



# Fatigue Strength Analysis of the Sandia Target Development Facility Reaction Chamber

R.L. Engelstad, E.G. Lovell and G.A. Moses

February 1985

UWFDM-618

Presented at the Sixth Topical Meeting on the Technology of Fusion Energy, San Francisco, CA, 3-7 March 1985; Fusion Technology 8, 1890-1894 (July 1985).

***FUSION TECHNOLOGY INSTITUTE***

***UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN***

***MADISON WISCONSIN***

### **DISCLAIMER**

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government, nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

# **Fatigue Strength Analysis of the Sandia Target Development Facility Reaction Chamber**

R.L. Engelstad, E.G. Lovell and G.A. Moses

Fusion Technology Institute  
University of Wisconsin  
1500 Engineering Drive  
Madison, WI 53706

<http://fti.neep.wisc.edu>

February 1985

UWFDM-618

Presented at the Sixth Topical Meeting on the Technology of Fusion Energy, San Francisco, CA, 3-7 March 1985; Fusion Technology 8, 1890-1894 (July 1985).

FATIGUE STRENGTH ANALYSIS OF THE  
SANDIA TARGET DEVELOPMENT FACILITY REACTION CHAMBER

R.L. Engelstad, E.G. Lovell and G.A. Moses  
Fusion Technology Institute, University of Wisconsin-Madison  
1500 Johnson Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706  
(608) 262-0944

ABSTRACT

The Target Development Facility (TDF) reaction chamber will be subjected to a mechanical shock from the cavity gas after each target ignition. This impulsive pressure produces transient stresses in the cylindrical shell wall which are characterized by an oscillatory response with decreasing amplitude. Such fluctuating stresses may fatigue the wall material and limit the useful lifetime of the chamber. Lifetime estimates have been determined and comparisons are made for chambers with different sizes, alloys and target yield.

INTRODUCTION

The target development facility has been proposed by Sandia National Laboratories for the program in light ion driven fusion. The facility is intended to test and qualify high yield ICF targets at an approximate rate of 10 shots per day for 5 years (~15,000 ignitions). For the preconceptual design, the target reaction chamber consists of a reinforced cylindrical shell submerged in a water shield as shown in Fig. 1. The physical characteristics of the chamber (radius, thickness, material) are determined, to a certain degree, by design limits on fatigue stress in the wall. An assessment of this is presented in the work which follows.

GENERAL PROCEDURE

The method follows the guidelines of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code.<sup>1</sup> It allows for fatigue damage from cyclic loading as well as creep rupture damage which could take place during extended hold times. Generally both effects would occur simultaneously and thus "creep-fatigue interaction" has been used to describe the problem. The procedure depends upon interaction relations for the material which can be represented as




Fig. 1. TDF Reaction Chamber.

$$\sum_{j=1}^p (n/N_d)_j + \sum_{k=1}^q (t/T_d)_k < D \quad (1)$$

where:

- D = total creep-fatigue damage
- $n_j$  = number of applied cycles of loading condition, j
- $N_{dj}$  = number of design allowable cycles of loading condition, j
- $t_k$  = time duration of load condition, k
- $T_{dk}$  = creep rupture time for the k-th stress acting alone.

Failure is predicted when either of these sums, acting alone, reaches a value of 1.0. When acting together, failure is predicted when the

total sum becomes equal to D. For many alloys the interaction is linear and the two effects are mutually independent. However, nonlinear interaction is possible (e.g., stainless steel) with degradation of fatigue by creep and vice versa, and failure predicted at values of D which are less than 1.0.

For the TDF reaction chamber, the steady loads are produced by hydrostatic pressure and dead weight. The corresponding stresses are not large and more significantly, occur at room temperature. Under these circumstances, creep is not considered to be an important design problem.

The ASME Section III fatigue design curves are based upon strain controlled tests but are presented in terms of alternating stress intensity, i.e., alternating strain multiplied by the elastic modulus. A safety factor of at least 2 on stress and 20 on life is used and the curves also incorporate an additional factor accounting for mean stress effects.

The recommended procedure requires a determination of the dynamic principal stresses ( $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ ) at critical points. From these, the stress differences  $S_{ij} = \sigma_i - \sigma_j$ , are calculated. The extremes of the range through which each of the stress differences fluctuates are found along with the absolute value of the range for each  $S_{ij}$ . The alternating stress intensity, " $S_{alt}$ ," is one half of the largest magnitude of the stress range. This parameter is then used with the appropriate fatigue design curve. (Modulus scaling and ultimate tensile strength interpolation are used if necessary.)

#### TDF FATIGUE ANALYSIS

For the cylindrical shell of the TDF reaction chamber, stresses are determined for a specific thickness, length, diameter, material and target yield. A conservative damping level of 2% critical is used in all calculations.<sup>2</sup> Shield water inertia is assessed but its damping characteristics are ignored. Both flexural and membrane stresses are included in the analysis. Since this is a plane stress problem in which the two non-zero principal values are of the same sign, the largest stress difference is  $\sigma_1$ , i.e.,  $S_{13}$ . A typical result is shown in Fig. 2 for  $\sigma_1$  and from such a response the alternating stress intensity is directly found.

A specific chamber could be required to sustain a number of target ignitions, N, of essentially the same yield. Then, of course, a stress history such as in Fig. 2 would be repeated N times. The ASME cumulative damage code specification is independent of the sequence of the various load cycles. Thus for the TDF application, the criterion would be based upon N cycles corresponding to the first positive to first negative extreme, N cycles for the second




Fig. 2. First Wall Stress History.

positive peak to the second negative, etc. Using this procedure with Eq. (1) and the appropriate fatigue design curve, the number of allowable ignitions can be determined.

#### BASE CASE - 3 m RADIUS/200 MJ YIELD

The basic cavity parameters used correspond to a 200 MJ yield and a 3 meter radius chamber for which the peak impulsive pressure at the wall is 0.64 MPa. The pulse profile is shown in Fig. 3. In addition to using this loading, the maximum pressure was also conservatively doubled to 1.28 MPa to allow for uncertainties in the fireball code calculations.

The first material considered for the vessel was 2-1/4 Cr-1 Mo steel, a ferritic alloy widely used in the nuclear industry. Its physical properties are well documented and general characteristics include low radiation damage and activation, good fabricability and strength. For ASME purposes it would be included in the category for carbon, low alloy, high tensile steels. The design data for Fig. I-9.1 and Table I-9.1 of ASME<sup>1</sup> was incorporated directly into the UW fatigue computer code and the data has also been reconstructed in Fig. 4.

The second material considered for the TDF reaction chamber was aluminum 6061-T6. It is generally regarded as a low activation material and easily fabricated. This alloy is strain hardenable and shows a significant loss of strength from welding. The high cycle fatigue properties of unwelded ALCOA 6061-T6 were presented by Powell et al.,<sup>3</sup> and are reproduced in Fig. 5. The curve includes a derating factor of 2 on stress. The stress-based fatigue results




Fig. 3. Dynamic Pressure and Heat Flux at First Wall for 200 MJ Yield.




Fig. 5. Fatigue Design Data for Unwelded Al 6061-T6.




Fig. 4. Fatigue Design Data for Low Alloy, High Strength Steels.




Fig. 6. Fatigue Design Data for Welded Al 6061-T6.

for this material identify the best life estimates for Al 6061-T6, i.e., best in the sense that there has been no assessment of degradation from fabrication.

The other extreme to consider is the effect of welding on fatigue life of this alloy. The American Society of Civil Engineers has developed design guidelines<sup>4</sup> which have been adopted by major commercial suppliers. The relevant code information has been replotted in Fig. 6. According to ASCE, the curve has a built-in safety factor of 1.35. Test results for plate samples<sup>5</sup> indicate that the ASCE design formulas provide factors of safety against failure under repeated loading of at least 1.35, the margin being larger for low cycle data.

The base case results for high strength steel are shown in Fig. 7. It can be seen that the design goal of 15,000 ignitions can be met with a wall as thin as 3.6 cm. Because of the apparent fatigue life beyond the design goal, an additional variation in the calculations was considered. The number of low yield (200 MJ) shots was specified at 15,000 and the number of extra high yield (800 MJ) shots which could be sustained was determined for a particular wall thickness. The pressure pulse for these limited 800 MJ shots is shown in Fig. 8. The corresponding fatigue results are presented in Fig. 9 based upon the best estimate of the impulsive pressure and its doubled value for the 3 m chamber of low alloy, high strength steel.




Fig. 7. Fatigue Life of 3 m Steel Chamber for 200 MJ Yield.




Fig. 9. Fatigue Life of 3 m Steel Chamber for Combined Yields.




Fig. 8. Dynamic Pressure at First Wall for 800 MJ Yield.

Results for unwelded Al 6061-T6 are presented in Fig. 10 for 200 MJ yields and a chamber radius of 3 meters. The unwelded aluminum compares favorably with steel. However, this is not the case for welded Al 6061-T6 as shown by Fig. 11. Achieving the design goal of 15,000 shots for a single vessel at the double pressure would require a very thick wall.




Fig. 10. Fatigue Life of 3 m Unwelded Al Chamber for 200 MJ Yield.




Fig. 11. Fatigue Life of 3 m Welded Al Chamber for 200 MJ Yield.

PARAMETRIC COMPARISONS FOR DIFFERENT CHAMBER SIZES AND YIELDS

Fatigue life calculations were also carried out for various combinations of yield and chamber radius. The relevant dynamic wall pressures as determined by Uesaka and Moses<sup>6</sup> are listed in Table 1. Generally, computations were done for the "best estimate pressure," "double pressure" and the three materials discussed previously. Every combination was not evaluated. In some cases, the material yield stress was exceeded. In others, calculations were not necessary when the design goal was shown to be possible under more severe conditions. For example, since a 3 m steel chamber can sustain the 200 MJ overpressure of 0.64 MPa, it will also be satisfactory for 50 MJ shots which have an overpressure of 0.199 MPa. Additional details and the corresponding fatigue life graphs for these cases can be found in UWFDM-594.<sup>7</sup>

CONCLUSIONS

Results of cumulative damage fatigue stress calculations have been made for proposed TDF cylindrical chambers. These are presented in the form of parametric design curves for low alloy, high strength steel, unwelded and welded Al 6061-T6, covering a range of values for radius, thickness and target yield. It has been shown that the goal of 15,000 ignitions can be met for many chamber designs. For example, with the best estimate for dynamic wall pressure,

Table 1. Peak Dynamic Wall Pressure (MPa)

		Yield		
		50 MJ	200 MJ	800 MJ
Radius	1.5 m	1.17	5.89	5.42
	3.0 m	0.199	0.64	2.96
	6.0 m	0.0668	0.134	0.365

steel chambers with radii of 1.5, 3 and 6 meters can sustain 15,000 shots at 50, 200 or 800 MJ. At the other extreme, design possibilities with welded Al 6061-T6 are more limited. Material yielding is predicted for some cases and a lifetime less than the design goal is the result for others. If necessary, in such cases objectives may be met by developing a more sophisticated wall design, replacing the chamber after its useful lifetime has been attained, or limiting the target yield.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Support for this work has been provided by the U.S. Department of Energy through Sandia National Laboratories.

REFERENCES

1. ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section III, Nuclear Power Plant Components.
2. "Damping Values for Seismic Design of Nuclear Power Plants," Regulatory Guide 1.61, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (1973).
3. J.R. POWELL et al., "Design Studies of an Aluminum First Wall for INTOR," 4th Topical Meeting on the Technology of Controlled Nuclear Fusion (1980).
4. "Suggested Specifications for Structures of Aluminum Alloys 6061-T6 and 6062-T6," Report of Task Committee on Lightweight Alloys, J. Str. Div. ASCE, 88, ST6, 1-95 (1962).
5. G.E. NORDMARK and J.W. CLARK, "Fatigue of Joints in Aluminum Alloy 6061-T6," J. Str. Div. ASCE, 35-50 (1964).
6. M. UESAKA and G.A. MOSES, "Parametric Survey of Microfireball Calculations for the Light Ion Fusion Target Development Facility Design," UWFDM-533, University of Wisconsin Fusion Technology Institute (1983).
7. R.L. ENGELSTAD, E.G. LOVELL and G.A. MOSES, "Fatigue Stress Analysis of the Sandia TDF Reaction Chamber," UWFDM-594, University of Wisconsin Fusion Technology Institute (1984).