

The Windscale Pile 1 Accident in '57, subsequent clean-up & decommissioning

Presented at WM14, Phoenix, Arizona, USA, 6 March 2014

MT Cross, Principal Consultant March 2014



Introduction



- The piles, their structure & history the '57 accident
- Early clean-up operations
- Present condition and uncertainties for decommissioning
- Conclusions
- Lessons learned





Background

- Non-conventional large decommissioning project (one accident-damaged reactor with fire damaged core, not all fuel removed)
- 2 reactors in safestore since core fire in Pile1, 1957
- Characterisation issues dominate
 - some unique considerations
 - intrusive inspection of fire-damaged region now carried out

The decommissioning problem has been dominated by the lack of a detailed knowledge of the state of the core







Schematic structure







Lateral cross-section







Pile parameters

- Graphite moderated, 2000 te
- 180 MW_t, air-cooled, oncethru, no PV, 200 °C outlet temp
- 3444 horizontal fuel channels
- 977 horizontal isotope channels
- Fuel:
 - natural uranium metal rods,
 21 elements per channel
 - later used 0.92% U-235
 - clad in finned aluminium

full charge

- 70, 000 elements, 180 te U





Piles' graphite core structure







The 1957 Accident in Pile 1 during a routine Wigner anneal

- 9th anneal started 7 October abnormally high core temps by 10th Oct
- Increase in activity on stack monitors
- Selected channels at red heat, flames at discharge face
- 'Firebreak' produced around affected zone
- Carbon dioxide injection no effect
- Finally, water injection and cooling fans switched off

Conjectured that inadequate instrumentation led to over temperature and clad failure on cartridges leading to runaway Wigner release and exothermic uranium, isotope and graphite oxidation.

Retrospective level '5' on INES scale

Exact cause still conjectured!







Fire-Affected Zone (FAZ) in Pile 1







Environmental Effects

- Filters on stack retained most Sr-90 and prevented a major disaster
- Most release, I-131 (740-1100 TBq) ~12% of total
- Fallout deposition on local farmland, milk discarded for several months to prevent human consumption over 200 sq. ml. zone
- Excess cancers re-estimated at 240 in 2007
- Several Official Inquiries initiated '57, '58





Early Decommissioning, Phase I - securing the safety of the facility

- After initial clean-up 57-60, Phase 1 decommissioning commenced early 1980's
 - Sealing of bioshield
 - Installation of ventilation and monitoring
 - Loose fuel removal from outside core
 - Drain-down of water duct
 - Core removal option studies
 - Completed June 1999





Air Duct Clearance







Water Duct Clearance - Before









Water Duct Clearance - After









Present condition of Pile 1





Apparently Pristine Fuel









Slightly Damaged Fuel









Destroyed Fuel – Channel 23.54









Intact Isotope Cartridge







Damaged Isotope Cartridge









Metal Pipe - channel 21.55











Hazards and decommissioning issues

MT Cross, Principal Consultant March 2014



Pile 1 safety issues for decommissioning

- ~15 te fuel still present
- Possible core voidage post '57 fire seismic collapse is Design Basis Accident under C&M
- Characterisation issues:
 - 'hydride event' (pyrophoric material present?)
 - Wigner energy in graphite?
 - graphite dust explosion?
 - Criticality?

Physical characterisation dominates.





Uranium Hydride Event Sequence

Conjectured event sequence:







Fuel element condition - gross corrosion, Channel 21, 58 – hydride unlikely









Fuel element condition - severe fuel damage, Channel 24, 61- hydride unlikely









Fuel element condition - minor fuel damage, Channel 23, 63 – hydride possible?









R&D programme demonstrated:

- Hydride will not self-heat to give a propagating thermal event (Ar not required during dismantling)
- Graphite dust is weakly explosible but Pile conditions rule it out (high concentrations and v. high energy input would be required)
- Direct neutron measurements give improved criticality margin over calculations (margin preserved under DBA, but need to retain Li absorbers during dismantling)





Lessons learned

During Pile operations

- UKAEA 'overstretched' at time of accident too many commitments
- Insufficient technical support to what became 'routine' operations
- Committed response of AEA operators averted a larger disaster in '57!

Decommissioning

- Emphasises the need for priorities put on characterisation unusual problems!
- Decommissioning problems initially overestimated over pessimism
- Lack of continuity many hiatus', plans and organisation changes during programme



