

### **SUMMARY**

# PROPERTY DATABASE

DATE: December 2023

This document summarises the properties included in the property database, including properties from both the DIPPR and the DNV property databases. It also includes (where known) a discussion of or reference to the source on non-DIPPR data.

Reference to part of this report which may lead to misinterpretation is not permissible.







Date: December 2023

#### **Prepared by: Digital Solutions at DNV**

© DNV AS. All rights reserved

This publication or parts thereof may not be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including copying or recording, without the prior written consent of DNV AS.



#### <span id="page-2-0"></span>**ABSTRACT**

This document summarises the properties currently included in the property database, including properties from both the DIPPR and the DNV property databases. It also includes (where known) a discussion of or reference to the source on non-DIPPR data.



## Table of contents





### <span id="page-4-0"></span>**1 INTRODUCTION**

This document summarises the properties currently included (and to be added) in the property database, including properties from both the DIPPR and the DNV property databases.

For further information and more details please refer to the XPRP theory manual<sup>1</sup>, the PHAST HELP information and the information included in the DIPPR and DNV property databases (DIPPR\_2018.MDB, DNV.MDB). These properties are combined in the property master database PROPERTY.MDB.

### <span id="page-4-1"></span>**2 DIPPR PROPERTIES**

<span id="page-4-4"></span>This section lists all DIPPR properties in the DIPPR property database DIPPR\_2018.MDB, which are taken directly from the DIPPR 2018 database<sup>2</sup>. These data are listed below.

### <span id="page-4-2"></span>**2.1 Compound descriptors**

The compound descriptors are as follows<sup>i</sup>:

- 1. Names for compound: CAS name, Compound name, iupac name, synonyms
- 2. CAS number, DIPPR id
- 3. Empirical chemical formula, structure (one dimensional representation of the molecule)

### <span id="page-4-3"></span>**2.2 Property constants**

See Sections 2.2 and 2.5 in Reference [2](#page-4-4) for further details. See also the DIPPR section in the PROP theory manual.

- 1. Molecular weight (kg/kmol)
- 2. Phase diagram data (fusion and vaporisation line in pressure/temperature curve): critical temperature (K), critical pressure (Pa), triple point temperature (K), triple point pressure (Pa), melting point at 1atm (K), normal boiling point (K)
- 3. Related data: critical volume (m<sup>3</sup>/kmol), critical compressibility factor (-), enthalpy of fusion at melting point (J/kmol)
- 4. Liquid molar volume at  $25C$  (m<sup>3</sup>/kmol)
- 5. Enthalpy of formation for ideal gas at 25C, gibbs energy of formation for ideal gas at 25C and 1atm
- 6. Absolute entropy of ideal gas at 25C and 1 atm (J/kmol/K)<br>7. Standard state data at 25C and 1 atm: enthalpy of formatic
- Standard state data at 25C and 1atm: enthalpy of formation (J/kmol), Gibbs energy of formation (J/kmol), absolute entropy (J/kmol/K)
- 8. Net standard state enthalpy of combustion at 25C (J/kmol)
- 9. Acentric factor (-)
- 10. radius of gyration (m)
- 11. solubility parameter at 25C  $(J/m^2)^{1/2}$
- 12. dipole moment (c m)
- 13. van der Waals reduced volume ( $m^3/kmol$ ) and area ( $m^2/kmol$ )
- 14. refractive index (-)
- 15. flammable data: flash point (K), lower and upper flammable limit (volume % in air), lower and upper flammable limit temperature (K), auto ignition temperature (K)

Note that in DNV's DIPPR database there are also added data in the database derived from the above data. These are the combustion coefficients  $A_t$ ,  $C_t$  defined by<sup>ii</sup>

$$
A_{t} = \frac{moles\ of\ fuel + moles\ of\ air}{moles\ of\ combustion\ products}, \quad C_{t} = \frac{moles\ of\ fuel}{moles\ of\ fuel + moles\ of\ air}
$$
 (1)

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>i</sup> ADD. Except for CASID, these are at present not made available via DNV's DIPPR database DIPPR.MDB. For future POLF/WHFIRE applications the chemical formula/structure will be required. Note that the latter is now already used in our tools to derive  $A_t,C_t$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>ii</sup> DOC. See the XPRP theory manual on details on how these are derived. Note that further combustion reaction data may be required for the future POLF and WHFIRE models. In the future A<sub>t</sub>, C<sub>t</sub> logic should ideally be moved to XPRP.



### <span id="page-5-0"></span>**2.3 Temperature-dependent properties**

See Sections 2.3 and 2.5 in Reference [2](#page-4-4) for further details. See also the DIPPR section in the PROP theory manual. Temperature-dependent properties are actually stored as a DIPPR equation number and coefficients. For each property are also stored minimum and maximum temperatures for evaluation, and property values at these temperatures.These properties are as follows:

- 1. Densities: solid, liquid (kmol/m<sup>3</sup>) [liquid density is at 1 atm for temperatures below normal boiling point, and at saturation pressure for temperatures above the NBP]
- 2. Vapour pressures: solid for solid-vapour equilibrium, liquid for liquid-vapour equilibrium (Pa)
- 3. Heat of vaporisation (J/kmol)
- 4. Heat capacities: solid, liquid, ideal gas (J/kmol/K) [up to NBP saturated heat capacity (Cs) and heat capacity at constant pressure (Cp) liquid heat capacity
- 5. Second virial coefficient  $(m^3/kmol)$
- 6. Viscosities: liquid, vapour (Pa s)<br>7. Thermal conductivities: solid, liqu
- Thermal conductivities: solid, liquid, vapour (W/m/K)
- 8. Surface tension (N/m)

### <span id="page-5-1"></span>**3 DNV PROPERTIES**

- 1. Flammable/toxic flag:  $-2$  = neither (inert),  $-1$  = toxic,  $0$  = both,  $1$  = flammable
- 2. Flammable data (see e.g. POLF theory manual for details)
	- 2.1. Flame type:  $0 =$ luminous,  $1 =$ smoky,  $2 =$ general
	- 2.2. Maximum Surface Emissive Power (kW/m<sup>2</sup>).
	- 2.3. Emissive power scale length (m)
	- 2.4. Pool fire burn rate length (m)
	- 2.5. Pool fire maximum burn rate (kg/m<sup>2</sup>/s)
- 3. Explosion data
	- 3.1. TNT explosion efficiency (%)
- 4. Toxic data:
	- 4.1. ERPG levels (mole fraction, ppm; Emergency Response Planning Guideline):
		- 4.1.1. ERPG1: Health effects more severe than mild odour perception or irritation, if relevant 4.1.2. ERPG2: Irreversible adverse health effects or symptoms which could impair an individ
			- 4.1.2. ERPG2: Irreversible adverse health effects or symptoms which could impair an individual's ability to take protective action
		- 4.1.3. ERPG3: Life-threatening health effects.
	- 4.2. IDLH concentration (mole fraction, ppm): immediately Dangerous to Life and Health, and the concentration is defined with an exposure time of 30 minutes
	- 4.3. STEL concentration (mole fraction, ppm): Short Term Exposure Limit, and the concentration is defined with an exposure time of 15 minutes.
	- 4.4. Probit equation constants: A,B,N. There are used in the probit function Pr =A + B ln( $C^Nt$ ), which is used to obtain the probability of death; *c* is the concentration in ppm, and *t* is the duration of the exposure in minutes.
	- 4.5. Dangerous toxic load, up to 6 values<sup>3</sup>
- <span id="page-5-2"></span>5. Thermodynamic data
	- 5.1. Equation of state (see XPRP theory manual for further details)
		- 5.1.1. flag for type of equation of state: two term virial, Soave Redlich Kwong, Redlich Kwong, Peng Robinson. Note: this flag is no longer used in the new property system. It has effectively been replaced by the new property system 'templates', which define methods (including EOS) for individual properties.



- 5.1.2. for Soave cubic equation of state, (integer) method flag for treatment of super-critical components (calcuation of  $\alpha$ ). Values are as follows:
	- 1 Mathias correlation:  $N_2$ , CO, CO<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S<br>2 Penn State Equation suggested by Grab
	- 2 Penn State Equation suggested by Graboski and Daubert: H2<br>0 Binary parameter used for binary pair involving the compone
		- Binary parameter used for binary pair involving the component: other chemicals
- 5.2. Reaction/association data:
	- 5.2.1. Reactivity with atmosphere:  $0 = \text{not strongly reactive}$  (no reactions modelled),  $1 = \text{reactive}$ (model reactions using (association reaction otherwise; however not recommended for non-HF),  $2 = HF$  only. This flag is used by the UDM only, to identify HF specific modelling.  $\ddot{m}$
	- 5.2.2. Material produced by reaction<sup>iv</sup>
	- 5.2.3. Association flag<sup>v</sup>:  $1 =$  modelled,  $0 =$  not modelled (not recommended to be modelled for non-HF)
	- 5.2.4. Association coefficients  $A_p$ ,  $B_p$  (dimer, trimer, hexamer, octamer) required for setting the association factor etc.
	- 5.2.5. Enthalpy interpolation range (K)

- 5.3. Aerosol class number (integer): Using multi-component logic, separate immiscible aerosols can form, and this will capture the separation between water and hydrocarbons. The aerosol classes are included below in **Error! Reference source not found.**. these are listed in the following tables
- 6. Water data [used in PVAP model; see PVAP theory manual]:
	- 6.1. Liquid-water surface tension (N/m)
	- 6.2. Solubility in water  $f_s$  (kg/kg)
	- 6.3. Heat of solution  $\Delta H_{sol}$  (J/kg) [used in PVAP model; see PVAP theory manual]
	- 6.4. Reaction with water model:  $0 =$  none,  $1 =$  Raj and Reid
	- 6.5. In case of reaction with water: liquid-water enthalpy coefficients  $A_{L,w}$ ,  $B_{L,w}$ ,  $C_{L,w}$ ,  $D_{L,w}$
	- 6.6. Water heat-transfer coefficient (W/m<sup>2</sup>/K). Used for the transfer of heat to boiling pools on water.

-

iii JUSTIFY. Note that the intermediate option seem never to be used

iv JUSTIFY. This seems to be never used in MDE. Why is this present?

V IMPROVE. This was designed for organic acids (such as acetic acid) as well as for HF, however users will need to specify their own coefficients. Only HF amongst the default materials uses association modelling. It is used in DISC/TVDI discharge models only in the case of HF. Note that hardwired values are used in the HGS HF dispersion modelling. This needs retesting for DISC as part of multi-compound work. See XPRP theory<br>manual for details. Overall association modelling between DISC/TVDI and UDM should



### <span id="page-7-0"></span>**4 SOURCE OF DNV DATA**

This section describes in more detail the origin and derivation (where known) of the values stored in the DNV database.

### <span id="page-7-1"></span>**4.1 Aerosol Class**

Aerosol class is used during dispersion of 2-phase releases, where multiple and immiscible liquid phases can occur. The reader is referred to the THRM Theory manual for further details on the calculations. The following aerosol classes have been adopted in the current version (8.4+) of Phast and Safeti.











#### **Table 1. Aerosol classes for materials in the standard set**

In general, aerosol class has been determined on the basis of polarity, adjusted according to actual solubility in water data. For example if a polar substance is insoluble in water, then we re-classify it as AC = 2. Some adjustment has also been made however for substances miscible with both water and organic solvents<sup>vi, vii, viii.</sup> These include the lighter alcohols. A separate aerosol class  $(AC = 11)$  is used to indicate such materials, and these are replaced at run-time by either non-polar (if the release stream contains any non-polar solvents) or polar (otherwise) values. In addition a special case is made of n-butanol, which despite being polar is not miscible in water<sup>ix</sup> and is therefore assigned to the non-polar class (AC = 2). Note that  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ 

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>vi</sup> e.g. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_water-miscible\\_solvents](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_water-miscible_solvents)

vii [https://www.organicdivision.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/organic\\_solvents.html](https://www.organicdivision.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/organic_solvents.html)

viii <https://www.solubilityofthings.com/water/alcohols>

ix <https://erowid.org/archive/rhodium/pdf/solvent.miscibility.pdf>

[<sup>\(</sup>https://chem.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Organic\\_Chemistry/Supplemental\\_Modules\\_\(Organic\\_Chemistry\)/Fundamentals/Intermolecular\\_Forces/](https://chem.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Organic_Chemistry/Supplemental_Modules_(Organic_Chemistry)/Fundamentals/Intermolecular_Forces/Polar_Protic_and_Aprotic_Solvents) [Polar\\_Protic\\_and\\_Aprotic\\_Solvents\)](https://chem.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Organic_Chemistry/Supplemental_Modules_(Organic_Chemistry)/Fundamentals/Intermolecular_Forces/Polar_Protic_and_Aprotic_Solvents)



is assigned its own aerosol class  $(AC = 3)$  due to its occurrence at atmospheric pressure as a solid rather than liquid.

Real miscibility is complex, and there is some flexibility available to users. Altogether 11 aerosol classes can be used, of which we currently use only 4. Therefore, any materials can be assigned to one of the remaining 7 aerosol classes if it is desired to model different behaviour.

### <span id="page-10-0"></span>**4.2 PVAP material properties for pools on water**

#### 4.2.1 Introduction

[Table](#page-10-1) 2 lists the material properties used in Phast (Risk) and SAFETI-NL for pools on water, including the PVAP module where they are used. These are all non-DIPPR properties. The last two properties i[n](#page-10-1)  [Table](#page-10-1) 2 concern ammonia only, and for this case the properties are obtained from Raj and Reid as described in the PVAP theory manual. For the remaining first four properties limited justification for the original values in Phast 6.54 has been found.



#### <span id="page-10-1"></span>**Table 2. Material properties for pools on water and corresponding PVAP module**

The effect of each of the above first four material properties on the prediction of the evaporation rate by PVAP was briefly tested in this task to obtain a preliminary indication of the sensitivity of the model predictions to the material property. Following a limited literature review regarding selection of appropriate values for the above properties, new values for these material properties have been proposed and implemented in Phast 6.7.

A more detailed literature review can be considered and/or persuading DIPPR to include added properties (including investigation) to their database. Further analysis of the sensitivity of PVAP results with respect to the material properties may be considered to obtain a more complete overall understanding.

The plan of the current section is as follows. In Sectio[n 4.2.2](#page-11-0) the main findings from the brief sensitivity analysis of PVAP results with respect to variations on the material properties are shown and discussed. Section [4.2.3](#page-24-0) lists the main sources consulted on this task which contain databases of material properties. Section [4.2.5](#page-25-0) presents the proposed changes in the values of the material properties stored in the property database for Phast Risk and SAFETI-NL.



### <span id="page-11-0"></span>4.2.2 Limited sensitivity analysis

The impact of the above material properties for pools on water on the evaporation rate predicted by PVAP was briefly investigated and the results of this are presented in this section.

[Figure](#page-11-1) 1 shows the effect on the maximum evaporation rate predicted by PVAP of a 50% increase on the material properties.

In

[Figure](#page-11-1) 1 the effect of the interfacial tension on the evaporation rate was analysed for a release of 1 ton of noctane at 298 K and a wind speed of 5 m/s. To analyse the impact of the heat of solution and the solubility factor, an instantaneous release of 1 ton of methanol at 298 K and a wind speed of 5 m/s was simulated. The sensitivity of the evaporation rate with respect to the heat transfer coefficient was investigated for an instantaneous release of 1 ton of n-pentane at 298 K and a wind speed of 5 m/s.



#### <span id="page-11-1"></span>**Figure 1. Comparison of the effect on the maximum evaporation rate predicted by PVAP of a 50% increase on the material properties.**

The effect of the material properties on the variation of the evaporation rate with time was also investigated. These results are shown in the figures below.























#### INTERFACIAL TENSION

The liquid-water interfacial surface tension  $\sigma_{Lw}$  (N/m) is used in the last viscous surface-tension regime for instantaneous spills on water. The start time of this regime is

$$
t_2 = (K_{20})^2 \left(\frac{M_{pool}^2(0)g \mu_w \Delta}{\rho_w \rho_L^2}\right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{\rho_w}{2\sigma}\right)
$$
 (2)

and the pool radius r(t) versus time t during this regime is given by

$$
r(t) = \left(\frac{4\sigma^2}{\rho_w \mu_w}\right)^{1/4} t^{3/4}
$$
 (3)

Here  $\sigma = \sigma_{wa} - \sigma_{La} - \sigma_{Lw}$  is the net surface tension (N/m), with  $\sigma_{wa}$ ,  $\sigma_{La}$ ,  $\sigma_{La}$  being the surface tension of water-air, liquid-air, liquid, water, respectively

See PVAP theory manual for details including notation, etc. It is seen that with increasing values of  $\sigma_{Lw}$ ,  $\sigma$ decreases, the viscous surface-time regime start later and the pool radius increases less.

The interfacial tension was found to have very little impact on the predicted evaporation rate, as in practice with the minimum thickness criterion implemented in this model the viscous surface tension regime is not encountered (see PVAP theory manual for details). For the example of an instantaneous release of 1 ton of noctane (shown in figure 1) the transition to the viscous-surface tension regime would take place at 800 s and the pool dimensions at that time would be 27.6 m radius and  $6.10^{-4}$  m height. For water surfaces the minimum thickness is  $1.10<sup>-3</sup>$  m, which indicates that the pool stops spreading before the viscous-surface tension regime is reached.

#### HEAT OF SOLUTION

The heat of solution of the material in water,  $\Delta H_{sol}$  (J/kg) is used in evaluation of the heat flow rate from dissolution,  $Q_{sol}$  (W)

<span id="page-14-0"></span>
$$
Q_{sol} = \Delta H_{sol} E_{sol}(t) \tag{4}
$$

Returning t[o](#page-11-1) 

[Figure](#page-11-1) 1 it can be seen that the property which has the major effect on PVAP results for the evaporation rate is the heat of solution. An increase on the heat of solution causes an increase on the net heat flux entering the pool, consequently rising the pool temperature and the evaporation rate.

[Figure 6](#page-15-0) t[o Figure 9](#page-17-0) show the variation of the maximum evaporation rate with the heat of solution for continuous and instantaneous releases of different masses of methanol at 293 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s. These figures also highlights two different values for the heat of solution, i.e. 2E4 J/kg (adopted in 6.54 and 6.7; corresponding to value from Cameo database) and 2.62E5 J/kg (corresponding to value from Critical Tables). For small values of the heat of solution,  $Q_{sol}$  is relatively smaller compared to the other heat terms and therefore the change in evaporation rate is very small. For large values  $Q_{sol}$  will become dominant, and therefore the evaporation rate will increase rapidly. This is confirmed by

[Figure](#page-15-2) 7,

[Figure](#page-16-0) 8 and

[Figure](#page-16-1) 9, where it is seen that the maximum evaporation rate hardly changes for values less than  $10^5$  J/kg, and increases rapidly for values larger than  $10<sup>5</sup>$  J/kg.

Therefore, from this sensitivity analysis it is not possible to establish a default conservative value for the heat of solution of soluble chemicals and accurate values for the heat of solution are required.

[Figure](#page-15-1) 6,





<span id="page-15-1"></span><span id="page-15-0"></span>**Figure 6. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the heat of solution for an instantaneous spill of 100,000 kg of methanol at 298 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**



<span id="page-15-2"></span>**Figure 7. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the heat of solution for an instantaneous spill of 10,000 kg of methanol at 298 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**





<span id="page-16-0"></span>**Figure 8. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the heat of solution for a continuous spill of 10,000 kg/s of methanol at 298 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**

<span id="page-16-1"></span>



#### <span id="page-17-0"></span>**Figure 9. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the heat of solution for a continuous spill of 1,000 kg/s of methanol at 298 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**

#### SOLUBILITY FACTOR

The mass solubility in water,  $f_s$  (kg/kg) is used in PVAP to evaluate the molar solubility  $w_s$ , which is used to calculate the rate of dissolution of material of liquid pool into water,  $E_{sol}$  [kg/s]. Relevant PVAP theory equations are as follows:

$$
E_{sol}(t) = 10\pi r^2 U_W^* \rho_W D a^* \ln\left(\frac{1 - w_{infinity}}{1 - w_s}\right)
$$
 (5)

$$
w_s = \frac{f_s}{1 + f_s} \tag{6}
$$

It is seen from the above equations that  $E_{sol}(t)$  increases with increasing molar solubility w<sub>s</sub>, and therefore it increases with increasing mass solubility fs.

According to Equation [\( 4](#page-14-0) ) increased solubility leads to increased heat of solution and therefore increased pool temperature and therefore increased pool evaporation rate. Thus one the one hand increased solubility reduces the pool evaporation rate (because of solution in water), while on the other hand it increases the evaporation rate (because of increased heat of solution).

[Figure](#page-11-1) 1 confirms that the maximum evaporation rate showed a slight decrease when the solubility factor increases. The higher the solubility factor is, the higher the rate at which the pool losses mass from dissolution; this reduces the spreading rate of the pool and consequently its evaporation rate.

[Figure 10](#page-18-0) t[o Figure](#page-19-0) 13 show the variation of the maximum evaporation rate with the solubility factor for continuous and instantaneous releases of different masses of ethanol at 293 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s. The old and proposed new values for the solubility factor of ethanol are also highlighted in the figures.

Fro[m Figure 10](#page-18-0) to [Figure](#page-19-0) 13 it is also observed that for solubility values less than  $10^{-3}$  the maximum evaporation rate is not visibly impacted by variations on the solubility factor. At solubility values between  $10^{-3}$ and 1 the maximum evaporation rate decreases rapidly with respect to the solubility factor. This behaviour is more pronounced for continuous spills [\(](#page-19-1)

[Figure](#page-19-1) 12 and [Figure 13\)](#page-19-0) than for instantaneous releases [\(Figure 10](#page-18-0) an[d Figure 11\)](#page-18-1). For both continuous and instantaneous releases the maximum evaporation rate decreases at a slower rate for solubility factors greater than 1 or 3, and eventually will converge to a lower limit as may be observed in figure 2. A value of the solubility factor of 1 is currently selected in cases when the literature flags a material as very soluble without giving a specific value. For highly soluble chemicals, the actual value may be higher.





**Solubility factor (kg/kg)**

<span id="page-18-0"></span>**Figure 10. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the solubility factor for an instantaneous spill of 100,000 kg of ethanol at 298 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**



<span id="page-18-1"></span>**Figure 11. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the solubility factor for an instantaneous spill of 10,000 kg of ethanol at 298 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**





<span id="page-19-1"></span>**Figure 12. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the solubility factor for a continuous spill of 10,000 kg/s of ethanol at 298 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**



<span id="page-19-0"></span>



[Figure](#page-20-0) 14 to [Figure 17](#page-22-0) show the variation of the maximum evaporation rate with the solubility factor for continuous and instantaneous releases of different masses of ammonia at 239K (just below boiling point) and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s. The old and proposed new values for the solubility factor of ammonia are also highlighted in the figures. For the instantaneous cases the new values of maximum evaporation rate are about 15% larger than the old values, while for the continuous cases they are around 60% larger.



<span id="page-20-0"></span>**Figure 14. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the solubility factor for an instantaneous spill of 100,000 kg of ammonia at 239 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**















#### <span id="page-22-0"></span>**Figure 17. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the solubility factor for a continuous spill of 1,000 kg/s of ammonia at 239 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**

#### **HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT**

The heat transfer coefficient  $h_s$  W/m<sup>2</sup>K, is used to calculate the heat conduction  $Q_{cond}$  (W) from water to the pool, in case of no ice formation. The relevant PVAP theory equation is as follows:

$$
Q_{cond} = h_s \pi r^2 (T_{surf} - T_{pool})
$$
 (7)

Returning t[o](#page-11-1) 

[Figure](#page-11-1) 1, when the heat transfer coefficient is increased the maximum evaporation rate also increases. Higher heat transfer coefficients increase the net heat flux into the pool, causing the pool temperature and consequently the evaporation rate to rise.

[Figure](#page-23-0) 18 t[o Figure](#page-24-1) 21 show the variation of the maximum evaporation rate with the heat transfer coefficient for continuous and instantaneous releases of different masses of propane at 231 K with a wind speed of 0.1 m/s and a surface temperature of 293 K. The old and proposed new values for the heat transfer coefficient of propane are also highlighted in the figures.

For the case of instantaneous propane spills [\(Figure 18](#page-23-1) an[d](#page-23-2)  [Figure 19\)](#page-23-2) it is observed that the maximum evaporation rate continuously increases with the heat transfer coefficient. On the other hand, for continuous propane spills [\(](#page-24-2)

[Figure](#page-24-2) 20 and [Figure 21\)](#page-24-1) it is observed that values for the heat transfer coefficient greater than 500 W/m<sup>2</sup>K have little effect on the maximum predicted evaporation rate. Thus, in case of missing data from the literature, a default value of 500 W/m<sup>2</sup>K for the heat transfer coefficient is suggested, bearing in mind this is a mostly conservative estimate for continuous spills, but it may not be conservative for instantaneous cases.





<span id="page-23-1"></span><span id="page-23-0"></span>**Figure 18. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the heat transfer coefficient for an instantaneous spill of 100,000 kg of propane at 231 K with a surface temperature of 293 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**



<span id="page-23-2"></span>**Figure 19. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the heat transfer coefficient for an instantaneous spill of 10,000 kg of propane at 231 K with a surface temperature of 293 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height**





<span id="page-24-2"></span>**Figure 20. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the heat transfer coefficient for a continuous spill of 10,000 kg/s of propane at 231 K with a surface temperature of 293 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height**



<span id="page-24-1"></span><span id="page-24-0"></span>**Figure 21. Variation of the maximum evaporation rate against the heat transfer coefficient for a continuous spill of 1,000 kg/s of propane at 231 K, with a surface temperature of 293 K and a wind speed of 0.1 m/s at 10 m height.**

<span id="page-25-15"></span><span id="page-25-11"></span><span id="page-25-10"></span>

### 4.2.4 List of literature sources

A list of the sources referred to in the literature review for improved material properties for pools on water is presented next. Some material properties currently in version 6.54 of SAFETI-NL and version 6.6 of Phast (Risk) use data from some of these references. This is indicated in the list below:

#### INTERFACIAL TENSION (N/m):

- <span id="page-25-13"></span><span id="page-25-12"></span><span id="page-25-3"></span>• Demond and Lindner (1993)<sup>4</sup>. Provides a database for interfacial tension measurements of 67 organic chemicals at temperatures ranging from 20 to 25  $\degree$ C.
- <span id="page-25-1"></span>• International Critical Tables (1928)<sup>5</sup>. Provides a large database of interfacial tension measurements for organic chemicals.
- <span id="page-25-5"></span>• Dodge et al. (1983)<sup>6</sup>. Includes data for the interfacial tension of relevant chemicals at  $20 - 25$  °C. Phast 6.6 is using this as the reference for the material property of some chemicals.
- <span id="page-25-16"></span><span id="page-25-2"></span>• Cameo  $(2011)^7$ . This appears to be the most up-to-date and trustworthy database with the most comprehensive set of values.

#### HEAT OF SOLUTION (J/kg or J/kmol):

- International Critical Tables (1928[\)](#page-25-1)<sup>5</sup>. Provides a large database of values for the heat of solution of organic chemicals
- <span id="page-25-9"></span><span id="page-25-8"></span>• Cameo (2011)<sup>7</sup>[.](#page-25-2) This appears to be the most up-to-date and trustworthy database with the most comprehensive set of values.

#### SOLUBILITY FACTOR (kg/kg or kmol/kmol):

- <span id="page-25-14"></span>• Dodge et al. (1983)<sup>8</sup>. Provides a database for solubility factor of 20 chemicals in water. Phast 6.6 is using Dodge et al. (1983) as the reference for the material property of some chemicals.
- Demond and Lindner (1993[\)](#page-25-3)<sup>4</sup>. Provides a comprehensive database of molar solubility (kmol/kmol) of 67 organic chemicals in water at temperatures between 20 °C and 25°C.
- <span id="page-25-6"></span>• IUPAC-NIST Solubility Database<sup>9</sup>. Is an online database which contains solubility measurements of about 1800 chemical substances with literature references. Typical solvents and solutes include water, sea water, heavy water, inorganic and organic chemicals.
- Cameo (2011[\)](#page-25-2)<sup>7</sup>. For most chemicals in this database the solubility is given at 20C (68F). For those chemicals for which the solubility was given as a function of the temperature (e.g. diethylether), the value of solubility was selected at 20C. Note that for some chemicals the solubility may be significantly dependent on the temperature.
- <span id="page-25-7"></span>Serida (1998)<sup>10</sup>. This RIVM database is no longer kept up to date, and contains some values of solubilities largely based on 'Chemiekaarten'. However some values were not found to be trustworthy and therefore Cameo values have been selected if present.

#### HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT WITH WATER (W/m<sup>2</sup>K):

- <span id="page-25-4"></span>Webber (1990)<sup>11</sup>. Proposes a value of 500 W/m<sup>2</sup>K taken from Reid and Smith (1978)<sup>12</sup> n-butane experiments.
- Woodward (1990)<sup>13</sup>. Proposes a rule of thumb  $h_{s} = 0.001 \Delta H_{v}$  based on cryogenic liquid tests; where,  $h_s$  is the heat transfer coefficient with water and,  $\Box H_v$  is the latent heat of vaporisation. According to Woodward (private communication) this rule of thumb has now been superseded by the reference below.
- Woodward and Pitblado (2010)<sup>14</sup> Provides a limited list of heat transfer coefficients of pure chemicals (nitrogen, methane, ethylene, ethane, propane and n-butane) and LNG mixtures. The heat transfer coefficient is quoted to be obtained as the heat flux divided by the temperature difference between water (assumed at 10C) and the normal boiling point. The quoted value in this book for n-butane based on Reid and Smith (1978)<sup>[12](#page-25-4)</sup> was found to be incorrect while the above value quoted by Webber appears to be correct.

### <span id="page-25-0"></span>4.2.5 Proposed changes in values

In [Table 3](#page-33-0) the old and proposed new values for the material properties for pools on water are shown. New values are shown only when they differ from the old values and/or when a value has been found from the



literature. An 'undefined' value of -9.95E36 refers to a material property for which no value is included in the DNV database, and for which the user himself needs to define a value.

The chemicals listed in the table are classified as standard and non-standard compounds. All chemicals indicated by an "x" in the "NL" column in [Table 3](#page-33-0) are included in the 6.54/6.7 SAFETI-NL material property database. The other chemicals, indicated by blanks in the "NL" column, are less frequently consulted and users are often prompted to supply missing material properties for these compounds.

The data in the table have been colour-coded according to the following legend:

- *Orange values*: are set in DNV database and no reference was found for them; no change will be applied.
- *Red values*: are new values found with expected significant differences; here, approximately more than 1% variation is considered significant but the actual variation has not been checked (to follow from sensitivity analysis)
- White values in the new data column: are new values for which no significant difference in the results is expected.
- *Bold values*: are the best choices amongst different new values, chosen because they are either the conservative assumption or come from a more trustworthy reference. Where multiple references are found, Dodge et al. (1983[\)](#page-25-5)<sup>6</sup> has been perceived as a less trustworthy reference since it does not include a justification/r[e](#page-25-6)ference for the values of the material properties. Since the IUPAC-NIST Solubility Database<sup>9</sup> is a more recent source (2006[\)](#page-25-3) than Demond and Lindner (1993)<sup>4</sup>, values of the IUPAC-NIST Solubility Database have been adopted when values are found in both references. Furthermore whenever interfactial t[e](#page-25-2)nsion or solubility data (heat of solution or solubility) are given by the Cameo database<sup>7</sup> they are selected. Finally in case no solubility is provided by the Cameo database, the SERIDA $10$  value has been selected if available.

#### Interfacial tension (N/m)**:**

From the sensitivity analysis it was found that the viscous-surface tension spreading regime is rarely encountered in pools on water. The new data found for the interfacial tension of several chemicals is shown as "white values" in **[Table 3](#page-33-0)**, as no significant impact on the results is expected.

Values indicated in the Cameo database as 'Not pertinent' are interpreted with zero values, and this was found not to lead to inconsistent values with the other literature. Moreover applying zero values is conservative.

#### Heat of solution (J/kg)**:**

This property is used in the calculation of heat losses due to dissolution of the material in water. Values for this property are only present in chemicals with positive values for the solubility factor f<sub>s</sub> (kg/kg).

Values indicated in the Cameo database as 'Not pertinent' are interpreted with zero values, and this was found not to lead to inconsistent values with the other literature.

For a limited number of chemicals (n-butanol, methylamine, 3-chloro1-propene, nitric acid, arsine, phosphine) the Cameo database indicates that the material is soluble but a value of the heat of solution is listed as not being available. It has therefore been decided not to change the heat of solution and solubility for these chemicals, and to wait until we have complete values and therefore justification for the change. Thus this applies a zero solubility for all chemicals except methylamine, n-butanol, methylamine, 3-chloro1-propene, nitric acid, arsine, phosphine.

#### Solubility factor (kg/kg):

Default zero values for the solubility factor are the conservative assumption as the sensitivity analysis showed that lower solubility factors produce higher evaporation rates..

The Cameo database indicates 'insoluble', which has also been interpreted as not soluble (zero solubility factor).

Except acrylamide, Cameo lists no values of solubility larger than 0.4 kg/kg, and thus it appears to be that in Cameo chemicals are set as 'very soluble (miscible)' if the solubility is larger than this value. Serida marks a chemical as 'very soluble' in case the solubility is larger than 0.1 kg/kg. A value of the solubility factor of 1 kg/kg is currently selected in case the material is known to be very soluble but a specific value of solubility is not given in the Cameo or Serida database. In Phast 6.6 a less conservative value of 5 kg/kg instead of 1 kg/kg was adopted in this case. Ideally a further reliable reference would be found with more precise values of solubilities for 'very soluble' materials. Quite a large number of chemicals have become fully soluble in 6.7.



For a limited number of chemicals (phosgene, methyl isocyanate, fluorione, nitric oxide) the Cameo database indicates that the chemical reacts with water. Note that this reaction is not modelled currently by the PVAP model. For all these cases the Serida value has been selected as the solubility factor.

#### Heat transfer coefficient (W/m<sup>2</sup>K)**:**

Default values of 500 W/m<sup>2</sup>K are close to the new data found for various chemicals, with the exception of the new data for liquid hydrogen.

Additionally, the sensitivity analysis showed that for continuous releases increasing values beyond 500 W/m<sup>2</sup>K for the heat transfer coefficient have little effect on the prediction of the maximum evaporation rate. However, this is not the case for instantaneous releases for which a heat transfer coefficient of 500 W/m<sup>2</sup>/K may be an un-conservative estimate.



















								Reacts <sup>1</sup>			(Cameo - Reacts in water)
630080	Carbon monoxide	X	0.05	0 <sup>f</sup>	$\mathbf{0}$	$0^{\text{f}}$	$\Omega$	$4E-05$	500		Solubility at 0C
1333740	Hydrogen	$\mathsf{x}$	0.05	$\Omega_{\rm t}$	$\Omega$	0 <sup>f</sup>	$\Omega$	$0^{\text{f}}$	500	194 <sup>e</sup> 159 <sup>e</sup> 123 <sup>e</sup>	Highest value chosen for the heat transfer coefficient as the most conservative. Lower Evap.
7446095	Sulfur dioxide	X	0.05	$0^{\text{f}}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$2.19E + 05$ <sup>f</sup>	1.00E-01	$1.00E-01$ <sup>f</sup> $1.05E-019$	500		Different E <sub>vap</sub> . Solubility at 20C.
7647010	Hydrogen chloride	X	0.05	$0^{\text{f}}$	$2.06E + 06$	$2.06E + 06$	5	7.2E-01 <sup>9</sup> 1	500		Lower E <sub>vap</sub>
7664393	Hydrogen fluoride	$\pmb{\mathsf{X}}$	0.05	0 <sup>f</sup>	3.076E+06	3.076E+06 <sup>f</sup>	5		500		Lower E <sub>vap</sub>
7664417	Ammonia	$\pmb{\mathsf{x}}$	0.05	$\Omega$ <sup>f</sup>	$5.40E + 05$	$5.40E + 05$ <sup>f</sup>	5	0.539	200		Lower E <sub>vap</sub>
7697372	Nitric acid		$\mathbf 0$		$\mathbf{0}$		$\Omega$	0 19	500		<b>CAMEO: Missing CHRIS Code, soluble</b> chemical, uncertainty on pool temperature estimation; original solubility value maintained
7722841	Hydrogen peroxide		$\mathbf 0$	0 <sup>f</sup>	$\mathbf 0$	$4.69E + 04$ <sup>t</sup>	$\mathbf{0}$		500		Different Evan
7726956	<b>Bromine</b>	$\mathsf{x}$	$\Omega$	N/Avail <sup>f</sup>	$\Omega$	0 <sup>f</sup>	$\Omega$	3.50E-02f 3.58E-02 <sup>9</sup>	500		Lower E <sub>vap</sub> . Solubility at 25C.
7727379	Nitrogen	x	0.05	$0^{\text{f}}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$0^{\text{f}}$	$\mathbf 0$	$0^{\dagger}$	500		Liquid nitrogen
7732185	Water <sup>x</sup>	$\mathsf{x}$	0.05		$\Omega$		$\Omega$		500		Old interface tension water in water?? <b>CAMEO: Missing CHRIS Code</b>
7782414	Fluorine	x	$\mathbf 0$	0 <sup>f</sup>	$\mathbf{0}$	0 <sup>f</sup>	$\mathbf{0}$	0 <sup>a</sup> Reacts <sup>f</sup>	500		<b>Use Serida solubility</b> (Cameo - Reacts in water)
7782447	Oxygen	X	0.05	O <sup>f</sup>	$\Omega$	0 <sup>f</sup>	$\Omega$	0 <sup>f</sup> $1E-05^9$	500		
7782505	Chlorine	$\mathsf{x}$	0.05	$0^{\text{f}}$	$\Omega$	$0^{\text{f}}$	6.50E-03	$6.50E - 03$ 7E-03 <sup>9</sup>	500		Solubility at 25C.
<b>CAS</b>	<b>Material name</b>	<b>NL</b>	Interfacial tension (N/m)		Heat of solution (J/kg)		Solubility in water (kg/kg)		<b>Heat transfer</b> coefficient (W/m <sup>2</sup> K)		<b>Comments</b>
7783064	Hydrogen sulfide	$\mathsf{x}$	0.05	N/Avail <sup>f</sup>	$\Omega$	0 <sup>f</sup>	$\Omega$	0 <sup>f</sup> 6E-03 <sup>9</sup>	500		
7784421	Arsine		$\overline{0}$		$\Omega$		$\mathbf 0$	0 7E-04 <sup>9</sup>	500		CAMEO: Missing CHRIS Code; ; soluble chemical, uncertainty on pool temperature estimation; original solubility value maintained

x For water, usage of the current properties for pools on water may make little sense. We have however not modified these data, but we would normally not expect that the user would attempt to model a 'water' pool on water. mixtures on water, which contain a fraction of water. This may be considered as part of future work.

1





**Table 3. Material properties for pools on water**

<sup>a</sup> Values taken from International Critical Tables (1928[\)](#page-25-10)<sup>5</sup>

**b** Values taken from Demond and Lindner (1993[\)](#page-25-11)<sup>4</sup>

**<sup>c</sup>** Values taken from Dodge et al. (1983) [8](#page-25-12)

<sup>d</sup> Values taken from IUPAC-NIST Solubility database (2006[\)](#page-25-13)<sup>9</sup>

<sup>e</sup> Values taken from Woodward and Pitblado (2010)<sup>[14](#page-25-14)</sup>

**<sup>f</sup>** Values taken from Cameo (2011[\)](#page-25-15)<sup>7</sup>

<span id="page-33-0"></span><sup>g</sup> Values taken from SERIDA (1998)<sup>[10](#page-25-16)</sup>



### <span id="page-34-0"></span>**4.3 Pool fire flammable material properties**

The pool fire data are as follows (see POLF theory manual for details):

- Flame type:  $0 =$ luminous,  $1 =$ smoky,  $2 =$ general
- Maximum Surface Emissive Power (kW/m<sup>2</sup>), E<sub>max</sub>.
- Emissive power scale length  $(m)$ ,  $L_s$
- Pool fire burn rate length  $(m)$ ,  $L_b$
- <span id="page-34-1"></span>Pool fire maximum burn rate (kg/m<sup>2</sup>/s),  $M_{max}$  (if defined)

The correctness of the above data was reviewed against available data from the literature (Lees<sup>xvi</sup>, the TNO Yellow Book<sup>xvii</sup>, Rew et al.<sup>xviii</sup>, and the SFPE Handbook of fire Protection Engineering<sup>[xix](#page-36-0)</sup>, [xxi](#page-38-0).

#### 4.3.1 Burn rate

For a pool fire on land the maximum burn rate  $(kg/m^2/s)$  is taken from the material database if defined. Otherwise it is calculated as:

<span id="page-34-4"></span>
$$
m_{\text{max}} = 1.27 * 10^{-6} \rho_L \frac{\Delta H_c}{\Delta H_v^*}
$$
, general (flame type = 2)

$$
m_{\text{max}} = 10^{-3} \frac{\Delta H_c}{\Delta H_v}
$$
, hydrocarbon (flame type = 0 or 1)

With the modified heat of evaporation given by

<span id="page-34-3"></span><span id="page-34-2"></span>
$$
\Delta H_{\nu}^* = \Delta H_{\nu} + C_{pL}(T_b) \max\{0, T_b - T_a\}
$$
 (9)

The general formula in Equation (2) is derived by multiplying the burning velocity  $y_{max}(m/s)$  given by Equation (3) in Mudan with the liquid density  $\rho_L$  (kg/m<sup>3</sup>). The second formula in Equation (2) follows from the general formula by using the typical density ρ<sub>L</sub> = 787 kg/m<sup>3</sup>. It is quoted by Mudan<sup>[xxi](#page-38-0)</sup> that the latter formula covers a wide range of hydrocarbon fuels, including liquefied gases (LNG and LPG).

For a pool fire on water the burn rate is multiplied with a factor of 2.5, if the normal boiling temperature is less than the ambient temperature. This is because considerable heat transfer takes places between the large body of water and the pool of liquefied gas. The factor of 2.5 is in line with Mudan and Croce<sup>[xxi](#page-38-0)</sup>, who quote a factor of nearly three for LNG and two for LPG.



| Summary | Property Database version 8.5 |





<span id="page-35-0"></span>**Table 4. Fuel data for maximum burn rate and inverse of characteristic burn length**



The actual burn rate is set as

<span id="page-36-0"></span>
$$
m = m_{\text{max}} \left[ 1 - e^{-\frac{D}{L_b}} \right]
$$
 (10)

[Table 4](#page-35-0) contains a list of published data for pool fire maximum burn rate (i.e. *mmax*) and the inverse of the pool fire characteristic burn length (i.e. *L -1 b* ) for a number of flammable compounds. These data are taken from Babrouskas (SFPE Handbook)<sup>xix</sup> and Rew et al.<sup>[xviii](#page-34-1)</sup>.

The maximum burn rate length  $L<sub>b</sub>$  for methane, ethane, propane equals 7.25m, 6.41m, 2m and these are in line with the above data for Rew et al.

For the following materials modified values are proposed for 6.6 in line with most conservative estimates from the literature:

- butane: change LB from 0.1 m to 0.35 m (Rew quotes 1.17m, SPFE handbook 0.37 m)
- pentane: change LB from 5.0m to 0.1m (conservative value, since no data found from the literature)
- hexane: change LB from 5.0m to 0.5m (Rew quotes 0.72m, SFPE handbook 0.53m)
- heptane: change LB from 10.0m to 0.7m (Rew quotes 0.72m, SFPE handbook 0.9m)
- octane: change LB from 10.0m to 0.7m (Rew quotes 0.72m, no value in SFPE handbook)
- xylene: change LB from 0.1m to 0.7 m (both Rew and SFPE quote 0.7m)

For all other chemicals the value is either 0.1m (luminous or smoke fires) or 0 (general fires), which is confirmed to be a conservative value from [Table 4.](#page-35-0)

Pritchard and Binding<sup>xx</sup> refer to validation for hydrocarbon pool fires. Their proposed values together with ours are included in the table below. Note that our values are virtually identical for both  $m_{max}$  and  $L_b$ .



#### <span id="page-36-1"></span>**Table 5. Comparison of pool fire data by PHAST6.51 and Pritchard and Binding (PB)**

The maximum burn rate calculation is shown in [Table 6](#page-37-0) for all flammable materials available in the DNV database, along with data from the literature. It is seen that the maximum burn rate is currently specified for methane, ethane, propane and butane only, and, these data are in line with the above data from the SPFE handbook (Babrouskas). For all other chemicals the maximum burn rate is calculated according to Equation [\( 8](#page-34-2) ). Overall the data are in line with the literature and/or they are conservative.

For hydrogen the general formula produces a maximum burn rate of 0.024 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/s, which is considerably smaller than the values of 0.161-0.169 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/s from Lees/YB and Rew, but larger than 0.017 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/s from the SFPE Handbook.





data derived in SAFETI-NL by "calculate" material property

calculated data by spreadsheet

### <span id="page-37-0"></span>Table 6. Comparison of literature against SAFETI maximum burn rate calculation



#### 4.3.2 Surface emissive power

The surface emissive power of the flame  $(W/m^2)$  is set as

<span id="page-38-1"></span>
$$
E_{f} = E_{m} \left[ 1 - e^{-\frac{D}{L_{s}}}\right],
$$
 luminous fires (flame type = 0)  

$$
= E_{m} \left[ e^{-\frac{D}{L_{s}}}\right] + E_{s} \left[ 1 - e^{-\frac{D}{L_{s}}}\right]
$$
sooty fires (flame type = 1)  

$$
= \frac{\chi_{R}m \Delta H_{c}}{\left[ 1 + 4\frac{H}{D} \right]},
$$
 (11)

where  $E_m$  is the maximum emissive power for luminous fires,  $E_s$  the smoke emissive power, and  $L_s$  a characteristic length for decay of E<sub>f</sub>. If experimental data are not available, the above equation for a 'general fire' is used. This equation is derived from the definition of the radiative fraction  $\chi_R$ ;  $\chi_R$  is the ratio of the total energy radiated (from the fire surface) to the total energy released (from the pool area):

$$
\chi_R = \frac{radiated\ energy}{releaseed\ energy} = \frac{(flame\ surface)*\ (surface\ emission) }{(burn\ rate)*\ (pool\ area)*(heat\ of\ combustion)}
$$

$$
= \frac{\left[\frac{1}{4}\pi D^2 + \pi \ D \ H\right] E_f}{m\left[\frac{1}{4}\pi D^2\right] \Delta H_c} = \frac{\left[1 + 4\frac{H}{D}\right] E_f}{m \Delta H_c}
$$
(12)

[Table 7](#page-40-0) includes results for SAFETI calculations of the surface emissive power, including a comparison against data from the Yellow Book. Results are included using both the former 6.51 properties, as well as the new proposed 6.6 SAFETI properties. Note that the Yellow Book data appear to be based on the above "general formula" (flame type = 2).

SAFETI 6.51 applies  $L_s = 6.75$  m for methane [which is in line with the experimental value quoted by Pritchard and Binding; see [Table 5\]](#page-36-1) and L<sub>s</sub> = 2.75m for all other luminous flammable chemicals. It applies  $E_m = 220$  kW/m<sup>2</sup> for methane, 160 kW/m<sup>2</sup> for propane, and the value of 170 kW/m<sup>2</sup> for all other chemicals. According to the Yellow Book the radiative fraction is typically in the range 0.15-0.4. It is seen that the calculated SEP is typically conservative except for perhaps hydrogen (always) and methane/ethane/propane/butane (for small diameters). Moreover for several chemicals the radiative fraction is larger than one, which is unrealistic. Therefore for several chemicals the predicted SEP values appear to be larger than most of those in the Yellow Book.

To overcome the above problem, all chemicals modelled 'luminous' in SAFETI 6.51 (except for methane, ethane, propane, butane), are now proposed to be modelled in the new SAFETI as general with  $L_b=0$  (i.e. always apply maximum burn rate). Furthermore the radiation fraction of  $\chi_R$  =0.4 is now applied instead of the former values of  $\chi_R$  =0.35. It is seen from Table [7](#page-40-0) that this leads to considerably more realistic predictions.

For methane, ethane, propane, butane, the SEP at diameter D=1 appears to be rather small. However in the POLF validation, the radiation predictions for methane appeared to be accurate (e.g. for experiments by Johnson where small pool fire diameters were included). As a result at this stage no changes are proposed. However, following further data and investigation these data may be considered to be updated.

#### Smoky fires

l

<span id="page-38-0"></span>The adopted formula in equation (11) for smoky fires agrees with formula (6.19) in the Yellow Book<sup>[xvii](#page-34-3)</sup> and Mudan and Croce<sup>xxi</sup>, and in line with these references it applies the maximum emissive power  $E_m = 140 \text{ kW/m}^2$ , the smoke emissive power E<sub>s</sub> = 20 kW/m<sup>2</sup>, and the emissive power scale length L<sub>s</sub>=8.33m (corresponding to L<sub>s</sub>-1=0.12m<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>11</sup>. Mudan derived

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> For 6.6 it is proposed to set  $L_s = 8.33$  also for Xylene to be in line with all other chemicals (6.51 value = 2.75m).



this correlation using data from gasoline, kerosene and JP-5. This formula corresponds to a reduced SEP for larger pool fire diameters. This is in conflict with Table 6.8 in the Yellow Book, where the SEP increases with large pool fire diameters for hexane, benzene, vinyl acetate and methyl bromide. However the latter Table is derived using the general formula for SEP (with 0.35 as radiative fraction), and this seems not to be correct for smoky fires.

Mudan quotes that for large hydrocarbon fires with a carbon-to-hydrogen ratio greater than about 0.3, a substantial part of the fire is obscured by a thick black smoke on the outer periphery. Using this criterion e.g. butane should be modelled as a smoky fire. It is however proposed for 6.6 to maintain modelling butane as a luminous fire, since quoted maximum value of SEP by Pritchard and Binding is 225 kW/m<sup>2</sup> while the smoky fire criterion would give a maximum of 140 kW/m<sup>2</sup> only.

For 6.6 it is proposed to model a fire as a smoky fire only if they have five or more hydrocarbon atoms. Thus vinylacetate, n-butanol, isobutanol and methylbromide are proposed to be modelled as a "general" fire instead of a "smoky" fire. Note that this also avoids unrealistic high radiative fraction for these chemicals.

Finally it is noted that the maximum surface emissive power of  $E_m = 140$  kW/m<sup>2</sup> and the smoke emissive power  $E_s = 20$ kW/m<sup>2</sup> may only be applicable to smoky hydrocarbon fires without an additional functional group. For other chemicals (such as e.g. benzylchloride) other values may be appropriate.





 $\overline{a}$ 

<span id="page-40-0"></span>**Table 7. Comparison of literature against SAFETI surface emissive power calculation<sup>12</sup>**

Summary | Property Database| Page 37 November 2012 12:00 November 2012 12:00 November 2012 12:00 November 2012 <sup>12</sup> Cyclohexane has been modified in Phast 3D to be smoky (D-4184)



### 4.3.3 Summary of changes between 6.51 and 6.6

- 1. Change all existing "luminous" fires to "general" (using  $L_b=0$ ), except for methane, ethane, propane and butane.
- 2. Modify values in line with the literature for the maximum burn rate length  $L<sub>b</sub>$  adopted in SAFETI for the following chemicals:
	- a. reduce values for the "smoky" chemicals pentane, heptane, octane and hexane
	- b. slight increase of values for butane and xylene
- 3. Use a radiative fraction  $\chi_R$  of 0.40 instead of 0.35 for all general fires. Consider making this input parameter available to the user (rather than hard coded, with default value of 0.4).
- 4. Set Ls=8.33 also for xylene to be in line with all other smoky chemicals
- 5. Model vinylacetate, n-butanol, isobutanol and methylbromide as a "general" fire instead of a "smoky" fire, in order to avoid unrealistic high radiative fraction and also to satisfy the criterion that chemicals are only modelled as smoky if they have five or more carbon atoms).
- 6. Possibly further investigate the literature for additional references, e.g. on
	- a. SEP's for smoky fires (with increasing diameter), including the validity of the usage of the maximum surface emissive power of 140 kW/m<sup>2</sup> and the smoke emissive power  $E_s = 20$  kW/m<sup>2</sup> for hydrocarbons containing an additional functional group (such as e.g. benzylchloride).
	- b. SEP for methane/ethane/propane/ethane. Particularly for smaller pool diameter we have currently poor agreement against reviewed literature. Further data may assist in a final recommendation for these chemicals.
	- c. Burn rate for hydrogen. There is inconsistency of data in the literature.

#### <span id="page-41-0"></span>**4.4 Laminar Burning Velocity**

Lees<sup>[xvi](#page-34-4)</sup> and CCPS<sup>xxii</sup> give experimental values of laminar burning velocity for a range of fuels. These are:



#### **Table 8. Experimental laminar burning velocities**

 $\overline{a}$ 

A 'default' value of 0.45 m/s was suggested by Mercx et al. (1998)<sup>xxiii</sup>. However Baker at al. (1996)<sup>xxiv</sup> observed the laminar burning velocity of a fuel is closely related to its reactivity. Based on the three reactivity levels the following has been adopted in Phast:

- **High reactivities**. There are only five fuels in this category: Hydrogen, Acetylene, Ethylene, Ethylene oxide, and Propylene oxide. The last two have no available experimental data and have been set at the value suggested by Lees for ethylene  $(0.83 \text{ m/s})^{13}$ .
- **Low reactivity**. Methane and carbon dioxide. Set as the same as the reactivity for methane from Lees (0.45 m/s)

Summary | Property Database | Page 38 13 JUSTIFY. Ethylene and propane in Phast 7.2 have values of 0.735 and 0.464 respectively, corresponding to the older CCPS data



• **Medium reactivities**. All other fuels fall into this category, including propane and cyclohexane which are assigned an LBV of 0.52 m/s by Lees. Based on this, all other medium reactivity fuels in Phast without specific experimental data will be given a value of 0.52.

### <span id="page-42-0"></span>**4.5 Dangerous Dose and Toxic Probit A, B and N**

Toxic probit coefficients have been reviewed for PHAST 6.4 by Phil Crossthwaite and Mike Harper, with a view to bringing the PHAST values up-to-date. The Purple Book values are used if available, after first being modified for units conversion (see below). For materials where these are not given, the coefficients are derived from the HSE SLOT (Significant Level of Toxicity) and SLOD (Significant Likelihood of Death)<sup>3</sup>[.](#page-5-2)

#### 4.5.1 Conversion of Purple Book Probit Coefficients

The Purple Book probit coefficients (A,B,N) are derived assuming concentration C in mg/m<sup>3</sup> and exposure time t<sub>exp</sub> in minutes:

$$
P = A + B \ln \left[ t_{\text{exp}} C^N \right] \tag{13}
$$

In PHAST / SAFETI coefficients are used assuming concentration C' in ppm and time in minutes. Thus a conversion is necessary:

$$
C' = C \times f \tag{14}
$$

Where f is 1 mg/m<sup>3</sup> air expressed in ppm of a substance  $X$  in air:

$$
f = 1 \times 10^6 \times \frac{moles \ of \ X \ in \ 1mg}{moles \ of \ air \ in \ 1m^3}
$$
  
= 1 \times 10^6 \times \frac{1 \times 10^{-6} kg / M\_w(X)}{\rho\_a / M\_w(air)} (15)

 $M_w$  = molecular weight (kg/kmol)  $p_a$  = density of air

The density of air,  $\rho_a$ , is calculated to be 1.25375 kg/m<sup>3</sup> at 282 K, 101510 Pa<sup>14</sup>. We can thus write:

$$
P = A + B \ln \left[ t_{\exp} \left( \frac{C'}{f} \right)^N \right]
$$
 (16)

Rearranging gives:

l

$$
P = A + BN \ln\left(\frac{1}{f}\right) + B \ln\left[t_{\exp} C'^{N}\right]
$$
 (17)

Thus to convert the Purple Book probit coefficients for use in PHAST / SAFETI we must replace A by A' where:

$$
A' = A + BN \ln\left(\frac{1}{f}\right)
$$
 (18)

### <span id="page-42-1"></span>4.5.2 Derivation of Probit Coefficients from DTLs

The HSE provides data on the dangerous toxic load (DTL) associated with specified levels of toxicity corresponding to  $\sim$ 1% (SLOT) and 50% (SLOD) mortality. It also provides the N coefficient. These are based on concentrations in ppm and exposure time in minutes, so no units conversion is required for their use in PHAST. They can be used to derive probit coefficients. We know by definition of SLOT and SLOD that:

Summary | Property Database| Page 39 | Pag <sup>14</sup> These are the conditions appropriate for Holland from the TNO books. Note that N, A and B expressed using ppm will therefore be very weakly dependent on T and P. However, this is unlikely to significantly affect consequence or risk results.



$$
P(p_d = 0.01) = A + B \ln \left[ SLOT \right]
$$
  
\n
$$
P(p_d = 0.5) = A + B \ln \left[ SLOD \right]
$$
\n(19)

 $P(p_a = 0.5) = A + B \ln [S \cup D]$  (19)<br>  $P(p_a = 0.5) = A + B \ln [S \cup D]$  (19)<br>
where  $P_{20} = 0.5$ ) is the problem page of consideration of such simulations of  $P_{20} = 0.6$ ) is the problem<br>
The A could baseline can easily be determined by sa where  $P(p_d = 0.01)$  is the probit number corresponding to 1% lethality (= 2.674) and  $P(p_d = 0.5)$  is the probit number corresponding to  $50\%$  lethality (= 5.0). The A and B coefficients can easily be determined by solving these equations simultaneously.

### 4.5.3 Data and Source for Specific Materials

The toxic data for the materials in the material database are given b[y](#page-44-0)  [Table](#page-44-0) 9**.** 





#### **Table 9. Toxic probit data for PHAST system materials and their source**

<span id="page-44-0"></span>The toxic data a,b,N are based on units ppm for concentration and time t for minutes. These data are derived from either the Purple Book (PB) or the HSE. All SLOT and SLOD values are from the HSE. Unlike PHAST/SAFETI, SAFETI-NL does not apply the HSE data. These values have been updated for Phast 3D, with values taken from the HSE website as of June 2013. For benzene and toluene the values are taken from Lees  $(2005)^{xx}$ .

Values for nitrogen and carbon dioxide

The A, B & N values for nitrogen (N<sub>2</sub>) and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) have been updated as shown in the table below.





The above values for nitrogen correspond to the probit function recommended in the "Reference Manual BEVI Risk Assessments" (New Purple Book) for inert gases such as nitrogen.

Using the method described in Section [4.5.2,](#page-42-1) the above valuesof A,B,N for carbon dioxide are derived from values recommended by the HSE for SLOT (1% probability of death), SLOD (50% probability of death) and N. The HSE SLOT DTL and SLOD DTL values for Carbon Dioxide are  $1.5 \times 10^{40}$  and  $1.5 \times 10^{41}$  respectively (units ppm for concentration c and minutes for time t), where the dangerous toxic load DTL is defined by

$$
DTL = \int c^N dt
$$

Please note that the above values are not used currently by default, since both nitrogen and carbon dioxide are flagged as inert materials. The material needs to be changed into a toxic material to enable toxicity calculations (and associated risk).



### <span id="page-46-0"></span>**4.6 Materials Added for 8.4**

A number of materials have been added to the standard set for convenience. These are materials that many customers have chosen to add themselves in the past. The non-DIPPR flammable properties are not researched for each individual material. Instead, the properties are set according to a 'similar' material already in the set. These are listed below in the Reference column.



**Table 10. Materials Added for Version 8.4**

### <span id="page-46-1"></span>**4.7 Materials added for Safeti-NL 8.5**

This version of Safeti-NL includes an additional 33 standard materials in the main application, largely identifiable due to the suffix (TG) have been added. The properties for these materials have had various modifications to the flammable/toxic flag, probit values and NLIV values.

\*\*In Safeti-NL 8.5 carbon dioxide has been renamed CARBON DIOXIDE (HSE\_RR749 PROBITS) and set as 'toxic'. As suggested by the name, A B and N values are taken from the HSE report RR749.

These new materials are:







### **About DNV**

We are the independent expert in risk management and quality assurance. Driven by our purpose, to safeguard life, property and the environment, we empower our customers and their stakeholders with facts and reliable insights so that critical decisions can be made with confidence. As a trusted voice for many of the world's most successful organizations, we use our knowledge to advance safety and performance, set industry benchmarks, and inspire and invent solutions to tackle global transformations.

### **Digital Solutions**

DNV is a world-leading provider of digital solutions and software applications with focus on the energy, maritime and healthcare markets. Our solutions are used worldwide to manage risk and performance for wind turbines, electric grids, pipelines, processing plants, offshore structures, ships, and more. Supported by our domain knowledge and Veracity assurance platform, we enable companies to digitize and manage business critical activities in a sustainable, cost-efficient, safe and secure way.



### <span id="page-49-0"></span>**REFERENCES**

<sup>1</sup> Harper, M., Topalis, P., and Wilkinson, S., and Witlox, H.W.M., "Multi-component property system XPRP, DNV, London (2004)  $\overline{a}$ 

<sup>2</sup> "Project 801 Evaluated Process Design Data 2018 Public Release Documentation", AICHE Design Institute for physical property data,

<sup>3</sup> Health and Safety Executive, "Assessment of the dangerous toxic load (DTL) for a specified level of toxicity (SLOT) and significant likelihood of death (SLOD)", <http://www.hse.gov.uk/hid/haztox.htm>

<sup>4</sup>Demond, A.H. & Lindner, A.S. (1993). Estimation of interfacial tension between organic liquids and water. *Environmental Science Technology, 27,* 2318-2331.

<sup>5</sup>Young, T.F. & Harkins, W.D. (1928). *International critical tables, vol. IV & V.* Washburn, E.W., Ed; McGraw Hill: New York. Electonically available from 2003 via Knovel.

<sup>6</sup>Dodge, F., Park, J., Buckingham, J., & Magott, R. (1983). *Revision and experimental verification of the hazard assesment computer system models for spreading, movement, dissolution, and dissipation of insoluble chemicals spilled onto water*. Washington.

 $7$  CAMEO (2011), Data obtained in February 2011 from CHRIS code stored on EPA website <http://cameochemicals.noaa.gov/>

<sup>8</sup>Dodge, F., Park, J., Buckingham, J., & Magott, R. (1983). *Revision and experimental verification of the hazard assesment computer system models for spreading, movement, dissolution, and dissipation of insoluble chemicals spilled onto water*. Washington.

<sup>9</sup> National Institute of Standards and Technology (2010). *IUPAC-NIST Solubility Database* (Online database). Available from[: http://stlq.info/2006/09/iupacnist\\_solubility\\_database\\_1.html](http://stlq.info/2006/09/iupacnist_solubility_database_1.html)

<sup>10</sup> SERIDA (1998). This database was previously available via PGS5, but is no longer made available or updated by RIVM. See for further details[: http://www.rivm.nl/milieuportaal/bibliotheek/databases/serida.jsp](http://www.rivm.nl/milieuportaal/bibliotheek/databases/serida.jsp)

<sup>11</sup>Webber, D. (1990). A model for pool spreading and vaporisation and its implementation in the computer code GASP. *UKAEA Report Safety and Reliability Directorate*.

<sup>12</sup>Reid, R., & Smith, K. (1978). Behaviour of LNG on water. *Hydorcarbon Processing , 57 (4),* 117-121.

13Woodward, J. L. (1990). An integrated model for discharge rate, pool spread, and dispersion from punctured process vessels, *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industry, 3,* 33-37.

<sup>14</sup>Woodward and Pitblado (2010). *LNG Risk Based Safety: Consequence Modelling*. Wily: Hoboken, N.J.

<sup>15</sup> CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics: a ready-reference book of chemical and physical data (2010). 91<sup>st</sup> Edition; Haynes, W.M., Ed.; CRC Press: London.

xvi Lees, F.P., "Loss Prevention in the process industries: hazard identification, assessment and control", Second Edition, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford (1996)

xvii Engelhard, W.F.J.M., "Heat flux from fires", Ch. 6 in "Methods for the calculation of physical effects", CPR14E, Part 2 (TNO Yellow Book), SDU Uitgevers, The Hague (1997)

xviii Rew, P.J., Hulbert, W.G., and Deaves, D.M., "Modelling of thermal radiation from external hydrocarbon pool fires", Trans. IchemE 75, Part B, pp. 81-89 (1997)

xix Babrauskas, V., "Burning Rates", Section 3.1 in "SFPE Handbook of fire Protection Engineering." Second Edition, National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA (1995); see also Volume 2, table 16.65, pp. 16.204 in Lee[sxvi](#page-34-4) 

xx Pritchard, M.J. and Binding, T.M., "FIRE2: A new approach for predicting thermal radiation levels from hydrocarbon pool fires", IChem Symposium Series No. 130, pp. 491-505 (19??)

<sup>xxi</sup> Mudan, K.S. and Croce, A.C., "Fire hazard calculations for large open hydrocarbon fires", Section 3-11 in "SFPE handbook of fire protection engineering", Second Edition, National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA (1995)

DNV | digital@dnv.com | dnv.com/digital



l

xxii Center for Chemical Process Safety of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, "*Guidelines for Evaluating the Characteristics of Vapor Cloud Explosions, Flash Fires and Bleves"*, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, New York, pp 48 (1994)

xxiii Mercx, W.P.M., van den Berg, A.C. and van Leeuwen, D., "Application of correlations to quantify the source strength of vapour cloud explosions in realistic situations, Final report for the project: 'GAMES'", TNO Report PML 1998-C53, pp 30, October 1998, NL

xxiv Baker, Q. A., Doolittle, Tang, M. J., Scheier, E. A., and Silva, G. J., Vapour Cloud Explosion Analysis, Process Safety Progress, **15**(2), pp 106-109, 199

xxv Lees, F.P., Loss Prevention in the Process industries: hazard identification, assessment and control, third edition (2005), ed. Mannan S., Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, ISBN-0750675551; also referred to in HSE report [http://www.hse.gov.uk/foi/internalops/hid\\_circs/technical\\_osd/spc\\_tech\\_osd\\_30/spctecosd30.pdf](http://www.hse.gov.uk/foi/internalops/hid_circs/technical_osd/spc_tech_osd_30/spctecosd30.pdf)