time step ensures minimal error. An additional within-loop iteration is also used. DEQNS calls TRIDG? to solve the equation matrix.

(19)

(20)

~

5.4 ECHOID

subroutine ECHOID echoes the input data. The complete data set is given give physical meaning for each run, rather than just the changed values. Care has been taken to
give physical meaning for the variables printed.

5.5 ICONDS

subroutine ICONDS initializes starting values and does some preliminary calculations on the input data. It also makes a few checks on the validity very rudimentary and in case of error exit or iteration failure the input be carefully examined. of the input data. The user, however, is cautioned that this checking is data must be carefully examined.

5.6 INC

Subroutine INC *is* called in when tabular input data are to be read.

5.7 OUTPUT

time step a large number of variables to output files (logical units) 2 and
3. The temperatures, burning rates and output files (logical units) 2 and Subroutine OUTPUT is the primary output routine. It writes at each File 2, while temperatures, burning rates, and other primary variables are put on
file 2, while the heat balance values and the mass fractions are written on file 2, while the heat balance values and the mass fractions are written on
file 3. OUTPUT also converts temperatures from Kelvin to degrees Celsius
before printing them out.

5.8 PFLFIX

calculated according to governing equations, but the ventilation is pessimized PFLFIX is a pessimization design routine. Fuel pyrolysis rate is by instantaneously adjusting the window width to give the highest possible by instantaneously adjusting the window width to give the highest possible in which case a pool fire is used. The window width is not allowed to exceed temperatures. Wood stick or wood crib fuel is assumed unless PLFUEL=T, specified a maximum, as set by AWDOW/HWDOW. Calculations stop when the fuel, as specified by FLOAD, is exhausted, since the window width would be undefined
beyond that point. Calculational procedures are similar to those in CRIB.

5.9 POOL

POOL is a pool fire burning routine. Computational details are similar Three to those as in CRIB. The pyrolysis rate is based on equations 13, 14, and ¹⁵ . modes of Three modes of subroutine operation are possible. If STOICH=T, the steady-
state temperatures and pool area are determined. If STOICH=T, the steadystate temperatures and pool area are determined for stoichiometric burning.
If EISCAN=T, the steady-state solution is found for a given pool area greater than stoichiometric.
defined as [10] ichiometric. The pool area is specified by use of the parameter EITA,
as [10]

(21)

solutions are possible for n>l. Finally, a transient calculation can be made, For constant window size, this becomes simply a ratio of pool areas. No which proceeds similarly as in the other transient calculations. The user must make sure that the pool size given is sufficiently large so that $n \leq l$.

I

5.10 pp

subroutine pp is ^aplotting routine. Details are not given since plotting routines are dependent on the hardware used.

5.11 PVTFIX

PVTFIX is a pessimization routine, and is effectively the inverse of PFLFIX. In PVTFIX a fixed ventilation opening is specified. The fuel release rate is instantaneously varied to always result in the highest possible burning temperature. Temperatures drop after the fuel load is consumed. Computational details are similar to those in PFLFIX.

5.12 RPFIX

For comparison of measured data against numerical predictions a routine is needed which can accept \bar{m} rates as an input tabular function of time. RPFIX provides for this type^rof checking calculation. The case of measured combustion rate input (as provided, for instance, by oxygen depletion measurements *in* the window outflow) can also be treated by dividing the measured rate by Δh_c (net) and setting $b_p = 1.0$.

5.13 STFLOW

Subroutine STFLOW is a wall heat conduction routine. It is similar to DEQNS, except that only the steady-state temperatures are determined.

5.14 TLU

Function TLU is a tabular data interpolating function used in several subroutines. If the independent variable entered is smaller than the smallest data point or larger than the largest data point, the output is set equal to the smallest, or largest dependent value, respectively.

5.15 TRIDGF

Subroutine TRIDGF uses a Gauss elimination procedure to solve a set of tri-diagonal matrix equations.

6. AGREEMENT WITH EXPERIMENT

A comparison of numerical predictions with experimental results has been given in [22] for the program COMPF. Similar agreement should hold for COMPF2, since·COMPF2 is improved mainly in operational features, especially increased versatility, while retaining the same theoretical model as in COMPF. For poo^l fires useable full-scale experimental data are not available.

7 . INPUT INSTRUCTIONS

7.1 Deck Set-up

The input *is* assigned to file 1. Each problem run consists of two or three card groups, as follows:

- 1. Title card (20A4). One card only. Card must be present. The identifying information from the title card is printed at the head of the output.
- 2 . Namelist card(s). One or more cards. Details are given in the next section.

Ensuing card(s): These are in the format (8F10.0) and arranged in
pairs (independent, dependent). For wall thermal properties, tempera-
ture is the independent variable, while for mass pyrolysis rate it is
time. The order

MECH 1841

Table 1 lists all the variables inputted in namelist VARS.

on file 5 may be useful in determining input errors.

7.3 Modes of Program Operation

3. Tabular input (optional). This input group is contained only for
the first run and for those ensuing runs where NEWPRP=T. If no
tabular input is present, then blank cards must not be inserted. If

points for the wall thermal conductivity, wall heat capacity, wall First card: NCN, NCP, NEM, NR, NQG (1013). These are the number of
points for the wall thermal conductivity, well begin

emissivity, mass pyrolysis rate, and wall heat generation rate,
respectively. The number of points may be 0, 1, or greater than 1.
If N=0, then the previous run value is unchanged. If N=1, then it
is assumed the value is a

After cards for one run are finished, the cards for the next one are

• Variables needed, but not specified in current run are automatically set equal to the prior given value.

The namelist card(s) must contain the following information: the first
card must start with \$VARS in columns 2-6, then a space, then the desired
values, separated by commas. Input may be continued on continuation cards,
ea

The user is cautioned to check the input carefully, since namelist format provides for only rudimentary error messages. The namelist VARS values are written to file 5 when read in. In normal operation file 5 can
be rewound or discarded. If error failures be rewound or discarded. If error failures occur, however, the VARS listing
on file 5 may be useful in determining input errors.

7.2 Namelist VARS For all non-tabular data, the namelist format was adopted. This undeservedly obscure Fortran feature is highly advantageous for the present
application. Its features include:

tabular input is present, it is arranged as follows:

time. If $N \geq 1$, then an array is inputted.

stacked, again with no blank cards.

• Semi free-format input

• Variables may be in any order

• Unneeded variable values need not be specified

Time

Three possibilities are available: complete time-temperature curve
calculation, calculation of steady-state temperature for a given wall, or the
calculation of a steady-state temperature for adiabatic walls. To select
adia

10

recommendation of the comment of the comment

set STEADY=TRUE. To obtain complete time-temperature curve, set ADIA and STEADY both FALSE. Note that for some fuel pyrolysis conditions below not all three possibilities are available. Fuel Pvrolysis The following modes of operations are available: l) Pool fire Set PLFUEL=TRUE. a = . Time-temperature curve. for given ventilation and pool area. Specify SIZE. Set STOICH and EISCAN both FALSE. b. Burning conditions at steady state for stoichiometric pool size, that is, determine values for EITA=l. Set STOICH=TRUE. Do not input SIZE. Do not set EISCAN=TRUE. c_{\star} c. Burning conditions for any other EITA. Set EISCAN=TRUE. Specify EITA. This option must be preceded by the stoichiometric problem (option lb, above). SIZE input is not used; if given, the value is disregarded. 2) Wood crib fire. This is the default option. Set FLSPEC, PLFUEL, RPSPEC, and VTSPEC all FALSE. a . Simple stick burning. Must specify a value for REGRES greater than zero. b . Nilsson's crib formulas for crib burning in three possible regimes. Specify REGRES=O. (default). Also specify SH. 3) Checking option when tabular input pyrolysis rates are given. Set RPSPEC=TRUE. Also must set NEWPRP=TRUE and give an appropriate array of RPX. 4) Pessimization over ventilation. Set FLSPEC=TRUE. Window width is automatically adjusted, but is no greater than determined by the inputted value of AWDOW/HWDOW. Program stops when fuel is exhausted. a . Simple stick burning. Must specify a value for REGRES greater than zero and set PLFUEL=FALSE. b . Nilsson's crib formulas for crib burning in three possible regimes. Set PFLUEL=FALSE and REGRES=O. Also specify SH. c . Pool burning. Set PLFUEL=TRUE. 5) Pessimization over fuel pyrolysis rate. Set VTSPEC=TRUE. Fuel pyrolysis rate is automatically adjusted for pessimal burning conditions. 8. FILES USED The Fortran file logical units must be declared as follows: File $1 -$ Input
File $2 -$ Output (echoed input and main calculated variables) File 2 -- Output (echoed input and main calculated variables)
File 3 -- Output (heat balance and mass fractions) File 4 -- Output (intermediate tracing output - used only if KTRACE=l)
File 5 -- Output (listing of namelist VARS contents). 11

Ę $-3.3 - 2.4$

医学学家医学家医学

 $\label{eq:1} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right)$ F

File 5 can be arranged to be rewound after each problem so that it will contain data only in case of error failure.

9. IMPLEMENTATION

Program COMPF2 has been successfully implemented on a UNIVAC 1108 computer
The predecessor program, COMPF, was run on a CDC 6400 computer. The program
uses, as much as possible, only standard Fortran expressions. Minor una usage.

10. LIST OF VARIABLES

Table 2 gives a list of all the major problem variables.

 $\label{eq:1} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}_i} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}_i \mathcal{L}_i} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}_$

11. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Ulf Wickstrom (Lund Institute of Technology) assisted in.program development; Richard Peacock (NBS) helped implement the program.

12. REFERENCES

- [1] Pettersson, O., Magnusson, S-E., and Thor, J., Fire Engineering Design of Steel Structures (Publication 50), Stålbygnadsinstitutet, Stockholm (1976).
- [2] .[Law, M.], Design Guide for Fire Safety of Bare Exterior Structural Steel, prepared for American Iron and Steel Institute by Ove Arup and Partners, London (1977).
- [3] Centre Scientifique et Technique du Batiment, The Behavior of Concrete Structures in Fire -- A Method for Prediction by Calculation, Nat. Bur.
Stand. (U.S.), Tech. Note 710-10 (1978), translation from French.
- $[4]$ Centre Technique Industriel de la Construction Métallique, Méthode du
Prévision par le Calcul du Comportement au Feu des Structures en Acier,
Construction Métallique, No. 4 (1976).
- [5] Kawagoe, K., Estimation of Fire Temperature Time Curve in Rooms (Research Paper 29), Building Research Institute, Tokyo (1967).
- [6] Magnusson, S-E., and Thelandersson, S., Time-Temperature Curves of Complete Process of Fire Development, Acta Polytechnica Scandinavica (Civil Engineering and Building Construction Series), No. 65 (1970).
- [7] Fedock, J. J., Combustion Gas Temperatures in Prestressed Concrete Apartment Fires, M.S. Thesis, University of Colorado, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering (1973).
- [8] Tsuchiya, Y., Computer Program for the Behavior of Fire in an Enclosure (CP 32), National Research Council, Division of Building Research, Ottawa (1972).
- [9] Babrauskas, V., COMPF, A Program for Calculating Post-Flashover Fire Temperatures (Report UCB FRG 75-2), Fire Research Grouo, University of California, Berkeley (1975). -
- [10] Babrauskas, V., and Wickstrom, U. G., Thermoplastic Pool Compartment Fires, Combustion and Flame, 34 , 195-202 (1979).

 \sim , \sim

l3

ŝ

Market

g

li
I

 \Box

 $\overline{\Box}$

 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$

 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$

 \Box

 \Box

 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$

 \overline{a}

 $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$

D

Table 1. Variables ·specified in the input Namelist VARS

÷.

14

 $pv = previous value$

ш.

أساجدها

 $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{2} \left(\frac$

ra de la propriéta de la propr

 \cdot

 \mathcal{L}_{in} . The construction of the c

T

E)

CONTRACTOR AND STATE AND STATE OF A STATE OF

Marine

Davids

REM

District

REAL

TANK

THE R

REAL

--

Table 2. (continued)

IPG IRUN IX IXC IXL J JM JPRINT in the state of the state \mathbb{K} I KD ¹KITER KNTRL KTRACE MTIME MtHN MWOUT MWPYR N NCND NCPW NEMS NEWPLT NEWPRP NFLPC NQGEN NRP 0 OFLPC OPENF PLFUEL PLOT PNCH PRNT **OCONW** QFIRE QFLOW OFUEL QGEN
ORADO ORADO
I QFLOW
QFUEL **OGEN** *⁷*QRADO QRADW QWLSUM R RO RC **REGRES** RMA RMF RP RPSPEC RPX **SCAN** SH SHAPE SIGMA SIZE SIZEl page number run number number of wall slices number of middle slice number of penultimate slice number of current time step maximum number of time steps output to be printed every JPRINT time steps number of trial iterations at any given time step number of iterations to converge differential equation equals 0 for normal operation, equals 1 for convergence failure parameter indicating exit status print intermediate tracing output if KTRACE-1 maximum time for fire simulation (s) molecular weight of amhient air (g/g-mole) molecular weight of exhaust gases (g/g-mole) molecular weight of pyrolysis gases (g/g-mole) moles of nitrogen in fuel (mole/kg fuel) number of points in CNDA table number of points in CPW table number of points in EMSA table true if start new plot frame (not overlay previous one) true if read in new set of tabular data percent of nitrogen, by weight, in fuel number of points in QGEN table number of points in RPX table moles of oxygen *in* fuel (mole/kg fuel) percent of oxygen by weight, in fuel opening factor ration $(m^2 \cdot ?)$ true if pool fire configuration true if plot time-temperature curve true if punch time-temperature curve number of times per second output is to be printed heat transfered to walls by convection (W) heat generated by combustion (W) net flow enthalpy (exhaust minus inflow) (W) heat lost in heating up unburned fuel fraction (W) wall heat generation, as a function of temp (W/\mathfrak{m}^3) heat radiated out the window (W) new flow enthalpy (exhaust minus inflow) (W) heat lost in heating up unburned fuel fraction (W) wall heat generation, as a function of temp (W/m^3) heat radiated out the window (W) heat transfered to walls by radiation (W) total heat removed from compartment and passing into the walls (J) stoichiometric air/fuel mass ratio stoichiometric oxygen/fuel mass ratio rate of burning (kg/s) rate of fuel surface regression (m/s) mass inflow rate df air (kg/s) mass outflow rate of hot gases (kg/s) rate of pyrolysis (kg/s) true if rate of pyrolysis is prescribed as input rate of pyrolysis, as a function of time (kg/s)
true if search for solution by scanning temperatures ratio of clear spacing between sticks to crib height contant indicating shape of fuel sticks Stefan-Boltzmann constant (W/m^2-K^4) thickness of crib sticks (m) area of pool (m^2) pool area for EITA=1 condition $(m²)$

17

CONTRACTOR

Í,

Service of Company

f,

ă. i

Å

w

ŗ \Box \Box

Table 2. (continued)

START Ţ RESET
COUNTERS \downarrow **READ**
INPUT ł NEWPL' PLTRST NEWPRE 7 INC ⇁ **ICONDS** ¥ $\left\langle \kappa$ rren= 了 ECHOID RPSPE ļ ŗ RPFIX FLSPEC ļ 户 PFLFIX VTSPEC ↴ PVTFIX PLFUEL.AND.
NOT.FLSPEC POOL $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ ↓ CRIB \bigstar ä KNTRL ٢í٠ KTRACE=1 PLOT KTRACE=1 订 DOUT

 $-$

19 ö.

Partner White

and was seen and

 $G = 1.4275$

APPENDIX A -- SAMPLE PROBLEMS

Given below is a set of ten concatenated input problems. Each problem is intended to test out a subroutine or other feature of the program. The output for the problems is given following the input.

TEST PROGRAM FOR POOL FIRE. STEADY STATE. EITA=1.0 svars Afloor=20..awall=80..awdow=4..aPF=0.7.CD=0.68.CFLPC=85.7. .
CVGROS=46.5E6.DENSW=790..DHP=2.4E6.EITA=1.0.FLDAD=20..HFLPC=14.3. HWDOW=1.5.0FLPC=0.0.PLFUEL=T.STOICH=T.TBOILC=390. THICKW=0.038.WFLPC=0.0\$ 001000001 $0 - 17$ $0 \bullet 5$ TEST PROGRAM FOR POOL FIRE, STEADY STATE, EITA=0.01 \$VARS EISCAN=T+EITA=0.01.PLFUEL=T\$ TEST PROGRAM WITH DELIBERATE ERROR TO CHECK KTRACE OPERATION SVARS EISCAN=T, PLFUEL=T, TBOILC=2000.5 TEST PROGRAM FOR POOL FIRE, TRANSIENT CASE, SIZE=7.5 M2 SVARS DTIME=60. MTIME=3600. NEWPRP=T, PLFUEL=T, PRNT=60..SIZE=7.5. TB0ILC=390.5 000001 840. TEST PROGRAM FOR WOOD CRIB FIRE, REGRES SPECIFIED svars CFLPC=44e4.CVGROS=18e8E6.FLDAD=10e0.HFLPC=5e4.OFLPC=38.2. REGRES=1.5E-5.SHAPE=2.0.SIZE=0.05.WFLPC=12.0\$ TEST PROGRAM 1 FOR WOOD CRIB FIRE, NILSSON'S FORMULAS \$VARS REGRES=0.0.SH=0.10\$ TEST PROGRAM 2 FOR WOOD CRIB FIRE, NILSSON'S FORMULAS \$VARS FLOAD=20., SH=0.20\$ TEST PROGRAM FOR PYTFIX ROUTINE, VARIABLE WALL PROPERTIES SVARS NEWPRP=T.VTSPEC=TS 004008 $273 0 - 21$ $372.$ 0.21 . $373.$ $0 - 16$ 1073. $0 - 26$ $273.$ 1090. $372.$ 1090. $373.$ 47300. $383 -$ 47300. $384 5000 413.$ $5000 414.$ 840. TEST PROGRAM FOR-PFLFIX ROUTINE, POOL OPTION $1073.$ 840. svars awdow=10..CFLPC=85.7.CVGRDS=46.5E6.FLSPEC=T.HFLPC=14.3.NEWPRP=T. OFLPC=0.0.PLFUEL=T.SIZE=5.0.WFLPC=0.0\$ 001001 0.17 $840.$ TEST PROGRAM FOR RPFIX ROUTINE \$VARS MTIME=1903..NEWPRP=T,RPSPEC=T\$ <u>ovagoogoogos</u> $0 - 0$ $0 - 12$ $120 0 - 12$ $121 0 - 25$

20

provided and the

1854

−.

 \mathcal{L} . The construction of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}))$

GECHETRY AND VENTILATION

TEST PROGRAM WITH DELIBERATE ERFOR TO CHECK KTRACE OPERATION

**WALL SURFACE AREA = 80.0 M2
FLOOR AREA = 20.00 M2
WINDOW MEIGHT = 1.550 M
OPENING FACTOR = 4.000 M2.5
OISCHARGE COEFF.** 4.609 M2.5

-FUEL LOAD PROPERTIES

FIRE LOAD PER FLOOR AREA = 20.0 KG/H2 ·
TOTAL ENTHALPY OF PYROLYSIS= 2.40+06 J/KG
BOILING TEMPERATURE=2000. DEG C

**SOLLING ISPERION - SECOND TO THE SECOND AND SECOND ASSESSMENT OF A SAMPLE CONSIDER A SAMPLE OF A SAMPLE CONSIDER *

COMPEZ VERSION 1.1 - RUN NO. 3

 $\label{eq:1} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \, d\mu \right) \, d\mu$

WALL TENPS $rac{71ME}{S}$ TENP
GAS.C ϵ -ITERATION FAILURE

---- WALL THERMAL PROPERTIES---THICKNESS = .038 M
DENSITY = 790. KG/M3

THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY = +170 W/M-K

1890.00 **TGAS***

EMISSIVITY = .50

TGAS.LT.TBOIL TGAS= 1890.0 GD TD NEXT CASE

 \mathcal{Q}

THERMOPLASTIC POOL FIRE

 $\overline{}$ RUN NO. яc OFIRE $\mathsf{F}\,1$ $F2$ DERIVI K KD KH \mathbf{J} $T2(1)$ TSF **OFLOW ORADW** RР TGAS1 TGAS2 $\begin{array}{cccc} & 1 & 3 & 0 \\ & 2 & 3 & 0 \\ & 3 & 3 & 0 \end{array}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $1730.86 \quad 1791.43 \quad 4.028+05 - 1.009+08 \quad 4.052*05-59.938$
1740.49 1801.51 2.891+04 -1.008+08 4.083+05-59.068
1827.13 1892.16 2.405+03 -9.183+07 4.363+05-50.558 $.009$ 1800-00 -001 1900-00 1800.00 $.000$ 1810.00

RP FC EXC.PYR. FUEL
KG/S KG/S KG/S PCT

AIR IN

$N_{\rm H}P_{\rm H}$ VELOCITY MOL.HT FUEL
CNTRL

RUN NO.

PAGE NO. 1

 M/S

いんじょう いっという いっと こくじょう アイディー・ディー・ディー・ディー・ディー・ディー・ディー・アール

● 「このことです」の記号で、「SES」では、「SES」で、「SES」をいうことになるので、「SES」を読みているので、「SES」となっているようなものです。 しゅうしょう

TEST PROGRAM FOR POOL FIRE, TRANSIENT CASE, SIZE=7.5 M2

----GEOMETRY AND VENTILATION----

WALL SURFACE AREA = 80.0 M2 $FLOOR AREA = 20.00 M2$ WINDOW HEIGHT = $1.50 M$ $AREA =$ 4.00 M2 OPENING FACTOR = $4.899 M2.5$ DISCHARGE CDEFF.= .68

----FUEL LOAD PROPERTIES-

FIRE LOAD PER FLOOR AREA = 20.0 KG/M2 TOTAL ENTHALPY OF PYROLYSIS= 2.40+06 J/KG
BOILING TEMPERATURE= 390. DEG C

FUEL COMPOSITION CARBON = 85.7 PERCENT BY WEIGHT HYDROGEN = 14.3 PERCENT DXYGEN = .0 PERCENT NITROGEN = .0 PERCENT $WATER =$.0 PERCENT $R = 14.78$ $RO = 3.43$ HEAT OF COMBUSTION OF DRY FUEL = 46.50+06 J/KG
LOWER ACTUAL HEAT OF COMBUSTION = 43.36+06 J/KG MOLECULAR WEIGHT OF UNBURNT PYROLYSATES = 28.97 CP OF PYROLYSIS GAS = $(.1127*TGAS + 1010.)$ J/KG-K MAXIMUM FRACTION OF PYROLYSATES BURNED = .70 GREY-GAS FLAME EMISSIVITY = .900 $FUEL AREA =$ 7.50 M2

---- WALL THERMAL PROPERTIES----

THICKNESS = .038 M DENSITY = 790. KG/M3

THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY = .170 W/M-K

HEAT CAPACITY = 840. J/KG-K

EMISSIVITY = $.50$

н

RESERVE

ľ

医深

THE

RANGE

SANTA

B

TERRA

ters

医皮肤

Make

REGIST

REGAR

President

Regist

 \sim

靏

٠

ä,

÷

ł,

ROSSON ROO

PAGE NO. $\overline{1}$ RUN NO-

THERMOPLASTIC POOL FIRE

¥

HEAT BALANCE Q-WALL
SUM YOZ
PCT TIME TNZ
PCT $rcaz$ **YH20 YPYR** WALL RAD $Q-FIRE$ GAS FLOW **FALL CNV** PCT PCT PCT PCT PCT PCT $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ ω MASS MASS HASS HASS MASS 5.222
 7.174
 7.950 11.092
4.559
3.297
2.523 28.910
22.952
20.091
17.707 $4.694+06$
 $4.582+06$
 $4.543+06$
 $4.514+06$ 1.127+08
1.883+08
2.520+08
3.068+08 $.376$
 $.099$
 $.107$ 44.886
51.859
54.089 $.060$
 $.058$
 $.058$ 679ء
663ء
657ء $.131$
 $.128$
 $.127$
 $.126$.054 $60 - 120 -$ - 052
- 052 $180 - 240 - 300 - 5$ $.357$
 $.057$
 $.057$
 $.057$ $\begin{array}{r} 4-514+06\\ 4-496+06\\ 4-481+06\\ 4-461+06\\ 4-453+06\\ 4-437+06\\ 4-437+06\\ 4-437+06\\ 4-429+06\\ 4-429+06\\ 4-420+06\\ 4-420+06\\ 0-1000\\ 0\end{array}$ 55.726 8.546 -652 $.052$ $.113$ 8,546

9.250

9.486

9.681

9.340

9.978

10.297

10.294 55.787
56.787
57.586
58.196 16.397
 14.794
 13.785
 12.954 -126
 -125
 -125
 -125 $.051$
 $.051$
 $.051$ -116
 -119
 -122 $2 - 091$ $2.559+08$ 1.787
 1.574
 1.411 $4.005+08$
 $4.417+08$
 $4.601+08$
 $5.163+08$ 360. $420.$ 58.693 $.057$ $.125$ $.051$ $.124$ $480.$ 59.095 $1 - 283$ 12.252 $.356$ -124 -051 -125 59.095
 59.440
 59.737
 59.996
 60.224
 60.427
 60.927
 60.927
 60.9776 $.056$
 $.056$
 $.056$ $+124$
 $+124$
 $+124$
 $+124$ $.051$
 $.051$
 $.051$ -126
 -128
 -129 $540.$
600- $1 - 180$ 11.659 $5 - 505 + 08$ 11.659
 11.144
 10.290
 10.290
 9.929
 9.604
 9.305
 9.037
 $= 0.270$ $1 - 094$
 $1 - 022$
 -960
 -907 $5.832 + 08$
 $6.143 + 08$
 $6.443 + 08$
 $6.731 + 08$ $660 - 720 -$ 10-201
10-376
10-376
10-518
10-560
1-743 $.056$
 $.056$ -124 $.051$.130 $780 - 780 - 840 - 900 - 760$ -124
 -123
 -123
 -123 -051
 -051
 -051
 -050 -130
 -131
 -132
 -132 $.80$.
-860
-818
-40.770 7.008+08
7.277+08
7.537+08
7.537+08 -056
-056
-056
-056 960. $9 - 037$
 $-59 - 079$
 $-47 - 486$
 $-41 - 795$
 $-37 - 859$
 $-35 - 129$
 $-33 - 129$ 96.257
97.357
97.717
97.914 1020. $.230$ $.000$ $.000$ $.000$ 7.537+08
7.537+08
7.537+08
7.537+08
7.537+08 $1080 - 1080 - 1140 - 1200$ 2.643
2.283
2.086
4.880
1.880
1.820
1.777
1.713
1.676
1.662
1.676
1.676
1.674
1.676 -52.654 $0 - 000$ $.230$ $.000$ $.000$ $.000$ $-52.83+$
 -58.391
 -62.064
 -64.780
 -67.042 0.000
 0.000
 0.000 $.230$
 $.230$
 $.230$
 $.230$
 $.230$ -000
 -000
 -000 $.000$
 $.000$
000. -
000 -
000 -
000 -1260. 98.036 1320. 98.120 $0 - 000$ $.000$ $.000$ $.000$ $1380.$ $1440.$ $1500.$ 98.180
98.223
98.258 770
 770
 770
 770
 770 -68.677 $-31 - 505$ $0 - 000$ 7.537+08 $.000$ $.000$ $.000$ -68.677
 -69.805
 -71.993
 -72.779
 -73.334
 -73.334
 -75.269
 -75.269
 -75.200 $-31-505$
 $-30-128$
 $-29-103$
 $-27-407$
 $-26-712$ 0.000
 0.000
 0.000 7-537+08
7-537+08
7-537+08 230
 -230
 -230
 -230 $.000$
-000 $.000$
-000 -
- 000
- 000
- 000 98.285
98.306
98.324
98.338
98.359
98.359 $.000$ 1560. $.000$ 7.537+08
7.537+08
7.537+08
7.537+08
7.537+08
7.537+08
7.537+08 1620.
1680.
1740.
1800. $0 - 000$ -000 $.000$ $.000$ 230
 -230
 -230
 -230
 -230
 -230
 -230 -770
-770
-770
-770
-770
-770 -000
 -000
 -000
 -000 $.000$
 $.000$
 $.000$
 $.000$ $0 - 000$ 0000 -26.712
 -26.146
 -25.603
 -25.162
 -24.756
 -24.394 $\begin{array}{c} 0.000 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.000 \\ \end{array}$ -000
 -000
 -000
 -000 1860- -000
 -000
 -000 $1920 .000$ $.000$ $1980 - 2040$ 98.374
98.379
98.384 -75.620 $.000$ $.000$ $.770$
 $.770$ -000
 -000 $1 - 621$ -75.777 -24.028 $0 - 000$ $7 - 537 + 08$ $.000$ 1.616 -76.079 $-23 - 735$ $0 - 000$
7.537+08 -230 $.000$ $.000$ 2100.

with a strain and the strain of the stra

بالأبداء وشاعرتي والمراجات

Y.

THE PERMIT WAS COMM

TEST PROGRAM FOR WOOD CRIB FIRE. REGRES SPECIFIED

--GEOMETRY AND VENTILATION-

WALL SURFACE AREA = 80.0 M2 FLOOR AREA = $20.00 M2$
WINDOW HEIGHT = $1.50 M$ $AREA =$ 4.00 M2 OPENING FACTOR = $4.399 M2.5$
DISCHARGE COEFF.= $.68$

----FUEL LOAD PROPERTIES-

FIRE LOAD PER FLOOR AREA = 10.0 KG/M2

FUEL COMPOSITION CARBON = 44.4 PERCENT BY WEIGHT HYDROGEN = $5-4$ PERCENT $OXYGEN = 38.2 PERCENT$ NITROGEN = .0 PERCENT WATER = 12.0 PERCENT $R = 5.32$
 $R0 = 1.23$ HEAT OF COMBUSTION OF DRY FUEL = 18.80+06 J/KG
LOWER ACTUAL HEAT OF COMBUSTION = 15.07+06 J/KG MOLECULAR WEIGHT OF UNBURNT PYROLYSATES = 28.97 CP OF PYROLYSIS GAS = $(.1127 * TGAS + 1010.) J/KG-K$ MAXIMUM FRACTION OF PYROLYSATES BURNED = .70 GREY-GAS FLAME EMISSIVITY = .900 RATE OF REGRESSION = $15.00-06$ M/S FUEL DIMENSION = .050 M SHAPE FACTOR = 2.00

---- WALL THERMAL PROPERTIES-

THICKNESS = $.038$ M DENSITY = 790. KG/M3

THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY = -170 W/M-K HEAT CAPACITY = 840 . J/KG-K EMISSIVITY = $.50$

ţ

a. ś

NQ.

What's plan is the plan

ารับเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพื่อนก
เพื่อนการเพื่อนการเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่มของเพิ่

J

l

l

l

l

l

l

l

l

l

TEST PROGRAM 1 FOR WOOD CRIB FIRE. NILSSON'S FORMULAS

----GEOMETRY ANO VENTILATION----

WALL SURFACE AREA $=$ 80.0 M2 $FLOOR AREA = 20.00 M2$ WINDOW HEIGHT = $1.50 M$
AREA = $4.00 M$ A.00 M2 OPENING FACTOR = 4e899 M2.5 DISCHARGE COEFF.= .68

----FUEL LOAD PROPERTIES---

FIRE LOAD PER FLOOR AREA = 10.0 KG/M2

FUEL COMPOSITION $CARBON = 44.4$ PERCENT BY WEIGHT $HYDROGEN = 5.4 PERCENT$ OXYGEN 38.2 PERCENT NITROGEN = . O PERCENT WATER 12.0 PERCENT $R = 5.32$ RO= *1.23* HEAT OF COMBUSTION OF DRY FUEL = 18.80+06 J/KG LOWER ACTUAL HEAT OF COMBUSTION = 15.07+06 J/KG MOLECULAR WEIGHT OF UNBURNT PYROLYSATES = 28.97 CP OF PYROLYSIS GAS = $(.1127*TGAS + 1010.1)$ J/KG-K MAXIMUM FRACTION OF PYROLYSATES BURNED = .70 GREY-GAS FLAME EMISSIVITY = .900 RATE OF REGRESSION = 00.00 FUEL DIMENSION $=$.050 M SHAPE FACTOR = 2.00 M/S

CRIB SPACING/HEIGHT RATIO= .100

----WALL THERMAL PHOPERTIES----

THICKNESS $=$ $.038$ M DENSITY 790. KG/M3

THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY = $.170$ W/M-K HEAT CAPACITY = $840.$ J/KG-K

EMISSIVITY = .so

Â

Ţ,

Ξ

 \mathcal{L}_{max}

in the company of the company of the company of the company of

-~--------_,

ees a

__________ ____

ДY.

TEST PROGRAM 2 FOR WOOD CRIB FIRE, NILSSON'S FORMULAS ---GEOMETRY AND VENTILATION----

·------··

WALL SURFACE AREA = $80.0 M2$ $FLOOR AREA = 20.00 M2$ $\begin{array}{cccc}\texttt{WINDOW} & \texttt{HEIGHT} & = & 1.50 M \\
 & \texttt{AREA} & = & 4.00 M\n \end{array}$ $AREA = 4.00 M2$ OPENING FACTOR = $4.899 M2.5$ DISCHARGE COEFF.= .68

----FUEL LOAD PROPERTIES----

FIRE LOAD PER FLOOR AREA = 20.0 KG/M2

FUEL COMPOSITION $CARBON = 44.4$ PERCENT BY WEIGHT HYDROGEN 5.4 PERCENT OXYGEN 38.2 PERCENT $NITROGEN = 0.0 PERCENT$ $WATER$ = 12.0 PERCENT R = 5.32 RO= 1.23 HEAT OF COMBUSTION OF DRY FUEL = 18.80+06 J/KG
LOWER ACTUAL HEAT OF COMBUSTION = 15.07+06 J/KG MOLECULAR WEIGHT OF UNBURNT PYROLYSATES = 28.97 CP OF PYROLYSIS GAS = $(.1127*TGAS + 1010.)$ J/KG-K MAXIMUM FRACTION OF PYROLYSATES BURNED = .70 GR EY-GAS FLAME EMISSIVITY = .900 RATE OF REGRESSION = 00.00 M/5 FUEL DIMENSION $=$.050 M SHAPE FACTOR = 2.00

CRIB SPACING/HEIGHT RATIO= .200

----WALL THERMAL PROPERTIES----

THICKNESS .038 M DENSITY 790. KG/M3

THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY = • 170 W/M-K HEAT CAPACITY = $840.$ J/KG-K EMISSIVITY = .so

 $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$

J.

Ř

经费

 $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$

 ϵ

 $31\,$

أبوادي

 $\frac{1}{2}$

TEST PROGRAM FOR PVTFIX ROUTINE. VARIABLE WALL PROPERTIES ---GEOMETRY AND VENTILATION-WALL SURFACE AREA = 80.0 M2 FLOOR AREA = 20.00 M2 WINDOW HEIGHT = EIGHT = 1.50 M
AREA = 4.00 M2 OPENIHG FACTOR = 4.899 M2.5 DISCHARGE COEFF.= .68 ----FUEL LOAD PROPERTIES----FIRE LOAD PER FLOOR AREA= 20.0 KG/M2 FUEL COMPOSITION CARBON $= 44.4$ PERCENT BY WEIGHT $HYDROGEN = 5.4 PERCENT$ $OXYGEN = 38.2 PERCENT$ $NITROGEN = 0.0 PERCENT$ WATER 12.0 PERCENT R = 5.32 RO= 1.23 HEAT OF COMBUSTION OF DRY FUEL = 18.80+06 J/KG LOWER ACTUAL HEAT DF COMBUSTION = 15.07+06 J/KG - MOLECULAR WEIGHT OF UNBURNT PYROLYSATES = 28.97 CP OF PYROLYSIS GAS *=* (.1127*TGAS + 1010.) J/KG-K MAXIMUM FRACTION OF PYRCLYSATES BURNED = $.70$ GREY-GAS FLAME EMISSIVITY *=* .900 ---- WALL THERMAL PROPERTIES----THICKNESS .038 M DENSITY = 790. KG/M3 THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY ARRAY (W/M-K) TEMPERATURE CONDUC TI VI TY 273.0 372.0 373.0 1073.0 HEAT CAPACITY ARRAY (J/KG-K) TEMPERATURE HEAT CAPACITY 273.0 372.0 373.0 363.0 364.0 413.0 414.0 1073.0 $EMISSIVITY = .50$.210 .210 .160 .260 1090. 1090. 47300. $47300.$ 5000. 5000. 640. 840. 32

 $\overline{\mathbf{z}}$

 \overline{z} 5

编

羅

53

深く

医说

 \mathcal{L}

E,

、
、
、
、

S.

Boscovered

A

E.

EGENA

E

 $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)$

E

REALT

ä,

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$, \mathcal{A}

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. \mathbf{B} YPYR HEAT BALA
WAD RAD
PCT $Q-WALL$ YO2 YN₂ $YCDZ$ $YM2C$ ANCE TIME WALL CHY HALL RAD
PCT $Q-FIRE$ $\frac{1}{2}$ \overline{PCT} PCT
MASS PCT PCT PCT GAS FLOW HASS MASS MA SS **HASS** PCT 48.339
 58.154
 60.694
 62.608
 64.103 14.745
 5.410
 4.060
 3.244
 2.695
 2.344 .073
570. -047
 -047
 -047
 -0477
 -0477
 -0477
 -047
 -047 .057 .648 $1 - 240 + 08$ $.180$ 4.946 32.022 $4 - 419 + 06$ $8-318$
 $9-415$
 $9-415$ 28.134
25.768
23.808
22.137 $4.363+06$
 $4.347+06$
 $4.334+06$
 $4.324+06$ $\begin{array}{c} 2.118 + 08 \\ 2.896 + 08 \\ 3.599 + 08 \\ 4.244 + 08 \\ 5.994 + 08 \\ 6.451 + 08 \\ 7.396 + 08 \\ 8.451 + 08 \\ 7.396 + 08 \\ 8.687 + 08 \\ 9.484 + 08 \\ 9.476 + 08 \\ 9.476 + 08 \\ 9.476 + 08 \\ 9.476 + 08 \\ 9.476 + 08 \\ 9.476 + 08 \\ 9.476 + 08 \\ 9.476 + 08 \\ 9.4$ $.057$ 648
-648
-648
-648
-648
-648
-648 $.180$ -073
-073
-073
-073
-073 -057
-057
-057
-057
--- $.180$ -180
 -180
 -180
 -180 11.047 22.137
20.860
19.807
18.807
17.190 11.590
12.068
12.493
12.868 65.155 4.317+06 2.081
 1.862
 1.686
 1.545 $4.310+06$ $.057$ $.180$ 360.
420. -057
 -057
 -057
 -057 $4.305*06$
 $4.301*06$ $.180$ $.073$ 66.825 -180
 -180
 -180 $480.$
 $540.$
 $600.$ 67.492 -073
-073
-073
-073 07.492
68.080
68.577
68.996
69.354
69.673 13.204 $4.296 + 06$ 13.204
13.494
13.741
13.956
14.149
14.313
14.448
14.561
4.066
3.687 1.543
 1.335
 1.254
 1.187
 1.132 16.529
 15.963
 15.443
 15.000 $4.293 + 06$ -648
-648
-6488
-648
-648
-648
-770
-770 $4.290 + 06$ -057 $.180$ $4 - 288 + 06$
 $4 - 285 + 06$
 $4 - 284 + 06$ $.057$ $.180$ $.073$ -057
-057
-057
-057 $.180$ $.073$ -047 $15-000$
 $14-625$
 $14-315$
 $14-056$
 $-65-520$
 $-52-475$
 $-45-402$
 $-40-481$ $.180$
 $.180$
 $.180$ -
- 073
- 073
- 073 $-0+7$
 $-0+7$
 $-0+7$
 $-0+7$ 59.940 70.160 70.342 95.334 1.132
 1.088
 1.052
 -34.635
 -47.715
 -54.773
 -59.342
 -39.342 4.282+06 $4.281+06$ 960. 0.000 0.000 0.000 230
 -230
 -230
 -230 $.000$ $.000$.300 1020. 96.914 97.433 97.701 97.857 97.958 $.000$ $.000$ -000 1080. -000
000 -
000 -
---- -0.00
 -0.00
 -0.00
 -0.00
 -0.00 $.000$ 1140.
1200.
1260.
1320. 2.567 $.000$
 $.000$ 2.299
 2.143
 2.042 0.000 -62.819
 -65.406
 -67.489 -37.109
 -34.512
 -32.461
 -30.849 $0 - 000$ $9.876 + 08$ -230 0.000 0.000 0.000 $9.876 + 08$
 $9.876 + 08$
 $9.876 + 08$
 $9.876 + 08$ $.230$
 $.230$
 $.230$
 $.230$ $.000$ -000 $.000$ $.000$.000 1380. 98.025 1.975
1.929 $.000$
 $.000$
 $.000$
 $.000$ $.000$
 $.000$
 $.000$ -000
 -000
 -000
 -000 -67.489
 -69.232
 -71.719
 -72.665
 -73.461
 -74.133
 -74.703
 -75.960
 -75.960
 -76.269 $1440.$
1500.
1560.
1620. 98.071
98.071
98.121 1.899
 1.879
 1.867 -29.483 $0 - 000$ $9.876*08$ $-28 - 347$ $0 - 000$ -230 0.000 0.000 0.000 $9.876+08$
 $9.876+08$
 $9.876+08$ -230
 -230
 -230 -27.396
 -26.598 $.000$ 98.133 000
 000
 000
 000
 000 1620-
1680-
1740-
1860-
1860-
1920-98.133
98.138
98.138
98.135
98.128
98.119 000.
000. -000 1.862 -000
 -000
 -000
 -000 1.862
 1.865
 1.872
 1.881
 1.892
 1.995 -25.925 $.000$
 $.000$
 $.000$ $9.876 + 08$
 $9.876 + 08$
 $9.876 + 08$
 $9.876 + 08$
 $9.876 + 08$ $.230$ $-25 - 355$ $0 - 000$ -254.333
 -24.459
 -24.108
 -23.809 $0 - 000$ -230 $.770$ $0 - 000$
 $0 - 000$ $.770$
 $.770$
 $.770$ -230 $.000$ $.000$ $.230$
 $.230$ $.000$ $.000$ $.000$ 1980. 98.108 $.000$ $.000$ $.000$ $0 - 000$ -0.40 98.095 1.905 -76.269

33

"不得见……"

Service.

×

TEST PROGRAM FOR PFLFIX ROUTINE. POOL OPTION

---GEOMETRY AND VENTILATION----

WALL SURFACE AREA = 80.0 M2 $FLOOR AREA = 20.00 M2$ $WINDOWN$ HEIGHT = 1.50 M $AREA = 10.00 M2$ OPENING FACTOR = 12.247 M2.5 DISCHARGE COEFF.= .68

----FUEL LOAD PROPERTIES----

FIRE LOAD PER FLOOR AREA = 20.0 KG/M2 TOTAL ENTHALPY OF PYROLYSIS= 2.40+06 J/KG BOILING TEMPERATURE= 390. OEG C

FUEL COMPOSITION $CARSON = 85.7 PERCENT BY WELGHT$ $HYDROGEN = 14.3 PERCENT$ $OXYGEN = 0.0 PERCENT$ $NITROGEN = 0.0 PERCENT$ $WATER = .0 PERCENT$ $R = 14.78$ RO= 3.43 HEAT OF COMBUSTION OF DRY FUEL = 46.50+06. J/KG LOWER ACTUAL HEAT OF COMBUSTION = 43.36+06 J/KG MOLECULAR WEIGHT OF UNBURNT PYROLYSATES = 28.97 CP OF PYROLYSIS GAS = (.1127*TGAS + lOlO.J J/KG-K MAXIMUM FRACTION OF PYROLYSATES BURNED $=$.70 GREY-GAS FLAME EMISSIVITY = $.900$ FUEL AREA= 5.00 M2

---- WALL THERMAL PROPERTIES----

THICKNESS .038 M DENSITY = 790. KG/M3 THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY = $.170$ W/M-K HEAT CAPACITY = 840 . J/KG-K EMISSIVITY = $.50$

FUEL PYROLYSIS (POOL) SPECIFIED, VENTILATION ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

5.556

5.292

5.062

4.859

4.679

 -266

 $.247$

 $.231$

 -218

 $.206$

 \mathbf{p}

FXC.PYR.

FUEL

 $0ⁿ$

PAGE NO. 1

RUN NO. 9

 $1 - 142 + 07$

 $1.141+07$

 $1.140 + 07$

 $1.140 + 07$

 $1 - 140 + 07$

Communication

ATR IN

 N_4P_4

 $.062$

 $.062$

 $.062$

 $.062$

 $.062$

6.990+08

7.369+08

7.731+08

8.079+08

8.413+08

 $.705$

 $.705$

 $.705$

 $.704$

 $.704$

 -136

 $.136$

 $.136$

 $.136$

 $.136$

 $.056$

 $.056$

 $.056$

 $.056$

 $.056$

 -041

 -041

 -042

 $.042$

 $.042$

ပ္ပ

540.

600.

660.

720.

780.

72.172

72.327

72.462

72.581

72.686

22.007

22.134

22.244

22,342

22.428

 \bullet

Designation

 -2.14 \rightarrow

Communication

Magdieus Tene

I

TEST PROGRAM FOR RPFIX POUTINE

---GEOMETRY ANO VENTILATION---

WALL SURFACE AREA = $80.0 M2$ FLOOR AREA = $20-00 M2$
winnow Height = $1-50 M$ WINDOW HEIGHT = $AREA = 10.00 M2$ OPENING FACTOR = 12.247 M2.5 DISCHARGE COEFF.= .68

----FUEL LOAD PROPERTIES----

FIRE LOAD PER FLOOR AREA = 20.0 KG/M2

FUEL COMPOSITION CARBON 85.7 PERCENT BY WEIGHT HYDROGEN = 14.3 PERCENT OXYGEN NITROGEN $WATER =$ $R = 14.78$ RO= 3.43
HEAT OF COMBUSTION OF DRY FUEL = 46.50+06 J/KG .0 PERCENT .o PERCENT .o PERCENT LOWER ACTUAL HEAT OF COMBUSTION = 43.36+06 J/KG MOLECULAR WEIGHT OF UNBURNT PYROLYSATES = 28.97 *CP* OF PYROLYSIS GAS= (o1127*TGAS + lOlO.J J/KG-K MAXIMUM FRACTION OF PYRCLYSATES BURNED = .70 GREY-GAS FLAME EMISSIVITY = .900

RATE OF PYROLYSIS (KG/S) TIME **T** 0. .120 120. .120 121. .250

----WALL THERMAL PROPERTIES----

Ù.

THICKNESS .038 M DENSITY 790. KG/M3 THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY = • 170 W/M-K HEAT CAPACITY = $840. J/KG-K$ EMISSIVITY = .SO

È.

美酒

医细胞

NEW PARTICIPATION

黑星

È

 ~ 14

INPUTTED VALUES OF RP ARE USED

 \sim \sim

 $GUN(60) = 10$ PAGE NO. 1

BOYLES (C)

à

APPENDIX B -- PROGRAM LISTING

MECH

SECTION OF STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE

Service Services of the Service Control

 C COMPF2--MAIN PROGRAM C CONSTITUTES REVISION OF PROGRAM COMPF C COMPF2 VERSION 1.0 PROGRAMMED 1 MARCH 1978 BY V. BABRAUSKAS C VERSION 1.1 MINOR REVISIONS 18 AUG 1978 C ϵ COMMON / CNSTS/ AWALLN, BWDOW, DENSA, G, GASCNT, KTRACE, MTIME CPA, CPCO(2), CPCO2(2), CPH2(2), CPH2O(2), CPN2(2), COMMON /CP/ CP02(2), CPPYR(2) $\mathbf{1}$ C.CFLPC.CVGROS.CVNET.H.HFLPC.MWPYR.N.NFLPC.O. COMMON /FUEL/ OFLPC.R.RO.REGRES.SH.SHAPE.SIZE.W.WFLPC.WTFUEL $\mathbf{1}$ AWDOW, BPF, CD, CNV, DTIME, EMS(2), HWDOW, IX, IXC, IXL, COMMON /GP/ J, JM, JP, JPRINT, K, KD, KH, KITER, KNTRL, MWIN, MWOUT, RC, RP, SIGMA $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /LOGIC/ FC.FLSPEC.KRIT.NEWPLT.NEWPRP.PLFUEL.PLOT.PNCH. RPSPEC, VTSPEC $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /PLAST/ TBOILC, OHP, STOICH, SIZE1, EITA, EISCAN COMMON /PRBLM/ ADIA+AFLOOR+AWALL+DENSW+FLOAD+IRUN+OPENF+ PRNT, STEADY, THICKW $\mathbf{1}$ DENF, DENU, TAMB, TGAS, TINPT, T1(20), T2(20), TSF, TSU COMMON /TEMP/ COMMON /THERML/ CNDA(2,10), CPW(2,10), DX, EF, EMSA(2,10), NCND.NCPW.NEMS.NQGEN.NRP.QGEN(2.10).RPX(2.50) \mathbf{L} COMMON /TITLE/ TITLE(14) COMMON /CPLOT/ BUFX(500), BUFY(500), SCALX, SCALY, SPECS(30) INTEGER TITLE LOGICAL ADIA, EISCAN, FC, FLSPEC, KRIT, NEWPLT, NEWPRP, PLFUEL, PLOT. PNCH.RPSPEC.STEADY.STOICH.VTSPEC $\mathbf{1}$ REAL MWIN, MWOUT, MWPYR, MTIME, N, NFLPC \subset DATA ADIA, CD, CFLPC, CNV, CPA, DENSA, EF, G 7.5 FALSE...0.68,44.4,5.0,1005...1.18,0.9.9.8/ $\mathbf{1}$ HFLPC.IRUN.IX.MTIME.MWPYR.NEWPRP \overline{c} /5.4,0,10,360.,28.97,.TRUE./, 3 NFLPC, OFLPC, PLOT, PNCH, REGRES, SH, SHAPE 4 /0.0, 38.2, .FALSE.,.FALSE.,0.0,0.0,2./, 5 SIGMA, SIZE1, STEADY, TINPT, WFLPC 6 /5.6697E-8.-10...FALSE..0.0.12.0/ $\overline{7}$ HEAT CAPACITIES ARE GIVEN IN THE FORM CP(1)*TEMP+CP(2) C DATA CPCO 70.1185 , 1018.7 $70.2114.931.7.$ CPC02 $\mathbf{1}$ 70.3549 , 1814./ CPH20 \overline{c} /0.6862, 13966./, CPH₂ В 70.3704 , 931.7 CP₀₂ Δ $/0.1127.1010.7.$ CPN₂ 5 CPPYR /0.1127, 1010./ 6 PROPERTIES OF PYROLYSIS GASES ARE ASSUMED SAME AS FOR NITROGEN C C NAMELIST /VARS/ ADIA, AFLOOR, AWALL, AWOOW, BPF, CD, CFLPC, CPPYR, CVGROS, DENSW, DHP, DTIME, EF, EISCAN, EITA, FLOAD, FLSPEC, HFLPC, HWDOW, $\mathbf{1}$ IRUN, IX, KTRACE, MTIME, MWPYR, NEWPLT, NEWPRP, NFLPC, OFLPC, PLFUEL, $\overline{2}$ PLOT.PNCH.PRNT.REGRES.RPSPEC.SH.SHAPE.SIZE.STEADY.STOICH. 3 TINPT.THICKW.TBOILC.VTSPEC.WFLPC. SCALX.SCALY 10 READ (1,900, END=150) TITLE 900 FORMAT (13A6, A2) WRITE(2,910) TITLE 910 FORMAT (1H1, 13A6, A2) EISCAN=.FALSE. STOICH=.FALSE.

Company of MARK CENT AND AN INTERNATIONAL AND AN INTERNATIONAL AND COMPANY

Clark of

STEADY=.FALSE. KITER= 0 TINPT= 0. $KNTRL = 1$ KTRACE= 0 NEWPLT= .FALSE. RPSPEC= .FALSE. FLSPEC= .FALSE. VTSPEC= .FALSE. PLFUEL= .FALSE. $IRUN = IRUN + 1$ 20 READ (1, VARS) WRITE (5, VARS) IF(ADIA.OR.EISCAN.OR.STOICH) STEADY=.TRUE. IF (PNCH) PUNCH 900, TITLE IF (NEWPLT.AND.PLOT) CALL PLTRST IF (NEWPRP) CALL INC NEWPRP= .FALSE. 30 CALL ICONDS IF (KNTRL.EQ.2) GOTO 10 IF (KTRACE.NE.1)GOTO 50 40 WRITE (4,901) Inst.
901 FORMAT (*1 RUN NO.*,14//
----- TGAS2 F1 $F2$ DERIV1 K KD * *KH J $\overline{2}$ $72(1)$ **TSF** OFIRE QFLOW QRADW $P = RP$ $\overline{3}$ $RC = 1/1$ 50 IF (KITER.EQ.1) GO TO 60 CALL ECHOID 60 IF (RPSPEC) GOTO 70 IF (FLSPEC) GOTO 80 IF (VTSPEC) GOTO 90 IF (PLFUEL.AND..NOT.FLSPEC) GOTO 100 CALL CRIB GOT 0 110 70 CALL RPFIX GOT 0 110 80 CALL PFLFIX GOTO 110 90 CALL PVTFIX GOT 0 110 100 CALL POOL 110 GO TO (120, 10, 130, 120), KNTRL \subset KNTRL= 1 INITIAL VALUE \subset KNTRL= 2 INPUT ERROR DETECTED, PROCEED TO NEW RUN \subset KNTRL= 3 ITERATION FAILURE-+PRINT OUT STEPS EVEN IF KTRACE= 0. C KNTRL= 4 SIMULATION TIME LIMIT EXCEEDED 120 CONTINUE \subset INSERT HERE ANY REWIND COMMAND TO BE DONE IF NO ERROR IF (PLOT.OR.PNCH) CALL DOUT GO TO 10 130 IF (KTRACE.EQ.1) GOTO 10 140 KTRACE= 1 $KITER = 1$ WRITE (2.903) TGAS 903 FORMAT ('0---ITERATION FAILURE-++'/' TGAS='+F16.2) GO TO 30 150 CONTINUE \subset ENDFILE 5 STOP END

J.

 \boldsymbol{J}

and companies of

SUBROUTINE CRIB

 C C CRIB FIRE ROUTINE C EQUATIONS FOLLOW NILSSON'S DATA FOR WOOD CRIBS. OTHER FUEL CRIBS CAN BE TREATED IF PYROLYSIS CONSTANTS C C ARE KNOWN. ϵ COMMON / CNSTS/ AWALLN.BWDOW.DENSA.G.GASCNT.KTRACE.MTIME COMMON /CP/ CPA, CPCO(2), CPCO2(2), CPH2(2), CPH2O(2), CPN2(2), $CPQ2(2)$. $CPPYR(2)$ $\mathbf{1}$ C, CFLPC, CVGROS, CVNET, H, HFLPC, MWPYR, N, NFLPC, O. COMMON /FUEL/ OFLPC, R, RO, REGRES, SH, SHAPE, SIZE, W, WFLPC, WTFUEL $\mathbf{1}$ AWDOW, BPF, CD, CNV, DTIME, EMS(2), HWDOW, IX, IXC, IXL, COMMON /GP/ J.JM.JP.JPRINT.K.KD.KH.KITER.KNTRL.MWIN.MWOUT.RC.RP.SIGMA $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /LOGIC/ FC.FLSPEC.KRIT.NEWPLT.NEWPRP.PLFUEL.PLOT.PNCH. RPSPEC, VTSPEC \mathbf{I} COMMON /PLAST/ TBOILC.DHP.STOICH.SIZE1.EITA.EISCAN COMMON /PRBLM/ ADIA, AFLOOR, AWALL, DENSW, FLOAD, IRUN, OPENF, \mathbf{I} PRNT, STEADY, THICKW COMMON /QS/ GCONW, GFIRE, GFLOW, GRADO, GRADW, GWLSUM COMMON /TEMP/ DENF, DENU, TAMB, TGAS, TINPT, T1(20), T2(20), TSF, TSU COMMON /THERML/ CNDA(2,10), CPW(2,10), DX, EF, EMSA(2,10), NCND, NCPW, NEMS, NQGEN, NRP, QGEN(2,10), RPX(2,50) $\mathbf 1$ COMMON /WOUT/ BWORST.FLREM.HRATIO.RMA.RMF.TTIME.VAVGIN. WA.WB.YCO2, YH2O. YN2. YO2. YPYR $\mathbf{1}$ LOGICAL ADIA.EISCAN, FC.FLSPEC.KRIT.NEWPRP, PLFUEL. PLOT, PNCH, RPSPEC, SCAN, STEADY, STOICH, VTSPEC $\mathbf{1}$ REAL MWIN, MWOUT, MWPYR, MTIME, N, NFLPC IF (STEADY) GOTO 190 FC= .FALSE. SCAN= .FALSE. ORADW=0. $OCONW = 0.$ $F2=0.$ $F1=0.$ DTGAS=10. CALL HEADNG C START TIME LOOP DO 170 J=1, JM $KH = 0$ DERIVI= $1.$ $TGAS2 = 0.$ $TSAS1 = 0.$ TGASP= 2000. TGASN= TAMB 20 CONTINUE $K = 0$ 30 CONTINUE IF (FLREM.GT.0.) GOTO 40 $RC = 0.$ $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a}}$ $RP = 0.$ GO TO 50 40 IF (REGRES.LE.0.0) GOTO 45 C USE THIS FORMULA IF INPUT REGRES IS SPECIFIED RP= REGRES*2.*SHAPE/SIZE*FLREM**(1.-1./SHAPE)*WTFUEL**(1./SHAPE) GO TO 50 45 CONTINUE

医肾道

n.

 C FUEL SURFACE CONTROL \sim ASSUME CRIB STICK DENSITY RHOCR= 500 KG/M**3 ϵ RHOCR= 500. REGREN= 1.24E-3/RHOCR*SIZE**-0.6 RPI= REGREN*2.*SHAPE/SIZE*FLREM**(1.-1./SHAPE)*WTFUEL**(1./SHAPE) C CRIB POROSITY CONTROL RP2= 0.22*WTFUEL/(RHOCR*SIZE)*SH C ROOM VENTILATION CONTROL RP3= 0.120*AWDOW*SQRT(HWDOW) RP= AMIN1 (RP1, RP2, RP3) 50 $RMF = RMA+RP$ YC02= 3.66667*CFLPC*RC/100./RMF YH20= (WFLPC*RP+9.0*HFLPC*RC)/100./RMF Y02= (0.23*RMA-R0*RC)/RMF YN2= 0.77*RMA/RMF +NFLPC*RP/100./RMF YPYR= (RP-RC)/RMF $IF(YPYR = LT - .0)YPYR = 0.$ MWOUT=44.*YCO2+18.*YH2O+28.*YN2+32.*YO2+MWPYR*YPYR HRATIO= 1./(1.+((TGAS/TAMB)*(MWIN/MWOUT)*(1.+RP/RMA)**2) \mathbf{I} **0.3333333333) c NOTE HIN IS TAKEN AS POSITIVE HIN= HWDOW* HRATIO ZW=1.-MWOUT*TAMB/MWIN/TGAS IF(ZW)195.55.55 55 VAVGIN= 0.666667*SQRT(2.*G*HIN*ZW) RMA= CD*VAVGIN*HIN*BWDOW*DENSA RMF= RMA+RP IF (RMA/R-RP) 60,60,65 60 RC= BPF*RMA/R GO TO 70 65 RC= BPF*RP $FC = .TRUE.$ 70 CONTINUE OFLOW= RMF*(YCO2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPCO2(1)*TGAS+CPCO2(2))-TAMB*(0.5* CPC02(1)*TAMB+CPC02(2))) +YH20*(TGAS*(0.5*CPH20(1)*TGAS+ $\mathbf{1}$ CPH20(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPH20(1)*TAMB+CPH20(2))) +Y02*(TGAS*($\overline{2}$ $\overline{3}$ 0.5*CP02(1)*TGAS+CP02(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CP02(1)*TAMB+CP02(2))) +YN2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPN2(1)*TGAS+CPN2(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPN2(1)* $\ddot{}$ TAMB+CPN2(2))) +YPYR*(TGAS*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TGAS+CPPYR(2)) \overline{a} -TAMB*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TAMB+CPPYR(2)))) 6 QFIRE= RC*CVNET IF (ADIA) GOTO 90 CALL DESOLV QRADW= AWALLN*EMS(1)*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TSF**4.) QCONW= AWALLN*(TGAS-TSF)*CNV*((TGAS-TSF)*(TGAS-TSF))**0.16666667 90 CONTINUE QRADO= AWDOW*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TAMB**4.) $K = K + 1$ $F3=F2$ $F2=F1$ FI= OFIRE-OFLOW-QRADO-QRADW-QCONW TGAS3=TGAS2 TGAS2=TGAS1 TGAS1=TGAS IF (F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASP) TGASP=TGAS IF (F1.6T.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASN) TGASN=TGAS DERIV2= DERIV1 IF (TGAS1.EQ.TGAS2) GOTO 130

The measurement and any representative of

ON THE COURSE SANTA SALE AND STREET

 $......$

```
DERIVI=(F1-F2)/(TGAS1-TGAS2)
     IF (KTRACE.GT.0) WRITE (4.99) TGAS1, TGAS2.F1.F2.DERIV1.K.KD.
    1 KH, J, T2(1), TSF, QFIRE, QFLOW, QRADW, RP, RC
  99 FORMAT(2F9.2.3(1PE9.2),313.15.2(0PF9.2).3(1PE10.3).2(0PF7.3))
     IF (.NOT.SCAN) GOTO 95
     IF (F1/F2.GE.0.0) GOTO 93
     SCAN = -FALSE -GOTO 100
  93 TGAS= TGAS-DTGAS
     IF (TGAS.LT.TAMB) GOTO 200
     GOTO 120
  95 IF (DERIVI.LT..0.AND.ABS(F2).GT..0001)GOTO 100
     IF(DERIV2.LT..0.AND.J.GT.2) GOTO 100
     TGAS= TGAS1+DTGAS/5.
     GOTO 120
 100 DIF= ABS(F1/QFLOW)
     IF (DIF.LT.0.002.AND.ABS(TGAS2-TGAS1).LT.2.) GOTO 130
     TGAS=(F1*TGAS2-F2*TGAS1)/(F1-F2)
     IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASP) GOTO 105
     IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.GT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASN) GOTO 105
     IF (K.EQ.1.AND.KH.EQ.0) TGAS= TGAS1 +10.
     IF (TGAS.GT.2000.) GOTO 110
     IF (TGAS.LT.(TAMB+30.)) GOTO 110
     GOT 0 120
 105 TGAS= (TGASN+TGASP)/2.
     GOTO 120
 110 SCAN= . TRUE.
     TGAS = 1900.120 CONTINUE
      IF. (K-200) 30.30.200
 130 CONTINUE
     CALL RSTA
     FLREM= FLREM-RP*DTIME
     IF(FLREM.LT.0.) FLREM=0.
      IF (QCONW.GT.0.) QWLSUM= QWLSUM+(QRADW+QCONW)*OTIME
      IF (TTIME .GE. MTIME) GO TO 210
      IF (TGAS.LE.353..AND.J.GE.10) GO TO 210
      IF (J.EQ.1) GO TO 150
      IF (JP.LT.JPRINT) GO TO 160
      JP = 0150 CALL OUTPUT
  160 JP= JP+1
      TTIME= TTIME+OTIME
  170 CONTINUE
        END TIME STEP DO-LOOP
\mathsf{C}180 CONTINUE
  185 CALL OUTPUT
      RETURN
          EFROR IN INPUT
\epsilon190 CONTINUE
      KNTRL = 2WRITE (2,910)
  910 FORMAT (///' CRIB ROUTINE DOES NOT ACCEPT STEADY-STATE CASE')
      RETURN
         SQUARE ROOT ERROR
\subset195 CONTINUE
      IF(KTRACE.EQ.1) WRITE(2,930) TGAS, RC, RP, YPYR, ZW, RMA, MWOUT
  930 FORMAT (/* TGAS=*,F5.0, 'RC=*,E10.4, 'RP=*,E10.4,
```
villanti i lingua

MECH

T!L $'$ YPYR= $'$, E10.4,' ZW=', F6.4,' RMA=', E10.4,' MWOUT=', F6.1) $\mathbf 1$ FAIL TO CONVERGE, ERROR EXIT c 200 CONTINUE \overline{a} $KNTRL = 3$ RETURN **BARBA SELA A PERSANA BEREKA SERANG ALAM SERANG**
BARBA SELA C FIRE IS OVER (TRANSIENT CASE) 210 CONTINUE CALL OUTPUT RETURN END l. â **Comment of the Comment of Comments** Ĭ 通告服务 $\underline{44}$

```
SUBROUTINE DEQNS
\mathsf{C}DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION SOLVER BASED ON CRANK-NICOLSON METHOD.
\mathsf{c}\mathsf{C}AWDOW, BPF, CD, CNV, DTIME, EMS(2), HWOOW, IX, IXC, IXL,
       COMMON /GP/
          J, JM, JP, JPRINT, K, KD, KH, KITER, KNTRL, MWIN, MWOUT, RC, RP, SIGMA
      \mathbf{1}COMMON /PRBLM/ ADIA, AFLOOR, AWALL, DENSW, FLOAD, IRUN, OPENF,
          PRNT, STEADY, THICKW
      \mathbf{1}COMMON /TEMP/ DENF, DENU, TAMB, TGAS, TINPT, T1(20), T2(20), TSF, TSU
       COMMON /THERML/ CNDA(2,10), CPW(2,10), DX, EF, EMSA(2,10),
          NCND, NCPW, NEMS, NQGEN, NRP, QGEN(2,10), RPX(2,50)
      \mathbf{1}DIMENSION A(20), B(20), C(20), CND(20), D(20), HCP(20)
\mathsf{C}ENTRY RSTA
\mathsf{C}ENTER HERE WHEN READY FOR NEW TIME STEP (FINISHED ITERATING)
\mathsf{c}c
       DO 10 I = 1.1XTI(I) = T2(I)10 CONTINUE
       TGOLD= TGAS
       IF (J.EQ.0) TGOLD=TAMB
       RETURN
\mathsf{C}ENTRY DESOLV
\mathsf{C}SOLVE DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION
\mathsf{C}\mathsf{C}KD = 1\overrightarrow{OX} 1 = DX00 20 I=1.IX
       CND(I)= TLU(CNDA, NCND, T1(I))
    20 HCP(I)= DENSW*DX/DTIME*TLU(CPW,NCPW,T1(I))
        EMS(1)= 1./(1./TLU(EMSA, NEMS, TSF) +1./EF -1.)
        EMS(2)= TLU(EMSA, NEMS, TSU)
        DO 50 I=2.IXL
        CNL= 1 \cdot / (DX/CND(1-1)+DX/CND(1))IF (I \cdot EQ \cdot 2) CNL= 1 \cdot / (DX1/CNO(1) + DX/CNO(2))CNG= 1./(DX/CND(I)+DX/CND(I+1))
        A(I) = -CMLB(I)= HCP(I)+CNL+CNG
        C(I) = -CNGD(I) = (HCP(I)-CNL-CNG)*TI(I)+CNL*TI(I-I)+CNG*TI(I+1)50 IF (NQGEN.GT.0) D(I)= D(I)+DX*TLU(QGEN.NQGEN.TI(I))
        CNG= 1./(DX1/CND(1)+DX/CND(2))
        C(1) = -CNGCNL= 1./(DX/CND(IXL)+DX/CND(IX))
        A(TX) = -CNL\mathsf{C}ENTER HERE WHEN KD. GT. 1 SINCE PRIOR EXPRESSIONS DO NOT CHANGE
 \mathsf{C}\mathsf{C}30 TSFOLD= TSF
        ZRF= TGAS*(TGAS*(TGAS+TSF)+TSF*TSF)+TSF*TSF*TSF
        ZCF= CNV*((TGAS-TSF)*(TGAS-TSF))**0.1666666667
        HF= ZCF+SIGMA*EMS(1)*ZRF
        DENF= HF*DX1/2./CND(1)
        ZF=HF/2*/(DENF+1.)
```
MECH 1877 ï $B(1) = HCP(1)+ZF+CNG$ $D(1) = (HCP(1) - ZF - CNG)*T1(1)+ZF*(TGAS+TGOLD) + CNG*T1(2)$ IF (NQGEN.GT.0) D(1)= D(1)+DX*TLU(QGEN.NQGEN.T1(1)) ZRU= TAMB*(TAMB*(TAMB+TSU)+TSU*TSU)+TSU*TSU*TSU ZCU= 1.87*((TAMB-TSU)*(TAMB-TSU))**0.16666666667 HU= ZCU+SIGMA#EMS(2)#ZRU DENU= HU*DX/2./CND(IX) かんさい ZU= HU/2./(DENU+1.) $B(IX) = HCP(IX)+ZU+CNL$ $D(1x) = (HCP(1x)-ZU-CNL)*T1(1x)+ZU*2.*TAMB+CNL*T1(1xL)$ IF (NOGEN-GT-0) D(IX)= D(IX)+DX*TLU(QGEN-NQGEN-TI(IX)) CALL TRIDGF (A, B, C, D, T2, IX) (以前の)の あたない こうしょう アイディスク あいこう TSF= (DENF*TGAS+T2(1))/(DENF+1.) TSU= (DENU#TAM8+T2(IX))/(DENU+1.) $KD = KD+1$ IF (ABS(TSF-TSFOLD).LT.4) RETURN IF (KD.LE.6) GO TO 30 WRITE (2,100) TSF, TSFOLD š 100 FORMAT ('0 FAIL TO CONVERGE D.E. TSF=',F7.2,' $TSFOLD = 'F7.2)$ IF (KD.LE.30) GO TO 30 RETURN END **1970年には、1972年により** 46

SUBROUTINE ECHOID C SUBROUTINE TO ECHO INPUT DATA C C CPA, CPCO(2), CPCO2(2), CPH2(2), CPH2O(2), CPN2(2), COMMON /CP/ $\mathbf{1}$ $CPD2(2)$, $CPPYR(2)$ COMMON /FUEL/ C.CFLPC.CVGROS.CVNET.H.HFLPC.MWPYR.N.NFLPC.O. CFLPC.R.RO.REGRES.SH.SHAPE.SIZE.W.WFLPC.WTFUEL $\mathbf{1}$ AWDOW, BPF, CD, CNV, DTIME, EMS(2), HWDOW, IX, IXC, IXL. COMMON /GP/ J.JM.JP.JPRINT.K.KD.KH.KITER.KNTRL.MWIN.MWOUT.RC.RP.SIGMA $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /LOGIC/ FC.FLSPEC.KRIT.NEWPLT.NEWPRP.PLFUEL.PLOT.PNCH. RPSPEC, VTSPEC $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /PLAST/ TBOILC, DHP, STOICH, SIZE1, EITA, EISCAN COMMON /PRBLM/ ADIA+AFLOOR+AWALL+DENSW+FLOAD+IRUN+OPENF+ PRNT.STEADY.THICKW $\mathbf{1}$.
СОММОН /THERML/ CNDA(2,10),CPW(2,10),DX,EF,EMSA(2,10), NCND.NCPW.NEMS.NGGEN.NRP.QGEN(2.10).RPX(2.50) $\mathbf{1}$ LOGICAL ADIA, EISCAN, FC, FLSPEC, KRIT, NEWPRP, PLFUEL, PLOT. PNCH, RPSPEC. STEADY. STOICH. VTSPEC REAL MWIN, MWOUT, MWPYR, N, NFLPC WRITE (2,90) IRUN WRITE (2,91) AWALL, AFLOOR, HWDOW, AWDOW, OPENF, CD WRITE (2,92) FLOAD IF (PLFUEL) WRITE (2,93) DHP, TBOILC WRITE (2,94) CFLPC, HFLPC, OFLPC, NFLPC, WFLPC, R,RO WRITE (2.95) CVGROS, CVNET, MWPYR, CPPYR.BPF.EF IF (.NOT.(PLFUEL.OR.VTSPEC.OR.RPSPEC)) WRITE (2.96) REGRES.SIZE. $\mathbf{1}$ IF (PLFUEL.AND..NOT.STOICH) WRITE (2.97) SIZE IF (.NOT.(PLFUEL.OR.VTSPEC.OR.RPSPEC).AND.SH.GT.0.0) WRITE (2,908) $\mathbf{1}$ IF (RPSPEC.AND.NRP.EQ.1) WRITE (2.913) RPX(2.1) IF (RPSPEC.AND.NRP.NE.1) WRITE (2.914) ((RPX(I.J).I=1.2).J=1.NRP) IF(ADIA) GOTO 200 WRITE (2,98) THICKW, DENSW IF (NCND.EQ.1) WRITE (2,900) CNDA(2.1) IF (NCND.GT.1) WRITE (2,901)((CNDA(I,J),I=1,2),J=1,NCND) IF (NCPW.EQ.1) WRITE (2,904) CPW(2,1) IF (NCPW.GT.1) WRITE (2,905)((CPW(I.J),I=1.2),J=1,NCPW) IF (NEMS.EQ.1) WRITE (2,902) EMSA(2,1) IF (NEMS.NE.1) WRITE (2.903)((EMSA(I.J).I=1.2).J=1.NEMS) IF (NOGEN.EQ.1) WRITE (2,906) QGEN(2,1) IF (NOGEN.GT.1) WRITE (2,907)((QGEN(I,J),I=1,2),J=1,NQGEN) 200 IF(ADIA) WRITE(2,909) RETURN 90 FORMAT (1H+, T86, COMPF2 VERSION 1.1 - RUN NO. 1, 14) 91 FORMAT ('0----GEOMETRY AND VENTILATION----'// * WALL SURFACE AREA = \cdot , $F8.1$, \cdot M2 \cdot / $\mathbf{1}$ ' FLOOR AREA = ', F8.2, ' M2'/ \overline{c} * WINDOW HEIGHT = **F8.2.* M*/ 3 Δ $AREA = 'F8.2.$ $M2'/$ 5 $'$ Opening factor = $1, F7.3, 1$ M2.5'/ ' DISCHARGE COEFF.= ',F4.2/) ϵ 92 FORMAT ('0-----FUEL LOAD PROPERTIES-----!// ' FIRE LOAD PER FLOOR AREA =', F6, 1, ' KG/M2') $\mathbf{1}$ 913 FORMAT ("ORATE OF PYROLYSIS =",F7.2," KG/S") 914 FORMAT ('ORATE OF PYROLYSIS (KG/S)'/' TIME RP.

 $50(Y3X, F5.0, F9.3)$ $\mathbf{1}$ 93 FORMAT (* TOTAL ENTHALPY OF PYROLYSIS= *
DE10.2.' J/KG'/' BOILING TEMPERATURE=',OPF5.0,' DEG C'), $\mathbf{1}$ 94 FORMAT ('OFUEL COMPOSITION'/ CARBON = '.F4.1.' PERCENT BY WEIGHT'/
' HYDROGEN = '.F4.1.' PERCENT'/ $\mathbf{1}$ \overline{c} \bullet OXYGEN = \bullet , F4.1, \bullet PERCENT \bullet 3 ' NITROGEN = $:$, $F4.1$, ' PERCENT'/ 4 * WATER 5 $=$ \cdot $,$ F4.1. \cdot PERCENT \cdot / 6 $R = 1.5627$ $R0 = 1, F5.2$ \overline{z} 95 FORMAT (' HEAT OF COMBUSTION OF DRY FUEL = ',2PE10.2,' J/KG'/ 'LOWER ACTUAL HEAT OF COMBUSTION = '.E10.2.' J/KG'/ MOLECULAR WEIGHT OF UNBURNT PYROLYSATES = ', OPF6.2/ $\overline{2}$. CP OF PYROLYSIS GAS = $(1, F6, 4, 1*TGAS + 1, F6, 0, 0)$ \mathbf{R} 4 1 J/KG-K $1/$ * MAXIMUM FRACTION OF PYROLYSATES BURNED = ',F5.2/ \leq \cdot GREY-GAS FLAME EMISSIVITY = \cdot F5.3) 6 96 FORMAT (' RATE OF REGRESSION = ',2PE9.2,' M/S'/ $'$ FUEL DIMENSION = $',$ OPF5.3, $'$ M'/ $\mathbf{1}$ ' SHAPE FACTOR = \cdot , F4.2 /) \overline{c} 97 FORMAT (* FUEL AREA=*, F10.2, * M2*) 908 FORMAT (' CRIB SPACING/HEIGHT RATIO=',F6.3) 98 FORMAT ('0-----WALL THERMAL PROPERTIES----'// $\frac{1}{1}$ ' THICKNESS = ' $F5.3$ ' M'/ * DENSITY = \cdot , F6.0, \cdot KG/M3*) 2° 909 FORMAT ('0---- WALL THERMAL PROPERTIES----'// * ADIABATIC WALL'//) \mathbf{I} and \mathbf{I} 900 FORMAT ('OTHERMAL CONDUCTIVITY = ',F7.3,' W/M-K') 901 FORMAT ("OTHERMAL CONDUCTIVITY ARRAY (W/M-K)"/ 1 'TEMPERATURE CONDUCTIVITY', 10(/3X,F7.1,4X,F10.3)) 902 FORMAT ('OEMISSIVITY = ',F4.2) 903 FORMAT ('OEMISSIVITY ARRAY'/' TEMPERATURE EMISSIVITY' $1 - 10(73X_7F7.1*4X_7F10.3)$ 904 FORMAT ('OHEAT CAPACITY = ',F7.0,' J/KG-K') 905 FORMAT ('OHEAT CAPACITY ARRAY (J/KG-K)'/ 1 • TEMPERATURE HEAT CAPACITY', 10(/3X,F7.1,4X,F10.0)) 906 FORMAT ('OWALL HEAT GENERATED = ', F9.3, ' W/M3') 907 FORMAT ('OWALL HEAT GENERATED ARRAY (W/M3)'/ 1 ' TEMPERATURE OGEN', 10(/3X,F7-1,4X,F10.3))

48

A my chine la shire del danno nel Storico nel Storic

 ϵ

C ϵ SUBROUTINE ICONDS

```
SET INITIAL CONDITIONS AND CONSTANTS
```
COMMON / CNSTS/ AWALLN. 8WDOW. DENSA.G. GASCNT. KTRACE, MTIME CPA, CPCO(2), CPCO2(2), CPH2(2), CPH2O(2), CPN2(2), COMMON /CP/ CP02(2), CPPYR(2) COMMON /FUEL/ C.CFLPC.CVGROS.CVNET.H.HFLPC.MWPYR.N.NFLPC.O. OFLPC, R, RO, REGRES, SH, SHAPE, SIZE, W, WFLPC, WTFUEL $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /GP/ AWDOW, BPF, CD, CNV, DTIME, EMS(2), HWDOW, IX, IXC, IXL, J.JM.JP.JPRINT.K.KD.KH.KITER.KNTRL.MWIN.MWOUT.RC.RP.SIGMA $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /LOGIC/ FC, FLSPEC, KRIT, NEWPLT, NEWPRP, PLFUEL, PLOT, PNCH, RPSPEC.VTSPEC $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /PLAST/ TBOILC.OHP.STOICH.SIZE1.EITA.EISCAN COMMON /PRBLM/ ADIA,AFLOOR,AWALL,DENSW.FLOAD.IRUN.OPENF. PRNT. STEADY. THICKW $\mathbf{1}$ QCONW.QFIRE.QFLOW.QRADO.QRADW.QWLSUM COMMON /QS/ COMMON /TEMP/ DENF, DENU, TAMB, TGAS, TINPT, T1(20), T2(20), TSF, TSU COMMON /THERML/ CNDA(2.10).CPW(2.10).DX.EF.EMSA(2.10). NCND.NCPW.NEMS.NQGEN.NRP.QGEN(2,10),RPX(2,50) $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /WOUT/ BWORST, FLREM, HRATIO, RMA, RMF, TTIME, VAVGIN, $\mathbf{1}$ WA.WB.YCO2.YH2O.YN2.YO2.YPYR LOGICAL ADIA, EISCAN, FC, FLSPEC, KRIT, NEWPRP, PLFUEL, PLOT. PNCH. RPSPEC. STEADY. STOICH $\mathbf{1}$ REAL MWIN, MWOUT, MWPYR, MTIME, N, NFLPC $FC = -FALSE.$ $KNTRL = 1$ AWALLN= AWALL-AWDOW BWDOW= AWDOW/HWDOW WTFUEL= FLOAD*AFLOOR OPENF= AWDOW*SQRT(HWDOW) MWIN= 28.97 MWOUT= MWIN ТАМВ= 298. TGAS= 1800. IF (TINPT.GT.0.) TGAS= TINPT $IXL = IX - 1$ $IXC = IX/Z$ TSF= TAMB TSU= TAMB DENF= 0. DENU= 0. $WA = 6H$ $WB = 5H$ IF (.NOT.FLSPEC) GO TO 10 WA= 6HWINDOW WB= 5HWIDTH 10 JP= 0 IF (.NOT.STEADY) JPRINT= PRNT/DTIME + (1.0-1.E-6) IF (STEADY) GOTO 20 IF (DTIME.GT.0.00001) GOTO 15 WRITE (2,95) KNTRL= 2 **RETURN** 95 FORMAT (///* FOR NON-STEADY PROBLEMS MUST SPECIFY DTIME ", ***GREATER THAN ZERO*)** \mathbf{I} 15 IF (MTIME.GT.DTIME) GOTO 20

Í.

SALES AND

MARINA PIER POSTAGE CENTRAL

MARKET

William State Against the Milliam

B

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}})$, where

 C

 C

WRITE (2.92) 92 FORMAT (///* FOR NON-STEADY PROBLEMS MUST SPECIFY MTIME *, I GREATER THAN DTIME") $KNTRL = 2$ RETURN 20 CONTINUE IF (.NOT.STEADY) JM= MTIME/DTIME +2 IF (STEADY) JM= 2 DX= THICKW/IX FLREM= WIFUEL TTIME= 0. $EMS(1) = 1.7(1.7TLU(EMSA, NEMS, TAMB) + 1.7EF - 1.)$ $QWLSUM = 0.$ DO 60 I=1.IX 60 T2(I)= TAMB $J = 0$ CALL RSTA TOTAL= CFLPC+HFLPC+OFLPC+NFLPC+WFLPC IF (TOTAL.LT.101.1.AND.TOTAL.GT.98.9) GOTO 70 CHECK FOR ERRORS IN FUEL COMPOSITION $KNTRL = 2$ WRITE (2,90) 90 FORMAT (///* SUM OF FUEL COMPOSITION INPUT IS INCORRECT*) **RETURN** 70 C= CFLPC*(10./12.) H= HFLPC*10. $D = OFLPC*(10.716.)$ $W = WFLPC*(10*/18.)$ $N = NFLPC*(10.714.)$ RO= (C+H/4.-0/2.)*32./1000. $R = R0/0.232$ CVNET= CVGROS*(1.-WFLPC/100.)-(WFLPC+9.0*HFLPC)/100.*2440.E+3 LATENT HEAT OF H2O EVAPORATION= 2440E+3 J/KG AT 25 C RMA= 0.16*AWDOW*DENSA*SQRT(G*HWDOW) **EMF=RMA** RC= BPF*RMA/R $YO2 = 0.10$ IF (STOICH) EITA= 1. IF (EISCAN) SIZE= SIZE1/EITA RETURN END

地地

Ā

an and an ag

Secondary

謝 3

ī.

 $\ddot{}$

SUBROUTINE INC

J.

-11

つきまく いちかん かんしょう こうしょうかんきょう きんかん てきかい かいしょう アール・プログラム

SUBROUTINE OUTPUT \subset C PRINTS OUTPUT DATA ϵ COMMON /FUEL/ C.CFLPC.CVGROS,CVNET.H.HFLPC.MWPYR.N.NFLPC.G. OFLPC, R, RO, REGRES, SH, SHAPE, SIZE, W, WFLPC, WTFUEL $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /GP/ AWDOW.BPF.CD.CNV.DTIME.EMS(2).HWDOW.IX.IXC.IXL J.JM.JP, JPRINT, K, KO, KH, KITER, KNTRL, MWIN, MWOUT, RC, RP, SIGMA \mathbf{L} COMMON /LOGIC/ FC.FLSPEC.KRIT.NEWPLT.NEWPRP.PLFUEL.PLOT.PNCH. $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /PLAST/ TBOILC.DHP.STOICH.SIZE1.EITA.EISCAN COMMON /PRBLM/ ADIA,AFLOOR,AWALL,DENSW.FLOAD.IRUN.OPENF. PRNT.STEADY.THICKW \mathbf{I} COMMON /QS/ QCONW, QFIRE, QFLOW, QRADO, QRADW, QWLSUM COMMON /TEMP/ DENF, DENU, TAMB, TGAS, TINPT, T1(20), T2(20), TSF, TSU COMMON /WOUT/ BWORST, FLREM, HRATIO, RMA, RMF, TTIME, VAVGIN, WA, WB, YCO2, YH2O, YN2, YO2, YPYR LOGICAL ADIA, EISCAN, FC, FLSPEC, KRIT, NEWPRP, PLFUEL, PLOT, PNCH, RPSPEC, STEADY, STOICH, VTSPEC $\mathbf{1}$ REAL MWIN. MWOUT. MWPYR. N. NFLPC LOGICAL DATPRT DIMENSION T2C(3) DATA DATPRT /.FALSE./ IF (KITER.EQ.1) RETURN IF (PLOT.OR.PNCH) CALL DSTO IF (ILINE.LE.47) GO TO 50 (TTIME, TGAS) DATPRT= .TRUE. GO TO 300 50 TGASC= TGAS-273. $T2C(1) = T5F-273.$ $T2C(2) = T2(1 \times C) - 273$ $T2C(3) = TSU-273.$ FUELPC= FLREM/WTFUEL*100. $ONORM = OFIRE/100.$ IF (QCONW.LT.0) QNORM= (QFLOW+0RADO)/100. ZFLOW= QFLOW/GNORM ZRADO= GRADG/GNORM ZCONW= QCONW/QNORM ZRADW= GRADW/GNORM EXCESS= RP-RC ILINE = ILINE+1 WRITE (2,90) J,TTIME,TGASC,T2C,RP,RC,EXCESS,FUELPC,RMA,HRATIO, $\mathbf{1}$ IF (FLSPEC) WRITE (2,91) BWORST WRITE (3,92) TTIME,ZFLOW,ZRADO,ZCONW,ZRADW,QFIRE,QWLSUM, Y02, YN2, YC02, YH20, YPYR $\mathbf{1}$ IF (STOICH) WRITE (2,901) SIZE1 RETURN \subset ENTRY HEADNG C START NEW PAGE IF (KITER.EQ.1) RETURN $IPG = 1$ 300 CONTINUE ILINE = 0 IF (.NOT.RPSPEC) GOTO 315 WRITE (2,94) IPG. IRUN

MECH

All State

WRITE (3,94) IPG, IRUN GO TO 400 315 IF (.NOT.FLSPEC) GOTO 325 IF (.NOT.PLFUEL) WRITE (2.95) IPG.IRUN IF (.NOT.PLFUEL) WRITE (3,95) IPG, IRUN IF (PLFUEL) WRITE (2,905) IPG.IRUN IF (PLFUEL) WRITE (3,905) IPG, IRUN GO TO 400 325 IF (.NOT.VTSPEC) GOTO 335 WRITE (2.96) IPG.IRUN WRITE (3,96) IPG, IRUN GO TO 400 335 IF (.NOT.PLFUEL) GO TO 345 WRITE (2,97) IPG.IRUN WRITE (3,97) IPG, IRUN GO TO 400 345 WRITE (2.98) IPG.IRUN WRITE (3,98) IPG, IRUN 400 IPG = IPG+1 WRITE (2.99) WA.WB WRITE (3,900) IF (.NOT.DATPRT) RETURN DATPRT= .FALSE. GO TO 50 90 FORMAT (1H , 14, T6, F8.0, T15, F7.0, T25, 3F6.0, T44, F6.3, T51, F6.3. T60,F6.3,T69,F5.1,T79,F4.2,T87,F7.2,T96,F9.2,T109,F6.2,5X,L1) $\mathbf{1}$ 91 FORMAT (1H+, T124, F6.2) 92 FORMAT (1H +F7+0+4F11+3+1PE15+3+E15+3+1X+0P(5F8+3)) 94 FORMAT (1H1, T14,' INPUTTED VALUES OF RP ARE USED' T100, PAGE NO. ', I3, T115, 'RUN NO. ', I4//) 95 FORMAT (1H1,T14, ' FUEL PYROLYSIS (CRIB) SPECIFIED, VENTILATION ' 1 . ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS', T100, PAGE NO.', I3, T115, **FRUN NO. 1.14//1** 96 FORMAT (IHI, T14,' VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED' $\overline{\mathbf{c}}$ 1 . FOR WORST CONDITIONS', T100, 'PAGE NO. ', I3, T115, 'RUN NO. ', I4/ λ 97 FORMAT (IHI.T14.' THERMOPLASTIC POOL FIRE', T100, 'PAGE NO.' \overline{c} I3, T115, 'RUN NO.', I4//) $\mathbf{1}$ 98 FORMAT (1H1,T14, 'CRIB FIRE',T100, 'PAGE NO.', I3, T115, 'RUN NO.', I4/) $\mathbf{1}$ 99 FORMAT (1H0, T10, 'TIME', T17, 'TEMP', T30, 'WALL TEMPS', T47, 'RP', T54, 'RC', T59, 'EXC.PYR.', T70, 'FUEL', T78, 'AIR IN', T90, 'N.P.', $\mathbf{1}$ T98, 'VELOCITY', T109, 'MOL.WT', T118, 'FUEL', T124, A6/ $\overline{2}$ T11,'S',T17,'GAS,C',T34,'C',T46,'KG/S',T53,'KG/S',T61, $\overline{3}$ "KG/S",T71, 'PCT",T79, 'KG/S",T101, 'M/S",T108, $\ddot{}$ T118, 'CNTRL', T124, A5/) 900 FORMAT (T5, 'TIME', T24, 'HEAT BALANCE', T75, 'Q-WALL', T88, 'Y02', T96, "YN2",T104, 'YCO2",T112, 'YH2O",T120, 'YPYR'/ T13, 'GAS FLOW', T25, 'WND RAD', T36, 'WALL CNV', T47, 'WALL RAD', $\mathbf{2}$ \overline{c} T60, 'Q-FIRE', T76, 'SUM', T88, 'PCT', T96, 'PCT', T104, 'PCT', T112, $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 'PCT', T120, 'PCT'/ 4 T16, 'PCT', T27, 'PCT', T39, 'PCT', T49, 'PCT', T62, 'W', T77, $\mathbf{5}$ "J", T88, 'MASS', T96, 'MASS', T104, 'MASS', T112, 'MASS', ϵ T120, 'MASS'/) 901 FORMAT (//' STOICHIOMETRIC FUEL SIZE= ', F8.3,' M2') 905 FORMAT (IHI,T14, ' FUEL PYROLYSIS (POOL) SPECIFIED, VENTILATION' . ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS', T100, 'PAGE NO.', I3, T115, $\mathbf{1}$.RUN NO. '. I4//1 \mathbf{z} END

扛.

あいいかいいい

History Country

SUBROUTINE PFLFIX \subset C \subset PESSIMIZATION ROUTINE FIXED FUEL PYROLYSIS, WINDOW WIDTH VARIED FOR WORST C c BURNING CONDITIONS. C EITHER CRIB OR POOL FUELS ACCEPTED C FOR POOL FUELS, MUST ALSO SET PLFUEL=.TRUE. C COMMON / CNSTS/ AWALLN.BWDOW.DENSA.G.GASCNT.KTRACE.MTIME CPA, CPCO(2), CPCO2(2), CPH2(2), CPH2O(2), CPN2(2), COMMON /CP/ $\mathbf{1}$ $CPQ2(2)$, $CPPYR(2)$. C.CFLPC,CVGROS.CVNET,H,HFLPC,MWPYR,N,NFLPC,O, COMMON /FUEL/ OFLPC, R, RO, REGRES, SH, SHAPE, SIZE, W, WFLPC, WTFUEL $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /GP/ AWDOW, BPF, CD, CNV, DTIME, EMS(2), HWDOW, IX, IXC, IXL, J.JM.JP.JPRINT.K.KO.KH.KITER.KNTRL.MWIN.MWOUT.RC.RP.SIGHA $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /LOGIC/ FC.FLSPEC.KRIT.NEWPLT.NEWPRP.PLFUEL.PLOT.PNCH. RPSPEC, VTSPEC COMMON /PLAST/ TBOILC, DHP, STOICH, SIZEI, EITA, EISCAN COMMON /PRBLM/ ADIA,AFLOOR,AWALL,DENSW.FLOAD,IRUN,OPENF. PRNT. STEADY. THICKW $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /QS/ GCONW, QFIRE, QFLOW, QRADO, QRADW, QWLSUM DENF, DENU, TAMB, TGAS, TINPT, T1(20), T2(20), TSF, TSU COMMON /TEMP/ COMMON /THERML/ CNDA(2,10), CPW(2,10), DX, EF, EMSA(2,10), NCND, NCPW, NEMS, NGGEN, NRP, QGEN(2,10), RPX(2,50) \mathbf{L} COMMON /WOUT/ \texttt{BWORST} , FLREM, HRATIO, RHA, RMF, TTIME, VAVGIN, WA.WB.YCO2, YH2O.YN2.YO2.YPYR $\mathbf{1}$ LOGICAL ADIA, EISCAN, FC, FLSPEC, KRIT, NEWPRP, PLFUEL, PLOT, PNCH, RPSPEC, SCAN, STEADY, STOICH, VTSPEC \mathbf{I} REAL MWIN, MWOUT, MWPYR, MTIME, N, NFLPC IF (STEADY) GOTO 190 FC= .FALSE. SCAN= .FALSE. QRADW=0. $OCONW = 0.$ $F2=0.$ $F1=0$. DTGAS=10. TBOIL=TBOILC+273. CALL HEADNG \subset START TIME LOOP DO 170 J=1, JM $KH = 0$ DERIVI= $1.$ $TSAS2 = 0.$ $TGASI = 0.$ TGASP= 2000. TGASN= TAMB 20 CONTINUE $K = 0$ 30 CONTINUE $KR = 0$...
RMA= 0.666667*CD*0.5*AWDOW*DENSA*SQRT(G*HWDOW*(1.-TAMB/TGAS)) IF (FLREN) 220,220,35 \subset AS SOON AS FUEL IS EXHAUSTED PROGRAM MUST STOP. \subset SINCE WINDOW SIZE WOULD NOT BE WELL DEFINED. 35 IF (.NOT.PLFUEL) GOTO 40

```
RP= SIZE*EF*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TBOIL**4.)/DHP
      PLUME= SIZE*0.0014*CVNET/DHP
      PROP= 1.-(TGAS**4.-TBOIL**4.)/(1700.**4.-TBOIL**4.)
      IF (PROP.LT.0.) PROP= 0.
      RP= RP+PROP*PLUME
      GO TO 50
   40 IF (REGRES.LE.0.0) GOTO 45
         USE THIS FORMULA IF INPUT REGRES IS SPECIFIED
\epsilonRP= REGRES*2.*SHAPE/SIZE*FLREM**(1.-1./SHAPE)*wTFUEL**(1./SHAPE)
      GD TO 5045 CONTINUE
         FUEL SURFACE CONTROL
\mathsf{C}ASSUME CRIB STICK DENSITY RHOCR= 500 KG/M**3
\epsilonRHOCR= 500.
      REGREN= 1.24E-3/RHOCR*SIZE**-0.6
      RPI= REGREN*2.*SHAPE/SIZE*FLREM**(1.-1./SHAPE)*WTFUEL**(1./SHAPE)
         CRIB PORDSITY CONTROL
\epsilonRP2= 0.22*WTFUEL/(RHOCR*SIZE)*SH
      RP= AMIN1 (RPI, RP2)
   50 RMF= RMA+ RP
      YCO2= 3.66667*CFLPC*RC/100./RMF
      YH2O= (WFLPC*RP+9.0*HFLPC*RC)/100./RMF
      YO2= (0.23*RMA-R0*RC)/RMF
      YN2= 0.77*RMA/RMF +NFLPC*RP/100./RMF
      YPYR= (RP-RC)/RMF
      IF(YPYR.LT..0) YPYR= 0.
      MWOUT= 44.*YC02+18.*YH20+28.*YN2+32.*Y02+MWPYR*YPYR
      HRATIO= L./(1.+((TGAS/TAMB)*(MWIN/MWOUT)*(1.+RP/RMA)**2)
         ** 0.333333333)
        . NOTE HIN IS TAKEN AS POSITIVE
\epsilonHIN= HWOOW* HRATIO
      ZW=1 -- MWOUT * TAMB/MWIN/TGAS
      IF(ZW)195,55,55
   55 VAVGIN= 0.666667*SQRT(2.*G*HIN*ZW)
      RMA= CD*VAVGIN*HIN*8WDOW*DENSA
      IF (RP-RMA/R) 60,60,65
   60 RC= RP*BPF
      BWORST= BWDOW*RC*R/RMA
      RMA= RC*R/BPF
      GO TO 70
   65 RC= BPF*RMA/R
      BWORST= BWDOW
          RECALCULATE Y- VALUES SINCE RP, RC HAVE BEEN CHANGED
\epsilon70 KR= KR+1
       IF (KR-3) 50.75.75
   75 CONTINUE
      QFLOW= RMF*(YCO2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPCO2(1)*TGAS+CPCO2(2))-TAMB*(0.5*
          CPC02(1)*TAMB+CPC02(2))) +YH20*(TGAS*(0.5*CPH20(1)*TGAS+
      \mathbf{1}CPH20(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPH20(1)*TAMB+CPH20(2))) +Y02*(TGAS*(
      \overline{2}0.5*CP02(1)*TGAS+CP02(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CP02(1)*TAMB+CP02(2)))
      \mathbf{B}+YN2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPN2(1)*TGAS+CPN2(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPN2(1)*
      \DeltaTAMB+CPN2(2)))'+YPYR*(TGAS*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TGAS+CPPYR(2))
      \mathbf{5}-TAMB*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TAMB+CPPYR(2))))
      6
       QFIRE= RC*CVNET
       IF (ADIA) GOTO 90
       CALL DESOLY
       QRADW= AWALLN*EMS(1)*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TSF**4.)
       QCONW= AWALLN*(TGAS-TSF)*CNV*((TGAS-TSF)*(TGAS-TSF))**0.16666667
```
Ŧ.

DELWARE

j

VALLAN

Т

, which is a second constant interest of the second state of the second state of the second state is a second state of the second state of th

 ~ 100


```
90 CONTINUE
   ORADO= HWDOW*BWORST*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TAMB**4.)
   K = K + 1F3=F2F2 = F1Fi= OFIRE-OFLOW-ORADO-ORADW-OCONW
   TGAS3=TGAS2
   TGAS2=TGAS1
   TGAS1=TGAS
   IF (F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASP) TGASP=TGAS
   IF (F1.6T.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASN) TGASN=TGAS
   DERIV2= DERIV1
   IF (TGAS1.EQ.TGAS2) GOTO 130
   DERIVI=(F1-F2)/(TGAS1-TGAS2)
   IF (KTRACE.GT.0) WRITE (4,99) TGAS1,TGAS2,F1,F2,DERIV1,K,KD,
       KH, J, T2(1), TSF, QFIRE, QFLOW, QRADW, RP, RC
  \mathbf{1}99 FORMAT(2F9.2.3(1PE9.2).3I3.I5.2(0PF9.2).3(1PE10.3).2(0PF7.3))
   IF (.NOT.SCAN) GOTO 95
   IF (F1/F2.GE.0.0) GOTO 93
   SCAN= .FALSE.
    GOTO 100
93 TGAS= TGAS-DTGAS
    IF ((PLFUEL.AND.(TGAS.LT.TBOIL)).OR.(TGAS.LT.TAMB)) GOTO 200
    GOT 0 120
 95 IF (DERIV2.LT..0.AND.ABS(F2).GT..0001)GOTO 100
    IF(DERIV2.LT..0.AND.J.GT.2) GOTO 100
    TGAS= TGAS1+OTGAS
    GOTO 120
100 DIF= ABS(F1/QFLOW)
    IF (DIF.LT.0.002.AND.ABS(TGAS2-TGAS1).LT.2.) GOTO 130
    TGAS=(FI*TGAS2-F2*TGAS1)/(FI-F2)
    IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASP) GOTO 105
    IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.GT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASN) GOTO 105
    IF (TGAS.GT.TGASP.OR.TGAS.LT.TGASN) TGAS=(TGASP+TGASN)/2.
    IF (K.EQ.1.AND.KH.EQ.0) TGAS= TGAS1+10.
    IF (TGAS.GT.2000.) GOTO 110
    IF (TGAS.LT. (TAMB+30.)) GOTO 110
    IF (PLFUEL.AND.TGAS.LT.TBOIL) GOTO 110
    GOT 0 120
105 TGAS= (TGASN+TGASP)/2.
    GOTO 120
110 SCAN= . TRUE.
    TGAS= 1900.
120 CONTINUE
    IF (K-200) 30,30,200
130 CONTINUE
    CALL RSTA
    FLREM= FLREM-RP*OTIME
    IF(FLREM.LT.0) FLREM=0.
    IF (QCDNW.GT.0.) QWLSUM= QWLSUM+(QRADW+QCDNW)*DTIME
    IF (TTIME .GE. MTIME) GO TO 210
    IF (TGAS.LE.353..AND.J.GE.10) GO TO 210
    IF (J.EQ.1) GO TO 150
    IF (JP.LT.JPRINT) GO TO 160
    JP = 0150 CALL OUTPUT
160 JP= JP+1
    TTIME= TTIME+OTIME
```
170 CONTINUE END TIME STEP DO-LOOP C RETURN ERROR IN INPUT C 190 CONTINUE KNTRL= 2 SIO FORMAT (///' PFLFIX ROUTINE DOES NOT ACCEPT STEADY-STATE CASE') IF(KTRACE.EQ.1) WRITE(2,930) TGAS, RC, RP, YPYR, ZW, RMA, MWQUT 195 CONTINUE So FORMAT (/* TGAS=*+F5.0.* RC=*+E10.4.* RP=*+E10.4.* (* TGAS=*+E10.4.* RC=*+E10.4.* RP=*+E10.4.* RP=*+E1 C 200 CONTINUE KNTRL=3 **RETURN** FIRE IS OVER (TRANSIENT CASE) C 210 CONTINUE CALL OUTPUT 220 CONTINUE **RETURN** END $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$

Links

THEF

a intr

Ę

H

r.
C

in 19

 \ddot{z}

÷ ल्ल्य

T H


```
PLUME= SIZE*0.0014*CVNET/DHP
      PROP= 1.-(TGAS**4.-TBOIL**4.)/(1700.**4.-TBOIL**4.)
      IF (PROP.LT.0.) PROP= 0.
      RP= RP+PROP*PLUME
   33 CONTINUE
      RMF= RMA+RP
      IF(FLREM.LE.0)RP=0.
   34 YC02= 3.66667*CFLPC*RC/100./RMF
      YH20= (WFLPC*RP+9.0*HFLPC*RC)/100./RMF
      Y02= (0.23*RMA-R0*RC)/RMF
      YN2= 0.77*RMA/RMF +NFLPC*RP/100./RMF
      YPYR= (RP-RC)/RMF
      IF(YPYR.LT..0) YPYR= 0.
      QFUEL= (RP-RC)*DHP
      MWOUT= 44.*YCO2+18.*YH2O+28.*YN2+32.*YO2+MWPYR*YPYR
      HRATIO= 1./(1.+((TGAS/TAMB)*(MWIN/MWOUT)*(1.+RP/RMA)**2)
         **0.3333333333)
     \mathbf{1}\epsilonNOTE HIN IS TAKEN AS POSITIVE
      HIN= HWDOW* HRATIO
      ZW=1.-MWOUT*TAMB/MWIN/TGAS
      IF(ZW)195,35,35
   35 VAVGIN= 0.666667*SQRT(2.*G*HIN*ZW)
      RMA= CD*VAVGIN*HIN*BWDOW*DENSA
      RMF = RMA+RPRC= BPF*RMA/R
      IF (STOICH) RP= RC/BPF
      IF ((EISCAN.AND.EITA.LT.1.).OR.STOICH) GOTO 37
   36 IF (RC.GT.RP*BPF) GOTO 40
   37 FC= .FALSE.
      GO TO 45
   40 FC= .TRUE.
      RC= RP*BPF
         RECALCULATE VALUES IF IN FUEL CONTROL REGIME.
\mathsf{C}YC02= 3.66667*CFLPC*RC/100./RMF
      YH20= (WFLPC*RP+9.0*HFLPC*RC)/100./RMF
      Y02= (0.23*RMA-R0*RC)/RMF
      YN2= 0.77*RMA/RMF +NFLPC*RP/100./RMF
      YPYR= (RP-RC)/RMF
   45 CONTINUE
      QFLOW= RMF*(YCO2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPCO2(1)*TGAS+CPCO2(2))-TAMB*(0.5*
         CPC02(1)*TAMB+CPC02(2))) +YH20*(TGAS*(0.5*CPH20(1)*TGAS+
     \mathbf{1}CPH2O(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPH2O(1)*TAM8+CPH2O(2))) +YO2*(TGAS*(
     \overline{2}0.5*CP02(1)*TGAS+CP02(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CP02(1)*TAMB+CP02(2)))
     3
     \Delta+YN2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPN2(1)*TGAS+CPN2(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPN2(1)*
     \overline{5}TAMB+CPN2(2))) +YPYR*(TGAS*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TGAS+CPPYR(2))
         -TAMB*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TAMB+CPPYR(2))))
     \epsilonQFIRE= RC*CVNET
      IF (ADIA) GOTO 90
      IF (.NOT.STEADY) CALL DESOLV
      IF (STEADY) CALL STFLOW
      QRADW= AWALLN*EMS(1)*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TSF**4.)
      QCONW= AWALLN*(TGAS-TSF)*CNV*((TGAS-TSF)*(TGAS-TSF))**0.16666667
   90 CONTINUE
      QRADO= AWDOW*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TAMB**4.)
      K = K + 1F3 = F2F2=F1F1= QFIRE-QFLOW-QFUEL-QRADO-QRADW-QCONW
```
· Sale Company Sale Company Sale Company Sale The Company Sale Company Sale Company Sale Company Sale

 \mathbf{r}

计可定

 \mathbf{L}

PALENT

مقامات که در ۱۳۸۷ میلیون به میخواهیم میشود. به مقامات میشود به مقامات میشود به مقامات در مقامات به این کار دست
مقامات که در مقامات است.

 C

 C

CONTRACTOR

```
TGAS3=TGAS2
     TGAS2=TGAS1
     TGAS1 = TGASIF (F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASP) TGASP=TGAS
     IF (F1.6T.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASN) TGASN=TGAS
     DERIV2= DERIVI
     IF (TGAS1.EQ.TGAS2) GOTO 130
     DERIVI=(F1-F2)/(TGAS1-TGAS2)
     IF (KTRACE.GT.0) WRITE (4,99) TGAS1, TGAS2, F1, F2, DERIV1, K, KD,
       KH, J, T2(1), TSF, QFIRE, QFLOW, QRADW, RP, RC
    \mathbf{1}99 FORMAT(2F9.2,3(1PE9.2),3I3,I5,2(0PF9.2),3(1PE10.3),2(0PF7.3))
     IF (.NOT.SCAN) GOTO 95
     IF (F1/F2.GE.0.0) GOTO 93
     SCAN= .FALSE.
     GOT0 100
  93 TGAS= TGAS-DTGAS
     IF (TGAS.LT.TAMB) GOTO 200
     IF (TGAS.LT.TBOIL.AND.(FLREM.GT.0.0)) GOTO 190
     GOTO 120
 95 IF (DERIVI-LT..0.AND.ABS(F2).GT..0001)GOTO 100
     IF(DERIV2.LT..0.AND.J.GT.2) GOTO 100
    TGAS= TGAS1+DTGAS
     GOT 0 120
100 DIF= ABS(F1/QFLOW)
    IF (DIF.LT.0.002.AND.ABS(TGAS2-TGAS1).LT.2.) GOTO 130
    TGAS=(F1*TGAS2-F2*TGAS1)/(F1-F2)
    IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASP) GOTO 105
    IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.GT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASN) GOTO 105
   . IF (K.EQ.1.AND.KH.EQ.0) TGAS= TGAS1+10.
    IF (TGAS.GT.2000.) GOTO 110
    IF (TGAS.LT.(TAMB+30.)) GOTO 110
    IF (TGAS.LT.TBOIL.AND.(FLREM.GT.0.0)) GOTO 110
    GOTO 120
105 TGAS= (TGASN+TGASP)/2.
    GOTO 120
110 SCAN= .TRUE.
    TGAS= 1900.
120 CONTINUE
    IF (STEADY.AND..NOT.ADIA) CALL STFLOW
    IF (K-200) 30,30,200
130 IF (STEADY) GOTO 180
    CALL RSTA
    FLREM= FLREM-RP*OTIME
    IF(FLREM.LT.0) FLREM=0.
    IF (QCONW.GT.0.) QWLSUM= QWLSUM+(QRADW+QCONW)*DTIME
    IF (TTIME .GE. MTIME) GO TO 210
    IF (TGAS.LE.353..AND.J.GE.10) GD TO 210
    IF (J.EQ.1) GO TO 150
    IF (JP.LT.JPRINT) GO TO 160
    JP = 0150 CALL OUTPUT
160 JP= JP+1
    TTIME= TTIME+OTIME
170 CONTINUE
      END TIME STEP DO-LOOP
180 CONTINUE
    IF(.NOT.STOICH) GOTO 185
      FIND STOICHIOMETRIC FUEL SIZE
```
MECH

Controller Design of School

en el composito de la provincia
SIZE1= RP/(EF*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TBOIL**4.)/DHP) 185 CALL OUTPUT NORMAL EXIT WHEN STEADY.EQ.T C **RETURN** ERROR EXIT c 190 CONTINUE IF (KTRACE.EQ.1) WRITE (2,910) TGAS. 910 FORMAT(///* TGAS.LT.TBOIL TGAS=".F8.1." GO TO NEXT CASE'///) GOT 0 200 SQUARE ROOT ERROR c 195 CONTINUE IF(KTRACE.EQ.1) WRITE(2,930) TGAS, RC.RP.YPYR.ZW.RMA.MWOUT 930 FORMAT (/* TGAS=*,F5.0,* RC=*,E10.4,* RP=*,E10.4,* MWOUT=*,F6.1) FAIL TO CONVERGE, ERROR EXIT C 200 CONTINUE $KNTRL = 3$ RETURN FIRE IS OVER (TRANSIENT CASE) C 210 CONTINUE CALL OUTPUT RETURN END

г

经定额

CONTAGE CARRIER

ာင္း အေမရပါတယ္။ မိုးကို အေမရပါတယ္။ အမွတ္ ေတြကို ေတြကို ေရာက္ေရး ေတြကို ေတြကို ေတြကို ေလ့လာမ္းေတာ့ ေတြက ေလးေကာင
ေလ့လာမ္းေတြက ေလ့လာမ္းေတြကို ေတြကို ေတြကိ

 $\frac{1}{2}$

different to

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 \rightarrow

The Case

 C C

 C

 ϵ

 C

SUBROUTINE PYTFIX PESSIMIZATION ROUTINE FIXED VENTILATION, WORST POSSIBLE FUEL PYROLYSIS RATE. COMMON / CNSTS/ AWALLN, BWDOW, DENSA, G, GASCNT, KTRACE, MTIME CPA, CPCO(2), CPCO2(2), CPH2(2), CPH2O(2), CPN2(2), COMMON /CP/ CP02(2), CPPYR(2) $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /FUEL/ C.CFLPC.CVGROS.CVNET.H.HFLPC.MWPYR.N.NFLPC.O. $\mathbf{1}$ OFLPC, R. RO. REGRES. SH. SHAPE, SIZE, W. WFLPC. WTFUEL COMMON /GP/ AWDOW.BPF, CD, CNV, DTIME, EMS(2), HWDOW, IX, IXC, IXL. J.JM.JP.JPRINT, K.KD.KH.KITER.KNTRL.MWIN.MWCUT, RC.RP.SIGMA $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /LOGIC/ FC.FLSPEC.KRIT, NEWPLT, NEWPRP.PLFUEL.PLOT.PNCH. $\mathbf{1}$ RPSPEC.VTSPEC COMMON /PLAST/ TBOILC.OHP, STOICH, SIZE1, EITA. EISCAN COMMON /PRBLM/ ADIA, AFLOOR, AWALL, DENSW, FLOAD, IRUN, OPENF, PRNT, STEADY, THICKW $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /QS/ QCONW, QFIRE, QFLOW, QRADO, QRADW, QWLSUM COMMON /TEMP/ DENF, DENU, TAMB, TGAS, TINPT, T1(20), T2(20), TSF, TSU COMMON /THERML/ CNDA(2,10), CPW(2,10), DX, EF, EMSA(2,10), NCND.NCPW.NEMS.NQGEN.NRP.QGEN(2,10).RPX(2,50) $\mathbf{1}$ COMMON /WOUT/ BWORST.FLREM.HRATIO.RMA.RMF.TTIME.VAVGIN. WA.WB.YCO2.YH2O.YN2,YO2.YPYR $\mathbf{1}$ LOGICAL ADIA.EISCAN.FC.FLSPEC.KRIT.NEWPRP.PLFUEL. PLOT. PNCH, RPSPEC. SCAN. STEADY, STOICH. VTSPEC $\mathbf{1}$ REAL MWIN, MWOUT, MWPYR, MTIME, N, NFLPC IF (STEADY) GOTO 190 FC= .FALSE. SCAN= .FALSE. QRADW=0. $QCONW = 0.$ $F2 = 0.$ $FI=0$. DTGAS=10. CALL HEADNG START TIME LOOP DO 170 J=1.JM $KH = 0$ DERIV1= 1. $TGAS2 = 0.$ $TGAS1 = 0.$ TGASP= 2000. TGASN= TAMB 20 CONTINUE $K = 0$ 30 CONTINUE IF (FLREM.GT.0.) GOTO 32 $RC = 0.$ $RP = 0.$ FC= .TRUE. 32 RMF= RMA+RP YC02= 3.66667*CFLPC*RC/100./RMF YH2O= (WFLPC*RP+9.0*HFLPC*RC)/100./RMF YO2= (0.23*RMA-R0*RC)/RMF YN2= 0.77*RMA/RMF +NFLPC*RP/100./RMF YPYR= (RP-RC)/RMF IF(YPYR.LT..0) YPYR= 0.

```
MWOUT= 44.*YC02+18.*YH20+28.*YN2+32.*Y02+MWPYR*YPYR
      HRATIO= 1./(1.+((TGAS/TAMB)*(MWIN/MWOUT)*(1.+RP/RMA)**2)
     \mathbf{1}**0.333333333)
\mathsf{C}NOTE HIN IS TAKEN AS POSITIVE
      HIN= HwDOW* HRATIO
      ZW=1.-MWOUT*TAMB/MWIN/TGAS
      IF(ZW)195,35,35
  35 VAVGIN= 0.666667*SQRT(2.*G*HIN*ZW)
      RMA= CD*VAVGIN*HIN*BWDOW*DENSA
      RMF= RMA+RP
      IF (.NOT.FC) RC= BPF*RMA/R
      IF (.NOT.FC) RP= RC/BPF
  45 CONTINUE
      QFLOW= RMF*(YCO2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPCO2(1)*TGAS+CPCO2(2))-TAMB*(0.5*
         CPC02(1)*TAMB+CPC02(2))) +YH20*(TGAS*(0.5*CPH20(1)*TGAS+
     \mathbf{I}CPH20(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPH20(1)*TAMB+CPH20(2))) +Y02*(TGAS*(
    \overline{c}\overline{\mathbf{3}}0.5*CP02(1)*TGAS+CP02(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CP02(1)*TAMB+CP02(2)))
         +YN2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPN2(1)*TGAS+CPN2(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPN2(1)*
    \blacktriangleTAMB+CPN2(2))) +YPYR*(TGAS*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TGAS+CPPYR(2))
    5
         -TAMB*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TAMB+CPPYR(2))))
    6.
     QFIRE= RC*CVNET
     IF (ADIA) GOTO 90
     CALL DESOLV
     QRADW= AWALLN*EMS(1)*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TSF**4.)
     QCONW= AWALLN*(TGAS-TSF)*CNV*((TGAS-TSF)*(TGAS-TSF))**0.16666667
  90 CONTINUE
     QRADO= AWDOW*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TAMB**4.)
     K = K + 1F3=F2F2=F1F1= QFIRE-QFLOW-QRADO-QRADW-QCONW
     TGAS3=TGAS2
     TGAS2=TGAS1
     TGAS1 = TGASIF (F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASP) TGASP=TGAS
     IF (F1.GT.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASN) TGASN=TGAS
     DERIV2= DERIV1
     IF (TGAS1.EQ.TGAS2) GOTO 130
     DERIVI=(F1-F2)/(TGAS1-TGAS2)
    IF (KTRACE.GT.0) WRITE (4,99) TGAS1, TGAS2, F1, F2, DERIV1, K.KD,
       KH.J.T2(1).TSF, QFIRE, QFLOW, QRADW.RP, RC
    \mathbf{1}99 FORMAT(2F9.2.3(1PE9.2).3I3,15,2(0PF9.2).3(1PE10.3).2(0PF7.3))
     IF (.NOT.SCAN) GOTO 95
     IF (F1/F2.GE.0.0) GOTO 93
    SCAN = .FALSE.GOT 0 100
 93 TGAS= TGAS-DTGAS
    IF (TGAS.LT.TAMB) GOTO 200
    GOTO 120
 95 IF (DERIV1.LT..0.AND.ABS(F2).GT..0001)GOTO 100
    IF(DERIV2.LT..0.AND.J.GT.2) GOTO 100
    TGAS= TGAS1+DTGAS
    GOTO 120
100 DIF= ABS(F1/QFLOW)
    IF (DIF.LT.0.002.AND.A8S(TGAS2-TGAS1).LT.2.) GOTO 130
    TGAS=(F1*TGAS2-F2*TGAS1)/(F1-F2)
    IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASP) GOTO 105
    IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.GT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASN) GOTO 105
```
「大きいという」というのは、そのことのことを

REACTION CONTRACTOR

modern part

Early Copyright about the same of a state of the complete shall and the same of the same

should entitle the

 $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$

Committee Street Committee

IF (K.EQ.1.AND.KH.EQ.0) TGAS= TGAS1 +10. IF (TGAS.GT.2000.) GOTO 110 IF (TGAS.LT.(TAMB+30.)) GOTO 110 GOTO 120 105 TGAS= (TGASN+TGASP)/2. GOTO 120 110 SCAN= .TRUE. TGAS= 1900. 120 CONTINUE IF (K-200) 30,30,200 130 CONTINUE CALL RSTA FLREM= FLREM-RP*OTIME IF(FLREN.LT.0) FLREM=0. IF (QCONW.GT.0.) QWLSUM= QWLSUM+(QRADW+QCCNW)*DTIME IF (TTIME .GE. MTIME) GO TO 210 IF (TGAS.LE.353..AND.J.GE.10) GO TO 210 IF (J.EQ.1) GO TO 150 IF (JP.LT.JPRINT) GO TO 160 $JP = 0$ 150 CALL OUTPUT 160 JP= JP+1 TTIME= TTIME+DTIME 170 CONTINUE c END TIME STEP DO-LOOP **RETURN** \subset ,ERROR IN INPUT 190 CONTINUE $KNTRL = 2$ WRITE (2,910) 910 FORMAT (///' PVTFIX ROUTINE DOES NOT ACCEPT STEADY-STATE CASE') RETURN SQUARE ROOT ERROR \subset 195 CONTINUE IF(KTRACE.EQ.1) WRITE(2,930) TGAS, RC, RP, YPYR, ZW, RMA, MWOUT 930 FORMAT (/' TGAS=',F5.0,' RC=',E10.4,' RP=',E10.4, 1 . YPYR=', E10-4,' ZW=', F6.4,' RMA=', E10.4,' MWOUT=', F6.1) FAIL TO CONVERGE, ERROR EXIT C 200 CONTINUE $KNTRL = 3$ RETURN FIRE IS OVER (TRANSIENT CASE) \subset 210 CONTINUE CALL OUTPUT **RETURN** END

 C C ϵ

 C

 C

 $\mathbf{1}$

 $\mathbf{1}$

 $\mathbf{1}$

 $\mathbf{1}$

 $\mathbf{1}$

 $\mathbf{1}$

 $\mathbf{1}$

 $\mathbf{1}$

 C

COTA-BAS

Ī

ł

ţ

SUBROUTINE RPFIX TABULAR FUEL PYROLYSIS ROUTINE FUEL PYROLYSIS RATE IS AN INPUT VARIABLE. COMMON / CNSTS/ AWALLN, BWDOW, DENSA, G, GASCNT, KTRACE, MTIME CPA, CPCO(2), CPCO2(2), CPH2(2), CPH2O(2), CPN2(2), COMMON /CP/ $CPD2(2) \cdot CPYR(2)$ C.CFLPC.CVGROS.CVNET, H. HFLPC.MWPYR.N.NFLPC.O. COMMON /FUEL/ OFLPC, R, RO, REGRES, SH, SHAPE, SIZE, W, WFLPC, WTFUEL COMMON /GP/ AWDOW.BPF.CD.CNV.DTIME.EMS(2).HWDOW.IX.IXC.IXL. J.JM.JP.JPRINT.K.KD.KH.KITER.KNTRL.MWIN.MWOUT.RC.RP.SIGMA COMMON /LOGIC/ FC.FLSPEC.KRIT, NEWPLT.NEWPRP.PLFUEL.PLOT.PNCH, RPSPEC, VTSPEC COMMON /PLAST/ TBOILC, DHP, STOICH, SIZE1, EITA, EISCAN COMMON /PRBLM/ ADIA, AFLOOR, AWALL, DENSW, FLOAD, IRUN, OPENF, PRNT.STEADY.THICKW COMMON /QS/ QCONW.QFIRE.QFLOW.QRADO.QRADW.QWLSUM COMMON /TEMP/ DENF, DENU, TAMB, TGAS, TINPT, T1(20), T2(20), TSF, TSU COMMON /THERML/ CNDA(2,10), CPW(2,10), DX, EF, EMSA(2,10), NCND, NCPW, NEMS, NGGEN, NRP, GGEN(2, 10), RPX(2,50) BWORST, FLREM, HRATIO, RMA, RMF, TTIME, VAVGIN, COMMON /WOUT/ WA, WB, YCO2, YH2O, YN2, YO2, YPYR LOGICAL ADIA, EISCAN, FC, FLSPEC, KRIT, NEWPRP, PLFUEL, PLOT, PNCH, RPSPEC, SCAN, STEADY, STOICH, VTSPEC REAL MWIN, MWOUT, MWPYR, MTIME, N, NFLPC SCAN= .FALSE. $QRADW=0$. $QCONW = 0.$ $F2 = 0.$ $FI=0$. $DTGAS=10.$ CALL HEADNG START TIME LOOP DO 170 J=1.JM $KH = 0$ DERIVI= 1. $TSAS2 = 0.$ $TGAS1 = 0.$ TGASP= 2000. TGASN= TAMB 20 CONTINUE $K = 0$ 30 CONTINUE FC= .FALSE. IF (FLREM.GT.0.) RP= TLU(RPX,NRP,TTIME) IF (FLREM.LE.0.) RP= 0. $RMF = RMA+RP$ YC02= 3.66667*CFLPC*RC/100./RMF YH20= (WFLPC*RP+9.0*HFLPC*RC)/100./RMF YO2= (0.23*RMA-R0*RC)/RMF YN2= 0.77*RMA/RMF +NFLPC*RP/100./RMF YPYR= (RP-RC)/RMF IF(YPYR.LT..0) YPYR= 0. MWOUT= 44.*YCO2+18.*YH2O+28.*YN2+32.*YO2+MWPYR*YPYR HRATIO= 1./(1.+((TGAS/TAMB)*(MWIN/MWOUT)*(1.+RP/RMA)**2)

ESPECIALMENT DESCRIPTION

0.3333333333) \mathbf{I} NOTE HIN IS TAKEN AS POSITIVE ϵ HIN= HWDOW* HRATIO ZW=1--MWOUT*TAMB/MWIN/TGAS IF(ZW)195,35,35 35 VAVGIN= 0.666667*SQRT(2.*G*HIN*ZW) RMA= CD*VAVGIN*HIN*BWDOW*DENSA $RMF = RWA+RP$ IF (RMA/R-RP) 40,40,45 40 RC= BPF*RMA/R GO TO 50 45 RC= BPF*RP FC= . TRUE. 50 CONTINUE QFLOW= RMF*(YCO2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPCO2(1)*TGAS+CPCO2(2))-TAMB*(0.5* CPC02(1)*TAMB+CPC02(2))) +YH20*(TGAS*(0.5*CPH20(1)*TGAS+ $\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{2}$ CPH20(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPH20(1)*TAMB+CPH20(2))) +Y02*(TGAS*(0.5*CP02(1)*TGAS+CP02(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CP02(1)*TAMB+CP02(2))) з 4 +YN2*(TGAS*(0.5*CPN2(1)*TGAS+CPN2(2))-TAMB*(0.5*CPN2(1)* 5 TAMB+CPN2(2))) +YPYR*(TGAS*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TGAS+CPPYR(2)) -TAMB*(0.5*CPPYR(1)*TAMB+CPPYR(2)))) 6 QFIRE= RC*CVNET IF (ADIA) GOTO 90 IF (.NOT.STEADY) CALL DESOLV IF (STEADY) CALL STFLOW QRADW= AWALLN*EMS(1)*SIGMA*(TGAS4.-TSF**4.) QCONW= AWALLN*(TGAS-TSF)*CNV*((TGAS-TSF)*(TGAS-TSF))**0.16666667 90 CONTINUE QRADO= AWDOW*SIGMA*(TGAS**4.-TAMB**4.) $K = K + 1$ $F3 = F2$ $F2 = F1$ F1= QFIRE-QFLOW-QRADO-QRADW-QCONW TGAS3=TGAS2 TGAS2=TGAS1 TGAS1=TGAS IF (F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASP) TGASP=TGAS IF (F1.GT.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASN) TGASN=TGAS DERIV2= DERIVI IF (TGAS1.EQ.TGAS2) GOTO 130 DERIV1=(F1-F2)/(TGAS1-TGAS2) IF (KTRACE.GT.0) WRITE (4,99) TGAS1, TGAS2, F1, F2, DERIV1, K, KD, I KH.J.T2(1).TSF.QFIRE.QFLOW.QRADW.RP.RC 99 FORMAT(2F9.2.3(1PE9.2).313.15.2(0PF9.2).3(1PE10.3).2(0PF7.3)) IF (.NOT.SCAN) GOTO 95 IF (F1/F2.GE.0.0) GOTO 93 SCAN= .FALSE. GOT 0 100 93 TGAS= TGAS-DTGAS IF (TGAS.LT.TAMB) GOTO 200 GOTO 120 95 IF (DERIVI.LT..0.AND.ABS(F2).GT..0001)GOTO 100 IF(DERIV2.LT..0.AND.J.GT.2) GOTO 100 TGAS= TGAS1+DTGAS GOTO 120 100 DIF= ABS(F1/QFLOW) IF (DIF.LT.0.002.AND.ABS(TGAS2-TGAS1).LT.2.) GOTO 130 TGAS=(F1*TGAS2-F2*TGAS1)/(F1-F2)

1898

IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.LT.0..AND.TGAS.GT.TGASP) GOTO 105 IF (K.GT.10.AND.F1.GT.0..AND.TGAS.LT.TGASN) GOTO 105 IF (K.EQ.1.AND.KH.EQ.0) TGAS= TGAS1+10. IF (TGAS.GT.2000.) GOTO 110 IF (TGAS.LT.(TAMB+30.)) GOTO 110 GOTO 120 105 TGAS= (TGASN+TGASP)/2. GOTO 120 110 SCAN= .TRUE. TGAS= 1900. 120 CONTINUE IF (STEADY.AND..NOT.ADIA) CALL STFLOW IF (K-200) 30.30.200 130 CONTINUE IF (STEADY) GOTO 180 CALL RSTA FLREM= FLREM-RP*DTIME IF(FLREM.LT.0.) FLREM=0. IF (QCONW.GT.0.) QWLSUM= QWLSUM+(QRADW+QCONW)#OTIME IF (TTIME .GE. MTIME) GO TO 210 IF (TGAS.LE.353..AND.J.GE.10) GO TO 210 IF (J.EQ.1) GO TO 150 IF (JP.LT.JPRINT) GO TO 160 $JP = 0$ 150 CALL OUTPUT 160 JP= JP+1 TTIME= TTIME+OTIME 170 CONTINUE END TIME STEP DO-LOOP 180 CONTINUE 185 CALL OUTPUT NORMAL EXIT WHEN STEADY.EQ.T **RETURN** SQUARE ROOT ERROR 195 CONTINUE LE(KTRACE_EQ.1) WRITE(2,930) TGAS,RC.RP.YPYR.ZW.RMA.MWOUT 930 FORMAT (/' TGAS=',F5.0,' RC=',E10.4,' RP=',E10.4, 1 ° YPYR=°,E10.4,° ZW=°,F6.4,° RMA=°,E10.4,° MWOUT=°,F6.1) FAIL TO CCNVERGE, ERROR EXIT 200 CONTINUE KNTRL=3 **RETURN** FIRE IS OVER (TRANSIENT CASE) 210 CONTINUE CALL OUTPUT RETURN END

 C

 C

 C

 C

 \subset

不定のない

● 「「このことのこと」ということになるのです。

 c

 C

 C

```
SUBROUTINE STFLOW
\mathsf{C}CALCULATES WALL HEAT CONDUCTION WHEN STEADY-STATE
\mathsf{c}CONDITION ONLY IS NEEDED.
                       AWDOW.BPF, CD, CNV, DTIME.EMS(2), HWDOW.IX.IXC.IXL,
      COMMON /GP/
         J, JM, JP, JPRINT, K, KD, KH, KITER, KNTRL, MWIN, MWOUT, RC, RP, SIGMA
     \mathbf{1}COMMON /PRBLN/ ADIA, AFLOOR, AWALL, DENSW, FLOAD, IRUN, OPENF,
        PRNT, STEADY, THICKW
      COMMON /TEMP/ DENF, DENU, TAMB, TGAS, TINPT, T1(20), T2(20), TSF, TSU
      COMMON /THERML/ CNDA(2,10), CPW(2,10), DX, EF, EMSA(2,10),
         NCND, NCPW, NEMS, NQGEN, NRP, QGEN(2,10), RPX(2,50)
         BIOT= BIOT NUMBER
      KD = 0TSF = TGAS - 30.TSU= TAMB +30.
   10 CONTINUE
      TSFOLD= TSF
      TSUGLD= TSU
      ENS(1) = 1.7(1.7TLUCENSA, NEMS, TSF) +1.7EF -1.EMS(2)= TLU(EMSA, NEMS, TSU)
      TAVG= (TGAS+TAMB)/2.
      CND= TLU(CNDA, NCND, TAVG)
      ZRF= TGAS*(TGAS*(TGAS+TSF)+TSF*TSF)+TSF*TSF*TSF
      ZCF= CNV*((TGAS-TSF)*(TGAS-TSF))**0.16666667
      HF= ZCF+EMS(1)*SIGMA*ZRF
      BIOTF= HF*THICKW/CND
      ZRU= TAMB*(TAMB*(TAMB+TSU)+TSU*TSU)+TSU*TSU*TSU
      ZCU= 1.31*((TAMB-TSU)*(TAMB-TSU))**0.16666667
      HU= ZCU+EMS(2)*SIGMA*ZRU
     BIOTU= HU*THICKW/CND
     TSF= ((BIOTF+HF/HU)*TGAS+TAMB)/(1.+BIOTF+HF/HU)
     TSU= ((BIOTU+HU/HF)*TAMB+TGAS)/(1.+BIOTU+HU/HF)
     T2(1)= TSF-'(TSF-TSU)*DX/THICKW/2.
     T2(IXC) = (TSF+TSU)/2.IF ((ABS(TSF-TSFOLD).LT.3.).AND.(ABS(TSU-TSUOLD).LT.3.))
     \mathbf{1}RETURN
     KD = KO + 1TSU= (TSU+TSUOLD)/2.
     IF (KD.LT.20) GOTO 10
      WRITE (2,90) TSF.TSFOLD
  90 FORMAT (//' ** UNSUCCESS FUL ITERATION IN STFLOW'/
    1^{\circ}\mathbf{r}TSF="+F15+2+" TSFOLD="+F15+2)
     RETURN
     END
```
Á

ł,

in the control

CASSICA

control to the Meridian


```
FUNCTION TLU (ARRAY, NUM, VALIN)
           TABULAR LOOK-UP INTERPOLATING ROUTINE
\epsilon\mathsf{C}DIMENSION ARRAY(2,NUM)
\mathsf{C}ARRAY(1.I)= INDEPENDENT VARIABLE
           ARRAY(2, I)= DEPENDENT VARIABLE
\mathsf{C}INTERPOLATES LINEARLY WITHIN GIVEN DOMAIN. SETS EQUAL TO
\mathsf{C}SMALLEST OR LARGEST VALUE IF OUTSIDE THE DOMAIN.
\mathsf{C}IF (NUM.NE.1) GO TO 10
       TLU = ARRAY(2,1)RETURN
   10 IF (NUM.NE.2) GO TO 20
       I = 2GO TO 50
   20 IF (VALIN.GT.ARRAY(1,1)) GO TO 30
       TLU = ARRAY(2,1)RETURN
   30 DO 40 I=2, NUM
       IF (VALIN.LE.ARRAY(1.1)) GO TO 50
   40 CONTINUE
       TLU= ARRAY(2.NUM)
       RETURN
   50 TLU= ARRAY(2,1-1) + (VALIN - ARRAY(1,1-1))*
     1 ((\text{ARRAY}(2,1) - \text{ARRAY}(2,1-1)) / (\text{ARRAY}(1,1) - \text{ARRAY}(1,1-1)))RETURN
       END
      SUBROUTINE TRIDGF (A.B.C.D.E.IX)
\mathsf{C}TRIDIAGONAL GAUSS ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR UNSYMMETRIC
\mathsf{C}\mathsf{C}MATRICES.
\mathsf{C}A=LEFT OF DIAGONAL, B=DIAGONAL, C=RIGHT OF DIAGONAL,
          D= CONSTANT VECTOR, E= SOLUTION VECTOR, IX= SIZE OF MATRIX.
\mathsf{C}\mathsf{C}DIMENSION A(20), B(20), C(20), D(20), E(20), CP(20)
      CP(1) = C(1)/B(1)E(1) = D(1)/B(1)C(IX) = 0IXL = IX - I00 10 I=2, IX
      J = I - IBX = B(I) - CP(J)*A(I)CP(I) = C(I)/BXE(I) = (D(I) - E(J) * A(I))/BX
```
10 CONTINUE DO 20 I=1, IXL $J = I X - I$ $E(J) = E(J) - E(J+1) * CP(J)$ 20 CONTINUE RETURN END

×.

SERRY

Contract Contract Contr

 $\label{eq:convergence} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathcal$

鵄

ł

 $\ddot{\cdot}$

.,

endo de la construcción de la const
En la construcción de la construcc

Appendix B

Vehicle Drawings Used for COMPF2 Study

 $M349-0.3$ M349-02 M349-03

Drawing Number

Drawing Title

\sim \sim

 $\bar{\rm B}$.

 λ_1

Appendix c

WMATA ROHR VEHICLE

FIRE LOADING DATA AND CALCULATION

 α

 $\frac{a}{1-\sqrt{2}}$

 γ

TABLE 4.3-1

ROHR VEHICLE HARDENING STUDY COMBUSTIBLE MATERIALS INVENTORY

 $\pmb{\cdot}$

TABLE 4.3-1 (CONT)

VEHICLE HARDENING STUDY COMBUSTIBLE MATERIALS INVENTORY

4-19

TABLE 4.3-1 (CONT)

VEHICLE HARDENING STUDY COMBUSTIBLE MATERIALS INVENTORY

TOTAL CAR

9,044

68,596

v.

Appendix D

COMPF2 COMPUTER PRINTOUTS

INPUT DATA AND CORRESPONDING RESULTS

and the state of the state of the state of

cus.

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{N}}$. The set of $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{N}}$

 ~ 10

 $\mathcal{L}_{\rm{max}}$

 \mathcal{M}

 $\mathbf{E}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 ~ 100

 \sim

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

×

PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

 ~ 10

 $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 ~ 0.01

 \sim 18

 \mathbb{R}^3

 $\mathcal{R}_{\rm{eff}}$

 \mathcal{G}

 \sim

 $\left\langle \sigma \right\rangle$

G.

 $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$

 $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$

 \Box

PERSONAL PROPERTY

Market

The State of the State of the State

VENTILATION SPECIFIED: FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR MORST CONDITIONS

 λ

PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

 $\begin{picture}(100,20) \put(0,0){\line(1,0){10}} \put(10,0){\line(1,0){10}} \put(10,0){\line($

 \mathbf{r}

 \cup $\ddot{\mathbf{C}}$

 \circ

 $\overline{\mathbf{z}}$

 ϵ

 \overline{E} -95

 \mathbf{V}

 \mathbb{Q}_i

 $\mathbf C$

 \mathbf{C}

 \subset

×.

3690.
3720.

 76.342 5.742
 76.342 5.742

4.990

4.990

ä.

12.906

12.906

100

10.

 \bullet

 \sim

 $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}$

 \mathcal{L}_{max}

- sk

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

K.

 $\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbb{C} & \mathbb{C} & \mathbb{C} & \mathbb{C} & \mathbb{C} & \mathbb{C} & \mathbb{C} \\ \mathbb{C} & \mathbb{C} & & & & \mathbb{C} \\ \mathbb{C} & \mathbb{C} & & & & \mathbb{C} \end{array}$

 \sim Æ \sim $12.906 - 34.243$ 3750. 76.342 5.742 4.990 2.635E+07 4.256E+04 0.106 0.716 0.118 0.025 0.035 3762. 97.593 2.407 -65.857 $0.000E + 00$ 9.962E+03 0.230 0.770 0. \circ . $0.$ ≥ 2 π_{1} in γ : J 石 N \cup ÷ à b \cup \sim $\overline{1}$ ϵ $\mathbf{r}^{\mathbf{r}}$ Ÿ. \mathcal{F} σ \pm . $\langle \psi \rangle$ μ $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{F}}$, \mathcal{F} \ddot{f} $r_{\rm i}$ X. α -19 $\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{S}$ ~ 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ \mathcal{U} $\overline{\varepsilon}$ τ ú. α \mathbf{R} $\frac{1}{\hbar}$ - 9 α \sim $\left($ \mathbf{t} λ \overline{W} ϵ $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{X} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Z} \right)$ \sim \overline{C} $\mathbf{F}_\mathrm{c} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{F} \right)$ $\sqrt{2m^2}$ -6 $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}$ α and dust considerably state of \mathbb{R}^n , where α acong i

 $\sim 10^{11}$ km s $^{-1}$

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}$

 \lesssim

MECH \Box

 \sim

 λ

×.

 \sim

 \sim

 $\overline{}$

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

 \blacksquare

T

Г

PAGE NO. 1 **RUN NO. 1**

Communication

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \overline{a}

Contractor

كالمسد مستطرات

 $\alpha=0$

 $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$

 \sim

 γ_{B} .

 \sim

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

IFFROM POPPOR PORTO POR

 ~ 100 km s $^{-1}$

1924

MECH

 ~ 10

 $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{F}}$. 그 사람들은 아이를 하고 있다.

 ~ 100 km s $^{-1}$

and the state of

 \circ

 \mathbf{I}

∽

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

941

- 2

1740. 73.242

1350.

1380.

1410.

1440.

1470.

1600.

1530.

1560.

1590.

1620.

1650.

1980.

1710.

Ú,

X

t

К.

 ζ

 \mathcal{Q}^{\prime}

 $\overline{}$

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

73.242

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 \sim

6.772

6.772

6.772

6.772

6.772

6.772

6.772

6.772

 6.772

6.772

6.772

<u>6.772</u>

6.772

 6.772

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

4.722

15.243

15.242

15.242

15.242

15.242

15.242

15,243

15.243
15.242

15.242

15.242

16.242

15.242

15.242

160

3.166E+07

5.705E+04

5.704E+04

6.704E+04

5.704E+04

5.704E+04

5.704E+04

5.705E+04

5.705E+04

5.704E+04

5.704E+04

5.704E+04

6.705E+04

5.704E+04

5.704E+04

÷

0.004

 0.084

0.084

 0.084

0.084

0.084

0.084

0.084

0.084

 0.084

0.084

 0.084

0.004

0.094

 \mathcal{C}_1

0.716

0.716

 0.716

0.716

0.716

 0.716

0.716

0.716

0.716

0.716

0.716

<u> 0.716</u>

0.716

0.716

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

 0.142

×

0.029

0.029

 0.029

0.029

0.029

0.029

0.029

0.029

 0.029

0.029

 0.029

0.029

 0.029

0.029

0.028

 0.028

 0.020

0.028

 0.028

0.028

 0.028

 0.028

 0.028

0.028

0.028

0.028

0.028

0.028

 $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{N}}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$. The set of \mathcal{L}

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$. The $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

 ~ 100

 ~ 100

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 ~ 100 km s $^{-1}$

 \sim

 \mathcal{D}_1 . The set of
 $\mathbf{r}_{\rm{max}}$

 ~ 100 km s $^{-1}$

 $\sim 10^{-11}$

 $\overline{\Delta}$

 α

 \sim 100 \pm 100 \pm

 \sim 100 μ

المساري المستعل

 $\overline{\sigma}$

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

FAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

لسنة المستدات

Contract Contract

 ~ 10 ~ 100

 $\langle\langle\lambda\rangle\rangle$

 ~ 10

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C})$. The set of the \mathcal{C} $\sim 10^{10}$

 α

 \sim

 \sim

 \mathcal{D}

 $\hat{\Sigma}$

 \sim

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$

 \sim

 \mathcal{L}

 \mathcal{L}

Ý.

 \mathcal{V} .

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

 $\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}$

 $\begin{picture}(180,10) \put(0,0){\line(1,0){10}} \put(10,0){\line(1,0){10}} \put(10,0){\line($

T

T T

PAGE NO. 1 **RUN NO. 1**

 $\begin{picture}(100,20) \put(0,0){\line(1,0){10}} \put(10,0){\line(1,0){10}} \put(10,0){\line($

 \overline{a}

 \sim

 $\sqrt{2}$

AL.

all March 1982 through the collection

 $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$

the control of the control of

 \mathcal{N}

E)

 \mathbf{C}

 \sim 100

¥.

 $\overline{\mathbf{z}}$ io.

 $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{C}}$. The contract of $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{C}}$

 ∞

MECH $r = r$

 $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{d}}$

 \bullet

 \sim 1

 $\overline{}$

 \sim

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

Œ

r

PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

m

-m

 \mathcal{V}

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 \mathcal{N}

 \mathbf{r}

 \sim the state of the state of the state of **Contract Contract** المسو and the state of the state of the \sim \sim served the country of the server of the

 \mathbf{u}

 \cup

 \bigcirc

 \cup

 \rightarrow

 $\overline{}$

-

۰

 $\overline{}$

 $\left($

 $\tilde{\phi}$

 $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{C}}$

... .

الأسبالة

 \mathbf{r} .

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR MORST CONDITIONS

PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

1710. 67.527 1740. 67.527

67.627

8.698

8.699

8.698

1690.

9.013E+04

9.013E+04

 0.041

 0.041

0.041

0.716

0.716

0.716

0.189

0.189

0.189

4.253

 4.253

4.253

19.489

19.489

19.489

4.206E+07

4.206E+07

a.

 0.014

0.014

0.014

0.039

 0.039

0.039

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

and the total first

 $\overline{}$

 \sim

 $\overline{\mathbf{v}}$

 \mathbf{x}

 $\langle \bullet \rangle$

 α

r

T

F

iú.

 \sim
\widetilde{H}

1941

 \sim 15 $-$

 $\left\langle \begin{array}{c} \ast \\ \ast \end{array} \right\rangle$

 $\sim 10^{-10}$

הוחד מיוחד הוא היה היה מיוחד הוחד הוח

 \mathbb{R}^N

 ~ 100

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z})$

 $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C})$

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

 $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$

المحل المحار المسار المسار المسار المسار المسار المسار the property of the control of the conthe contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of

 ~ 100 km s $^{-1}$

्री

control of the control

 \mathbb{R}^n . The set of
 $\langle \Psi \rangle$. The set of $\langle \Psi \rangle$

 $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$. The set of $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$

1944

and both but he had

 \sim \times

 \sim 100 μ

 $\langle \nabla \cdot \rangle$

السا السا السا السا السا السا

 \sim

المتعادل أيمت المتعادل المتعادل المستو

 \sim

 σ

FT.

 \cup

 $\sqrt{2}$

T

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

and the state of the state

السابق المسارقين المسارقينا المسار

 \sim

 \rightarrow

×.

i i m

 \sim

 α

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 \sim \sim

the state of the state of

Contract Contract Contract

Contract Contract Contract

Contract Contract Street

the company's control of the company's

 \mathbf{y}_i^*

 \mathbb{S}^n .

Sandwich

 \mathbf{r} المدام

- 16

the control of the con-

78

 $\frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)$

 ~ 85

 \mathcal{N}_α

 \mathcal{M}

 \mathcal{V}

 ~ 100

 $\overline{}$

 \mathcal{L}

 \mathcal{M}

77

1948 - Ç

 \sim

 Δ

 $\omega_{\rm c}$, and $\omega_{\rm c}$, $\Delta\omega_{\rm c}$

 \lesssim

 \tilde{a}).

 \sim

 \sim \sim

 \mathbb{R}^{n+1}

WEBTTEATION OPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR MORST CONDITIONS

ran n

FAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

 $\sqrt{2}$

 \sim \sim

Contract Contract

 $\sqrt{2}$

 $\bar{\Sigma}$

MECH Communication

 α

 \mathbb{R}^n

Ľ.

 $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$

1950

 $\bar{\kappa}$

 $\tilde{\chi}$

 $\frac{1}{k^2}$

Ÿ.

-1

 $\overline{}$

 \sim 10 $^\circ$

 \vec{b}

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r})$

 \mathbf{X}

CONTRACTOR IN AN ARTICLE OF THE CONTRACTOR \sim

and the contract of the contract of the contract of

المستحدة المستحدة
التي

1952

 \sim

HEAT BALANCE YC02 $YH20$ **YPYR** TIME Q-WALL YO2 YN₂ **GAS PLON WND RAD WALL CNV** WALL RAD 0-FIRE SUM. **FCT** PCT **PCT** PCT. **PCT** \cup MASS **DOT** PCT. MASS MASS **HCT FCT BTU/HR** BTU, MASS MASS 61.696 0.7 4,024 18.106 18.173 2.927E+07 3.016E+03 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 0.063 \cup $7.4 - 75.1.7$ 9.034 0.021 $30.$ $6 - 336$ 4.832 14.264 2.944E+07 5.430E+04 0.716 0.166 0.063 745545 6.337 4.831 0.034 **BO.** 14.263 2.944E+07 5.073F+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.021 90. 74.549 6.337 4.831 $2.944F + 07$ 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 14.262 5.073E+04 0.063 120. 74,550 6.337 4.831 14,263 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 74.649 150. 6.337 4.831 14.262 2.944E+07 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 $5.073E + 04$ 0.063 0.021 74.550 0.716 0.166 0.034 180. 6.337 4.830 14.262 $2.944E+07$ 5.073E+04 0.063 74.550 6.337 4.830 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 210. 14.262 Z.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 $250.$ 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 270. 74,550 6.337 4.830 14.262 $2.944E+07$ 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 74.550 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.166 0.034 0.021 $200.$ 6.337 4,830 14.262 0.063 0.716 ಾಂ. 0.166 0.034 0.021 74.550 3.830 14.262 $2.944E+07$ 0.063 0.716 76.337 5.073E+04 360. 74.650 6.337 4.630 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 390. 74,550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 0.166 0.034 0.021 5.073E+04 0.716 420. 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 0.063 450. **74.550** 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 $480.$ 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 0.021 510. 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.034 0.021 540. 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 $2.944E+07$ 5.073E+04 0.063 570. 74,550 6.337 4.030 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 600. 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 74.550 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 6.337 4.830 630. 0.034 74,550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.021 660. 2.944E+07 6.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 890. 74.550 6.337 4.030 14.262 2.944E+07 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 5.073E+04 0.063 720. 74.550 6,337 4.830 14.262 0.034 0.021 6,337 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 750. 74,550 4,830 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 74.550 6.331 4.830 14.262 750.7 0.716 0.034 0.021 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.166 810. 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 $840.$ 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 74.050 6.337 4.830 14,262 জাদা 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 900, 74,550 74.650 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 980. 4.830 6.337 0.034 0.021 0.166 980. 74.050 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 290. 74,550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 1020. 74,550 6.337 4.830 14,262 0.716 0.034 0.021 1050. 74.55 6.337 4.030 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 ত.তৰ্ভ 0.166 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 74.550 6.337 4.830 1080. 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 1110. 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 0.034 0.021 Z.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.165 74.650 6.337 4.030 14.262 $+130.7$ 0.034 0.021 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 4.830 1170. 74.550 6.337 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 6.337 4,830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 1200. 74,550 ಕಾರಣ 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 ত 133 ত:তঃয 0.021 $74,000$ 1230; 0.034 0.021 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 $2.944F + 07$ 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 1260. 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 1290. 74.550 6,337 4.830 14.262 0.034 2.944E+07 **5.073E+04** 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.021 1320. 74.550 5.33 4.830 14.262 0.034 0.021 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 1350. 74.550 74.550 5.073E+04 0.716 0.034 0.021 14,262 2.944E+07 0.063 0.166 6.337 4.830 1380. Z.944E+07 **5.073EF04** 0.063 0.713 0.166 0.034 0.021 74.550 6.337 4.830 14.262 1410. 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 74.550 1440. 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 1470. 74,650 6.337 4.030 0.034 0.021 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 **BC073EF04** 0.063 চ.713 6.133 1500. 74.050 6.337 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 6.337 4.830 1530. 74,5950 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 14.262 $2.944F + 07$ 74.550 6.337 4.830 1560. 0.034 0.021 1590. 71.050 6.337 4.030 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 ত.713 0.166 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 1620. 74.550 6.337 4.830 0.034 1650. 74,550 6.337 4.830 14.262 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.021 Z.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.716 0.166 0.034 0.021 1580. 74.050 6.337 4.830 14.262 0.716 0.034 0.021 2.944E+07 5.073E+04 0.063 0.166 1710. 74.550 6.337 4,830 14.262

VENTILATION SPECIFIED, FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

2.944E+07

5.073E+04

 0.063

0.716

 0.166

 0.034

 0.021

4.830

6.337

14.262

74,550

1740.

 ~ 100

<u>Literatual para la propin</u>

 \sim 100

 \overline{w} (\overline{w}) () ()

Contract Contract

CONDUCTOR CONTROLLER

÷.

المناقب المناسب المسارات المساوية والمساري المساري المساري المساري المسارات والمساري

and the state of the state of the state of

 \sim

 \sim

J.

- 1

 \sim

السنة السنة السنة السنة

 \sim

 \sim

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

WINTELATION SPECIFIED. FUEL PYROLYSIS ADJUSTED FOR WORST CONDITIONS

PAGE NO. 1 RUN NO. 1

 \sim \sim

المستحدث والمستحدث المستحدث المستحدث والمستحدث المستحدث والمستحدث

 $4 - 11$

the control of the control of the control

Contract Contract

 $\left\langle \hat{m}\right\rangle$

 $\frac{1}{2}$.

 \sim

 \sim

amendment in cross com- $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac$

<u>in an illustration in the country studies in the fact the companies of the country states and the country states in the fact of \mathbb{R}^n </u> $\sim 10^7$ У.

 $\overline{}$

Contractor

 $\left\langle \mathbf{r}\right\rangle$ γ_4 \sim

 $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$

 \angle

1963

APPENDIX D

DATA ACQUISITION HARDWARE

D.1 **AIR VELOCITY**

The air velocity measurements utilize fan anemometers built by Airflow Development Inc. (Figure D-1). These anemometers have an operating range from 50 to 2000 fpm and were used for the following reasons:

- o They are relatively unaffected by the swirling components of the airflow. That is, they detect only the desired longitudinal component of the flow.
- o Their size (four inches in diameter) makes them well suited for measuring airflows over a large cross section.
- o Due to their mechanical nature, they have long-time constants which tend to filter the readings, thereby providing better time-average trends.

The fan anemometers consist of a stainless steel impeller mounted in a plastic assembly. Encased in the base of the assembly is an electronic circuit and capacitance sensor. As the impeller passes the capacitance sensor the capacitance is changed. The electronic circuit monitors these changes and creates a 100 millivolt peak-to-peak signal. As the impeller rotates, a pulse train is created whose frequency is proportional to the air velocity. The signal created by the fan anemometer is then sent to a signal conditioning module which converts frequency into a voltage level signal which can then be directly input to an analog to digital conversion board (A/D board) which resides on the bus of the microprocessor.

The signal conditioning modules chosen for this application are the 3B45 series made by Analog Devices. The 3B45 is an isolated frequency input module. To increase the resolution of the 3B45, custom ranging modules (resistor networks) were developed by KLD. The input signal is then compared to ^a threshold voltage selected by the resistor network, and the comparitor's frequency is finally converted to a voltage. This signal is then amplified and filtered to give an output in the range of 0-10 Vdc. The resistor network was designed such that a value of zero Vdc corresponds to an air velocity of zero fpm and 10 Vdc corresponds to a velocity of 2000 fpm. All fan anemometers were calibrated for both directions, over this range with KLD's open jet wind tunnel facility.

IMPELLERS **CAPACITANCE PICKUP TITTER ELECTRONICS**

AIRFLOW DEVELOPMENTS FAN ANEMOMETER

0.2 STATIC PRBSSURB MEASUREMENT

The measurement of static pressure involves a static pressure tip and a differential pressure transducer. The static pressure tip built by United Sensor is designed so that only the static pressure component of the total pressure in a flow is sensed. The probe used for this program was constructed of 1/16-inch stainless steel tubing. The end of the tube is aerodynamically sealed shut. Approximately 4.2 diameters from the closed end of the probe, small holes are bored into the tube. It is these small holes that sense the static pressure. At 14 diameters (7/8 of an inch) from the closed end the tube is bent at ^a the tip to a differential pressure transducer. To provide the accurate measurement of static pressure, a Setra model $#$ 239 low range differential pressure transducer was selected. The operating range of the transducer is from 0 to 0.5 in. wg with a respective output range of $0 - 5$ Vdc. Since a 12 bit D/A connector was used, a resolution of 0.00024 in. wg was achieved. The Setra pressure transducer is a variable
capacitance device. A stainless steel diaphragm and a fixed isolated electrode form a variable capacitance. As the pressure changes so does the capacitance which is detected and converted to a high level signal. To provide the accuracy of these devices a remote zeroing capability was added. This allows each device to be zeroed before a given test. Since the Setra transducer created a linear high level signal, there was no need to use separate signal conditioning modules. Signals from the transducers were directly output to the A/D board in the microprocessor.

D.3 **HUMIDITY AND TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENT**

Measurement of temperature and humidity were both performed with a Vaisala HMO 30YB. This device is capable of measuring temperature from -20 degrees Celsius (-4 degrees Fahrenheit) to +80 degrees Celsius (+176 degrees Fahrenheit), and the humidity spanned the full range of zero to 100 percen^trelative humidity.

D.4 BAROMETRIC PRESSURE MEASUREMENT

The barometric pressure (BP) instrument is the only handheld measurement device. Before a test run, the BP was measured with the handheld barometer, then manually entered into data acquisition software. The handheld barometer is made by Taylor Instrument Company. This barometer, Model #2075C, has ^achrome-finished brass case, measures three inches in diameter, and weighs approximately one pound. This instrument has the capability of measuring barometric

pressures in the range from 24.86 to 31.00 inches of mercury, in gradations of two-hundredths of an inch.

D.5 COMPUTER HARDWARE CONFIGURATION

All digitization, data storage and analysis is accomplished on ^aNEC386S "portable" personal computer (PC) running at 20 Megahertz. The digitization is performed via a National Instruments AT-MI0-16 data acquisition board which resides on the NEC386S' ATbus. The AT-MI0-16 is a high performance, multi-function analog, digital and timing I/O board for the PC. This board interfaces with two (2) National Instruments AMUX-64 boards which provide the ability to sample and acquire up to 64 differential channels of analog information. Each channel could be attached to either a pressure, air velocity, temperature or humidity sensor.

In order to provide the flexibility required at the test site(s), two PCs are used, a "host" and a "remote". The host PC would execute the DAS test software. The remote PC would control the host through use of a remote access program ("PC Anywhere III", DMA Associates, Inc.). This access software allows the host PC to execute in the required proximity of the test equipment, with remote PC "mirroring" the host's execution and providing remote control of the host's functions. This software is used with Black Box short haul modems; the actual distance between the two computers could be several thousand feet. This configuration allows the operator to work in an environment more conducive to doing analysis than in a tunnel test section. In addition, the presence of personnel in the test section would disrupt the airflow.

An Epson FX800 parallel printer provides the ability to output disk-based reports.

D.6 SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND COMMUNICATION PATHWAYS

The number of transducers for a given test series could range from 37 to 47. To support these transducers, four rakes were built. Of these four rakes, two were designed for ^aribbed tunnel section (Figure D-2) and two for a box tunnel section (Figure D-3). The positioning of the instruments allowed each rake to be designed according to standard techniques for monitoring air flow through ducts. The circular tunnel rake is constructed of 1/8-inch aluminum two-inch square channel. The square tunnel rake was built of both square channel and two-inch angle aluminum. The circular rake has a total of 19 fan anemometers while the square rake has 17. Each transducer is attached to the rake with a 3/8-inch bolt. All interconnections on a rake are terminated with connectors to facilitate installation and replacement of equipment. Each rake is interconnected to its

 $FIGURE D-2$

प
ທ

FIGURE D-3

 $D-6$

corresponding signal conditioning rack. The signal conditioning rack (SCR) is a standard 19-inch electronics rack that houses a sub-rack containing a power supply backplane and the individual signal conditioning modules. The SCRs also have an interface panel where interconnections from the velocity rakes are provided. Each SCR is interconnected to a multiplexer rack via two cables which are terminated with DB25 connectors. The multiplexer rack contains the two National Instruments AMUX-64 boards which multiplex the channels into the A/D board. The multiplexer rack also acts as an interface for the signals from the static pressure, temperature and humidity transducers. The static pressure, humidity and temperature transducer stands are all constructed in a similar manner. These stands consist of cement-filled buckets and an imbedded aluminum upright (Figure D-4). This configuration was found to provide the needed stability for these stands.

D-8

APPENDIX B

TEST NOMBNCLATORB

E.1 GENERAL

Each test or run was given a name that provided identification of the test location, the type of test, whether fan shaft dampers were being used or not, the number of fan shaft fans being operated, etc.

For all tests, the first two characters of the test name identified the test location:

- $MC -$ Tunnel between Metro Center Station and the New York Avenue fan shaft.
- $BR -$ Tunnel adjacent to the Blueridge Avenue fan shaft.
- $7I -$ Tunnel adjacent to the 7th and I streets sw fan shaft.

E.2 FRICTION FACTOR TESTS

Five or six character test names were used. The first two characters identified the test site.

The third and fourth characters, FF, identified the test as a friction factor test.

If used, the fifth character, D, indicated the test included the use of a damper to direct the fan shaft airflow through two tunnel legs.

The last character was the number of fan shaft fans operating.

E.3 BARRIER VENTILATION TESTS

Five, six or seven character test names were used. The first two characters identified the test site.

The third character, B, identified the test as a barrier test.

The fourth character was indicating the number of fan shaft fans operating.

The remaining characters were:

- T ^Adamper was not used. A train was present in the third tunnel leg.
- DTR- OT tests repeated.

E.4 **JET PAN MOUNTING HEAD LOSS COEFFICIENT TESTS**

Five or six character test names were used. The first two characters identified the test site.

The third character, D, identified the test as a jet fan mounting head loss coefficient test. The use of the ^D occurred because the tests were originally described as "drag" tests.

The remaining characters were the numbers 50, 75 or 100 identifying the distance between jet fans.

E.5 **JET FAN PRESSURE EFFICIENCY TESTS**

Eight or nine character test names were used. The first two characters identified the test site.

The third and fourth characters, JF, identified the test as ^ajet fan pressure efficiency test.

The next two or three characters were the numbers 50, 75 or 100 identifying the distance between jet fans.

The penultimate character identified the elevation of the jet fan.

- H The lift table was in the high position such that the distance from the centerline of the jet fan to the tunnel wall was 20 inches.
- M The lift table was in the medium position such that the distance from the centerline of the jet fan to the tunnel wall was 26 inches.
- L The lift table was in the low position such that the distance from the centerline of the jet fan to the tunnel wall was 32 inches.

The last character was the number of fan shaft fans operating.

APPENDIX P

TEST DESCRIPTIONS

F.1 INITIAL TBSTS AT KBTRO CENTER STATION/KBW YORK AVENUE FAN SHAFT

The first series of tests of the test program involved the establishing of the Single Point Measurement Factors for Ribbed Wall Tunnel without a train.tl These tests were conducted in the tunnel between Metro Center and McPherson Station on the morning of 10 June 1990.

The tests involved 10 flow conditions (5 with the damper open and 5 with the damper closed) and the fan shaft fans operating from all 5 decreasing to 1.

Each test took about five to ten minutes. This included the time to adjust the number of fans operating, the time for the airflows to reach quasi-steady-state, the time to initialize the individual test disk file and 60 to 80 seconds to record the data for averaging purposes. While the airflows were approaching quasi-steady-state, fluctuations of about plus or minus 20 percent were observed. These decreased to about plus or minus five percent prior to recording. The time to reach quasi-steady- state increased as the number of fans operating decreased. The barometric pressure was measured three times during the test period and manually input to each test. The air temperature and humidity were updated every second during the observations and recordings. Figure F-1 shows the results.

The results were not as anticipated. It was expected that the single point measurement factor would be about 0.95 with five fans operating and would decrease as the number of fans operating decreased.

The following hypotheses were advanced as causes for the unanticipated results:

- 1. An error in the data reduction computer program.
- 2 A mechanical or electrical instrument problem.
- 3. The horizontal curvature of the tunnel distorting the airflow.
- 4. The inlet effect of the ventilation shaft distorting the airflow upstream of the ventilation shaft.
- 5. The location of the anemometers in proximity to the tunnel walls.

F-1

ALPHA

 $F-2$

 \sim

SINGLE POINT MEASUREMENT FACTOR IN EXHAUST

1975

Aug. 19

- 6. An unknown effect caused by the ribbed tunnel.
- 7. The instrumentation error changing from reading higher than actual (plus error) to reading lower than actual (minus error) as the number fans operating, and therefore the tunnel air velocities, increased.

It was therefore decided to plot the horizontal and vertical velocity profiles shown in Figures F-2 and F-3. This was initially done using the data reduction computer program.

A separate computer program was written to calculate the average airflows and the single point measurement factors and to plot the air velocities shown in the following graphs. This separate computer program was hand checked. It was concluded that Hypothesis 1 was unlikely, since these results agreed with the direct plots from the data reduction computer program. After a review of the plots, it was concluded that Hypotheses 2 and 5 were unlikely.

Hypothesis 7 was reviewed and the instrument calibration logs were checked. It was concluded that Hypothesis 7 was unlikely since the maximum error was less than two percent and did not change sign over the range of airflows tested.

Hypotheses 3, 4 and 6 remained. Since insufficient data was available to further evaluate them, it was decided to make a number of traverses in the horizontal plane at various stations along Tracks 1 and 2. It was anticipated that measuring horizontally along the tunnel would provide insight to Hypothesis 5 and that measuring in Track 2 would provide insight to Hypothesis 3. It was decided to do these measurements at the beginning of the 16 June test program.

Special ventilation tests were conducted in the tunnels between Metro Center and McPherson Stations on the morning of 16 June 1990.

Air velocity measurements were made in the Track 1 and 2 tunnels between Metro Center Station and the New York Avenue Ventilation Shaft (FSC-1). The air velocity measurements consisted of horizontal traverses made at six locations along Track 1 and two locations along Track 2. For each traverse, the instrument pole was located next to the walkway (about two feet from the tunnel wall), outside the rail nearest the walkway, centered between the rails, outside the rail away from the walkway, outside the third rail, and near the opposite wall (about 15 inches from the fire line). The instrument was an Airflow DVA-30 Anemometer having a four-inch head assembly mounted on top of a square aluminum pole such that the center of the anemometer was about 73.5 inches from the ground. The instrument was factory calibrated in April 1990. The five FSC-1 fans were operated in the exhaust. Four readings were taken at each

म
5
9

je.

 $FIGURE F-3$

traverse point about 20 seconds apart. The time averaging allowed for each reading was about 10 seconds. Table F-1 lists the readings and Fiqures F-4 and F-5 plot their averages transversely and longitudinally along the tunnel.

^Acomparison of the results for Tracks 1 and 2 showed the horizontal curvature had some effect on the velocity profile.

Both graphs showed some shifting to the right, which is the "outside" of the curve.

^Areview of the Track 1 fiqures (traverse and longitudinal) showed the distance from the ventilation shaft inlet had some effect on the velocity profile. There was some tendency for the profile to become more symmetric as the distance from the ventilation shaft increased.

It was therefore concluded the velocity profiles in the tunnel were not as anticipated in the tunnel and that the Metro Center/McPherson Station test program would have to be modified to account for this. The following modifications were decided upon:

- 1. Full traverses rather than single point measurement factors were used in the remaining tests.
- 2. Single Point Measurement Factor Tests would be deleted.
- 3. All future tests would be done using one track.

The impact of this was some reprogramming of the data acquisition and data reduction computer programs and some loss of convenience during testing at Metro Center since more set-up and take-down of instruments would be required. The overall objectives of the test proqram and the accuracy of the data being acquired were not compromised in any way by the issues and modifications discussed above.

One friction factor test was performed to check out the instrumentation and software. The single point measurement factor was assumed to be 0.75. The results were as anticipated.

MECH

 $\tau_{\rm c}$

 $F-T$

Communication

Contract Contract

Contract Contract

 \cdot

 $\overline{ }$

VELOCITY TRAVERGED BY HAND

TABLE F-1

1980

1

FIGURE F-5

F.2.1 Ribbed Wall Tunnel

F.2.1.1 Hew York Avenue Pan Shaft-Exhaust Mode

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-6.
- o Two wooden dampers were placed at fan shaft openings on Track #2 side completely blocking off Track #2 tunnel.

Instrumentation Used

o One traverse transducer rake, 2 static pressure probes, ¹pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used for these tests.

Location of Sensors

- o One traverse transducer rake was placed on Track #1 at station 6+20 with the center of the fan shaft located at station 8+35.
- ^oStatic pressure probes were placed on Track #1 at stations 7+70 and 4+70.
- o One pressure transducer was placed on Track #1 at station 6+20.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #1 at station 5+70.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 5+00.

Test Sequence

o Tested for ten flow conditions in the following sequence:

Friction Factor Set-Up: New York Avenue Fan Shaft Test Site

FIGURE $F-6$

Damper Opened Damper Closed

The test nomenclature is presented in Appendix ^E

F.2.1.2 **New York Avenue Pan Shaft - Supply Mode**

Followed the same procedures as in F.2.1.1 except the fans were in the supply mode.

Test Sequence

o Tested for seven flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Opened Damper Closed

1) MCFF5S 4) MCFFD5S 2) MCFF4S 5) MCFFD4S 3) MCFF3S 6) MCFFD3S 7) MCFFD2S

F.2.1.3 7th and I streets Pan Shaft-Exhaust Mode

Equipment Location

- o Refer to Figure F-7.
- o A one-car train was located on Track #2 at station 70+40 approximately 100 feet from fan shaft inlet.
- o Two plastic tarpaulin dampers were placed across Track #1 on both sides of the fan shaft blocking off Track #1 tunnel.

Instrumentation Used

^oOne traverse transducer rake, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used for these tests.

Friction Factor Site Set-Upis
7th & I Streets Fan Shaft Test Site

 $E-13$

Location of Sensors

- o One traverse transducer rake was placed on Track #2 at station 63+00 with the center of the fan shaft located at station 69+90.
- o Static pressure probes were placed on Track #2 at stations 63+00 and 68+50.
- o One pressure transducer was placed on Track #2 at station 65+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #2 at station 65+25.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 65+75.

Test Sequence

o Tested for ten flow conditions in the following sequence:

F.2.2 **Smooth Wall Tunnel**

F.2.2.1 Blueri4ge Pan Shaft-Bzhaust Mode

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-8.
- o A one-car train was located on Track #2 at station 653+00 approximately 100 feet from fan shaft inlet.
- o The dead-end tunnel provided the equivalent of a fan shaft isolation damper. Therefore, all tests were performed with the damper closed.

Friction Factor Site Set-Up:
Blueridge Avenue Fan Shaft Test Site

FIGURE F-8

Instrumentation Used

o One traverse transducer rake, 2 static pressure probes
1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used for these tests.

Location of Sensors

- o One traverse transducer rake was placed on Track #1 at station 648+00 and on Track #2 at station 653+50.
- o Static pressure probes were placed on Track #1 at stations 648+00 and 653+50.
- o one pressure transducer was placed on Track #1 at station 650+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed at station 650+25 on Track #1.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 650+75 on Track #1.

Test Sequence

o Tested for four flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

BRFF4 BRFF3 BRFF2 BRFFl

- F.3 JBT PAR TESTS
- F.J.l Ribbed Wall Tunnel
- F.3.1.1 7th and I Streets Fan Shaft Location
- F.3.1.1.1 100-Foot Jet Fan Spacing With Train

These tests were repeated for different jet fan locations relative to the top of the tunnel.

F.3.1.1.1.1 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 20 Inches

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-9.
- o A one-car train was located on Track #2 at station 70+40 approximately 100 feet from fan shaft inlet.
- o Four jet fans were placed at the center of the tunnel on Track #2. Fan 1, fan 2, fan 3 and fan 4 were located at stations 67+25, 66+25, 65+25, 64+25 respectively. When testing in the exhaust mode the output of the jet fans were in a direction away from the fan shaft.
- o Two plastic tarpaulin dampers were placed across Track
#1 on both sides of the fan shaft blocking off Track #1 tunnel.

Instrumentation Used

o Two (2) traverse transducer rakes, 10 static pressure probes, 5 pressure transducers, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used for these tests.

Location of Sensors

- o The traverse transducer rakes were placed on Track #1 at stations 69+90 and 63+00.
- o A static pressure probe was placed 25 feet from either side of each jet fan. Two additional static pressure probes were placed on Track #2 at stations 68+50 and 63+00.
- o A pressure transducer was placed at the following 5 stations 67+25, 66+25, 65+75, 65+25, and 64+25.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed at station $65+25$ on Track $#1.$
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 65+75 on Track #1.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Jet Fan Site Set-Up: 100-ft. Spacing 7th & I Strrets Fan Shaft Test Site

FIGURE F-9

Damper Closed

1) 7IJ100H4 2) 7IJ100H3 3) 7IJ100H2 4) 7IJ100H1

5) 7IJ100HO

F.3.1.1.1.2 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 26 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.1.1.1.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of 26 inches from top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

- 1) 7IJ100M4 2) 7IJ100M3 3) 7IJ100M2 4) 7IJ100Ml 5) 7IJ100MO
- F.3.1.1.1.3 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 32 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.1.1.1.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of 32 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

F.3.1.1.2 75-Foot Jet Fan Spacing With Train

These tests were repeated for different jet fan locations relative to the top of the tunnel.

F.3.1.1.2.1 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 20 Inches

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-10.
- o A one-car train was located on Track #2 at station 70+40 approximately 100 feet from the fan shaft inlet.
- o Four jet fans were placed at center of the tunnel on Track #2. Fan 1, fan 2, and fan 3 and fan 4 were located at stations 66+87.5, 66+12.5, 65+37.5, and 64+62.5 respectively. When testing in this exhaust mode the output of the jet fans were in a direction away from the fan shaft.
- o Two plastic tarpaulin dampers were placed across Track #1 on both sides of the fan shaft blocking off Track #1 tunnel.

Instrumentation Used

o Two traverse transducer rakes, 10 static pressure probes, 5 pressure transducers, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used for these tests.

Location of Sensors

- o The traverse transducer rakes were placed on Track #2 at stations 69+90 and 63+00.
- o A static pressure probe was placed 19 feet from either end of each jet fan. Two additional static pressure

MECH 1994

Jet &th Fun & I Site Set-Up: 75-ft. Streets Fun Shuft Spucing Test Site

 $FIGURE F-10$

probes were placed on Track #2 at stations 68+50 and 63+00.

- o A pressure transducer was placed at the following ⁵stations: 66+87.5, 66+12.5, 65+75, 65+37.5, and 64+62.5.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed at station 65+25 on Track #2.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 65+75 on Track #2.

Test Sequence

o Tested for 5 flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

1) 7IJ75H4 2) 7IJ75H3 3} 7IJ75H2 4) 7IJ75H1

- 5) 7IJ75HO
- F.3.1.1.2.2 Exhaust Mode, Distance from Top of Tunnel: 26 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.1.1.2.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of ²⁶ inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

F.3.1.1.2.3 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 32 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.1.1.2.1 except the center of the jet fans were lowered to a distance of 32 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

1) 7IJ75L4 2) 7IJ75L3 3) 7IJ75L2 4) 7IJ75L1 5) 7IJ75LO

F.3.1.1.3 50-Foot Jet Fan Spacing With Train

These tests were repeated for different jet fan locations relative to the top of the tunnel.

F.3.1.1.3.1 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 20 Inches

Equipment Locations

o Refer to Figure F-11.

- o A one-car train was located on Track #2 at station 70+40 approximately 100 feet from the fan shaft inlet.
- o Four jet fans were placed at the center of the tunnel on Track #2. Fan 1, fan 2, fan 3, and fan 4 were located at stations 66+50, 66+00, 65+50, and 65+00 respectively. When testing in the exhaust mode the output of the jet fans was in a direction away from the fan shaft.
- o Two dampers in the form of circular plastic tarpaulins were installed on Track #1 at each side of the fan shaft, blocking off Track #1 tunnel.

МЕСН в процессионально производит в соответстве и производит в соответствующего и производит в соответствуют п

Jet Fan Site Set-Up: 50-ft. Spacing 7th & I Streets Fan Shaft Test Site

 $FIGURE F-11$

 $F - 24$

Instrumentation Used

o Two traverse transducer rakes, 10 static pressure probes, 5 pressure transducers, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used for these tests.

Location of Sensors

- o The traverse transducer rakes were placed on Track #2 at stations 69+90 and 63+00.
- o A static pressure probe was placed 13 feet from either end of each jet fan. Two additional static pressure probes were placed on Track #2 at stations 68+50 and 63+00.
- o A pressure transducer was placed at the following 5 stations: 66+50, 66+00, 65+75, 65+50, and 65+00.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed at station 65+25 on Track #2.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 65+75 on Track #2.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

- 1) 7IJ50H4
- 2) 7IJ50H3
- 3) 7IJ50H2
- 4) 7IJ50H1
- 5) 7IJ50HO

F.J.1.1.3.2 Exhaust Mode, Distance from Top of Tunnel: 26 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.1.1.3.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of 26 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

1) 7IJ50M4 2) 7IJ50M3 3) 7IJ50M2 4) 7IJ50M1 5) 7IJ50MO

F.3.1.1.3.3 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 32 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.1.1.3.1 except the center of the jet fans were lowered to a distance of 32 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

- 1) 7IJ50L4
- 2) 7IJ50L3
- 3) 7IJ50L2
- 4) 7IJ50L1 5) 7IJ50LO
- F.3.2 smooth Wall TUnnel

F.3.2.1 Blueridge Avenue Shaft Location

F.3.2.1.1 100-Foot Jet Fan Spacing With Train

These tests were repeated for different jet fan locations relative to the top of the tunnel.

F.3.2.1.1.1 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 20 Inches

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-12.
- o Located a one-car train on Track #2 at station 653+00 approximately 100 feet from the fan shaft inlet.

MECH

 $F-27$

 $FIGURE F-12$

2000

TO MAKE A

o Four jet fans were placed at the center of the tunnel on Track #1. Fan 1, fan 2, fan 3, and fan 4--were at stations 649+12, 650+25, 651+25, and 652+25,

respectively. When testing in the exhaust mode the output of the jet fans were in a direction away from the fan shaft.

o The dead-end tunnel provided the equivalent of a fan shaft isolation damper. Therefore, all tests were performed with damper closed.

Instrumentation Used

o Two traverse transducer rakes, 10 static pressure probes, 5 pressure transducers, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used for these tests.

Location of Sensors

- o Placed 1 traverse transducer rake on Track #1 at station 648+00 and 1 traverse transducer rake on Track 12 at station 653+50.
- o A static pressure probe was placed 25 feet from either side of each jet fan. Two additional static pressure probes were placed on Track #1 at stations 648+00 and 653+50.
- o A pressure transducer was placed at the following 5 stations: 649+25, 650+25, 650+75, 651+25, and 652+25 on Track #1.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed at station 650+25 on Track #1.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 650+75 on Track #1.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

1) BRJ100H4 2) BRJ1003 3) BRJ100H2 4) BRJ100H1

5) BRJ100HO

F.3.2.1.1.2 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 26 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.2.1.1.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of 26 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

- 1) BRJ100M4 2) BRJ100M3 3) BRJ100M2 4)'. BRJlOOMl 5) BRJ100MO
- F.3.2.1.1.3 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 32 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.2.1.1.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of 32 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

.Damper Closed

1) BRJ100L4 2) BRJ100L3 3) BRJ100L2 4) BRJ100L1

- 5) BRJlOOLO
	-

F.3.2.1.2 75-Foot Jet Fan Spacing With Train

These tests were repeated for different jet fan locations relative to the top of the tunnel.

F.3.2.1.2.1 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 20 Inches

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-13.
- o Located a one-car train on Track #2 at station 653+00 approximately 100 feet from fan shaft inlet.
- o Four jet fans were placed at the center of the tunnel on Track #1. Fan 1, fan 2, fan 3 and fan 4 were located at stations 649+12.5, 649+87.5, 650+62.5 and 651+37.5 respectively. When testing in the exhaust mode the output of the jet fans must be in a direction away from the fan shaft.

The dead-end tunnel provided the equivalent of a fan shaft isolation damper. Therefore, all tests were performed with damper closed.

Instrumentation Used

o Provided 2 traverse transducer rakes, 10 static pressure probes, five pressure transducers, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer.

Location of Sensors

- o Placed one traverse transducer rake on Track #1 at station 648+00 and 1 traverse transducer rake on Track #2 at station 653+50.
- o Placed a static pressure probe 19 feet from either side of each jet fan. Two additional static pressure probes were placed on Track #1 at stations 648+00 and 653+50.
- o Placed a pressure transducer at the following 5 stations on Track #1: 649+12.5, 649+87.5, 650+62.5, 651+37.5, and 651+87.5.
- o Placed temperature/humidity sensor at station 650+25 on Track #1.

 $FIGURE F-13$

հ–31

MECH 2004

o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 650+75 on Track #1.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

- 1) BRJ75H4 2) BRJ75H3 3) BRJ75H2 4) BRJ75H1 5) BRJ75HO
- F.3.2.1.2.2 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 26 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.2.1.2.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of 26 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

- 1) BRJ75M4 2) BRJ75M3 3) BRJ75M2 4) BRJ75M1
- 5) BRJ75MO

F.3.2.1.2.3 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 32 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.2.1.2.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of 32 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

1) BRJ75L4

2) BRJ75L3

3) BRJ75L2

4) BRJ75L1

5) BRJ75LO

F.3.2.1.3 50-Foot Jet Fan Spacing With Train

These tests were repeated for different jet fan locations relative to the top of the tunnel.

F.3.2.1.3.1 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 20 Inches

Equipment Locations

o Refer to Figure F-14.

- o Located a one-car train on Track #2 at station 653+00 approximately 100 feet from the fan shaft inlet.
- o Four jet fans were placed at the center of the tunnel on Track #1. Fan 1, fan 2, fan 3, and fan 4 were located at stations 650+00, 650+50, 651+00, and 651+50, respectively. When testing in the exhaust mode the output of the jet fans must be in a direction away from the fan shaft.
- o The dead-end tunnel provided the equivalent of a fan shaft isolation damper. Therefore, all tests were performed with damper closed.

Instrumentation Used

o Provided 2 traverse transducer rakes, 10 static pressure probes, 5 pressure transducers, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer.

Location of Sensors

- o Placed 1 traverse transducer rake on Track #1 at station 648+00 and 1 traverse transducer rake on Track f2 at station 653+50.
- ^oPlaced a static pressure probe 12 feet from either side of each jet fan. Two additional static pressure probes were placed on Track #1 at stations 648+00 and 653+50.

 $FIGURE F-14$

 $F = 34$

- o Placed a pressure transducer at the following 5 stations on Track #1: 650+00, 650+50, 650+75, 651+00, and 651+50.
- o The humidity/temperature sensor was placed at station 650+25 on Track #1.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near 650+75 on Track #1.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

- 1) BRJ50H4 2) BRJ50H3 3) BRJ50H2 4) BRJ50H1
- 5) BRJ50HO
- F.3.2.1.3.2 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 26 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.2.1.3.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of 26 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

- 1) BRJ50M4 2) BRJ50M3
- 3) BRJ50M2
- 4) BRJ50M1
- 5) BRJ50MO

F.3.2.1.3.3 Exhaust Mode, Distance From Top of Tunnel: 32 Inches

Followed the same procedure as in F.3.2.1.3.1 except the center of the jet fans was lowered to a distance of 32 inches from the top of the tunnel.

Test Sequence

o Tested for five flow conditions in the following sequence:

Damper Closed

- 1) BRJ50L4 2) BRJ50L3 3) BRJ50L2 4) BRJ50L1
- 5) BRJ50LO

F.4 BARRIER TESTS

F.4.1 **New York Avenue Fan Shaft Location**

These tests were made to measure the deployment characteristics of the barrier. The time necessary for full deployment, the ability to conform to the shape of the tunnel, the special fitting problems around the third rail, walkway, other intrusions into the tunnel, and the personnel access opening were monitored closely. Data were collected to determine the barrier head loss coefficient, pressure differential through the barrier, and air velocities in the tunnel with the barrier and the adjacent tunnel.

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-15.
- o Scaffolding covered by nylon-reinforced tarp was erected across Track f1 to simulate the presence of a train. Scaffolding was erected at station 9+55.
- o The barrier was placed on Track #1 at station 7+20.

Instrumentation Used

o Two traverse transducer rakes, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used.

Location of Sensors

o The traverse transducer rakes were placed on Track #1 at stations 6+20 and 9+05.

Cincular Barrier Set-Up:
New York Avenue Fan Shaft Test Site

 $FIGURE F-15$

- o Two static pressure probes were placed on Track #1 at stations 4+70 and 7+70.
- o The pressure transducer was placed on Track #1 at station 6+15.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #1 at station 5+70.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 5+00 on Track #1.

Test Sequence

o Tested for 14 flow conditions in the following sequence:

*Tests MCB5DT through MCB1DT were repeated due to loss of air pressure in the barrier torus.

F.4.2 7th and x streets ran Shaft Location

F.4.2.1 **Exhaust Mode**

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-16.
- o A one-car train was located on Track #2 at station 70+40 approximately 100 feet from the fan shaft inlet.
- o The barrier was placed on Track #2 at station 68+00.

Instrumentation Used

o Two traverse transducer rakes, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used.

Cincular Barrier Set-Up:
7th & I Streets Fan Shaft Test Site

 $F=39$

 $FIGURE F-16$
Location of Sensors

- o The traverse transducer rakes were placed on Track #2 at stations 69+90 and 63+00.
- o Two static pressure probes were placed on Track #2 at stations 68+50 and 63+00.
- o The pressure transducer was placed on Track #2 at station 65+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #2 at station 67+75.
- o Readings from the hancheld barometer were taken at or near station 65+25 on Track #2.

Test Sequence

o Tested for 15 flow conditions in the following sequence:

1 Damper Closed Egress Closed 1 Damper Closed Egress Open

9) 7IB4D1TEC 10) 7IB3D1TEC 11) 7IB3D1TECR* 12) 7IB2D1TEC 13) 7IB4D1TEO 14) 7IB3D1TEO 15) 7IB2D1TEO

*Test repeated due to loss of air pressure in the barrier torus.

F.4.2.2 Supply Mode

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-16.
- o A one-car train was located on Track #2 at station 70+40 approximately 100 feet from the fan shaft inlet.

o The barrier was placed on Track #2 at station 68+00.

Instrumentation Used

o Two traverse transducer rakes, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used.

Location of Sensors

- o The traverse transducer rakes were placed on Track #2 at stations 69+90 and 63+00.
- o Two static pressure probes were placed on Track #2 at stations $68+50$ and $63+00$.
- o The pressure transducer was placed on Track #2 at station 65+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #2 at station 5+70.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 65+25 on Track #2.

Test Sequence

o Tested for 6 flow conditions in the following sequence:

F.5 JET FAN MOUNTING HEAD LOSS COEFFICIENT TESTS

These tests were made to measure the impediment to airflow caused by the jet fan mounting equipment used to transport and raise/lower the jet fans. These data were collected by measuring the pressure drop over a tunnel length containing the jet fans. These tests were performed in both smooth wall and ribbed wall tunnels.

The jet fan mounting head loss coefficient tests were performed with the jet fans mounted.

F-41

F.5.1 Ribbed Wall Tunnel - 7th and I Streets Fan Shaft Location

 $F.5.1.1$ Bxhaust Mode With Train = 100-Foot Jet Fan **Spacing**

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-17.
- o A one-car train was located on Track #2 at station 70+40 approximately 100 feet from fan shaft inlet.
- o Four jet fans were placed at the center of the tunnel on Track #2. Fan 1, fan 2, fan 3 and fan 4 were located at stations 67+25, 66+25, 65+25, 64+25, respectively. During this test the jet fans were not operating.
- o Two dampers in the form of circular plastic tarpaulins were installed on Track #1 at each side of the fan shaft, blocking off Track #1 tunnel.

Instrumentation Used

o Two traverse transducer rakes, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used.

Location of Sensors

- o The traverse transducer rakes were placed on Track #1 at stations 69+90 and 63+00.
- o The static pressure probes were placed on Track #1 at stations 68+50 and 63+00.
- o The transducer was placed on Track #1 at station 65+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #1 at station 65+25.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near 65+75 on Track #1.

Test Sequence

o Tested for one flow condition, four fan shaft fans operating in the exhaust mode.

> Jet Fan Mounting Head Loss Coefficient Set-Up 100-ft. Spacing
7th & I Streets Fan Shaft Test Site

 $F - 43$

FIGURE F-17

Damper Closed

1) 7ID100

F.5.1.2 Bxhaust Mode With Train - 75-Foot Jet Fan Spacing

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-18.
- o A one-car train was located on Track #2 at station 70+40 approximately 100 feet from fan shaft inlet.
- o Five jet fans were placed at the center of the tunnel on Track #2. Fan 1, fan 2, fan 3 and fan 4 were located at
- o stations 66+87.5, 66+12.5, 65+37.5, 64+62.5, respectively. During this test the jet fans were not operating.
- o Two dampers in the form of circular plastic tarpaulins were installed on Track #1 at each side of the fan shaft opening blocking off Track #1 tunnel.

Instrumentation Used

o Two traverse transducer rakes, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used.

Location of Sensors

- o The traverse transducer rakes were placed on Track #2 at stations 69+90 and 63+00.
- o The static pressure probes were placed on Track #2 at stations 68+50 and 63+00.
- o The pressure transducer was placed on Track #2 at station 65+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #2 at station 65+25.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 65+75 on Track #2.

 $F-45$

Jet Fan Mounting Head Loss Coefficient Set-Up
75-ft. Spacing
7th & I Streets Fan Shaft Test Site

 $FIGURE F-18$

 \bullet

2018

o Tested for one flow condition, four fan shaft fans operating in the exhaust

Damper Closed

1) 7ID75

$F.5.1.3$ Bxhaust Mode With Train $=$ 50-Foot Jet Fan spacinq

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-19.
- o A one-car train was located on Track i2 at station 70+40 approximately 100 feet from fan shaft inlet.
- o Four jet fans were placed at the center of the tunnel on Track #2. Fan 1, fan 2, fan 3 and fan 4 were located at stations 66+50, 66+00, 65+50, 65+00, respectively. During this test the jet fans were not operating.
- o Two dampers in the form of circular plastic tarpaulins were installed on Track #1 at each side of the fan shaft opening blocking off Track #1 tunnel.

Instrumentation Used

o Two traverse transducer rakes, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer were used.

Location of Sensors

- o The traverse transducer rakes were placed on Track #2 at stations 69+90 and 63+00.
- o The static pressure probes were placed on Track #2 at stations 68+50 and 63+00.
- o The pressure transducer was placed on Track #2 at station 65+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #2 at station 65+25.

> Jet Fan Mounting Head Loss Coefficient Set-Up 50-ft. Spacing
7th & I Streets Fan Shaft Test Site

 $FIGURE F-19$

 $F - 47$

o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 65+25 on Track #2.

Test Sequence

o Tested for one flow condition, four fan shaft fans operating in the exhaust mode.

Damper Closed

1) 71050

F.5.2 Smooth Wall Tunnel - Blueridge Avenue Fan Shaft Locatiop

F.5.2.1 bhaust Kode With Train - 100-Foot Jet Fan spacinq

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-20.
- ^oLocated a one-car train on Track #2 at station 653+00, approximately 100 feet from the shaft inlet.
- o Placed the jet fan mounting equipment, with the jet fans, on Track #1 at station 649+25, 650+25, 651+25 and 652+25.
- o The dead-end tunnel provided the equivalent of a fan shaft isolation damper. Therefore, all tests were performed with dampers closed.

Instrumentation Used

o Provided 2 traverse transducer rakes, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer.

Location Sensors

- ^oPlaced a traverse transducer rake on Track #2 at stations 653+50 and on Track #1 at station 648+00.
- o A static pressure probe was placed on Track #1 at stations 648+00 and 653+50.

 $FIGURE F-20$

2022

-
- o The pressure transducer was placed on Track #1 at station 650+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #1 at station 650+25.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 650+75 on Track #1.

o Tested for 1 flow condition, 4 shaft fans operating in the exhaust mode.

Damper Closed

1) BRD100

 $F.5.2.2.$ Bxhaust Mode With Train = 75-Foot Jet Fan Spaoinq

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Figure F-21.
- o Located a one-car train on Track #2 at station 653+00, approximately 100 feet from the shaft inlet.
- o Placed the jet fan mounting equipment, with the jet fans, on Track #1 at station 649+12.5, 649+87.5, 650+62.5 and 652+37.5.
- o The dead-end tunnel provided the equivalent of a fan shaft isolation damper. Therefore, all tests were performed with dampers closed.

Instrumentation Used

o Provided 2 traverse transducer rakes, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer.

Location Sensors

- o Placed a traverse transducer rake on Track #2 at stations 653+50 and on Track #1 at station 648+00.
- o A static pressure probe was placed on Track #1 at stations 648+00 and 653+50.

Jet Fan Mounting Head Loss Coefficient Set-Up 75-ft. Spacing

Blueridge Avenue Fan Shaft Test Site

 $FIGURE F-21$

MECH

- o The pressure transducer was placed on Track #1 at station 650+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #1 at station 650+25.
- o Readinqs from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 650+75 on Track #1.

o Tested for one flow condition, four fan shaft fans operatinq in the exhaust mode.

Damper Closed

1) BRD75

F.5.2.3 Bxhaust Mode With Train - 50-Foot Jet Fan Spacing

Equipment Locations

- o Refer to Fiqure F-22.
- o Located a one-car train on Track #2 at station 653+00, approximately 100 feet from the shaft inlet.
- o Placed the jet fan mountinq equipment, with the jet fans, on Track #1 at station 650+00, 650+50, 651+00 and 651+50.
- o The dead-end tunnel provided the equivalent of a fan shaft isolation damper. Therefore, all tests were performed with dampers closed.

Instrumentation Used

o Provided 2 traverse transducer rakes, 2 static pressure probes, 1 pressure transducer, 1 temperature/humidity sensor, and 1 handheld barometer.

Location Sensors

- o Placed a traverse transducer rake on Track #2 at station 653+50 and on Track #1 at station 648+00.
- o A static pressure probe was placed on Track #1 at stations 648+00 and 653+50.

Jet Fan Mounting Head Loss Coefficient Set-Up 50-ft. Spacing

Blueridge Avenue Fan Shaft Test Site

 $FIGURE F-22$

 \mathcal{A}

 $E-53$

MECH

2026

-
- o The pressure transducer was placed on Track #1 at station 650+75.
- o The temperature/humidity sensor was placed on Track #1 at station 650+25.
- o Readings from the handheld barometer were taken at or near station 650+75 on Track #1.

o Tested for one flow condition, four fan shaft fans operating in the exhaust mode.

Damper Closed

1) BRD50