

#### ADVANCEMENTS IN UNDERSTANDING WATER-MIST SYSTEMS: FROM SPRAY CHARACTERIZATION TO REAL-SCALE APPLICATIONS

Paolo E. Santangelo<sup>a</sup>, <u>Paolo Tartarini<sup>b</sup></u>, Massimiliano Bettati<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Fire Protection Engineering, University of Maryland, USA <sup>b</sup> DIEF, Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Italy <sup>c</sup> Bettati Antincendio S.r.l., Italy

## **Agenda and Problem Statement**





#### Task 1 – Spray Characterization

- •What are the discharge characteristics of water-mist sprays issued by commercial nozzles?
- •What physical parameters are to be investigated to quantitatively assess their performance?
- •What spray-related mechanisms are of significant interest in determining suppression?

#### **Task 2 – Suppression in Full-Scale Scenarios**

- How does the spray actually perform against a realscale severe fire case?
- •What parameters are to be measured to quantitatively evaluate suppression performance?
- How is suppression performance influenced by the introduction of additives to water?

12th International Water Mist Conference – Barcelona, Spain – November 14h - 15th, 2012



# **Background and Recent Advancements**

#### **Main References:**



- **Wang et al.**, Exp. Fluids 33 (2002) 587-593. Low pressure (2-8 bar), PIV + Digital-Image Processing. Main results: drop size and velocity distribution at 1 m distance from the orifice. Other: breakup length.
- **Paulsen Husted et al.**, Fire Saf. J. 44 (2009) 1030-1045. High pressure (100 bar), hollow- and full-cone nozzles, PIV and PDA. Main results: comparison of these techniques, drop size and axial velocity in the initial region of the spray.
- **Santangelo**, Exp. Therm. Fluid Sci. 34 (2010) 1353-1366. High pressure (60-80 bar), full-cone nozzle, *Malvern Spraytec*, PIV, mechanical patternator. Main results: drop-size and flux distribution at 1 m distance from the orifice, velocity field and spray-cone angle in the initial region of the spray. Other: breakup length.
- **Santangelo et al.**, Proc. IMECE2011 6 (2011) 1167-1174. High pressure (80 bar), hollow-cone nozzle, *Malvern Spraytec*, PIV, mechanical patternator. Main results: drop-size axial trend from the orifice throughout 1-m distance, initial velocity, parametric analysis.

#### **Recent Developments:**

- Drop-size axial evolution: potential **coalescence** and **secondary atomization**.
- Initial velocity and cone angle for hollow-cone water-mist sprays.
- **Parametric analysis** comparing different orifices (flow number, outlet diameter).



Sketch of the experimental apparatus: a) PIV setup (velocity field and spray-cone angle); b) *Malvern Spraytec* and mechanical patternator (droplet size). All dimensions are in mm.

#### **Employed Nozzles and Injectors**





*CJX* series by *Bettati Antincendio S.r.l.* (pressure-swirl atomizers, hollow-cone sprays), here operated at 80 bar (pressure right upstream the injector)

Injector	Orifice Diameter (mm)	Flow Number (lpm bar <sup>-0.5</sup> )	
B070	0.49	0.1167	
B250	1.14	0.4167	

## **Drop-Size Experimental Procedure**



- Radial symmetry of the spray is assumed as a simplifying hypothesis.
- At 5, 10, 25 and 50 cm distance from the injector outlet, the drop-size distribution consists of the crude *Malvern Spraytec* results along a generic diameter.
- At 1 m distance from the injector outlet, a flux-based weighting procedure is employed to reconstruct the overall drop-size distribution, thus overtaking the biasing effect due to the mismatch between the geometric shape of *Malvern Spraytec* sampling volume and the spray cross section.
- Volume flux is yielded by patternation tests.





Equation to reconstruct the volume fraction pertaining to the *i*th drop size over all the *j* measurement locations:

$$V_{i}^{''} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} q_{j}^{''} \cdot \frac{1}{\rho_{L}} \cdot \frac{\Delta r}{R} \cdot VF_{i,j}$$

## **PIV Analysis: Parameters and Procedure**





- The PIV apparatus features a 30 mJ pulsed-Nd:YAG laser (by *Dantec Dynamics*), a thermo-electrically cooled CCD camera (14 bit, 4 Mpixels) and a post-processing software (by *LaVision*).
- Measurements have been taken at 4 Hz frequency, with a time interval of 5  $\mu$ s between two exposures of the same pair.
- >No seeding has been added: droplets constitute tracking particles themselves.
- >Only axial and radial velocity components have been considered, because the tangential tends to collapse onto this latter within few millimeters downstream the outlet.
- LSV (Laser Speckle Velocimetry) has been employed to process images in the highlysaturated region (axially stretching over about 5 mm from the orifice).
- >Results upstream the breakup location are to be considered as unreliable (continuum flow).
- >The velocity field has been reconstructed over a set of 300 images.

## **PIV Results: Velocity Maps and Profiles**





Map of velocity magnitude for *a)*  $B070 (V_{max} \approx 101 \text{ m s}^{-1})$  and *b)*  $B250 (V_{max} \approx 85 \text{ m s}^{-1})$  injectors

Radial velocity profiles in the region

- a) close to the orifice (10-20 mm) and
- b) far from the orifice (30-40 mm).





- Coalescence phenomena appear to govern droplet size after secondary atomization has occurred (about 15 cm downstream the outlet).
- The same qualitative drop-size trend is shown by both the injectors, even though larger diameters are generated by the bigger orifice.
- An attempt to extrapolate SMD at the supposed breakup location (4 mm downstream the outlet) has been made through a simple 3<sup>rd</sup>-degree polynomial curve.

## **Physical Modeling for Initial Velocity**



The classic inviscid model developed by Giffen and Muraszew (Atomization of Liquid Fuels, Chapman & Hall, London, UK, 1953) for pressure-swirl atomizers inspired some theoretical analysis to predict velocity and spray-cone angle.



# **Physical Modeling for Droplet Size**

The very first physical parameter to be investigated is sheet thickness, which is  $(1 - 12^{0.5})$ 

Rizk and Lefebvre (J. Propul. Power 1 (1985) 193-199) found that initial SMD is proportional to  $t^{0.39}$  in pressure-swirl atomizers: this relation was mainly connected to fuel sprays, but results to be correct for water-mist too.

Lefebvre (Atom. Spray Technol. 3 (1987) 37-51) discusses the characteristic diameter as constituted by two contributions:

- **First stage:** disruptive hydro- and aerodynamic forces, *f((Re·We<sup>0.5</sup>)<sup>-c</sup>)*;
- Second stage: velocity gradients, *f(We<sup>-g</sup>)*.

Wang and Lefebvre (J. Propul. Power 3 (1987) 11-18) provide an expression for SMD under certain ranges for dynamic viscosity and surface tension:

$$SMD = 4.52 \cdot \left(\frac{\sigma \mu_L^2}{\rho_A \Delta P_L^2}\right)^{0.25} \left(t \cdot \cos\theta\right)^{0.25} + 0.39 \cdot \left(\frac{\sigma \rho_L}{\rho_A \Delta P_L}\right)^{0.25} \left(t \cdot \cos\theta\right)^{0.75}$$

Injector	Theoretical sheet thickness, t (mm)	Extrapolated SMD (mm)	SMD/t <sup>0.39</sup>	Modeled SMD	SMD relative error
B070	149.78	27.64	3.92	28.14	1.80%
B250	244.77	35.83	4.19	37.34	4.21%





## **Task 2 – Main References and Motivation**



#### **References:**

- Experimental and numerical studies on flow-flame interaction of water-mist sprays in simple heptane pool fires (P.E. Santangelo et al., Proc. 14<sup>th</sup> Int. Heat Transf. Conf. 5 (2010) 571-580);
- Experimental tests of water-mist discharge against high-rise-storage fires, within a highly equipped large-scale facility (P.E. Santangelo and P. Tartarini, Appl. Therm. Eng. 45-46 (2012) 99-107; P.E. Santangelo and P. Tartarini, Proc. 12<sup>th</sup> Int. Conf. Multiph. Flow Ind. Plants (2011) paper V.4).

#### **Objectives:**

- Challenging water-mist fire-suppression performance in a large-scale and highly hazardous scenario;
- Comparing suppression capabilities with and without a commercially available additive.



Water-mist tests in a High-Hazard Storage facility (UNI EN 12845); additive F-500 by *Hazard Control Technologies Inc.* 

#### **Parameters of Suppression Performance**



- The fire should be **spatially controlled**, preventing the surrounding materials (i.e., the target shelf) from being burnt;
- The higher temperatures within the domain should be **limited under conservative values** to preserve the structural configuration of the building (i.e., the test chamber);
- The temperatures at eye level should be **kept as low as possible** to allow the best conditions for fire fighters;
- The fire spread within the involved commodities (i.e.: in the main shelves) should **be vertically and horizontally limited** as much as possible to optimize the rate of damages.

## **Experimental Setup**



- •Test chamber: Prefabricated iron box, base area ~ 83 m<sup>2</sup> (12 m × 6.94 m × 8 m);
- •**Storage structure:** Iron beams, 3 shelves (5.65 m × 0.8 m × 6.89 m each), 8 storage levels;
- **Nozzle:** CJX 1140 B1SG by *Bettati Antincendio S.r.l.*, 7 injectors (total flow number = 1.4 l min<sup>-1</sup> bar<sup>-0.5</sup>); 9 nozzles located at the ceiling above the ignition-involved shelves;
- **Electric pump:** Maximum static head = 130 bar, operative pressure at the nozzle inlet = 100 bar.



Technical sketch of the experimental facility: a) view from side; b) view from above

## **Combustible Materials**



#### **Commodities (***EUR Standard Plastic Commodities*):

- wooden pallets,
- cardboard boxes,
- plastic glasses.

	Wooden pallets	Cardboard boxes	Polystyrene glasses
Main shelves	64	256	30 720
Target shelf	32	128	15 360
Total amount	96	384	46 080
Total mass (kg)	2 400	691.20	138.24

Material	Lower Heat Value (MJ kg <sup>-1</sup> ), H	Combustion Efficacy, $\phi$	Limiting Coefficient, $\psi$
Wood	19	0.8	1
Cardboard	17	0.8	1
Polystyrene	40	1	1

$$\int_{f}^{N} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} m_{i} \cdot H_{i} \cdot \phi_{i} \cdot \psi_{i}}{A} = 617.33 \, MJm^{-2}$$

**NOMINAL FIRE LOAD:** 

q

## **Experimental Facility – Photos**





#### **Experimental Measurements and Procedure**



- •**Thermocouples:** K type, diameter = 0.5 mm. 5 (TC1-TC5) placed between the ceiling and the nozzle height (hot gas temperature), 1 (TC6) placed at the flame axis 3.6 m distant from ignition source, 1 (TC7) placed at the target shelf, 1 (TC8) placed at eye-level height in between the shelves;
- •**Thermal-response wires:** Activation temperature = 88 °C, all wires placed along the ignition-involved shelves at 1.1, 1.9 and 6.5 m from the floor;
- **Ignition source:** Heptane pool fire (120 ml), placed below the ignition-involved shelves;
- **Discharge:** 30 min; Test 1 sole water, Test 2 water/F-500 (2% volumetric concentration); if temperature at the ceiling = 350 °C, the test is interrupted (manual extinction for building preservation; failed suppression);
- Water-mist activation: both thermal-response-wire and temperature based.

Report From the Sensors	Discharge-Activation Time (s)
Alarm from 3 thermal-response wires within 60 s after ignition	60
Alarm from 2 thermal-response wires within 90 s after ignition	90
No/1 alarm from thermal-response wires within 120 s after ignition	120
Ceiling temperature = 300 °C	Immediate



#### Locations

- Ceiling Height: 5 thermocouples (TC1-5) to measure hot-gas temperature;
- **Main Shelves:** 1 thermocouple (TC6) at the axis of the heptane pool fire to measure flame temperature;
- **Target Shelf:** 1 thermocouple (TC7) to measure the potential involvement of the target shelf;
- **Eye Level:** 1 thermocouple (TC8) to measure the environmental conditions for fire fighters.



12th International Water Mist Conference – Barcelona, Spain – November 14<sup>h</sup> - 15th, 2012



# **Additional Outcomes**



#### Mass-loss evaluation:

- No mass-loss actual measurement was carried out, since the main scope was to evaluate thermal control and because the size of the involved experiments;
- Following a post-fire damage evaluation, 4 pallets (base) and 6 storage levels (height) in the main shelves were involved in the fire spread for both the tests;
- As a conservative assumption, 25% and 37.5% of the combustible materials were burnt in Test 1 (sole water) and Test 2 (water/F-500) respectively;
- As an additional assumption, burning in Test 1 is assumed to stop at the end of emergency operations (0.16  $t_{Discharge}$ ), while burning in Test 2 is assumed to stop at the end of the discharge;
- Considering a free-burn time of 120 s (as in both tests), the **average burning rate** in **Test** 1 is **3.15 higher** than in **Test 2**.

#### How does the presence of an additive affect drop size?

- Relative viscosity (to water) appears to be the main governing parameter in determining droplet size in water/surfactants (retardants) flows;
- According to F-500 declared components, its relative viscosity seems to be quite high (1.6-7.7);
- This case seems to be similar to agricultural water/drift retardant sprays;
- Drop size is assumed to **increase** by **35%** ( $D_{v50}$ ) with respect to the sole-water flow.

# Conclusions



- An experimental investigation was conducted to investigate velocity field, spray-cone angle drop-size axial evolution in water-mist sprays generated by two hollow-cone nozzles, employing laser-based diagnostics.
- The velocity field shows the same qualitative characteristics for both the injectors, while the cone angle is wider for larger orifices.
- Drop-size trends show that secondary atomization is the governing phenomenon until a minimum is reached; then, coalescence tends to increase droplet size.
- Drop-size trends are qualitatively very similar, but larger orifices tend to generate bigger droplet size on an average basis.
- Some predictive relations for pressure-swirl atomizers have been successfully validated for the water-mist case, as a result of non-viscous modeling.
- A water-mist system operating at high pressure was challenged in suppressing a fire within a high-hazard scenario; sole-water and water/additive flow were employed;
- Thermal transients was considered as the main parameter to determine suppression performance, together with post-fire damage evaluation and a temperature safety threshold;
- The sole water has been proved to provide ineffective action, even enhancing the temperature rise (turbulent effect on fire); on the other hand, the water/F500 flow yielded to successful thermal control and fire suppression;
- Fire spread was mainly vertical over both the tests (reduced temperature rise at the target shelf); eye-level temperature was lower than 80 °C over both the tests, thus allowing safe fire-fighters' operations.

## **Future Work**



- Coupled velocity and drop-size measurements are to be pursued, employing shadowgraphy as one of the possible techniques.
- A more accurate patternation system should be designed to collect the smaller floating particles, thus implying an indirect evaluation of the evaporated share of the whole spray.
- Statistic analyses on turbulence can be conducted on PIV images, thus evaluating air entrainment within the spray.
- > Modeling air entrainment in hollow-cone sprays still needs to be accomplished.
- Additional full-scale tests under downsized configurations should be performed to carry out a scaling approach on the involved physical phenomena;
- Numerical simulations of the fire scenario through CFD codes should be attempted to evaluate their predictability in terms of temperature profile and fire spread.



# Thanks for your kind attention.

# **Questions?**

Prof. Ing. Paolo Tartarini Dipartimento di Ingegneria «Enzo Ferrari» Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia Via Vignolese 905/b 41125 Modena (Italy) Tel.: +39 059 205 6146 Fax: +39 059 205 6126 E-mail: paolo.tartarini@unimore.it