i

THE MOMENTUM FLUX IN TWO-PHASE FLOW

by

GERRY B. ANDEEN

B.S. (M.E.) University of Michigan (1962) S.M. (M.E.) Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1963)

> SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF SCIENCE

> > at the

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

October, 1965

Signature of Author Depertment of Mechanidal Angineering Certified by • • Thesis Supervisor

Accepted by Chairman, Departmental Committee on Graduate Students

THE MOMENTUM FLUX IN TWO-PHASE FLOW

by

Gerry B. Andeen

Submitted to the Department of Mechanical Engineering in October, 1965, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Science

ABSTRACT

The average momentum flux at a section of a pipe with twophase upflow has been measured by the impulse technique. Steamwater and air-water mixtures were tested in one-inch and onehalf inch nominal pipes. Homogeneous velocities ranging from 150 to 1200 ft/sec. and qualities from 5% to 85% were tested.

The results are compared to the results of models currently in practice for predicting pressure drop and critical flow. The influence of the void fraction, the velocity profile, phase distribution and fluctuations upon the momentum flux are discussed.

Thesis Supervisor: Peter Griffith Title: Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

I was born in Chicago in 1940, of little importance to me since we didn't live there long enough for me to remember it. I went to grade school in Minneapolis and caught gophers. You see, gophers always have two entrances to their burrows. If you pour water down one entrance, a wet gopher will come up into an old pan over the other.

I attended high school in Connecticut as the family moved there, and I learned that I never really learned to spell. The problem is that spelling is hardly ever phonetic. Take "nite," for example, neither kind is spelled the way they both sound. You can see why I studied engineering at the University of Michigan. The only prehistoric characteristic of engineering is akward units, and no student pays attention to units anyway.

In 1962 I graduated from Michigan and came to MIT where I have been since. In fact, with the exception of summer industrial jobs, and an NROTC cruise, I have been in school continuously. For this, I owe thanks to the Scott Paper Company Foundation as an undergraduate and to the National Science Foundation as a graduate student. I have been elected to several honorary societies and, of course, am a student member of the ASME.

iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Professor Peter Griffith and the other members of the committee, Professor J. L. Smith, Jr., and Professor S. W. Gouse, Jr., for their guidance throughout the project. Special thanks are also due to Professors Rohsenow, Brown, Bergles, Suo, and Richardson for their thoughtful and constructive suggestions.

Appreciation is expressed to the Engineering Project Laboratory Staff for their efforts in assembling the experimental apparatus.

Financial support for the project was provided by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, AEC Contract AT(30-1) - 3496.

The MIT Computation Center provided computer time for data reduction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Pressure Drop in a Pipe	l
1.2	Momentum Flux Models	3
1.3	Differences between Models	6
1.4	Direct Measurement	7
1.5	Fluctuation	8
1.6	Critical Flow	8
CHAPTER II	ANALYTICAL CONSIDERATIONS	10
2.1	The Momentum Multiplier	10
2.2	Possible Bounds on the Momentum Multiplier Value	10
	2.2.1 Martinelli's Bounds	11
	2.2.2 Requirements for Minimum Possible Momentum Flux	12
	2.2.3 Minimum Momentum Flux at Specified Void Fraction	13
	2.2.4 Minimum Momentum Flux Model	14
	2.2.5 Unsteady Minimum Momentum Flux	16
2.3	Deviations from Minimum Possible Value	17
	2.3.1 Void Fraction	17
	2.3.2 Velocity Distribution	19
	2.3.3 Phase Distribution	22
	2.3.4 Time Variation	24
2.4	Differential Deviation from Single Phase	29
CHAPTER III	EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM	30
3.1	Feasibility	. 30
3.2	Design Requirements	30

v

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

3•3	3 Original Design	
	3.3.1 Tank and Internals	31
	3.3.2 Turning Tee	34
	3.3.3 Feed System	35
3.4	Modified Design	38
	3.4.1 Tank and Internals	38
	3.4.2 Tee	39
	3.4.3 Feed System	40
3•5	Void Fraction Data	40
3.6	Testing	4 <u>1</u>
3.7	Data System	41
	3.7.1 Observation	42
	3.7.2 Tape Recorder	42
	3.7.3 Brush Recorder	42
3.8	Data Reduction	43
	3.8.1 Average Force Data	43
	3.8.2 Fluctuating Data	43
CHAPTER IV	RESULTS	44
4.1	Average Momentum Flux Data	44
4.2	Rose's Results	45
4.3	Vance's Results	46
4.4	Void Fraction Measurements	47
4.5	Fluctuations	48
	4.5.1 Brush Recorder	49
	4.5.2 Spectral Analysis	49
4.6	Choke Flow	50
4.7	Non-Adiabatic Flow	51
4.8	Discussion of Effects	52
	4.8.1 Void Fraction Deviation	52

7

٠

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	4.8.2 Velocity Distribution	52
	4.8.3 Entrainment	53
	4.8.4 Fluctuations	53
4.9	Interpolation and Extrapolation	54
CHAPTER V	SUMMARY	57
5.1	The Two-Velocity Slip Model	57
5.2	The Homogeneous Model	57
5.3	Deviations from Minimum Momentum Flux	58
5.4	Implications	59
APPENDIX A	MOMENTUM EQUATION DERIVATIONS	60
APPENDIX B	CAUSES OF ZERO SHIFT	64
APPENDIX C	FUNCTIONS TO FIT CURVES FOR DATA REDUCTION PROGRAM	66
APPENDIX D	EQUATION OF MOTION OF THE TEE	68
APPENDIX E	DATA	69
APPENDIX F	DATA OF VANCE	70
REFERENCES		71
FIGURES		

ŀ

÷

viii

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. Number

Ŧ

3

5

٠.

Title

1	Comparison between Homogeneous and Slip Models
2	Cross Section of Pressure Vessel Showing Internals
3	Schematic of Test Apparatus
4	LVDT Arrangement
5	Electrical Apparatus
6	Jet Surface Profiles
7	Turning Tee Design
8	Core Traverse
9	Beam Constant
10	Static Test
11	Weigh Tank Calibration
12	Steam Calibration Test
13	Beam Response
14	Filter Performance
15	Pluck Tests
16	Quality-Void Fraction Relationship
17	Air-Water Liquid Fraction
18-19	Effect of Void Fraction on Slip Model Momentum Multiplier
20	Entrainment Model
21	Anderson and Mantzoranis Model

Fig. Number

r

Title

22	Reichardt's Hot-Wire Data
23 - 28	Fluctuating Model
29	Rose's Void Fraction Data
30	Rose's Momentum Flux Data
31-40	Steam-Water Data
	31 - Atmospheric Pressure, One-Inch Pipe
	32 - Atmospheric Pressure, One-Half Inch Pipe
	33 - 30 psia, One-Inch Pipe
	34 - 30 psia, One-Half Inch Pipe
	35 - 60 psia, One-Inch Pipe
	36 - 60 psia, One-Half Inch Pipe
	37 - 90 psia, One-Inch Pipe
	38 - 90 psia, One-Half Inch Pipe
	39 - 120 psia, One-Inch Pipe
	40 - 120 psia, One-Half Inch Pipe
41-42	Air-Water Data
43	Data of Vance
24.54	Brush Records
45	Fluctuation Magnitude
46	Spectral Analysis

ix

NOMENCLATURE

А Area В Body force °C Degrees Centigrade Constant in equation (2-22)C С₂ Constant in equation (2-22) C₃ Constant in equation (2-28) С₁₄ Constant in equation (2-28) Constant in equation (2-45)С₅ CG Constant in equation (2-46) C.S. Control Surface C.V. Control Volume F Force \mathbf{F}_{s} Surface force Shear force Fr G Mass velocity Defined, equation (2-5) Η_η Defined, equation (2-10) H₂ Orifice Coefficient (C-4) Κ Momentum Flux Μ Momentum Multiplier ΜM Ρ Pressure

Ŧ

5

5

;

3

2

2

R Potentiometer Reading (C-2)

- Re Reynolds Number
- T Length of Time
- V Velocity

۲

- 2

? ,

3

3

)

- V' Fluctuating Velocity with Zero Mean
- X Quality
- YK Defined equation (4-6)
- ZK Defined equation (4-7)
- a Location or position in area
- b Magnitude of sinusoidal perturbation, equation (2-34)
- c Coefficient of Damping
- c' Coefficient of Damping
- d Indicates differential
- e Voltage
- f Subscript indicates liquid
- g Gravitational acceleration
- g Subscript indicates gas
- g Gravitational constant
- h Width of arriving flow, equation (3-1)
- i Subscript indicates ith term
- k Spring constant
- k' Spring constant
- l Length
- m Mass

xii

- m' Mass
- m Mass flow rate
- n Exponent in equation (4-3)
- r Radius
- r_o Outside radius
- t Time
- v Specific volume (1/p)
- x Displacement
- y Displacement
- z Displacement

Greek Letters

- \checkmark Void fraction
- β Decay constant
- γ Mean liquid fraction deviation equation (2-52)
- S Calculus of variations differential
- Entrainment, equation (2-29)
- **S**, Constant defined in equation (2-3a)
- 5₂ Constant defined in equation (2-4a)
- 53 Constant defined in equation (2-9a)
- $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\rm f}$ Local liquid mass flow fraction
- $\gamma_{\rm g}$ Local gas mass flow fraction
- Θ Thom's constant, equation (2-21)
- λ_1 Constant, see 2.2.2
- λ_z Constant, see 2.2.2

- λ_3 Constant, see 2.2.3
- A Coefficient of viscosity
- π Ratio of circle circumference to radius
- **f** Density

T

•)

- **b** Bankoff's constant, equation (2-20a)
- ω Sinusoidal frequency, equation (2-34)

Other symbols

- **d** Partial differential
- f Indicates function of the variables following
- Volume
- Indicates vector quantity
- Indicates averaged quantity

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The two-phase momentum flux has come to attention primarily through its relationship to pressure changes in systems involving phase change, water tube boilers, nuclear reactors, refrigerating evaporators and condensers, rockets, condensing ejectors, and the like. In addition to being of direct application, knowledge of the momentum flux would also result in additional basic knowledge and understanding of the nature of two-phase flows and the applicability of various models. This basic understanding of the momentum flux is, among other applications, particularly relevant to the critical flow phenomena.

1.1 Pressure Drop in a Pipe

The ability to predict two-phase pressure change to nearly the same degree of accuracy as is possible with single-phase flow has eluded investigators. This is fascinating from a motivational point of view as accurate determination of the two-phase pressures are of fundamental importance in the design of evaporators, condensers, and particularly nuclear reactors. That the technological need has not brought about a dependable solution is sufficient testimony to the difficulty of the problem.

The two-phase pressure change, like the single-phase change, can be considered to be composed of several, individual contributing terms. A development of the general momentum equation (see Appendix A) shows these contributing terms to be a frictional pressure drop, an hydrostatic pressure change, a momentum flux change, and an acceleration transient. Each of the terms is considerably more difficult to evaluate in the two-phase case than for a single phase. In particular, the hydrostatic pressure change is elementary for the single phase while it requires a knowledge of phase distribution for the two-phase phenomena. In single phase, fully developed, incompressible flows, the difference is easily computed assuming a similarity of velocity profiles. Further, the momentum pressure change is only significant in proportion to the frictional pressure change at high Mach numbers. It is seen that for general use the pressure change in a single phase flow, neglecting transient terms, is due primarily to one difficult term, the frictional term.

The relative simplicity of the single phase flow may well be one of the important reasons for the retarded development of twophase technology. In the single phase, a simple pressure difference measurement is easily related to the one term needing correlation, the frictional term. This is simply not so for the two-phase system, but it did serve as a starting point for two-phase study. Certain holdovers unfortunately serve as mental blocks, and time after time

-2-

the hydrostatic and momentum flux terms were simply estimated and subtracted out in investigating the two-phase friction term. It was not considered important to consider these terms more carefully, even though they often served as the largest portion of the pressure change. Through careless consideration of the overall equation, only a half-way job can be done on the frictional correlation.

A second reason for the retarded development of two-phase technology, also due to the single phase study influence, is the tendency to consider the flow on the average. This is acceptable in the single phase as there are no natural deviations from the average steady flow, except in a careful consideration of turbulent flow. Averaging is not generally acceptable in two-phase flow because of the non-linear nature of the momentum flux and the occurrence of slugs, waves, and other natural fluctuations. As with turbulent flow, the first level of complication is a recognition and treatment of the natural fluctuations.

1.2 Momentum Flux Models

A model is a proposal giving the phase and velocity distribution as a function of space and time. For the purposes here, it is information from which one may calculate a momentum flux. A model may, of course, include several experimental parameters, in the limit being an actual photograph of the phenomena, or it may be a

-3-

highly simplified approximation. Several models have been proposed by investigators of two-phase flow pressure change in order to reduce their data for friction correlation. It should be noted that all are steady or averaged in time models.

The most simple model is the homogeneous. It merely assumes that the phases are mixed in the ratio of the flowing quality at a single velocity. The assumption is popular in that it is simple to deal with. Unfortunately, it assumes that the average velocity of the liquid and the gas are the same. Through measurement of the void fraction, the percentage of gas-occupied area at a section, this has been shown to be a gross error; the average gas velocity is often many times the average liquid velocity. Incidentally, the original purpose of the void fraction measurement was to establish the hydrostatic term.

Introduction of the void fraction as an experimental parameter, leading to a calculation of a velocity for the liquid and another for the gas, gives the two-velocity or slip model. Martinelli (1)^{*} made a moderately successful two-phase pressure change correlation in which he calculated the momentum flux by the slip model. He presented an empirical chart of void fraction versus quality. Even recent investigation (2), apparently inspired by Martinelli's relative success, retains the two-velocity model for the momentum flux calculation.

* Numbers in parentheses refer to references at end of report.

-4-

They differ only in that Thom, the recent investigator, presents a mathematical relationship between void fraction in quality. The two velocity model is by far the most popular model, perhaps because it is the most simple model which manages to avoid obvious errors such as discrepancy in the void fraction.

At higher qualities and gas velocities, much of the liquid flow seems to become entrained as droplets in the gas stream. Thus was developed the entrainment model. An entrainment factor, of empirical origin, denotes the fraction of the liquid flow which is traveling at the gas velocity. The entrainment model also establishes the velocities to preserve the empirical void fraction. Magiros and Duckler (3) essentially adopt the entrainment model when they recommend that momentum be neglected in the liquid film and calculated on the basis of entrainment in the gas core.

Bankoff (4) demonstrated additional sophistication by proposing that the density and velocity profiles need not, and in fact do not, take step changes across a section. He proposed a profile for the density and another for the velocity and proceeded to show that slip between the average velocities was indeed the result. Bankoff investigated the low quality, bubbly flow, region. The power law profiles he suggested were essentially guesses based on satisfying the void fraction data.

Anderson and Mantzoranis (5) did essentially the same thing

-5-

as Bankoff in the annular flow region. Their results were highly tailored to fit empirical data and the profiles they suggest are suspect on the basis of physical reasoning. Silvestri (6) has made measurements of both the density and velocity profiles in the entrained liquid gas region. He was unsuccessful in integrating the values to predict reasonable momentum flux differences. The difficulties with complete profile specification are to find the profiles, or enough empirical data to reasonably specify them, and to deal with the problem of non-linear averaging.

1.3 Differences between Models

The selection of a model is not critical when the difference between them for the purposes for which they are to be used is small. Unfortunately, the difference in momentum predicted by the models is large. Figure la shows a plot of momentum pressure change versus quality as predicted by the homogeneous and by the twovelocity model, void fraction as given by Martinelli. The two models predict significantly different results at the lower qualities. Figure 1b shows the ratio of the homogeneous to the two-velocity model. Thus it can be seen that in cases where momentum flux differences play any significant role, as in rapid heating or cooling, the accurate determination of the correct model, the correct momentum flux, is of vital importance.

-6-

1.4 Direct Measurement

Four experiments are described in the literature which directly measure the momentum flux. All used the turning tee method used by this experimenter. Linning (7) first made the measurement and reduced his data to slip ratio data according to the two-velocity model. Semenov (8) did essentially the same thing, followed by Vance (9) who reproduced Linning's experiment. Semenov and Vance, both patterned their data reduction after Linning, using the twovelocity model to predict slip. As will be emphasized later, the momentum flux is more than a function of the slip ratio, and the momentum flux cannot be returned to a slip ratio which is representative of the true void fraction data. The experimenters mentioned had steady force measuring devices and were not equipped to consider fluctuating forces.

The other investigation is that of Rose (10) who attempted to evaluate each of the pressure drop terms by independent measurement in the bubbly flow regime. Rose measured the void fraction and compared his momentum flux data with that predicted by his measured void fraction in the two-velocity model and with that predicted by the homogeneous model. Although one does not necessarily expect the two-velocity model to hold as well in bubbly flow as it does in annular flow, (the two-velocity model is often called the "annular model"), the data does point out that the slip model does violate

-7-

experimental data. Rose's data is shown in Figures 29 and 30 and will be discussed in more detail.

Outside of the bubbly flow regime, the total number of experimental points is about fifty, mostly due to Vance. Considerably more direct measurement discussed in relation to the flow models is awaited.

1.5 Fluctuation

As has been mentioned, the time unsteadiness is of vital importance in two-phase flow as waves and slugs occur naturally. Some attempts have been made to correlate these natural fluctuations (8), and many investigators have presented some of their fluctuating data in its raw form. Silvestri (6) among others is able to recognize flow regimes by the fluctuating nature of some quantity. Although virtually all researchers have observed the unsteady nature, as has been mentioned, every effort has been made to neglect it through averaging. Even systematic investigations as with limited data reduction such as that of Semenov (8) are rare.

The void fraction and the momentum flux are excellent variables for the investigation of fluctuations as they can be measured at a section.

1.6 Critical Flow

Critical flow of two-phase mixtures have been predicted on the

-8-

basis of the homogeneous and two-velocity models (11). Fauske (11) claims, without giving his reasoning, that critical flow is bounded by the predictions based on these models. At the critical flow, the momentum flux change is of greatest importance. The investigation of the momentum flux should then lend some information to the validity of the critical flow modeling and the critical flow itself.

;

ÿ

-9-

CHAPTER II

ANALYTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 The Momentum Multiplier

;

7

The momentum flux can be reduced with respect to the flow rate by the consideration of a momentum multiplier defined as

$$MM = \frac{A \iint \int V^2 dA}{g_c (\iint \int V dA)^2} = \frac{Force}{G^2 A}$$
(2-1)

This is the same momentum multiplier defined and presented by Martinelli (1). It is important to note that the momentum multiplier is not a dimensionless quantity and that the dimensions used by Martinelli are not the same as those presented in this paper.

The consideration of the momentum flux at a particular flow rate is the same as the consideration of the momentum multiplier at the same flow rate. With this fact in mind, the terms will be used interchangeably.

2.2 Possible Bounds on the Momentum Multiplier Value

In any investigation it is of interest to know of any limits that bound the values of inquiry. The knowledge of bounds is helpful in evaluating the validity of the empirical data and in forming models or parameters by which the data may be correlated and understood. 2.2.1 <u>Martinelli's Bounds</u> Martinelli suspected that the actual momentum multiplier lay between those predicted by the homogeneous and two-velocity models. The given reasoning was that "the watervapor mixture ... will be partially in the form of fog and partially separated liquid and vapor." To be more exact, the reasoning is that the two models represent idealization from which deviations always occur toward the other. Homogeneous flow is always moderated by slip, so that the average gas velocity exceeds the average liquid velocity. The two-velocity model cannot exist either, if only for the step velocity gradient between the phases and the resulting deviation will be toward the homogeneous. Apparently Fauske (11) would hold to a similar argument as he predicts that the two models give bounds to critical flow values.

That the two-velocity model gives a minimum momentum multiplier value is valid as will be shown shortly. It is impossible to conceive of a model whereby a smaller momentum multiplier value may be achieved. That the homogeneous model represents an upper bound is not similarly true, but represents only the opinion of the investigators as to the nature of the phenomena. If one conceives of the flow of one of the phases in a smaller and smaller area, the momentum multiplier grows larger without bound. As the investigators have given no physical reasoning as to why all deviations should be lower in value than the homogeneous, it does not seem reasonable to accept this as a real bound.

-11-

2.2.2 <u>Requirements for Minimum Possible Momentum Flux</u> The density, \boldsymbol{j} , and the velocity, V, are allowed to be unknown functions of the position, a, in the cross sectional area, A, and of time, t. We wish to find the requirements on these functions such that the minimum possible average momentum flux is given as a result.

$$M = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} \iint_{A} \mathcal{G}(a,t) V^{2}(a,t) da dt \qquad (2-2)$$

The only constraint to be considered is that of average continuity of each phase.

$$\frac{m_f}{S_1} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \iint_A \left(\mathcal{G}(a,t) - \mathcal{G}_g \right) V(a,t) \, da \, dt \qquad (2-3)$$

$$5_{i} = \frac{f_{+}}{f_{+} - f_{g}}$$
 (2-3a)

$$\frac{m_g}{S_2} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_A \left(f_f - f(a, t) \right) V(a, t) \, da \, dt \qquad (2-4)$$

$$S_2 = \frac{S_2}{S_f - S_g}$$
 (2-4a)

Following the method of calculus of variations

$$H_{i} = \lim_{T \to 00} \frac{1}{T} \iint_{A} \left[\int (a, t) V_{(a, t)}^{2} + \lambda_{i} (f(a, t) - f_{g}) + \lambda_{z} (f_{x} - f(a, t)) V(a, t) \right] da dt$$

$$(2-5)$$

where
$$\lambda_{1}$$
 and λ_{2} are constants.
 $SH_{i} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} \int_{A} \left\{ \left[2S(a,t) V(a,t) + \lambda_{i} (S(a,t) - S_{g}) + \lambda_{2} (S_{f} - S(a,t)) \right] SV + \left[V(a,t) + \lambda_{i} V(a,t) - \lambda_{2} V(a,t) \right] SP \right\} la dt$
(2-6)
 $+ \lambda_{2} (S_{f} - S(a,t)) \int_{0}^{T} SV + \left[V(a,t) + \lambda_{i} V(a,t) - \lambda_{2} V(a,t) \right] SP \left\} la dt$
In order that $SH = 0$

$$Z S(a,t) V(a,t) + \lambda_1 (S(a,t) - S_g) + \lambda_2 (S_f - S(a,t)) = 0 \quad (2-7)$$

and

$$V^{2}(a,t) + \lambda, V(a,t) - \lambda_{z} V(a,t) = 0$$
(2-8)

Equations (2-7) and (2-8) along with the two continuity equations, (2-3) and (2-4), specify the conditions on S (a,t), V(a,t), λ_{\perp} , and λ_{2} for the minimum possible momentum flux.

3

2.2.3 <u>Minimum Momentum Flux at Specified Void Fraction</u> In addition to the continuity constraints of equations (2-3) and (2-4), an average void fraction constraint may be added.

$$\frac{\alpha}{S_3} = \frac{\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_A S_f - f(a, t) \, da \, dt \qquad (2-9)$$

$$\mathbf{5}_{\mathbf{3}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{A}\left(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{f}} - \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{g}}\right)} \qquad (2-9a)$$

Equation (2-5) is modified by the additional constraint

$$H_{2} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} \iint_{A} \left[S(a,t) V^{2}(a,t) + \lambda_{1} (S(a,t) - S_{g}) + \lambda_{2} (S_{f} - S(a,t)) V(a,t) + \lambda_{3} (S_{f} - S(a,t)) \right] da dt$$
(2-10)

where λ_3 is an additional constant.

$$\begin{split} \delta H_{2} &= \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int \int A \left\{ \left[2 f(a, t) V(a, t) + \lambda, \left(f(a, t) - f_{g} \right) \right. \right. \\ &+ \left. \lambda_{2} \left(g_{f} - f(a, t) \right) \right] \delta V + \left[V^{2}(a, t) + \lambda, V(a, t) - \lambda_{2} V(a, t) - \lambda_{3} \right] \delta F \right\} da dt \\ \text{Again setting } \delta H = 0 \text{ gives} \end{split}$$

$$V(a,t) + \lambda, V(a,t) - \lambda_2 V(a,t) - \lambda_3 = 0 \qquad (2-12)$$

and equation (2-7) as before. Thus equations (2-7) and (2-12) along with the constraints, equations (2-3), (2-4), and (2-9) specify the conditions for the minimum momentum at a given void fraction.

Although it is difficult to find the solutions to the equations by direct means, it is quite simple to test a suspected solution. Because of its flat velocity profiles, we suspect that the twovelocity model may be a solution for the minimum momentum flux at a given void fraction. That this is true is easily verified. Thus Martinelli's minimum bound is shown to be valid by continuity considerations alone.

2.2.4 <u>Minimum Momentum Flux Model</u> It is suspected that the void fraction in the two-velocity model might be adjusted to give the minimum momentum flux and that the result might satisfy the minimum possible momentum flux requirements. It is noted that as the void fraction approaches zero or one, the momentum flux value of this model approaches infinity (Figures 18 and 19). Also of note is the fact that void fraction values are not singular, that another void fraction in addition to the homogeneous void fraction gives the homogeneous momentum flux value.

$$M = \left[\frac{\dot{m}_{f}}{(1-\alpha)} + \frac{\dot{m}_{g}}{\alpha}\right] \frac{1}{A ge}$$
(2-13)

In order that $\frac{dM}{d\mathbf{x}} = 0$

$$=\frac{1}{1+\left(\frac{1-\chi}{\chi}\right)\left(\sqrt[4]{y_{\tilde{f}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$
(2-14b)

A substitution shows that the two-velocity model at the void fraction given in equation (2-14) satisfies the requirements for the minimum possible momentum.

At the value of void fraction giving the minimum possible momentum flux, the slip ratio is found to be

$$\frac{\bigvee_{g}}{\bigvee_{f}} = \left(\begin{array}{c} v_{\bar{g}} \\ \not v_{\bar{f}} \end{array} \right)^{\frac{1}{Z}}$$
(2-15)

a result common in two-phase flow. It can be found by considering the kinetic energy per unit cross sectional area to be the same in each phase. It was also derived by Fauske (11) by a more tortuous route. Fauske's critical flow model is thus the flow with minimum momentum flux.

2.2.5 <u>Unsteady Minimum Momentum Flux</u> It should be recognized that the two-velocity model at the specified void fraction represents only one of many solutions to the minimum momentum flux requirements. The other solutions are all of a time varying nature, however, leaving the two-velocity model as the only steady-state solution.

That time varying solutions exist can be demonstrated by physical reasoning. Consider a liquid jet leaving a nozzle in a steady flow at some angle upward, against gravity. Surface tension acts to break up the stream into droplets which, when they pass through the same elevation as the nozzle, have the same average momentum as at the nozzle. If the stream is enclosed in a frictionless wall duct including a gas phase introduced to give the minimum possible two-phase momentum flux at the jet, the flow will have an unsteady, minimum average momentum flux as it passes the nozzle elevation. Many of the unsteady solutions can be visualized by changing the angle of the jet giving more or less time for the fluid to form droplets.

-16-

2.3 Deviations from Minimum Possible Value

Ţ

1

Generally speaking, deviation from the minimum possible momentum flux value is caused by deviation of the density and velocity profiles from their minimum functions. These deviations may be classified in one or more of four categories: void fraction phase distribution changes, velocity profile alterations, entrainment phase distribution changes, or time variations. An attempt will be made to investigate the influence of each of the types of deviation.

2.3.1 <u>Void Fraction</u> The large deviation between the homogeneous and two-velocity model momentum fluxes is due entirely to difference in void fraction assumption. The homogeneous void fraction

is considerably greater than minimum momentum flux void fraction. A graphical comparison is provided in Figure 16 at atmospheric pressure.

Several other values of void fraction versus quality have been suggested and are shown on the same figure. Martinelli's curve was reduced from actual data and has been given without mathematical correlation.

-17-

Zivi (12) developed the relation

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \frac{\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}} \end{pmatrix}^{\frac{r}{3}} \boldsymbol{\chi}}{\left| + \left[\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}} \end{pmatrix}^{\frac{r}{3}} - \right] \boldsymbol{\chi}} = \frac{1}{\left| + \left(\frac{1-\chi}{\chi} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \end{pmatrix}^{\frac{r}{3}}}$$

$$\frac{\sqrt{q}}{\sqrt{q}} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}} \end{pmatrix}^{\frac{r}{3}}$$
(2-18)
$$(2-19)$$

on the basis of a minimum kinetic energy flux.

Bankoff (4) gave the relation

)

$$\phi = 0.71 + .0001 P$$
 (2-20a)

on the basis of his assumed density and velocity profiles in bubbly flow. One notes that Bankoff's model certainly fails outside of the low quality region and does not satisfy the known point that the void fraction is unity at single-phase gas flow.

Thom (2) proposes that the general form,

$$\alpha = \frac{\Theta X}{I + X(\Theta - I)}$$
(2-21)

where Θ should be determined by experimental evidence, best fits all the known data.

The relations of the form

$$\alpha = \frac{C_{,X}}{I + C_{z}X}$$
(2-22)

are symmetric about the $X = (1 - \alpha)$ axis (the expressions are identical when X is replaced by $(1 - \alpha)$ and α by (1 - X)). This is at variance to the Martinelli result which is clearly skewed. The Bankoff model, although intended for low quality is also pleasingly skewed, a shape which seems necessary to best fit the data.

The void fractions reviewed are between the homogeneous and the minimum momentum flux void fractions. They are, excluding the Bankoff model, sufficiently close to the minimum momentum value that they all give nearly the same momentum flux. This is to be expected since they are in the region where $dM/d\alpha$ is small. At lower qualities ($X \leq .05$) the Martinelli curve does depart by a sufficient difference to make a noticeable difference in the momentum flux. It can be said, with the exception of the Bankoff model and the Martinelli curve at low quality, that the selection of void fraction correlation makes no difference in the momentum flux value. They are all sufficiently close to the minimum momentum flux value (see Figures 18 and 19).

2.3.2 <u>Velocity Distribution</u> In a single-phase flow the minimum momentum velocity profile is the uniform profile where

)

$$V = \frac{G}{P}$$
(2-23)

-19-

The corresponding momentum flux is

$$M = \frac{AG^2}{S}$$
(2-24)

Integration of universal velocity profiles indicates that the fully developed turbulent flow is 1%-10% greater than the flat profile value (13)(5). Further, the integration is of an averaged curve and, depending upon the fluctuations present, the actual value should be higher still. The laminar velocity profile is

$$V = \frac{2G}{\beta} \left(1 - \left(\frac{r}{r_{o}}\right)^{2} \right)$$
(2-25)

and results in a momentum flux of

$$M = \frac{4 A G^2}{3 S}$$
(2-26)

or 33% greater than the minimum possible. The laminar value is the maximum considering steady flow where viscosity is the only physical force producing factor present.

A laminar model has been investigated. The assumptions made were the following: 1) the phases flow in annular layers with a smooth interface between them (this minimizes the surface energies), 2) pressure is constant across a cross section, 3) no slip boundary conditions, and 4) shear stress matching between the phases. The

-20-

Navier-Stokes equation reduces to

$$\frac{dP}{dz} + \int g = \frac{\mu}{r} \frac{d}{dr} \left(r \frac{dV}{dr} \right) \tag{2-27}$$

whose solution is

$$V = \frac{\frac{dp}{dz} + gg}{4\mu} + C_3 + C_4$$
 (2-28)

in each phase.

The void fraction is a function of the flow as well as of the quality and the void fraction is on the opposite side of the minimum momentum flux void fraction from the homogeneous. This is indicative of very high slip ratios. The momentum flux value exceeds the homogeneous value except below 3% quality. At higher qualities, the values are prohibitively high. One can safely conclude that the laminar model bears such small relation to reality as to be useless; the results are not presented graphically.

Anderson and Mantzoranis (5) made the same assumptions as were made for the laminar model. They did not, however, satisfy the laminar flow equations in each phase but used Van Karman's (14) "universal velocity profile." They determined a factor giving the ratio of the actual momentum to the two-velocity momentum. Essentially, they predicted a 1% to 10% increase in the flux.

The work of Anderson and Mantzoranis presents a few conceptual difficulties. For example, they draw the velocity and shear stress

-21-

profiles as in Figure 21. Within the liquid phase it is impossible to have a positive sloping shear stress and a concave downward velocity profile. They admitted to the difficulty saying that "the assumption must involve some error Nevertheless the universal velocity profile is used here as the best approximation to the truth ..." They go even further to define the double velocity profile also shown in the sketch. The double profile amounts to two universal profiles back to back in the liquid region. There is no substantial reason for the assumption other than it might accidentally predict some results.

Note that velocity profile moves the momentum flux value toward the homogeneous model value without altering the measured void fraction. That the momentum flux values are like the homogeneous model does not imply that the flow is homogeneous, but that other factors have made their addition to the flux predicted by the slip model.

2.3.3 <u>Phase Distribution</u> The phenomena of phase distribution has no analogy in the single-phase flow. Here it specifically refers to the phenomena of entrainment, a portion of the liquid phase traveling at the gas velocity. The void fraction may still be specified independently. Entrainment is defined as

$$E = \frac{ent_{rained} \dot{m}_{f}}{t_{otal} \dot{m}_{f}} \qquad (2-29)$$

-22-

Real entrained flows have been observed (6) (20) to have very laminar-like velocity profiles in the core region. Here, however, the effect of entrainment is being viewed for its mass distribution effect between the two average velocities of the slip model. The steep profiles are not considered.

The two-phase momentum multiplier is

$$MM = \left(\frac{\chi(\chi + (I-\chi)\epsilon)\upsilon_{\overline{g}}}{\alpha} + \frac{(I-\chi)^{2}(I-\epsilon)^{2}\upsilon_{\overline{f}}}{(I-\alpha - \frac{\epsilon\alpha\upsilon_{\overline{f}}(I-\chi)}{\upsilon_{\overline{g}}\chi})}\right) - \frac{1}{g\epsilon}$$
(2-30)

One notes that when $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = 0$, the momentum multiplier reduces to the two-velocity slip model value

$$MM = \left(\frac{\chi^{2} \upsilon_{\overline{g}}}{\alpha} - \frac{(1-\chi)^{2} \upsilon_{\overline{f}}}{(1-\alpha)}\right) - \frac{1}{g_{c}}$$
(2-31)

However, when $\epsilon = 1$, the value is

$$MM = \frac{X \sigma_2}{\alpha g_e}$$
(2-32)

which is larger than the homogeneous value,

$$MM = \left(X \upsilon_{\overline{g}} + (1-X) \upsilon_{\overline{f}}\right) \frac{1}{g_{\epsilon}}$$
(2-33)

This is because to satisfy the void fraction, some liquid must stand on the wall, reducing the effective tube size. Entrainments larger than 1.0 are possible with back flow in the annular water at the wall. Figure 20 shows the results of the entrainment model
with entrainments of 0, 20, 40, 60, 80, and 100 percent along with the homogeneous result.

2.3.4 <u>Time Variation</u> In a single-phase flow, the average momentum flux may be higher than that predicted by an integration using the average velocity profile. This is because the momentum is a function of the square of the velocity. Consider a flow, with a uniform instantaneous velocity profile, varying sinusoidally about a mean value with amplitude ^b.

$$\dot{m} = \dot{m}_{mean} + b \sin \omega t$$
 (2-34)

The average momentum flux is proportional to

$$M \approx \dot{m}^2 + \frac{b^2}{2}$$
(2-35)

as opposed to the steady value of

$$M \approx \dot{m}^2 \tag{2-36}$$

Schlicting(13) reproduces turbulent flow measurements of Reichardt as in Figure 22. Using a hot-wire anemometer, Reichardt obtained the average velocity profile and a profile of the root mean square of the fluctuating velocities in the axial and the transverse directions. Considering the velocity to be composed of a steady average and a fluctuating velocity, whose average is zero,

$$V = \overline{V} + V' \tag{2-37}$$

-24-

and that the momentum flux is proportional to the velocity squared.

$$M \approx \iint_{A} \left(\bar{V}^{2} + 2 \bar{V} V' + {V'}^{2} \right) da \qquad (2-38)$$

the average momentum flux is proportional to two terms

$$\overline{M} \approx \iint_{A} \left(\overline{V}^{2} + \overline{V}^{\prime 2} \right) da \qquad (2-39)$$

An integration of Reichardt's data shows that the fluctuating component amounts to slightly over one percent of the steady velocity profile integration.

In calibrating his apparatus, Rose (10) consistently measured higher momentum fluxes than he was able to support by integration of universal velocity profile. The difference is of the same magnitude as that which is attributed to fluctuation according to Reichardt's data.

The fluctuating velocity is expected to be large at the airwater interface in annular flow. This is visually evident in the fluid to one observing liquid waves propagating up the wall and in the gas from Reichardt's data. This fluctuation may well explain the inability of Silvestri to integrate steady measured profiles to reasonable momentum pressure drop data.

In the two-phase fluctuation generally, some model must be selected to relate parameters before a calculation similar to

-25-

equation (2-35) can be made. For example, one may assume the homogeneous model in which the solution is the same as for a single phase. One may assume that the void fraction remains constant and that the flow variations occur in each phase independently, similar to Reichardt's turbulent data. In a slug flow model the void fraction will have some functional relation to the fluctuating flow rates.

The model taken to represent varying void fraction conditions was the two-velocity model with the following assumptions: 1) constant gas velocity

$$\frac{m_{g}}{\alpha} = \text{constant}$$
 (2-40)

and 2) constant volume flow rate

 $\dot{m}_{f} v_{f} + \dot{m}_{g} v_{g} = \text{constant.}$ (2-41)

For computation, step variations in the parameters were used. Any number of steps (i) can be chosen per cycle, but the percentage of time at each step (t_i) must be chosen so as to total unity.

$$\sum_{i} \epsilon_{i} = 1. \qquad (2-42)$$

Void fractions selected must be time weighted to give the known overall average value, $\overline{\checkmark}$.

$$\sum_{i} t_{i} \alpha_{i} = \overline{\alpha} \qquad (2-43)$$

The continuity relations are written in terms of the local qualities

-26-

$$\gamma_{\rm fi}$$
 and $\gamma_{\rm gi}$ where

Equations (2-50) and (2-58) are now

$$\frac{\gamma_{gi}}{\alpha_i} = C_{s}$$
(2-45)

and

;

4

$$\mathcal{T}_{i} \quad \mathcal{V}_{f} + \mathcal{T}_{gi} \quad \mathcal{V}_{g} = C_{6} \tag{2-46}$$

Of course,

$$\sum_{i} \mathcal{T}_{gi} \quad \forall i = \mathbf{X} \tag{2-47}$$

and

$$\sum_{i} \gamma_{fi} t_{i} = (\overline{I - \chi})$$
(2-48)

which give

$$C_{s} = \frac{\chi_{v_{\overline{q}}}}{\overline{\varkappa}}$$
(2-49)

and

$$C_{c} = (I - X) v_{f} + X v_{f}$$
 (2-50)

so that all ? gi and ? fi can be evaluated. The resulting momentum multiplier is

$$MM = \frac{1}{g_e} \sum_{i} t_i \left[\frac{\gamma_{f_i}^2 \sigma_f}{(1 - \alpha_i)} + \frac{\gamma_{g_i}^2 \sigma_g}{\alpha_i} \right] \qquad (2-51)$$

Note that $?_{fi}$ and $?_{gi}$ may have been selected in place of \prec_i along with t_i to determine the value of the other parameters.

Figures 23 through 28 show computed results of the time varying model using two steps (i = 2). The results are given in terms of δ an average deviation from the average liquid fraction $(1-\alpha)$

$$X = \sum_{i} \frac{|\overline{\alpha} - \alpha_i| + i}{|-\overline{\alpha}|}$$
(2-52)

The time at each step was varied as well as the value of \checkmark . Figure 23 shows the effect of changing the time at each step while holding \checkmark constant. Figures 24 and 25 show the effect of variable \checkmark while the time at each step remains constant. Figure 26 shows the value of the momentum at each step and the resulting average. Figures 27 and 28 show the ratio of the fluctuation in amplitude to the average value as \checkmark varies.

Assuming that the model and the ensuing calculations have some validity, the last curve is particularly significant. By comparing the given figure with actual experimental data, a sample of which is given in Figure 45, one can estimate the correct values of X.

2.4 Differential Deviation from Single Phase

The single-phase limits are points where the two-phase models can be checked against single-phase theory. This, of course, is well recognized and virtually all the models give the single phase limits in void fraction and momentum flux if they claim to be valid in the region. Bankoff's model, of course, deviates at the high qualities as discussed because it was intended to apply only to the bubbly flow regime.

In addition to the limiting values, the slope of the values with respect to quality can also be estimated with a little additional reasoning. A differentially small addition of a gas to a single-phase liquid can be imagined best as well dispersed throughout the flow (unless artifically made otherwise). Thus at the low quality limit the homogeneous flow is seen to predict the slopes of the void fraction and momentum multiplier. A differential addition of a liquid, not wetting the walls, can be expected to produce the same result. A differential addition of a wetting liquid could eventually be expected to be found at the wall. Thus the two-velocity model would best predict the slope of values for this phenomenon.

-29-

CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

An experimental program was undertaken to obtain direct measurements on the momentum flux in two-phase pipe flow.

3.1 Feasibility

Two methods were initially considered to measure the momentum flux at a section. The first involved condensing the vapor portion of a pipe flow exhausting into a large chamber. The measurement of the pressure difference between the end of the pipe and the exit of the chamber would then relate the negligible chamber exit section momentum flux to the entering flux of interest. The second, the method actually used, involved turning the two-phase fluid as described in Appendix A, in a tee. Calculations indicated that the second method would give more accurate results. It would also be flexibile to measuring two-component as well as two-phase flow where one phase can condense. As a further incentive, turning arrangements had been successful for other investigators.

3.2 Design Requirements

An apparatus to measure the momentum flux by the method considered must accurately measure the force on the turning tee. It must provide facilities for making the force measurement under a variety of conditions and must monitor those conditions.

It was decided to work principally with steam-water with adaptation to air-water. This decision was based upon the relative ease of availability of the fluids and their significance in regard to two-phase flow application and current studies.

Laboratory steam was available at 200 psia. This pressure and the corresponding saturation temperature set the upper bounds for which the apparatus was to be designed for both operation and safety. Unfortunately, this upper bound is well below values common in industrial practice. Since, however, momentum effects are accentuated at lower pressures, it was felt that the data could be safely extrapolated from the experimental to higher pressures. Atmospheric pressure was the lower bound on the apparatus.

The parameters to be experimentally varied were the flow rate of each of the phases, the pressure, and the inlet pipe diameter.

3.3 Original Design

The final apparatus evolved, through several design changes, from less successful earlier attempts.

3.3.1 <u>Tank and Internals</u> With the turning tee method, it is necessary that the tee be surrounded by an atmosphere at the pressure being tested. Further, the vessel must be large enough so that exit flow from the tee cannot be diverted so as to affect the measurement being made.

-31-

A 0.3125-inch wall steel tank having an internal diameter of 16 inches and a length of 36 inches with welded, dome-shaped heads was selected as the pressure containment vessel. The vessel was designed as a refrigerant receiver tank for use at 300 psi. It was hydrostatically tested to 500 psi.

Several fittings already available were used as steam exit, water exit, gage glass mounts, and thermocouple well header. Additional access ports made in the tank include the inlet pipe fitting, an instrumentation fitting and a 10-inch man hole. The man hole provided an entrance through which parts could be inserted and adjustments made. A 9-inch diameter, 1-inch thick tempered glass plate was inserted and sealed by an 0-ring in the man hole flange cover. The glass provided a 7-1/2 inch unsupported diameter window for viewing the internal mechanism in actual operation. External mounting fittings were provided with the tank.

Measurement of the forces in the high temperature, pressure, steamwater environment posed a difficult problem. Temperature compensated strain gages presented a possible solution which would have required a great deal of calibration to prove merit on an unsupported measurement. The solution adopted is that of placing a displacement transducer external to the tank where it is not affected by the adverse environment. The transducer would then measure the deflection of a beam, a displacement proportional to the force on the tee. A Linear

-32-

Variable Differential Transformer (LVDT) was selected as the transducer so that the transmission of information could be by magnetic means through the wall of the pressure vessel. The primary LVDT coil was fed a 15 KC signal with a peak and peak amplitude of 16 volts.

The pressure vessel wall at the position of the transducer consists of stainless steel, number ten gage tubing (for hypodermic use) with an inside diameter of 0.113 inches and an outside diameter of 0.133 inches. The LVDT used is a Sanborn Linearsyn Differential Transformer Model 590T-025. As shown in Figure 4, the coil assembly has an inside diameter of 0.136 inches while the core has an outside diameter of 0.100 inches. The core was silversoldered to another stainless steel tube serving as the displacement pushrod.

The electrical output of the coil assembly as a function of the core traverse position is shown in Figure 8. The voltage output is considerably smaller than that which would be achieved in the absence of the stainless steel pressure vessel wall. The end effect of the pushrod is sufficiently far from the core effect and excellent linearity occurs in the test distance.

Fittings to clamp the deflecting beam were welded into the tank. Two beams were initially tried, one a brass beam of $1/8 \ge 1/2$ inch squared section and the other a steel beam of $3/16 \ge 1/2$ inch squared section. The two beams were tried for their different spring rates,

-33-

from the point of view of frequency response and sensitivity. The steel beam was selected for its higher natural frequency and sufficient sensitivity. The tee was attached to the beam by a threaded stainless steel 10-30 rod. Both the beam and the tee connections are threaded and locked by nuts.

3.3.2 <u>Turning Tee</u> The function of the turning tee, as can be seen from the momentum equation analysis in Appendix A, is simply to turn the flow through a right angle. As long as this is accomplished, the tee internals are of little importance. In exploratory experiments, the tee used by Rose (10) in bubbly air-water flow, was tested in the present apparatus. Rose's tee, being soft soldered, did not stand the temperatures involved. Further, it was found that Rose's tee, being a double pipe elbow, was suitable only for flows approximating a single phase becuase of the extreme secondary flow patterns encountered in other regimes. Thus it was decided to use a tee of radially symmetric design with flow exiting from between parallel plates to insure perpendicularity to the inlet direction.

It was decided to design the tee as a flat plate deflector with guide walls to prevent splash back not normal to the inlet direction. As might be expected, the solution for a two-phase jet striking an overhead plate has not been attempted for two-phase flow. Thus it was decided to design on the basis of a single phase and modify as was deemed necessary by performance. Note that by designing on the

-34-

basis of a deflecting plate rather than in a more gradual turning nozzle, it was hoped to increase the time response of the tee.

The problem of a radially symmetric jet striking a surface has not been solved. Two approaches are taken here which bound the solution. First, a continuity approach, where the depth of the tee aperture at each radius is determined by the criteria that it pass the same flow in a radial direction as entered the tee, provides the minimum guide wall dimension. The two-dimensional jet solution (15)

$$y = \frac{h}{2} + \frac{h}{\pi} \log \coth \frac{\pi}{4} \left(\frac{2Z}{h} - 1 \right)$$
(3-1)

h = thickness of arriving flow

provides the other limit. The actual solution must approach the continuity solution at the exit of the tee, and the two-dimensional solution at the inlet. As an approximation to the actual solution, the two-dimensional solution was modified to a radially symmetric solution by the criteria that flow area normal to the inlet be the same. This solution is asymptotic to the two-dimensional solution at the inlet and the continuity solution at the exit as shown in Figure 6. The resulting tee design is that of Figure 7a and b. The material was aluminum.

3.3.3 <u>Feed System</u> City water is supplied at the system pressure by an Aurora Model E5T two-stage, vane pump designed to deliver 5 gpm

-35-

at 200 psi. The pump is bypassed so that any intermediate pressure and flow may be achieved without overloading the pump.

The liquid flow is measured by a Fischer & Porter 3000 Series Flowrator Meter measuring 5.70 gpm at full scale. The flowmeter was calibrated by weigh tank measurement presented in Figure 11.

The water was preheated in an Economy Steam and Water Mixer rated at 500 gallons per hour. The steam for the contact mixer was supplied at 200 psia from the laboratory supply through a 1/2-inch pipe. Pressure at the point of temperature measurement was read on a 1%accuracy, 200 psi max. pressure gage (#410R-TD Helicoid Test Gage 8-1/2"). The flow rate of the steam was obtained from a heat balance on the mixer. Copper Constantan thermocouples were provided to establish the temperatures necessary for this balance.

The main steam is supplied from the laboratory steam supply through a two-inch line. The flow rate of the steam is determined by flange tap orificing according to the ASME Power Test Code (16). Two sharp-edged orifices were used of 0.4-inch and of 1.0-inch diameter. Pressure readings are provided by the same Helicoid gage used to measure the heater steam pressure and the temperature by another thermocouple. The differential pressure across the orifice was measured by high pressure manometers filled with mercury or with Meriam #3 Manometer Fluid having a specific gravity of 2.95.

-36-

Air is supplied from the laboratory supply at 125 psi. It is measured by a laboratory setup equipped with mercury and oil manometers, a .3102-inch diameter orifice in a 2.067-inch diameter pipe, a thermometer, and a pressure gage. A shop air supply at 300 psi could also be used.

The steam and water are mixed in a jet pump mixing fixture, the inner chamber supplying the steam and the outer the water. The fixture, a McDaniels Suction tee, is fitted with one-inch female pipe connections. A valve is provided in both the steam and water lines immediately proceeding the mixing chamber for control and to introduce a large impedance just before mixing. The impedance is intended to minimize feedback into the feed systems. The exit of the mixing fixture feeds a length of insulated pipe leading to the pressure vessel and tee.

The pressure in the tank is monitored by a #41OR 4-1/2" Helicoid gage reading to 200 psi. The pressure is determined for calculational purposes by measuring the saturation temperature in the vessel by a Copper-Constantan thermocouple set in an eight-inch well near the beam. The exhaust steam, after passing through a control valve, is condensed in a two-inch line by contact mixing with tap water and dumped. Water level is determined by a sight glass and valve controlled in a half-inch dump line.

-37-

3.4 Modified Design

3.4.1 <u>Tank and Internals</u> The initial assembly proved to have two difficulties: considerable frctional hysteresis and an annoying zero shift during operation. Figure 15a and b shows the decay of the beam vibration following the release of an initial deflection, a pluck. Figure 10 shows a static test in which the hysteresis is of disturbing proportions. Friction between the LVDT core and the stainless steel tube vessel wall was blamed for the hysteresis when it was estimated that a quarter of a pound of normal force there could cause the effect. Also suspect was the clamping arrangement for the beam connection to the pressure vessel. The clamping was further suspect of being somewhat responsible for the zero shift at operating temperatures.

Two modifications were made. One end of the beam was bent into a dogleg and welded to the pressure vessel wall. This was to eliminate any buckling problems and to render the attachment more immobile, absorbing deflections in the elastic beam material. The second change involved an alignment mechanism so that the pushrod could always be aligned with the stainless steel tube within the LVDT coil. A flexible wire, too short to buckle, was built into the alignment mechanism so that no torque could be transmitted to the pushrod providing a normal force at the LVDT core. Figure 2 shows a diagram of the final apparatus.

-38-

Figures 10 and 15c show that the modification eliminated the column damping and the hysteresis. An operational zero shift persisted, however. Differential thermal expansions, and differential strains from pressure and water level change were investigated (Appendix B). Thermal expansion differences were shown to be of primary effect with a possible assistance from pressure changes.

The elimination of the zero shift lay either in a complete redesign of the apparatus, reducing the lengths subject to the differential strains and compensating somehow for differential expansion, or in the definition of an operational procedure to account for the change. Of course, the operational solution was chosen. Thermocouples were placed in the wall of the pressure vessel so that equilibrium could be detected through time spaced measurements. At the operating equilibrium, a zero point would be measured and the run would commence. The procedure has worked well and the zero value can be checked many times during a run.

3.4.2 <u>Tee</u> The original tee gave an estimated 5% runback (liquid leaving through the entrance). A new tee was designed, the change being a larger aperture, a larger overall radius, and a larger flat distance on the radius. The redesigned tee is given in Figure 7c and d. Further opening between the deflection plate and the guide walls was provided by the insertion of washers to open the slot from 0.10 inches to 0.35 inches. The tee, also constructed

-39-

from aluminum, weighs 0.84 pounds. It has performed to satisfaction at all operating conditions.

3.4.3 <u>Feed System</u> At flow rates only one-third of its specified value, the contact heater become noisy in operation. The noise was detectible in a flowmeter oscillation, an oscillation of the feed system that was considered undesirable. One positive effect was that it led to a consideration of the effect of oscillations on the average momentum flux.

A recirculating line, returning water from the pressure vessel to the feed system, replaced the contact heater. A centrifugal pump made up the small pressure difference in the circuit. The recirculated water, mixed with any makeup water needed is returned to the system preceeding the flowmeter. The final arrangement is shown in Figure 3. The recirculation loop successfully eliminated the undesirable noise and was further beneficial in reducing the number of measurements to be made, and in reducing the difficulty of holding specified conditions.

3.5 Void Fraction Data

A direct measurement of the void fraction for air-water was made by isolating a section of the inlet pipe with quick closing valves. The isolated section was plexiglass pipe of 0.75-inch diameter and 75 cm. length. The ratio of liquid volume to total volume was taken to be the liquid fraction.

-40-

3.6 Testing

T

Several tests to verify the performance of the apparatus have already been mentioned. They will merely be listed here.

Test	Purpose
Core Traverse, Fig. 5	Test operation, determine operating range
Pluck Tests, Fig. 15	Determine damping nature and factors
Static Calibrations, Fig. 10	Calibrate flowmeter

The spring constant of the beam was determined by direct measurement of the deflection under a steady load (Figure 9).

The most significant test is the single-phase steam test for it evaluates the principle and the function of the apparatus against known results. Steam flow was measured by the orifice and the momentum flux was measured by the tee. The single-phase momentum flux as calculated from the measured flow is compared with the measured result in Figure 12. The results are excellent.

3.7 Data System

The data consists of all the pressure, temperature, and flow readings necessary to establish the thermodynamic state of the twophase flow and the temperature equilibrium state of the pressure vessel, and the LVDT output voltage measuring the deflection of the beam. The pressure, temperature, and flow conditions are steady state and are not monitored continuously. The LVDT output is monitored in several ways as indicated in Figure 5 as its fluctuating nature as well as the average value is of interest.

3.7.1 <u>Observation</u> All of the pressure, temperature, manometer, and flow readings were recorded for each run. The LVDT signal was read from a vacuum tube volt meter after being averaged by a resistor capacitor circuit with a 15 second time constant. In addition, the flow was visually observed and the LVDT output was viewed on an oscilloscope to detect any irregularities. This data is sufficient to determine the average momentum multiplier values.

3.7.2 <u>Tape Recorder</u> For many runs the LVDT output was recorded by a frequency modulated tape deck. As shown in Figure 5, the LVDT signal was first biased and amplified before recording. The purpose of recording the data was for automatic spectral density later.

3.7.3 <u>Brush Recorder</u> The signal was often recorded directly by a Brush recorder. The same signal was also passed through a standard tee filter (17) (18) designed to zero out the natural beam frequency (43.8 cps) and recorded on the second band of the recorder. A diagram of the filter and its experimental frequency response are shown in Figure 14. Also shown is the combined response of the beam and the filter. Samples of the Brush recordings are shown in Figure 44.

-42-

3.8 Data Reduction

3.8.1 <u>Average Force Data</u> The recorded data was reduced on the computer to the parameters presented in Chapter IV. Appendix C gives the equations and approximations used in the computer program. 3.8.2 <u>Fluctuating Data</u> Appendix D gives the equation of motion for the beam, the frequency response of which is plotted in Figure J. This is to be compared with the analog computer spectral analysis, samples of which are shown in Figure 46. A Philbrick Researchers

SK Analog computer was used for the analysis with a filter, Dynamic Analizer Model 5D101A, made by Spectral Dynamics Corporation of San Diego. Unfortunately, the extremely long averaging times and narrow, sharp bandwidths required for accuracy at low frequencies limit the accuracy of the actual analog analysis.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

4.1 Average Moemntum Flux Data

The average momentum flux data, both raw and reduced, are presented in chart form in Appendix E. Figures 31 through 42 give a graphical presentation of the data. The figures locate the data on a mass velocity versus quality map, scribed with lines of constant homogeneous velocity; and present the momentum flux information as a momentum multiplier versus quality. The lines of homogeneous and minimum possible momentum multiplier values are given for reference. An individual figure is presented for each pressure and pipe size tested; atmospheric pressure, 30 psia, 60 psia, 90 psia, and 120 psia in nominal one-half and one-inch pipes for steam-water, and atmospheric pressure in a one-half inch pipe for air-water.

The temperature of the mixing water at the tee did not have any observable effect on the data. It was concluded that the entrance pipe was of sufficient length to diameter ratio to assure the thermal equilibrium and steady flow development conditions standard for adiabatic two-phase flow.

The two pipe sizes tested had no noticeable effect upon the momentum multiplier values.

-44-

Flow rate at a particular quality has a noticeable influence on the momentum multiplier values. In an attempt to correlate this effect, the data was coded according to the homogeneous velocity. It is not meant to suggest that the flow is actually homogeneous; the parameter was selected for calculational purposes as a quantity which varies at each quality in the same way as the mass flow rate. Some lines of constant homogeneous velocity have been drawn through the data on the figures of momentum multiplier versus quality. Further mention will be made later concerning the velocity effect for purposes of extrapolation and interpolation.

A few of the data points fall below the minimum possible momentum multiplier line. They are clearly in error. The principle cause of error is the difficulty of measuring the low forces involved. All of the points in error are characterized by low momentum flux and subsequent difficulty of measurement. Points with a small force measurement, generally less than one-half pound, are plotted with bounds of one-tenth of a pound error in each direction. Onetenth of a pound measurement error is sufficient to explain most of the points which fall into the region of impossibility.

4.2 Rose's Results

The bubbly flow regime momentum flux measurements of Rose (10) are presented in Figure 30. The homogeneous and absolute minimum momentum multipliers are also shown on the figure along with other

-45-

predicted values. Rose experimentally determined the void fraction, the results being presented here in Figure 29. The void fraction data was approximated by

$$\alpha = 21.59 \quad \chi^{0.574}$$

$$\chi < 0.001$$
(4-1)

and by

$$x = 4.07 X^{0.333}$$

$$0.001 < X < 0.004$$
(4-2)

for calculational purposes. The momentum multiplier calculated from these void values according to the two-velocity model is also presented on Figure 30.

Rose's data did not show a systematic variation with the mass velocities he tested, and thus no velocity correlation has been made.

4.3 Vance's Results

Vance (9) made some careful measurements of the momentum flux in horizontal flow with an apparatus very similar to that proposed by Griffin (19). His results, due to the apparatus, are steady rather than average results. Along with the appropriate reduction, the data is shown in Appendix F. The data is taken at widely varying pressures and it is difficult to present the data on a graph. Figure 43 makes an attempt by plotting momentum multiplier versus quality and showing the range of the homogeneous and minimum possible value for the same pressure and quality.

The question of the relationship between horizontal and vertical flow can be answered by comparison of Vance's results to the results of this investigation. At the flows tested, it is not expected that the difference due to inclination would be detected since the frictional forces are considerably greater than the body forces throughout the flow. One cannot, however, form a definite conclusion on this basis since some lever mechanism may be involved whereby a small body force would dominate much larger forces in influencing flow formation. The similarity of this investigation's data with that of Vance affirms the predominance of the friction forces in determining the flow.

Vance measured the momentum flux for the purpose of determining the slip ratio (or the void fraction) and this is how he presents his data. This is not a valid method of determining the void fraction, however, as the many additional factors mentioned in Chapter II affect the momentum flux. This is the same error as made by Semenov and discussed in Chapter I.

4.4 Void Fraction Measurements

The void fraction measurements are presented in Appendix E and graphically in Figure 17. Two values are given in the appendix estimating the bounds of the range of reliability. The limiting values are connected by a line on Figure 17.

-47-

As can be seen from Figure 29 of Rose's data, the void fraction is essentially that of the homogeneous model at qualities approaching zero. As the quality increases the void fraction deviates toward the minimum momentum void value. By 30% quality the void is substantially the minimum momentum void value.

The momentum multiplier calculated by the two-velocity model from the measured void fraction data is shown on Figure 42. This line is substantially below the data, demonstrating, as did Rose's data, that factors in addition to the void fraction are important in determining the momentum flux. Attention is again called to Figures 18 and 19 which shown that large differences in the void fraction near the minimum possible momentum void fraction result in small changes in the momentum multiplier. Above 15% quality, the minimum possible momentum is essentially the same, with respect to the data, as that predicted by measured voids with the slip model. The void fraction deviation from the minimum momentum void plays only a small role in the deviation of the momentum multiplier from its minimum value at higher qualities.

The voids measured here essentially verify Martinelli's results. 4.5 Fluctuations

Two types of data on the fluctuations were reduced, data maximum fluctuation amplitudes as reduced from Brush recorder

-48-

traces and spectral density analysis performed on an analog computer from a taped signal.

4.5.1 <u>Brush Recorder</u> Samples of the Brush records are reproduced in Figure 44. Both the unfiltered and filtered signals were recorded (filter response shown in Figure 14). Figure 45 shows data on the maximum filtered amplitude as a percentage of the average force. The data on this figure represents all pressures and mixtures tested and thus is not intended to be an accurate plot. It is intended to indicate the region in which fluctuations play a major role.

The parameter of fluctuating amplitude divided by average amplitude is used in plotting the results of the fluctuating model. By comparing Figures 27 and 28 and 45, one can estimate values of χ in the fluctuation model.

4.5.2 <u>Spectral Analysis</u> Samples of spectral analysis made on an analog computer from a recorded signal can be seen in Figure 46. Also shown in the figure is an oscilloscope photograph of the raw signal during the analysis. The effect of the beam natural frequency is, of course, predominant. By comparison with the expected beam response with a white noise input, Figure 13, one can determine that the fluctuations are of interest in the lower frequency portion of the spectrum (0 - 10cps).

Very small amplitude fluctuations exist at frequencies higher than the beam natural frequencies due to droplet entrainment. This can be tested empirically by holding one's hand in front of an expelling two-phase flow. These are difficult to detect with the beam arrangement and may well be impossible with a tee since the period of the fluctuations approaches the transit time in the tee. The fluctuations are still very small and they do not affect the validity of the large amplitude measurements at lower frequencies.

It is difficult to explain the fluctuating period of two seconds in a ten-foot long tube where the homogeneous velocity is perhaps 200 ft/sec. Yet Schlicting (13) reports the same sort of data in the velocity fluctuations in turbulent flow. In the twophase flow it is suspected that the low frequencies are due to continuity type waves easily visible to investigators standing at a distance from a two-phase flow. Reasonable precautions have been taken to isolate the feed systems and the data is presently understood to be valid.

4.6 Choke Flow

A few of the data points taken approach the choke flow (choke flow predictions shown on the flow map of Figure 47 and on Figures 31, 32, 33, and 34). The momentum flux values are not the minimum possible momentum flux as is the assumption in the Fauske model. The Fauske model may predict the critical flow quite accurately, but it is clear from this investigation that the physical reasoning is incorrect.

-50-

Although it is inconceivable that the momentum flux would naturally arrive at its minimum possible value, some of the data in the 20-50% quality range indicates that the momentum multiplier drops as the critical flow is approached.

One may think of two-phase critical flow in the following way: as the pressure drops in a tube, the adiabatic momentum multiplier rises. However, if the pressure drops rapidly enough, the flow may not be able to redistribute itself rapidly enough, and the real momentum multiplier will lag behind the adiabatic value. Of course, it cannot lag too far behind because it runs into the continuity minimum -- but before that, some sort of realisitic minimum momentum multiplier. When the flow reaches this condition it is unable to adjust more rapidly -- the critical flow model must incorporate the situation of maximum adjustment rate before continuing.

The factors influencing the maximum rate of adjustment are 1) thermodynamic metastability, 2) flow adjustment, and as a subtitle under adjustment, 3) fluctuations. The Fauske model assumes that the minimum possible momentum represents the maximum adjustment.

4.7 Non-Adiabatic Flow

In a heated tube, bubbles can be observed to occupy a large fraction of the flow channel although the average quality is known to be subcooled. This metastable effect obviously has an effect on

-51-

the momentum flux which is difficult to predict. Clearly in the case described, the momentum flux will be higher than that predicted on an average quality basis. Yet in a mist flow, the cool droplets might lag behind in the accelerating fluid stream and result in a lower momentum flux than predicted on an adiabatic basis. The answer to the question seems to be dependent upon the flow regime and the heating rate.

A condensing tube can be considered more generally. The metastable vapor can have no other effect than to make the momentum flux greater than that predicted on an adiabatic basis.

4.8 Discussion of Effects

The momentum multiplier deviates from the minimum possible for the reasons discussed in Chapter II. At this point it will be attempted to note where the various reasons predominate.

4.8.1 <u>Void Fraction Deviation</u> In the bubbly flow regime, the flow is almost homogeneous. The void fractions and momentum fluxes measured by Rose verify the homogeneous model as the single phase liquid is approached. The deviation of the void fraction from the minimum momentum flux value still plays a small role up to 10% quality, but is insignificant when the quality reaches 20%.

4.8.2 <u>Velocity Distribution</u> Velocity and density distribution are almost always important. This is the lion's share of the reason

-52-

that momentum multiplier is greater than the homogeneous model as single-phase liquid is approached. Investigators (6) (20) using velocity traverse probes have noted a significant, laminar like, velocity profile in the entrained annular flow region. As the single-phase gas is approached, the velocity profile approaches the same importance as in turbulent flow. The regime where the velocity profile plays the least role is in the annular flow without entrainment.

4.8.3 <u>Entrainment</u> Entrainment is important where there is droplet entrainment since the gas velocities are higher.

4.8.4 <u>Fluctuations</u> Slug flow momentum flux is predominantly fluctuation. As the void fraction influence tapers off, the fluctuation influence increases (the macroscopic void fraction fluctuation). Well into the slug-annular transition, the fluctuation plays a predominant role.

The continuity waves in the annular layer may be considered to be the same sort of fluctuation, but may also be considered to be axial velocity fluctuation similar to the turbulent flow fluctuation. This type of fluctuation is important even in the limiting singlephases if turbulence is present. This is experimentally demonstrated in the inability to calibrate totally on the basis of the universal velocity profiles.

-53-

T

4.9 Interpolation and Extrapolation

Much of the data is in regions where entrainment is expected. Furthermore, the forces causing entrainment are the same as those causing wavy films and some of the fluctuations. Thus it seemed reasonable to attempt to correlate on the basis of the entrainment.

Steen and Wallis (21) report that

$$\epsilon = f(V S_g^{(1-m)}) \tag{4-3}$$

where m is a constant between .52 and .85, the higher values at higher entrainments. They report that the entrainment is directly proportional to the velocity at lower entrainments and proportional to the square root of the density.

A more recent publication of Minh and Huyghe (22) reports that entrainment may be correlated on the basis of a homogeneous $V^2 g$ defined as

$$(V^2 f)_{\text{Homogeneous}} = \frac{\dot{m}_g^2}{\beta_g \alpha^2 A^4} \left(1 + \epsilon \frac{\dot{m}_f}{\dot{m}_g} \right)$$
 (4-4)

This is very similar to that reported by Steen and Wallis, more concise but inconvenient as the entrainment correlation parameter itself includes entrainment.

The data reported in Appendices E and F give the homogeneous

-54-

velocity and an entrainment correlation parameter.

It is recommended that the data be interpolated to intermediate pressure by means of this correlation parameter.

Appendices E and F give two factors

$$YK = \frac{homogeneous MM - actual MM}{homogeneous MM - minimum MM}$$
(4-6)

and

$$ZK = \frac{actual MM}{minimum MM}$$
(4-7)

The factor YK represents the location of the momentum multiplier with respect to the homogeneous and minimum values. It is suggested that this parameter remains relatively constant through pressure changes as the entrainment parameter remains constant. ZK is the ratio of the actual to the minimum momentum multiplier. As with the ratio of the homogeneous to the minimum, the values are expected to diverge with pressure change at lower qualities (see Figure 1). ZK serves as a convenient term when working with higher quality momentum fluxes where the difference between the homogeneous and minimum fluxes is only a small portion of the total value.

The difference between the homogeneous and minimum momentum

flux models is often proportionately a small part of the total flux. Thus the YK given in the appendices is in large error due to a small measuring error. It is recommended to make interpolation and extrapolations by the lines of constant velocity drawn on the data in Figures 31, 33, 35, 37 and 39.

The difference between the homogeneous and minimum fluxes becomes proportionately smaller as the pressure rises. It is considered safe then to extrapolate in that direction. Note that as the critical pressure is approached, the turbulent velocity fluctuation and velocity distribution become increasingly important.

-56-

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

5.1 The Two-Velocity Slip Model

The two-velocity slip model results in the minimum possible momentum flux value for given flow rates of liquid and gas if the slip ratio is taken to be

$$\frac{V_g}{V_f} = \sqrt{\frac{U_g}{U_f}}$$
(5-1)

No rearrangement of the flow from that assumed in the model can result in a lower average momentum flux.

The two-velocity model results in a minimum momentum flux when a specific void fraction (or slip ratio) is established for that void fraction. No deviations from the steady, flat profile assumed in the model can further decrease the average momentum flux at that void fraction.

No criteria for an upper bound was found.

5.2 The Homogeneous Model

The homogeneous model correlates the experimental momentum flux data more closely than does the slip model. This does not mean that the flow is more homogeneous than like the two-velocity model, but merely that the disturbances from the minimum momentum flux slip model drive the momentum flux toward a value corresponding to the homogeneous model. The flow cannot possibly achieve an absolute minimum momentum flux configuration nor a local minimum at a given void fraction.

5.3 Deviations from Minimum Momentum Flux

The momentum flux deviates from the minimum possible momentum flux for the following reasons:

a) The void fraction deviates from the void fraction for a minimum momentum flux. At extremely low qualities (x < .003), the flow is essentially homogeneous. The void fraction deviates considerably from the minimum momentum void fraction and the contribution to the real momentum is significant. However, by 15% quality the contribution of a non-minimum void fraction is small but detectible. Greater than 30% quality, the contribution is negligible.

b) The velocity profiles are not flat. Velocity profiles always play a significant role. They are especially important at high entrainments and least important when the flow is most nearly annular. The velocity profile effect remains of importance in determining the momentum flux even as the flow approaches single phase limits, either at the quality extremes or at the critical pressure.

c) phase distribution (entrainment).

-58-

and d) fluctuation. Two types of fluctuation are distinguished, both of which contribute to the momentum flux, turbulent fluctuation, and void fraction fluctuation. Turbulent like velocity variations are especially important in annular flow with waves. The turbulent fluctuation, like the velocity profile effect, is important even in the single-phase limits. Void fraction fluctuation is of great importance in slug and degenerating slug flows.

5.4 Implications

The implications of the investigation are threefold.

a) to replace the use of the slip model by the homogeneous model in predicting momentum flux values. More exact estimation of the fluxes can be made through direct reference to the data.

b) to reconsider critical flow and other momentum associated phenomena in the light of the data.

and c) to carefully investigate fluctuations. Two-phase flow has been considered for its average steady-state properties when it is basically an unsteady phenomenon where the unsteadinesses play a fundamental role.

-59-
APPENDIX A

MOMENTUM EQUATION DERIVATIONS

Pressure Drop in a Pipe

The general momentum equation for a control volume can be written as (23)

 $\overline{F_s} + \iint_{C,V} \overline{B} S a 2^{\varphi} = \oint_{C,V} \overline{V}(S \overline{V} \cdot a \overline{A}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \iint_{C,V} \overline{V}(S a 2^{\varphi})$ (A-1)

In the case of upflow in a tube, the surface force is composed of pressure and shear forces while the body force is gravity.



Lumping the shear forces at the control surface into a single fractional term and writing the general momentum equation in the direction of flow, the only non-trivial principal direction, one arrives at an equation for pressure drop in a pipe.

 $F_{\tau} + \left[\iint_{A} P_{d} A_{0}^{0} + \iint_{O} P_{g} Q_{2} = \left[\iint_{A} P_{d}^{2} A_{0}^{0} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \iint_{O} P_{d}^{2} Q_{2}^{0}\right]_{O} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \iint_{O} P_{d}^{2} Q_{2}^{0}$ (A-2)

-61-

Considering the pressure to be constant throughout a cross section perpendicular to the flow gives the more simplified relation

 $(P, -P_2)A = F_r + \iiint gggge + \left[\iint gV_d A \right]^{\circ} - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \iiint gV_d \mathcal{P}$ (A-3)

(Note: The assumption of constant pressure throughout a cross section is excellent in vertical flow. It is also excellent at the homogeneous velocities tested for flow in any direction, losing validity as the flow begins to stratify due to large relative body forces.)

The pressure change is seen to be composed respectively of a frictional term, an hydrostatic consideration, momentum flux changes, and a transient effect.

Momentum Flux Measurement in a Tee

T

Writing the general momentum equation for the control volume in a tee which turns the flow through a right-angle bend, one arrives at



 $F + \iint_{C,V} Sg d 2^{p} = \iint_{C} SV^{2} dA + \frac{d}{dt} \iint_{C} SV d 2^{p}$ (A-4)

in the direction of the inward flow, again the only non-trivial principal direction. In non-transient flow, the final term vanishes. The other control volume term can be made negligibly small as the size of the control volume is made small. In the case that the term cannot be made negligibly small, it can be estimated with sufficient accuracy to make the maximum possible error negligible. For experimental purposes the equation can be viewed as

$$F = \iint \mathcal{G} V^2 dA \tag{A-4}$$

The force on the tee is a direct measurement of the momentum flux entering the turning tee.

Since the measurements of momentum flux made with the tee are to be applied to sections other than exit sections, it is of importance to note a significant difference between exit and other sections. When the flow is reversing, the same fluid passing forward through a section will return when the flow is reversed as it has been constrained in the pipe forward of the section. If, however, the section is at or near an exit, the forward flowing fluid may be dumped and replaced by the exit atmosphere fluid. The exit condition will persistas far into the tube as the exit fluid replaces the flowing fluid. The tee measurement therefore is inapplicable to measuring in-tube momentum fluxes with flow reversals. This region was avoided in experimentation.

APPENDIX B

CAUSES OF ZERO SHIFT

Thermal Expansion

Т

Coefficients of thermal expansion are given (24) as

	Δg			
	l°C			
Stainless steel	17.3 x 10 ⁻⁶			
Steel	10.5 x 10 ⁻⁶			

The differential coefficient is thus

$$6.8 \times 10^{-6} \Delta l/2 C$$
 (B-1)

Over fifteen inches, a 100° C temperature change gives a 0.01 inch which corresponds to a zero shift of 0.0714 volts. This is close to the observed zero shift of 0.077 volts.

Weight of Water

The strain area in the wall of the pressure vessel is

$$\pi (16 \text{ in.})(0.3125 \text{ in.}) = 15.7 \text{ in.}^2$$
 (B-2)

The cross-sectional area of the tank is

$$f(Bin)^2 \approx 200 in^2 \approx 1.4 ft^2$$
 (B-3)

A one-inch change in the water level adds .12 ft^3 of water on 7.5 lbm of water.

$$\frac{7.5 \ lbm}{15.7 \ in^2} = 30 \times 10^6 \ psi \ \frac{\Delta l}{15 \ in} \tag{B-4}$$

Therefore, using $E = 30 \times 10^6$ psi, the $\Delta \mathbf{l}$ over 15 inches is .239 x 10^{-6} inches. This is four orders of magnitude less than that observed in the thermal strains. It can be safely concluded that this effect cannot be detected since the maximum water level change is four inches.

Pressure Change

A 10 psi pressure change would cause a $\Delta \mathbf{1}$ change of .637 x 10⁻⁴ inches.

$$\frac{10 \text{ psi } 200 \text{ in}^2}{15.7 \text{ in}^2} = 30 \times 10^6 \text{ psi } \frac{\Delta R}{15 \text{ in}}.$$
 (B-5)

This is small, but detectible, \sim .005 volts for 100 psi pressure change.

APPENDIX C

FUNCTIONS TO FIT CURVES FOR DATA REDUCTION PROGRAM

To obtain water flow rate from the rotometer scale reading, the following equation is used:

water flow rate
$$(lbm/hr) = 27.6 \times scale reading$$
 (C-1)

Temperature is obtained from Cu-Const. thermocouple millivolt reading by

Temp
$$(^{\circ}F) = 32.0 + 46.2036R - 0.96412R^2$$
 (C-2)
R = potentiometer reading in millivolts

when R 4.5, and

T

Temp
$$(^{\circ}F) = 40.655 + 41.9795R - 0.44641R^2$$
. (C-3)

The orifice flow coefficients (16) are functions of Reynolds Number.

$$K = \cdot 5974 + \frac{26}{\text{Re} + 33.333}$$
 (C-4)

for the 0.4-inch orifice with a diameter ratio of .200, and

$$K = .6250 + \frac{126.884}{\text{Re} - 492.063}$$
(C-5)

for the 1.0-inch orifice with a diameter ratio of .500.

Martinelli's void fraction versus quality curves were found to fit the form

$$X^{c_{i}} + (1 - \alpha)^{c_{i}} = 1 \qquad (c-6)$$

quite well. Values of the coefficients for atmospheric and 60 psia steam-water data are C_{-} C_{-}

	СŢ	C2
atmospheric pressure	0.116	0.669
60 psia	0.153	0.660

For computational purposes, Rose's void fraction data was fit by

$$\alpha = 21.59 \times 0.574$$

for x (.001

and by

$$\alpha = 4.07 \quad \chi^{0.333}$$
 for .001 $\langle x \langle .004 \rangle$

APPENDIX D

EQUATION OF MOTION OF THE THE

$$F = \mathbf{k} \times + c \, \frac{d \times x}{dt} + m \, \frac{d^2 \times x}{dt^2} \tag{D-1}$$

$$F = k' \mathbf{z} + c' \frac{d\mathbf{e}}{dt} + m \frac{d^2 \mathbf{e}}{dt^2}$$
(D-2)

where equation $(\mathbf{p}-2)$ is written in terms of the LVDT voltage output, e. The relation between e and x is simply

$$x = 7.14 \left(\frac{v_{o}/t_{s}}{in}\right) e \tag{D-3}$$

Values of \boldsymbol{k} and $\boldsymbol{k'}$ have been experimentally determined in static tests.

$$k = 208 \frac{16f}{in}$$
 $k' = 29.18 \frac{16f}{volt}$ (D-4, a&b)

The natural frequency is $43.8 \frac{\text{cycles}}{\text{sec}}$ or $275 \frac{\text{radians}}{\text{sec}}$

$$\sqrt{\frac{k}{m}} = \sqrt{\frac{k'}{m'}} = 275 / sec \quad (D-5)$$

$$m = \frac{208}{75625 / sec^{-1}} \quad m' = \frac{29.18}{75625 / sec^{-1}}$$

$$= .275 \times 10^{-2} \frac{16f sec^{-1}}{in.} = .3855 \times 10^{-3} \frac{16f sec^{-1}}{volt} \quad (D-6, a\&b)$$

$$= 1.028 / bm.$$

Т

The measured mass of the tee was .84 lbm. The effective mass computed includes the pushrod mass and a contribution from the beam itself.

The decay constant β of the envelope was measured to be 0.4/sec.

$$\frac{c}{zm} = \frac{c'}{zm'} = 0.4/sec.$$
 (D-7)

$$C = 0.22 \times 10^{-2} \frac{16f sec}{in}$$
 $C = 0.308 \times 10^{-3} \frac{16f sec}{volt}$ (D-8, a&b)

APPENDIX E

DATA

	TEST NUMBER
	TEST NOMBER
0640 212 2160 550 550 550 550 550 550 550 550 550 5	MIXING WATER THERMOCOUPLE READING (millivolts)
11198. 220.6 PRE 5.000 8.700 8.700 8.700 110.5000 110.50000 110.50000 110.50000 110.50000 110.50000000000	ORIFICE MANOMETER READING (in.Hg.)
2000 2000	ROTOMETER READING (% SCALE)
14.70 .2780 .22780 .24200 .12420 .12420 .12420 .12420 .1460 .1460 .1470 .1470 .1470 .1470 .1470 .1470 .1470 .1480 .1480 .1480 .1480 .1480 .1480 .2770 .1310 .2310 .13100 .131000 .131000 .1310000000000	LVDT VOLTAGE (voits)
280000 0659 0659 06659 06659 06662 06662 06662 06655 06655 06655 06655 06655 06655 06655 06655 06655 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06662 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 0666 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 06665 066	ZERO VOLTAGE (volts)
1172.8 1168.4 1168.4 186.6 181.9 186.6 186.6 183.9 186.6 183.9 182.9 182.9 182.9 182.9 183.0 183.000000000000000000000000000000000000	MIXING WATER TEMPERATURE (°F)
.1835E 25112E 2098E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2125E 2136E 2136E 2136E 2136E 2136E 2136E 2136E 2136E 2136E 2136E 2125E 2125E 2136E 21376E 213	MIXING WATER FLOW RATE (1bm/hr)
4 4	MIXING STEAM FLOW RATE (1bm/hr)
	QUALITY
2476 22277 22227 2030 22629 22769 22769 22769 22769 2769 2769	MASS VELOCITY (1bm/hrin ²)
7657227 2021 672277520752075376 7557207 2021 672277520752075376 755722772207520752075207507 75788772088801009872878386529270 7518877206598010098727868549206028	FORCE ON TEE (1bf)
.1133E-05 .1678E-05 .7860E-06 .3795E-06 .3795E-06 .1930E-05 .1930E-05 .1930E-05 .1930E-05 .1930E-05 .1971E-05 .1971E-05 .299E-05 .2798E-05 .2798E-05 .2798E-05 .27915E-05 .3861E-05 .3861E-05 .2396E-05 .2396E-05	MOMENTUM MULTIPLIER (lbfhr ² in ² /lbm ²)
.1653 .2829 .5465 .3865 .3805 .2915 .2915 .2915 .2353 .1994 .1554 .2358 .2358 .1554 .2358 .1911 .1911 .2837 .2151 .2154 .2837 .2154 .2837 .29377 .29377 .29377 .29377777 .293777777777777777777777777777777777777	үк
3.254 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.2555 3.25555 3.25555 3.25555 3.25555 3.255555 3.255555 3.25555555 3.2555555555555555555555555555555555555	ZK
555440225402154022211040 55544025402540254022540255 504557025597610055604468877 2642045579174676762120466778888475	ENTRAINMENT CORRELATION FACTOR (ft/sec)
55545000540005540005540000000000000000	HOMOGENEOUS VELOCITY (ft/sec)
Pipe Diameter=1.064 in. Pressure=14.7 psia	Mixing Steam Enthalpy=1198 BTU/1bm
	Specific Volume = 2.28 ft ³ /1bm

ENTRAINMENT CORRELATION FACTOR (f1/sec) MULTIPLIER (Ibf hr² in²/Ibm² Hg.) (ibm/hr) ij, (lbm/hr (°F) (ft/sec) READING ш THERMOCOUPLE (millivolts) SCALE TEMPERATURE MASS VELOCITY (Ibm/hrin²) RATE RATE VELOCITY %) (volts) MANOMETER READING VOLTAGE (volts) TEE (Ibf) FLOW FLOW READING VOLTAGE HOMOGENEOUS WATER WATER STEAM TEST NUMBER ROTOMETER MOMENTUM NO ORIFICE 1 QUALITY MIXING IXING V MIXING MIXING FORCE LVDT ZERO Ϋ́ чĸ .521 .3669E-06 .641 .3140E-06 .752 .2543E-06 1.282 .3977E-06 1.384 .1777E-06 .801 .9234E-06 1.107 .9234E-06 2.126 .2910E-06 2.019 .1787E-06 .489 .3880E-06 .693 .1231E-06 .702 .6707E-07 1.596 .1550E-06 1.392 .3347E-06 2.237 .1967E-06 1.921 .5174E-06 1.727 .4600E-06 1.921 .5174E-06 1.727 .4600E-06 1.929 .3117E-06 1264 1515 1823 1904 2244 2959 988 1160 2058 2058 2058 2163 3564 1191 2516 3403 2163 3577 2049 2055 2092 1899 .3299 2.726 135 132 124 189 183 157 228 2241 241 28 158 158 165 194 201 2229 158 174 70 69 98 95 82 119 136 126 114 98 607 82 607 82 105 137 .2663 3.220 3.766 3.331 3.519 3.717 1.806 1.894 2.985 3.674 3.770 2.012 3.121 .<u>.</u> .1495 .2067 .3225 .2182 .1676 .1625 .1952 .3113 .5181 .4996 .5284 .3579 .2276 .2796 .1501 .1705 .2736 = 1.064 2 0 ē 59. Diamet 3.179 Pressure = Pipe Diam 3.179 3.673 3.291 3.822 2.851 2.984 3.427 124 82 91 .3311 2.947 1.369 .4747E-06 1.558 .5510E-06 1.762 .4813E-06 2.170 .3441E-06 2.432 .2765E-06 1.282 .7221E-06 1.282 .7221E-06 1.282 .7221E-06 3.073 .1048E-05 3.073 .1048E-05 3.073 .1048E-05 3.073 .1048E-05 3.018 .7354E-06 4.253 .6274E-06 4.253 .6274E-06 4.253 .6274E-06 4.253 .6274E-06 4.253 .6274E-06 4.253 .6274E-06 1.014 .3365E-05 3.906 .1716E-05 5.208 .1186E-05 5.208 .223E-05 6.213 .8651E-06 3.286 .2235E-05 5.092 .2449E-05 5.092 .2449E-05 5.096 .2028E-05 6.733 .1663E-05 5.7865 .1302E-05 4.005 .3271E-05 2.957 .427TE-05 .5204 .4917 .48455 .4948 .5564 .4948 .55038 .3610 .3872 .4229 .45512 .3303 .3446 .3303 .36869 .26490 .2747 .33784 .3584 .38535 .2707 .3584 .38535 .2707 .3584 .38535 .2707 .3584 .38535 .2707 .3584 .38535 .2707 .3584 .3810 .22346 .2346 .2346 .2346 .2031 3.878 3.846 4.172 4.405 4.345 3.325 2.858 2.096 3.588 3.892 179 195 194 198 199 199 199 197 306 308 312 312 312 312 179 195 194 198 199 199 196 197 304 306 308 312 312 4.089 4.156 4.261 2.688 2.096 1.2939 3.297 3.819 3.931 3.931 3.931 2.9483 1.997 1.3897 1.3897 1.387 3.467 3.167 3.2015 Pressure=14.7 312 312 312 311 395 400 401 403 403 402 398 492 499 503 311 395 4001 401 403 402 398 497 503 502 882 .3047 1.519 502 502 2.097 .4256E-06 2.447 .3659E-06 2.767 .3145E-06 2.971 .2707 2354 2742 3146 3456 .3901 .3759 .3782 2.320 2.554 2.738 304 305 305 " 4 159 159

(ft/sec) MULTIPLIER (Ibf hr²in²/Ibm² Ц, FACTOR (Ibm/hr) (lbm/hr) (-E) Ë. (ft/sec) THERMOCOUPLE (millivolts) READING e) TEMPERATURE ы. Ч **CORRELATION** scal RATE RATE (lbm/hr % VELOCITY (volts) (volts) FLOW READING MANOMETER FLOW (JqI) VELOCITY WATER TI WATER TEE VOLTAGE VOLTAGE STEAM WATER NUMBER ENTRAINMENT HOMOGENOUS ROTOMETER MOMENTUM S QUALITY DNIXI ORIFICE MIXING MIXING MIXING FORCE MASS TEST LVDT ZERO χX X ž .4787E 03 4787E 03 2.174 1.886 1.562 1.123 .718 1.625 1.737 2.100 2.230 1.893 1.573 1.253 .874 .539 .3889 .4367 •2568 •3052 2097 1768 .4844E-06 158 158 303 303 305 305 582 596 584 570 2097 1.893.4844E-06 1768 1.573.5562E-06 1159 .874.7314E-06 833 .539 .8729E-06 2172 4.602.1097E-05 2598 5.272.8785E-06 2191 6.263.8427E-06 3157 6.496.7328E-06 3157 6.496.7328E-06 3469 6.088 .5690E-06 2795 5.039.7255E-06 1368 2.141.1287E-05 2283 6.248.1348E-05 3020 8.666.1069E-05 3290 10.006.1040E-05 3267 12.045.1065E-05 3714 14.375.1172E-05 3846 15.686.1193E-05 .4787E .4787E .4787E .4787E C3 .3052 O3 .3685 O3 .4690 O3 .6541 O3 .4783 U3 .4087 O3 .3596 O3 .3213 .4367 .5396 .8495 1.7953 .2063 .2920 .1304 .1653 158 159 159 304 311 304 297 bsi .9098E 03 .9300E 03 .9145E 03 .8893E 03 Pressure = 14.7 2.230 2.633 2.162 1.604 .855 1.269 1.597 2.316 1.760 1.663 1.571 .8763E .8844E .8924E .8876E C3 .2522 O3 .3252 O3 .4574 C3 .7314 .1661 .1994 .2952 493 511 536 560 779 806 707 901 257 266 280 292 406 420 369 470 1.6513 .8876E C3 .7314 .1230E 04 .6070 .1297E 04 .4761 .1158E 04 .3828 .146CE 04 .4507 .1641E 04 .4895 .1763E 04 .5C95 .3956 .2493 .1403 .1370 .1192 .1762 1019 1098 531 573 2161 2.563 .6176E-06 2477 2.884 .5285E-06 3122 3.779 .4816E-06 3122 3.743 .4319E-06 361 4.151 .3898E-06 3728 4.602 .3724E-06 4047 4.923 .3381E-06 1846 2.097 .6923E-06 1263 1.689 .7774E-06 1264 1.689 .7774E-06 1222 1.486 .1119E-05 2073 6.598 .7859E-06 3073 6.598 .7859E-06 3073 6.088 .7167E-06 4156 10.050 .6544E-06 1991 4.544 .1289E-05 3028 9.001 .1104E-05 3525 10.399 .9414E-06 4124 12.001 .735E-06 4488 13.108 .7321E-06 4486 11.593 .1089E-03 3450 12.467 .1178E-05 3450 12.467 .1178E-05 3450 12.467 .1178E-05 .8226E 03 .4287 .8226E 03 .334 .8278E 03 .3317 .8330E 03 .303 .8415E 03 .2729 .8364E 03 .2528 .8381E 03 .2330 .8381E 03 .604 .8381E 03 .7776 .1411E 04 .5977 .3223 .3191 .2605 1.605 1.756 1.966 182 182 184 185 426 426 430 2.091 2.216 2.402 2.488 433 437 436 437 .2622 187 187 187 .2621
 83640
 03
 -2308

 83810
 03
 -2310

 83810
 03
 -5064

 83810
 03
 -5064

 83810
 03
 -5074

 83810
 03
 -7776

 14110
 04
 -5977

 13600
 04
 -3009

 13600
 04
 -5042

 13710
 04
 -5901

 17246
 04
 -5632

 16990
 04
 -5603

 169910
 04
 -5604

 169910
 04
 -5701

 169910
 04
 -5603

 169910
 04
 -5722

 197110
 04
 -5528

 197110
 04
 -5528

 199210
 04
 -46912

 199210
 04
 -4692

 199210
 04
 -6924

 -215110
 04
 -6924
 .2305 .5289 .8342 1.3060 1.297 435 435 436 734 707 680 703 186 186 186 314 Pressure = 90 psia .960 i 6.950 i 7.000 6.50 47. 7 6.250 6.60 72.00 442. 8 6.950 6.50 84.60 4550 110. 9 6.110 6.20 16.00 2660 1100 11 6.470 10.50 51.10 4670 110 12 6.310 10.20 71.30 5220 110 13 6.500 10.00 83.60 6500 110 14 6.110 10.10 21.40 3620 110 15 6.550 10.20 10.10 320 111 216 6.550 13.80 49.00 5300 11 218 5.850 13.80 49.00 5300 11 220 5.760 14.10 13.80 49.00 5300 11 221 5.510 16.60 33.00 4130 1 221 5.510 16.60 33.00 4130 1 222 5.510 16.50 48.00 5900 1 223 5.150 2.79 30.00 3930 2 224 4.560 2.76 41.50 4370 3 225 4.840 2.76 58.50 5100 4 400 2.76 19.80 3330 1 7 3 8.80 2730 -.0745 1.541 2.196 2.244 1.185 302 291 300 .1875 -.0920 293 383 377 365 685 896 882 855 -.1054 -.0454 1.354 1.583 1.887 -.0562 -.0837 -.0981 -.0049 1.9305 .7524 -.0749 2.051 1.183 .981 1.048 849 871 885 363 372 378 497 1163 973 984 989 1030 1.048 1.536 2.041 1.872 1.027 1.261 416 420 423 440 469 -.6462 -.0618 .4515 -.0219 1096 471 .2151E 04 .6133 .0343 1.385 1101 1200 245.0 .8280E 03 .8940E 03 1200 222.8 .1145E 04 .8893E 03 1200 233.4 .1615E 04 .8893E 03 1200 216.6 .5465E 03 .8893E 03 1200 216.6 .2429E 03 .8844E 03 1200 225.1 .8446E 03 .1252E 04 1200 225.8 .1297E 04 .1252E 04 1200 225.8 .1297E 04 .1252E 04 1200 225.8 .1297E 03 .1252E 04 1200 174.0 .4637E 03 .1252E 04 .1200 172.8 .9108E 03 .1489E 04 796 768 772 779 784 1937 1.579 .5351 7.952 .2384E-05 .1535 570
 8940E
 03
 -5351

 .8893E
 03
 -3563

 .8893E
 03
 -5263

 .8893E
 03
 -6280

 .8844E
 03
 -6079

 .1252E
 04
 -6079

 .1252E
 04
 -5296

 .1252E
 04
 -5495

 .1252E
 04
 -4956

 .1254E
 04
 -8471

 .1489E
 04
 -6115
 7.952.2384E-05 9.234.1983E-05 11.360.1611E-05 6.204.2676E-05 4.457.3118E-05 14.302.2892E-05 16.108.2532E-05 17.099.2339E-05 11.622.3509E-05 10.253.4062E-05 5.150 4.560 4.840 4.400 4.400 4.620 4.620 4.660 3.300 2288 2816 1615 1268 .0870 .0847 .3298 1.933 2.289 1.304 .939 550 553 558 561 P=30 psi 1.4067 789 780 782 779 785 2358 2675 2867 1930 -.0044 -.0143 .0160 -.0323 1.500 1.709 1.792 1.264 1101 1089 1092 1088 230 231 10.253 .4062E-05 13.195 .2038E-05 1.300 1685 -.1121 1.107 1096 2699 .9078

CORRELATION FACTOR (ft/sec) hr² in²/lbm²) ЧĞ RATE (Ibm/hr) RATE (Ibm/hr) ij. (e F) (ft-sec) SCALE) WATER THERMOCOUPLE READING (millivolts) READING TEMPERATURE MULTIPLIER (Ibf VELOCITY (Ibm / hr in²) VELOCITY %) (Ibf) READING (volts) (volts) FLOW FLOW MANOMETER TEE VOLTAGE VOLTAGE WATER STEAM HOMOGENEOUS WATER ENTRAINMENT NUMBEF ROTOMETER MOMENTUM NO QUALITY I FICE ບ Z MIXING IXING MIXING FORCE MASS ZERO TEST LVDT MIXII ž ¥ ORI Ξ 2895 19.808 3029 20.478 2483 17.594 2284 16.487 2087 15.380 2475 21.322 2596 22.109 3002 23.536 .2657E-05 .2510E-05 1283 919 .0826 1.525 psia 1.525 1.607 1.422 1.343 1.271 1.111 1.169 1.209 908 901 900 896 .0761 1268 .2510E-05 .3209E-05 .3553E-05 .3970E-05 .3914E-05 .3689E-05 1258 1258 1257 1251 1577 1563 -.0864 -.2012 -.4573 30 .0618 1129 1120 u ٦ 3002 23.536 .2937E-05 3179 4.748 .5285E-06 3517 5.331 .4846E-06 3517 5.480 .4430E-06 4052 5.331 .3651E-06 2707 4.107 .6302E-06 2707 4.107 .6302E-06 2703 3.262 .7318E-06 1782 2.476 .8774E-06 1782 2.476 .8774E-06 1782 2.476 .8774E-06 1782 1.631 .1111E-05 2811 7.253 .1032E-05 3804 9.991 .7765E-06 4310 10.923 .6614E-06 4310 10.923 .6614E-06 4286 5.564 .1197E-05 1886 4.457 .1410E-05 3782 11.943 .938E-06 4234 13.487 .8460E-06 4318 1.478 .7737E-06 2812 8.826 .1256E-05 2426 7.341 .1403E-05 3703 13.341 .1094E-05 4247 14.768 .9208E-06 4915 17.215 .8014E-06 3183 11.360 .1261E-05 3002 23.536 .29376-05 .3839 1580 1132 .1099 .0191 .0300 486 467 465 2.167 2.526 2.654 208 200 199 197 198 199 .1991 .0028 .0979 2.475 2.117 1.737 460 463 464 465 756 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 759 701 735 741 945 .2673 1.6382 -.1303 -.1146 -.1225 199 199 323 323 1.363 .927 1.517 1.737 psi 1.737 1.988 2.145 2.428 1.253 1.005 1.400 1.609 324 -.1225 -.1209 -.1864 -.0457 06 300 ... 314 317 404 393 397 406 409 462 445 463 464 .8589 -.1117 Pressure 936 919 929 949 957 -.0770 1.850 1.958 1.198 -.1323 -.1323 -.1012 -.0521 1.2860 -.0599 -.0460 -.0363 .992 1.376 1.604 1.800 1081 1042 1051 3183 2779 11.360 .1261E-05 9.613 .1400E-05 1.182 1084 -.0223 .7722 3374 4003 2788 2139 3.190 .3152E-06 3.758 .2637E-06 2.738 .3963E-06 2.068 .5084E-06 2.390 2.463 2.058 359 374 372 134 .1307 .1929 .1405 .1996 140 139 138 1.664 371 2.068 .5084E-06 1.573 .6486E-06 1.078 .8311E-06 3.991 .8027E-06 4.952 .7060E-06 5.884 .5891E-06 6.671 .5500E-06 7.836 .4668E-06 2.855 .1056E-05 6.605 1.664 1.329 .944 1.363 1.658 1.883 2.097 2.362 138 138 219 218 1652 1208 2365 2809 .3163 371 -.0153 -.1415 371 587 585 3352 3693 4345 1744 -.0890 -.1472 -.1282 590 588 589 220 219 220 psi 120 2.362 .992 1.319 1.621 1.844 2.124 1.062 1.232 1.3148 591 703 681 680 220 2705 3265 3795 5.505 6.554 7.632 .8462E-06 .6914E-06 .5960E-06 262 254 254 11 -.0796 Pressure 4524 2047 3137 9.292 4.136 7.690 .5106E-06 .1110E-05 .8786E-06 -.0898 -.8025 .0386 686 687 863 256 256 322 858 852 842 859 891 1005 320 318 314 320 9.088 10.545 12.351 6.758 .7459E-06 .6678E-06 .5760E-06 .0033 -.0678 -.0934 .0104 1.439 1.660 1.927 3702 3702 9.008 //372-00 .003 4214 10.545 .6678E-06 -.0678 4911 12.351 .5760E-06 -.0934 2750 6.758 .1005E-05 .0104 510 6.059 .1082E-05 .2.9663 3515 9.933 .9040E-06 .1062 3995 11.331 .7986E-06 -.0163 1.105 332 375 368 1.370 986

1

ENTRAINMENT CORRELATION FACTOR (ft/sec) MULTIPLIER (Ibf hr²in²/Ibm²) (in. Hg.) (lbm/hr) (Ibm/hr) (eF) (ft/sec) scale) READING MIXING WATER THERMOCOUPLE READING (millivolts) TEMPERATURE VELOCITY (Ibm/hr in²) RATE RATE % VELOCITY READING (volts) MANOMETER (volts) STEAM FLOW FLOW (Ibf) TEE WATER ZERO VOLTAGE VOLTAGE WATER HOMOGENOUS NUMBER ROTOMETER MOMENTUM S QUALITY ORIFICE MIXING MIXING MIXING FORCE MASS TEST LVDT ¥ ň .2207E 04 .2170E 04 .2286E 04 .5132 .4842 .7975 4717 4954 3192 972 964 1019 363 360 380 13.341 14.710 9.001 .6743E-06 .6740E-06 .9938E-06 -.0428 -.1886 .4308 1.617 1.796 1.048 P=120 2159E 03 .0888 22159E 03 .0732 22159E 03 .1171 22159E 03 .0653 22159E 03 .4998 3047E 03 .2664 3097E 03 .2204 3078E 03 .1245 3078E 03 .1245 3078E 03 .1245 3078E 03 .1245 3063E 03 .1245 3638E 03 .1245 3647E 03 .6112 .4411E 03 .3462 .4423E 03 .2044 .4439E 03 .2144 .4439E 03 .2149 1.631 .2424E-06 1.923 .967E-06 1.232 .3262E-06 .903 .4590E-06 .466 .6117E-06 1.273 .132E-05 1.806 .8112E-06 3.161 .4459E-06 3.161 .4459E-06 3.161 .4459E-06 3.161 .4459E-06 3.161 .4459E-06 3.2476 .1714E-06 2.479 .1033E-05 1.835 .2399E-03 2.476 .1234E-05 3.466 .1292E-05 3.466 .1292E-05 3.466 .7178E-06 5.6248E-06 2751 3316 21028 4927 115827 2823 3419 22331 1084 928 34720 2331 1084 928 12557 23159 3334 .5166 .5215 .5215 .5215 .5215 .5215 .5215 .5215 .5215 .3400 .3127 .3126 .2243 .2243 .2243 .2243 .2127 .3029 .8033 .1921 .1583 .1209 .1457 3.475 3.685 3.102 2.514 1.471 .400 2.046 2.728 3.345 3.856 190 189 191 190 190 190 191 268 271 272 273 324 322 323 322 323 324 389 2395 394 395 Pressure=30 psia 4.011 4.046 1.164 3.399 2.711 1.865 1.097 1.527 1.970 2.601 3.150 3.665 .2005 3.810 181.1 .2484E 03 .1800E 03 .4223 54.0 .3643E 03 .2383E 03 .3163 54.0 .3091E 03 .3020E 03 .4360 53.5 .2706E 03 .303E 03 .2322 53.5 .2208E 03 .4411E 03 .6274 53.5 .2208E 03 .4401E 03 .6559 52.6 .5796E 03 .4633E 03 .3747 52.6 .5796E 03 .4633E 03 .3747 54.4 .6872E 03 .3749E 03 .2652 53.5 .7946E 03 .2737E 03 .1488 52.6 .8832E 03 .2706E 03 .1380 53.5 .6072E 03 .4401E 03 .3592 54.0 .8556E 03 .4420E 03 .2262 54.0 .8556E 03 .4420E 03 .2262 1.923 .3214E-05 3.204 .2707E-05 4.515 .3709E-05 5.768 .4370E-05 6.729 .5121E-05 9.467 .2287E-05 9.467 .2287E-05 9.467 .2287E-05 6.612 .1798E-05 3.080 .6709E-06 3.262 .7265E-06 7.486 .1843E-05 9.516 .2563E-05 9.516 .2563E-05 9.467 .1270E-05 1.771 2.576 1.923 1.597 1.316 1.245 1.847 2.702 2.373 3.777 3.873 3.131 2.627 1.920 2.315 1396 1964 1992 2074 2069 2219 3399 3075 3462 3856 3856 3856 3856 3638 3479 4295 4930 .3330 .1193 .1563 .2253 .3588 .4320 .3956 .0476 .3883 .3247 .4376 .5209 .3107 .3839 .4226 .0851 633 667 932 1164 1392 1561 1367 1119 986 559 477 560 994 1341 1209 778 633 667 932 1164 1392 1561 1367 1119 986 559 477 560 994 1341 1209 778 Pressure = 14.7 psia Diameter = 0.625 in. .3921E 03 .5162 .4494E 03 .5083 .2827E 03 .3956 .2334E 03 .3660 .1907E 03 .1034 .2649E 03 .1824 .3478E 03 .2747 .3966E 03 .3181 .4587E 03 .3888 .4587E 03 .2434 .4039E 03 .1835 .3460E 03 .1517 .2769E 03 .0821 .2471E-05 .2713E-05 .1768E-05 .1532E-05 .2273E-06 .7471E-06 .1276E-05 .1503E-05 .1698E-05 .110E-05 .8026E-06 .6860E-06 .2430E-06 3.685 4.617 1.981 1.296 .443 1.759 3.367 4.334 5.622 5.817 4.297 3.082 1.107 2205 2355 1911 1660 2520 2771 2933 3066 3285 4122 4177 3827 3853 1.752 875 626 737 416 335 145 279 444 538 650 554 424 334 176 1.601 2.069 2.072 2.609 3.472 2.908 2.629 2.381 3.154 3.693 4.061 3.893 -.0123 .1105 .2083 .6573 .1888 .0373 .0115 .0093 .0544 .1113 .1158 .4570 1029 581 468 202 390 621 751 907 773 592 466 246 Pressure=30 psia

Ĭ

(ft/sec) hr² in ²/ Ibm²) Ē (lbm/hr) FACTOR (lbm/hr) 3 . Е (ft/sec) scale) READING TEMPERATURE in²) RATE CORRELATION MULTIPLIER (Ibf RATE (millivolts) 2% (lbm/hr VELOCITY (volts) READING FLOW FLOW MANOMETER (volts) (Ibf) VELOCITY READING WATER ΤEE WATER ' STEAM VOLTAGE WATER NUMBER VOLTAGE ENTRAINMENT HOMOGENOUS ROTOMETER MOMENTUM S QUALITY ORIFICE DNIXING g g MIXING FORCE MASS TEST LVDT ZERO MIXIN MIXIN ¥ ¥
 348
 5.350
 15.00
 10.00
 .1690
 .1220

 349
 5.450
 20.50
 8.50
 .1790
 .1220

 350
 .830
 28.00
 9.00
 .1910
 .1220

 351
 .760
 32.60
 9.00
 .2015
 .1220

 352
 .670
 33.30
 19.40
 .2130
 .1220

 352
 .670
 32.30
 19.40
 .2130
 .1220

 353
 .550
 20.70
 21.80
 .1774
 .1220

 354
 .540
 12.70
 20.20
 .1475
 .1220

 354
 .550
 11.98
 .600000
 2.280000
 7.200000
 2.280000

 749
 22.71
 PRESS=
 60.00
 7.0126
 0.335
 135
 .135
 252.5 .2760E 03 256.2 .2346E 03 69.7 .2484E 03 66.6 .2484E 03 62.5 .5354E 03 57.1 .6017E 03 56.7 .5575E 03 .3140E .3656E .4248E .4567E .4614E .3673E .5234 .6070 .5547 .5747 .3374 .2269 1.369 1.660 2.010 2.316 2.651 1.614 .743 1.533 1.360 1.551 1.524 2.317 2.954 2.617 1923 1956 2194 D .1207E-05 .1819 560 660 676 734 611 401 277 290 341 350 380 316 207 143 03 03 03 03 03 03 .1207E-05 .1414E-05 .1361E-05 .1429E-05 .8184E-06 .5273E-06 psi .1977 2298 3249 3158 2761 .0047 .0442 .1016 30

 333
 .340
 200
 2.200000
 2.200000
 2.200000

 345
 .340
 102.70
 20.20
 1475
 1220
 54.75
 5575E
 03
 2295E
 03
 1768

 0.7
 .6250
 1194.000000
 2.200000
 1356
 6.200
 1105
 0723
 287.4
 1366E
 0.4
 1574E
 03
 .1004

 356
 6.200
 3.70
 49.50
 0.1023
 287.4
 .1366E
 04
 .1574E
 03
 .1004

 356
 6.200
 3.55
 10.000
 0.0123
 271.2
 .5796E
 03
 .1542E
 03
 .2048

 356
 6.200
 3.55
 6.00
 0.0723
 .73.5
 .3152E
 03
 .2048

 356
 6.200
 3.55
 6.00
 0.0720
 .75.7
 .6376E
 03<.1173E</td>
 03
 .1432

 362
 5.980
 2.05
 2.10
 .0902
 .07102
 .283.4
 .8660E
 03<.1173E</td>
 03<.11432</td>
 .1432

 363
 6.200
 2.05
 3.10
 .0922
 .0710
 u 03 -3177E-06 .2895E .3989 Δ 1.491 .1971E-06 1.346 .2595E-06 1.113 .3539E-06 .836 .4763E-06 .6690 .6011E-06 .516 .6684E-06 .393 .8580E-06 .553 .2979E-06 .676 .2060E-06 .705 .2148E-06 .859 .1481E-06 .859 .1481E-06 .431 .4150E-06 .431 .4150E-06 .431 .4150E-06 .239 .6303E-06 .239 .6303E-06 1.455.073E-06 .450 .6973E-06 .450 .6973E-06 .450 .6973E-06 .450 .6973E-06 .450 .4973E-06 .450 .4973E-06 .450 .4973E-06 .450 .4973E-06 .450 .4973E-06 .451 .4973E-06 .821 .1181E-05 .471 .2235E-06 .2825 .1862 .0959 3.769 3.866 3.750 283 279 273 146 145 141 142 139 4111 3201 .0996 2392 1935 3.155 274 269 276 273 198 198 205 2.890 2.173 1.783 3.268 3.450 3.441 3.589 3.443 3.560 3.444 3.560 3.444 .2314 .2691 .2838 .2264 .3367 143 141 103 1586 1222 2461 2461 3270 3270 4348 4348 5842 5842 103 106 .2964 .4042 .3757 .4514 .4305 .2839 205 214 214 213 106 111 111 110 110 psi 60 213 1840 1840 1426 1426 1111 1111 å 111 111 109 109 110 110 2.695 2.877 2.027 214 .2839 .2070 .4440 .3354 .6150 .4583 -.0768 -.0637 -.0783 .0207 214 211 211 213 213 2.227 1.518 1.729 3412 2609 1930 1506 3.586 2.939 2.315 1.765 390 391 396 402 202 202 205 208 .021.1101E-05 .0207 1.471.2235E-06 .1172 1.233.2331E-06 .0925 1.005 .3806E-06 .0925 1.005 .3806E-06 .0513 .560 .5966E-06 .1654 .4719.4692E-06 -0621 1.340 .6223E-06 -0824 786 .9279E-06 .0334 .786 .9279E-06 .0749 1.253 .1015E-05 .0018 1.602 .9236E-06 -.2223 1.844 .8130E-06 -.1846 .810 .5602E-07 .5290 .533 .6982E-07 .6088 .320 .1089E-06 .6359 .184 .2133E-06 .6324 .044 .1135E-06 1.4363 307 312 311 131 133 133 133 133 3.487 3.216 2.895 2.479 1.890 1.594 2.811 2.323 1.843 1.472 1.427 1.427 2.006 2.724 2.396 2.112 1.450 4631 4051 3797 2934 2346 1762 311 311 310 423 427 428 429 133 181 182 183 183 1420 3455 2649 2139 1662 2006 2378 2719 6864 4989 3097 1683 1110 psi 06 +29 552 546 552 178 180 176 236 234 236 76 77 75 75 ä 176 1.092 .2058E-06 1.384 .1736E-06 .976 .2685E-06 .743 .4124E-06 .422 .6023E-06 1.719 .3695E-06 1.282 .4999E-06 .976 .6245E-06 .772 .7219E-06 .874 .7116E-07 .1411 .1449 .1098 2.941 3.138 2.673 2.387 1.850 1.456 2.639 2.100 1.635 1.331 2.689 2.577 2.564 2.202 4159 295 110 5097 3442 306 309 115 2423 1962 1512 -.0400 .1256 .2365 303 309 310 113 115 116 psid .2365 -.0649 -.0578 .0325 .1942 .4490 .4488 .3272 .3192 .4013 .6402 160 163 165 3894 2891 2257 1867 6327 4725 3048 2140 1655 430 436 443 444 211 210 207 206 120 1.282 .4999E-06 .976 .6245E-06 .772 .7219E-06 .874 .7116E-07 .655 .9567E-07 .481 .1686E-06 .347 .2467E-06 .253 .3017E-06 .175 .3453E-06 165 79 78 77 77 75 75 " 1 1.823 202 1285

2828288888822885265555555556646464001 TEST NUMBER 6 - 402 6 - 402 6 - 402 6 - 402 6 - 402 6 - 402 6 - 402 7 - 402 6 - 402 6 - 402 7 - 402 6 - 402 7 - 402 8 -217 25 WATER FLOW RATE (1bm/hr) AIR FLOW RATE (1bm/hr) L: 522

 3
 3
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 4
 $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{ZK}\\ \textbf{$ 162.5 162.5 164.4 178.3 178.3 181.8 209.8 209.8 209.8 2203.4 2212.3 2212.3 2248.0 2248.0 2248.0 2248.0 2248.0 2248.0 2259.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2250.0 2050 HOMOGENEOUS VELOCITY (ft/sec)

> Pipe Diameter = 0.625 in. ρ_{water} = 62.2 lbm/ft³

 $P_{\text{air}} = 0.076 \text{ lbm/ft}^3$

AIR-WATER DATA

TEST NUMBER	ORIFICE MANOMETER READING (in Hg.)	ORIFICE AIR DENSITY (Ibm/ft ³)	ROTOMETER READING (% SCALE)	LENGTH FILLED WITH WATER (cm.)	WATER FLOW RATE (Ibm/hr)		AIR FLOW RATE (Ibm/hr)		MASS_VELOCITY_(Ibm/hr in ²)	QUALITY	a MINIMUM POSSIBLE	a MAXIMUM POSSIBLE	
1	5.40	.1620	25.10	6.70	.69271E	03	-69662E	02	1726	.0914	.9107	.9219	
3	4.30	.1670	50.00	9.90	.13 JOCE	04	•63189E	02	3267	•0438	.8680	.8781	
<u> 4 </u> 5	3.85	1685	58.50	<u>9.70</u> 12.20	-16146E	04	.57910E	02	<u> </u>	.0359	<u>.8707</u>	<u>-8808</u> -8466	
6	2.90	.1740	91.30	13.70	.2519\$E	04	-53062E	02	5824	.0206	.8173	.8260	10° 40. 40
7 8	2.70	.1750	98.00	15.50	•27)48E	04	•51361E	02 02	6239	.0186	•7933	.8014	
9	6.10	.1570	10.00	4.40	•27600E	03	.72839E	02	790	.2088	• 94 13	•9534	
10	5.70	.1570	20.00	5.90	.55200E	03	.70439E	02	1409	.1132	•9213	.9329	
12	5.25	-1628 -2080	30.00	6.70 4.20	.78108E	03	•0880/E	02	1990	.1116	.9107	.9219	
13	7.95	.2175	41.20	5.20	.11371E	04	.97657E	02	2 795	.0791	.9307	-9425	
14	7.10	•2179	50.00	<u>6.70</u>	.13800E	04	•92445E	02	3333	.0628	.9107	.9219	
16	6.68	•2225	-60-70	7.90	•10070C	04	.89725E	02	3995	.0525	.8973	.9082	
17	6.60	.2278	70.00	7.50	.193:0E	04	.91170E	02	4580	.0451	.9000	.9110	
18	6.05	.2255	7.9.90	8.70	-220 12E	04	.86894E	02	5188	<u>•0379</u>	<u>-8840</u>	.8945	
20	5.70	.2910	94.00	9.60	•259 +4E	04	•85115E	02	6065	.0318	.8720	-8822	
- 21	8.50	2065	26.00	3.80	.717 NE	03	.98350E	02	1 847.	.1205	.9493	-9616	
22_	12.25	.2640	27.50	3.50	<u>.7591:E</u>	03	.13304E	_03	2019	.1491	.9533	<u>•9658</u>	
23	10.55	.2690	40.00	4.40	-138 KF	04	•12480F	03	2 199	.0829	.9410	• 9397	
25	10.35	.2760	60.80	6.30	.167 HE	04	.12523E	03	4082	.0694	.9160	.9274	
26	9.43	• 2735	71.00	6.90	.195.161	04	.11908E	03	4705	•0573	.9080	•9192	
21	9+12 8+50	.2810	84.50 95.50	7.50	•233 12E	04	•11509E	03	5 2 4 8	.0485	- 9000	.9110	
29	10.70	.3100	88.00	7.00	.242 181	04	.13489E	03	5803	.0526	•9067	.9178	
	11.00	.2970	66.00	5160	.18216	04	-13384E	03	4426	.0684	.9253	<u>+9370</u>	
32	1.30	• 1447	99 . 90	20.80	•21012t	04	.37334F	02	5082	.0119	.7400	.7466	
33	2.32	.1398	58.00	14.20	.16008E	04	.42604E	02	3720	.0259	.8107	.8192	••••
34		-1202	61.00	19,20	.1683.E	04	.28154E	02	3875	.0164	.7440	.7507	
35	•83	.1212	79.00	22620	•21804E	04 04	-23051E	02	4989	.0108	. 6400	1030	

VOID FRACTION DATA

APPENDIX F

DATA OF VANCE

.

44 49 69 7 6 9 7 6	TEST NUMBER
7110 71100 7110 7110 7110 7110 7110 7110 7110 7110	WATER SPECIFIC VOLUME (ft ³ /ibm)
8,51500 8,515000 8,515000 8,515000 8,515000 8,515000 8,515000 8,5150	STEAM SPECIFIC VOLUME (ft ³ /lbm)
293.4100 297.4000 297.4000 297.4000 297.4000 297.4000 297.4000 297.4000 287.4000 287.4000 287.4000 297.4000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000	MASS VELOCITY (Ibm/hrft ²)
10.544 6.824 15.600 15.600 10.7481 10.544 10.544 10.7481 1	FORCE (1bf)
	QUALITY
· 990 3E-06 · 071 3E-06 · 071 3E-06 · 171 3E-06 · 172 3E-06 · 182 2E-06 · 182 2E-06 · 192 3E-07 · 173 4E-07 · 174 4E-06 · 174	MOMENTUM MULTIPLIER (16f hr ² in ² /16m ²)
- 5748E-06 - 38276-06 - 38276-06 - 38778-06 - 38778-06 - 38778-06 - 38778-06 - 38778-06 - 38778-06 - 38778-06 - 38778-06 - 32598-06 - 32598-06 - 37958-06 - 31788-06 - 31788-06	MINIMUM MOMENTUM MULTIPLIER
	HOMOGENEOUS MOMENTUM MULTIPLIER
-3306-0 .23726 0 .33736 0 .33736 0 .33736 0 .33736 0 .34706 0 .24706 0 .24706 0 .24706 0 .24706 0 .24706 0 .24757 0 .237576 0 .237576 0 .237576 0 .237576 0 .237576 0 .237576 0 .237576 0 .237576 0 .258976 0 .258976 0 .55956 0 .25956 0 .25	үк
	zκ
PPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPP	
U911440170110811101500014401001100500000000000000	HOMOGENEOUS VELOCITY/25 (ft/sec)
9922222222222222222222222222222222222	
-7477E -5726E -9734E -9734E -9734E -9734E -9734E -9734E -9734E -9734E -9734E -9734E -1138E -7138E -7138E -7138E -7388E -1378E -7388E -7	ENTRAINMENT CORRELATING FACTOR/25(ft/sec)
999222222222222222222222222222222222222	

Pipe Diameter = 0.5045 in.

j

VANCE'S DATA, STEAM-WATER

REFERENCES

- Martinelli, R.C., and D.B. Nelson, "Prediction of Pressure Drop During Forced Circulation Boiling of Water," <u>Trans</u>. Am. Soc. Mech. Engrs., <u>70</u>, 695, 1948.
- Martinelli, R. C., L.M.K. Boelter, T.H.M. Taylor, E.G. Thomson, and E.H. Morrin, "Isothermal Pressure Drop for Two-Phase, Two-Component Flow in a Horizontal Pipe," <u>Trans. Am. Soc</u>. <u>Mech. Engrs.</u>, <u>66</u>, 139, 1944.
- 1b) Lockhart, R.W., and R. C. Martinelli, "Proposed Correlation of Data for Isothermal, Two-Phase, Two-Component Flow in Pipes," <u>Chem. Eng. Prog</u>., 45, 39, 1949.
- 2) Thom, J.R.S., "Predicition of Pressure Drop During Forced Circulation of Boiling of Water," <u>International Journal of</u> Heat and Mass Transfer, 7, 709, 1964.
- 3) Magiros, P.G. and A.E. Dukler, "Entrainment and Pressure Drop in Concurrent Gas-Liquid Flow II. Liquid Property and Momentum Effects," <u>Developments in Mechanics, Vol. I</u>, Plenum Press, New York, 1961.
- 4) Bankoff, S.G., "A Variable Density Single-Fluid Model for Two-Phase Flow with Particular Reference to Steam-Water Flow," <u>Trans. Am. Soc. Mech. Engrs</u>., Series C, 84, 265, 1960.
- 5) Anderson, G.H., and B.C. Mantzoranis, "Two-Phase (gas-liquid) Flow Phenomena - Part I," <u>Chem. Eng. Sci</u>., 12, 109, 1960.
- 6) Silvestri, M., et al., "A Research Program in Two-Phase Flow," Centro Informazioni Studi Esperienze, EURATOM Contract No. 002-59-11, ROI (CAN-1), January, 1963.

- 7) Linning, D.L., "The Adiabatic Flow of Evaporating Fluids in Pipes of Uniform Bore," <u>Proc. Inst. Mech. Engrs</u>., London, 1B
 2, 64, 1952.
- Semenov, N.I., "Pressure Pulsations During the Flow of Gas-Liquid Mixtures in Pipes," Heat Power Engineering Part I, U.S.A.E.C., Division of Technical Information, AEC-tr-4496, Dec. 1961, translated.
- 9) Vance, W.H., "A Study of Slip Ratios for the Flow of Steam-Water Mixtures at High Void Fractions," Ph.D. thesis, University of Washington, 1962.
- 10) Rose, S., "Some Hydrodynamic Characteristics of Bubbly Mixtures Flowing Vertically Upward in Tubes," Sc.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1964.
- 11) Fauske, H.K., "Two-Phase Critical Flow," <u>Two-Phase Gas-Liquid</u> <u>Flow</u>, ed. by P. Griffith and S. W. Gouse, Jr., Special Summer Program, MIT, Cambridge, Mass., 1964.
- 12) Zivi, S.M., "Estimation of Steady-State Steam Void-Fraction by Means of the Principle of Minimum Entropy Production," <u>Trans. Am. Soc. Mech. Engrs</u>., Series C, 86, 247, 1964.
- 13) Schlicting, H., Boundary Layer Theory, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.
- 14) Von Karman, T., "Mechanische Ahnlichkeit und Turbalenz," Proc. 3rd Intern. Congress Appl. Mech., Stockholm, 1930.
- 15) Pai, Fluid Dynamics of Jets, D. Van Nostrand, New York, 1954.
- 16) ASME Power Test Codes; Chapter 4, Flow Measurement; Part 5, Measurement of Quantity of Materials, PTC 19.5, 4-1959, New York.
- 17) <u>Radiotron Designers' Handbook</u>, F. Langford-Smith, Amalgomated Wireless Valve Company Ptg, Ltd., Sidney, Australia, 1953.

- 18) <u>Electronic Designers' Handbook</u>, R. W. Landee, D. C. Davis, and A. P. Alvrecht, McGraw Hill, New York, 1957.
- Griffin, E. and T. F. Crang, "Steam Flow in Nozzles: Velocity Coefficient at Low Steam Speeds," <u>Proc. of Inst. of Mech. Eng.</u>, 155, 83, 1946.
- 20) Gill, L.E., G.F. Hewitt, and P.M.C. Lacey, "Sampling Probe Studies of the Gas Core in Annular Two-Phase Flow, Part III, Studies of the Effect of Phase Flow Rates on Phase and Velocity Distributions," AERE-R3955, Harwell, England, 1963.
- 21) Wallis, G.B., D. S. Steen, S.N. Brenner, and J.M. Turner, Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, Report NYO 10, 489, 1964.
- 22) Minh, Q.T. and J.D. Huyghe, "Mesure et Correlation de la Fraction D'Entrainment en Ecoulement Diphasé a Deux Composants en Regime Annulaire Dispersé," Centre D'Etudes Nucléaires de Grenoble, Commissariat a l'Energie Atomic, Grenoble, France, Rapport TT No. 52, 1965.
- 23) Shames, I.H., Mechanics of Fluids, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962.
- 24) <u>Handbook of Chemistry and Physics</u>, 35th edition, C. D. Hodgman, Chemical Rubber Publishing Co., Cleveland, 1953.



FIGURE 1.

COMPARISON BETWEEN HOMOGENEOUS AND SLIP MODELS



FIGURE 2. CROSS SECTION OF PRESSURE VESSEL SHOWING INTERNALS



i

FIGURE 3. SCHEMATIC OF TEST APPARATUS







ELECTRICAL APPARATUS





PROFILES SHOWN TO LARGER SCALE

FIRST DESIGN ABOVE FINAL DESIGN BELOW

All Aluminum

FIGURE 7. TURNING TEE DESIGNS





FIGURE 9.

BEAM CONSTANT

á.



FIGURE 10.

STATIC TEST







WEIGH TANK CALIBRATION



FIGURE 12. STEAM CALIBRATION TEST


FIGURE 13.

BEAM RESPONSE

.



FIGURE 14.

FILTER PERFORMANCE







(b) Horiz. Scale Vert. Scale

0.5 sec/unit 0.1 volts/units

with frictional damping



(c) Horiz. Scale Vert. Scale

1.0 sec/unit 0.02 volts/units

(d) Horiz. Scale Vert. Scale 0.1 sec/unit 0.02 volt/units

frictional damping eliminated



(e) Horiz.Scale O.I sec/unit
Vert. Scale O.5 volts/units
as playback from tape deck

FIGURE 15. PLUCK TESTS

T

i













FIGURE 18.

EFFECT OF VOID FRACTION ON SLIP MODEL MOMENTUM AMPLIFIER



FIGURE 19. EFFECT OF VOID FRACTION ON SLIP MODEL MOMENTUM MULTIPLIER

Ť



FIGURE 20.



PAGES (S) MISSING FROM ORIGINAL



FIGURE 21.

ANDERSON AND MANTZOURANIS MODEL



FIGURE 22. REICHARDT'S HOT-WIRE DATA



FIGURE 23.



FIGURE 24.

FLUCTUATING MODEL



FIGURE 25.





FIGURE 26.



FIGURE 27.

١

FLUCTUATION MODEL



FIGURE 28. FLUCTUATION MODEL

1





Å



FIGURE 30. ROSE'S MOMENTUM FLUX DATA



FIGURE 31.

ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE ONE INCH PIPE



-



ı

4



30 PSIA ONE INCH PIPE











60 PSIA ONE INCH PIPE





60PSIA ONE - HALF INCH PIPE



FIGURE 37.

90 PSIA ONE INCH PIPE



FIGURE 38.

90 PSIA ONE-HALF INCH PIPE



FIGURE 39.

120 PSIA ONE INCH PIPE



FIGURE 40.

120 PSIA ONE-HALF INCH PIPE



FIGURE 41.

AIR-WATER 65°F



FIGURE 42.

AIR - WATER 65°F



FIGURE 43. DAT

DATA OF VANCE



FIGURE 44 BRUSH RECORDINGS



and the second



Steam-Water, Atmospheric Pressure, One Inch Pipe

FIGURE 46. MOMENTUM FLUX SPECTRAL DENSITY



FIGURE 47.

CRITICAL FLOW