




AGC-4 Disassembly Report

July 2021

Philip L. Winston
Idaho National Laboratory



*INL is a U.S. Department of Energy National Laboratory
operated by Battelle Energy Alliance, LLC*

DISCLAIMER

This information was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the U.S. Government. Neither the U.S. Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, expressed 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. References 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 U.S. Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U.S. Government or any agency thereof.

**INL/EXT-21-63591
Revision 0**

AGC-4 Disassembly Report

**Philip L. Winston
Idaho National Laboratory**

July 2021

**Idaho National Laboratory
Advanced Reactor Technologies
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415**

<http://www.ART.INL.gov>

**Prepared for the
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Nuclear Energy
Under DOE Idaho Operations Office
Contract DE-AC07-05ID14517**


Page intentionally left blank

INL ART Program
AGC-4 Disassembly Report

INL/EXT-21-63591
Revision 0

July 2021

Technical Reviewer: (Confirmation of mathematical accuracy, correctness of data, and appropriateness of assumptions.)




William E. Windes
ART Graphite R&D Technical Lead

21 July 2021

Date


Approved by:



Michael E. Davenport
ART Project Manager

7/23/21


Date



Travis R. Mitchell
ART Program Manager

7/23/2021

Date



Michelle T. Sharp
INL Quality Assurance

7/22/21

Date

ABSTRACT

The Advanced Reactor Technologies Graphite Research and Development program is currently measuring irradiated material property changes in several grades of nuclear graphite to predict behavior and operating performance within the core of new high-temperature reactor designs. The Advanced Graphite Creep (AGC) experiment series, consisting of six irradiation capsules, will generate the irradiated graphite performance data for high-temperature gas-cooled reactor operating conditions. All six capsules will be irradiated in the Idaho National Laboratory Advanced Test Reactor (ATR), disassembled in the Hot Fuel Examination Facility, and examined at the Idaho National Laboratory Research Center. This disassembly report describes the disassembly and initial evaluation of the graphite specimens contained within the AGC-4 irradiation test capsule (the fourth irradiation capsule of the series). AGC-4 was irradiated in the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) East Flux Trap (EFT) during Cycles 157D, 158A, 162A, 162B, 164A, 164B, 166A, and 166B. Approximately 8 displacements per atom was achieved. Desired experiment temperatures were exceeded by at least 100°C during the second cycle of irradiation due to the increased flux produced by insertion of the KiJang Research Reactor experiment in the same reactor lobe as the East Flux Trap. The capsule was removed from the ATR and transferred to the Hot Fuel Examination Facility (HFEF) on May 15, 2020 and unloaded into the HFEF Decon Cell through Penetration 2D on February 26, 2021. It was moved to the HFEF Main Cell Window 3M for disassembly on March 15, 2021. Disassembly and specimen extraction began March 18, 2021 and packaging of the graphite specimens was completed on April 16, 2021. Several anomalies were noted, specifically that the radiological dose rates were nominally an order of magnitude higher than the previous AGC experiments. Due to the high activity of the samples, they have not been shipped to the IRC Carbon Characterization Laboratory, which has been designed for low activity samples. Additional radiological and mass characterization is being done at the MFC Analytical Laboratory to determine the origin of the high activity. Once this additional characterization is completed to a satisfactory degree, it may be possible to transfer some or all of the samples to the CCL to complete the material properties analysis. This report summarizes the disassembly of the AGC-4 experiment.

Page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| ABSTRACT..... | 2 |
| ACRONYMS..... | 7 |
| 1. DESCRIPTION OF AGC EXPERIMENT | 9 |
| 2. AGC-4 STATUS..... | 10 |
| 2.1 Pre-irradiation Examination of AGC-4 Samples | 12 |
| 2.2 Disassembly of AGC-4 Capsule | 12 |
| 2.2.1 AGC-4 Capsule Disassembly Activities | 13 |
| 2.2.2 Dose Rate Evaluations | 26 |
| 3. Conclusions from AGC-4 Capsule Disassembly Activities..... | 27 |
| 3.1 Visual Inspection, Inventory, and Storage of AGC-4 Specimens..... | 28 |
| 4. REFERENCES..... | 28 |

FIGURES

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 1. CCL glovebox used to visually inspect graphite samples, perform initial dimensional measurement, and repackage samples for storage in the irradiated graphite vault located in Lab C-19..... | 10 |
| Figure 2. Dimensional measurement and transfer of samples to plastic storage containers | 10 |
| Figure 3. Above: AGC-type test train being lifted from the basket with a lifting fixture cap installed. Below: The AGC-4 test train on the HFEF 3M table, lying horizontally, cutting table in the center of table..... | 15 |
| Figure 4. The top (cut) end of AGC-type test train..... | 16 |
| Figure 5. Specified cut point for bottom end cap cut..... | 16 |
| Figure 6. Sliding graphite body out of pressure tube..... | 17 |
| Figure 7. Separating graphite body sections prior to TC and gas line removal. Upper section pistons are visible on the right. Piggyback samples are visible in the catch tray. | 18 |
| Figure 8. Upper section pistons are visible on the right. Piggyback samples are visible in the catch tray..... | 19 |
| Figure 9. Loose piggyback sample identification. | 20 |
| Figure 10. Transferring creep samples into the transfer tube..... | 21 |
| Figure 11. Milling graphite body to expose center channel..... | 22 |
| Figure 12. 240-degree sector of graphite body with exposed center section. Shiny samples are can design used for HOPG..... | 23 |
| Figure 13. AGC-4 shipping tubes survey with and without shielding..... | 25 |
| Figure 14. Image of the caliper measuring the graphite body..... | 26 |
| Figure 15. Preliminary results precision gamma scanner creep specimens (Hawkins, 2021) | 27 |

TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1. Cycle Number, Effective Full-Power Days (EFPD), and Cumulative Megawatt-days | 11 |
| Table 2. Graphite body physical measurements. | 26 |

Page intentionally left blank

ACRONYMS

| | |
|-------|---|
| AGC | Advanced Graphite Creep |
| AL | Analytical Laboratory |
| ART | Advanced Reactor Technologies |
| ATR | Advanced Test Reactor |
| CAN | Can, Alternate Term for Container |
| CCL | Carbon Characterization Laboratory |
| DOE | Department of Energy |
| dpa | Displacements per Atom |
| DOA | DTCCI Overpack Adapter |
| DR | Direct Reading |
| DTCCI | Dry Transfer Cubicle Cask Insert |
| EFPD | Effective Full- Power Days |
| EFT | East Flux Trap |
| EMM | Electromechanical manipulators |
| HDG | High Dose Graphite |
| HFEF | Hot Fuel Examination Facility |
| HOPG | Highly Oriented Pyrolytic Graphite |
| ID | Inside Diameter |
| INL | Idaho National Laboratory |
| IRC | Idaho National Laboratory Research Center |
| KJRR | KiJang Research Reactor |
| MCNP | Monte Carlo N-Particle |
| MFC | Materials and Fuels Complex |
| NEFT | Northeast Flux Trap |
| OD | Outside Diameter |
| ORNL | Oak Ridge National Laboratory |
| PIE | post-irradiation examination |
| RT | Room Temperature |
| TC | Thermocouple |

Page intentionally left blank

AGC-4 Disassembly Report

1. DESCRIPTION OF AGC EXPERIMENT

The Advanced Reactor Technologies (ART) Graphite Research and Development program is currently measuring irradiated material properties to predict the behavior and operating performance of new nuclear graphite grades available for use within the cores of new high-temperature reactor designs. The Advanced Graphite Creep (AGC) experiment series, consisting of six irradiation capsules, will generate irradiated graphite performance data for high-temperature gas-cooled reactor operating conditions. The AGC experiment is designed to determine the changes to specific material properties such as thermal diffusivity, thermal expansion, elastic modulus, mechanical strength, irradiation-induced dimensional change rate and irradiation creep for a wide variety of nuclear grade graphite types over a range of temperature and fluence conditions. A series of six capsules containing graphite test specimens will be used to expose graphite test samples to a dose range of 1–7 displacements per atom (dpa) at three different temperatures (600, 900 and 1,200°C) as described in the Graphite Technology Development Plan. Since irradiation-induced creep within graphite components is considered critical to determining the operational life of the graphite core, some of the samples will also be exposed to an applied load to determine the creep rate for each graphite type under both temperature and neutron flux. (Windes, 2010)

Irradiation of AGC-1, 2, 3 and 4 has been completed, as has characterization of AGC-1, 2 and 3. The final two capsules in the series are High Dose Graphite (HDG) experiments (HDG-1 and 2) in which previously-irradiated graphite specimens are repackaged into a new capsule for further irradiation. All six AGC-type capsules in the series are to be irradiated in the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR). AGC-1 and AGC-2 were irradiated in the south flux trap and AGC-3 through HDG-2 are to be irradiated in the East Flux Trap (EFT). The change in flux traps was due to program irradiation priorities that required the AGC experiment to be moved to accommodate fuel irradiation experiments. After irradiation, all AGC-type capsules cool in the ATR Canal, are sized for shipment, and shipped to the Materials and Fuels Complex (MFC) where the capsule will be disassembled in the Hot Fuel Examination Facility (HFEF). During disassembly, the metallic capsule is machined open and the interior graphite body containing the samples is removed. Individual creep and piggyback samples are removed from the graphite body and packaged with the intent that they would be loaded into a shielded drum and shipped to the Idaho National Laboratory Research Center (IRC) Carbon Characterization Laboratory (CCL) for post-irradiation examination and storage for any future testing.

The CCL is located in Labs C-19 and C-20 of the IRC. It was specifically designed to support graphite and ceramic composite research and development activities. The CCL is an unshielded laboratory space equipped to characterize low-activity irradiated high-purity graphite, carbon-carbon composites, and silicon-carbide composite materials. Limited-activity irradiated and nonirradiated materials properties are measured working with the samples on the bench top. All test specimens processed through the CCL receiving glovebox undergo visual inspection and dimensional measurement. and are logged for shielded storage in the irradiated graphite vault located in Lab C-19, shown in Figures 1 and 2.



Figure 1. CCL glovebox used to visually inspect graphite samples, perform initial dimensional measurement, and repackage samples for storage in the irradiated graphite vault located in Lab C-19




Figure 2. Dimensional measurement and transfer of samples to plastic storage containers

2. AGC-4 STATUS

Activities for AGC-4 began with the pre-irradiation characterization of all graphite samples to be inserted into the AGC-4 capsule. Following characterization, the samples were loaded into the AGC-4 capsule in

the summer of 2009. The completed AGC-4 capsule was then inserted into the ATR East Flux Trap. The experiment was irradiated during ATR Cycles 157D, 158A, 162A, 162B, 164A, 164B, 166A, and 166B. ECAR-5345, As-Run Physics Analysis for the AGC-4 Experiment Irradiated in the ATR, derived a cumulative received dose of approximately 8 dpa. Desired experiment average temperatures of 800°C were exceeded by at least 100°C during the second cycle of irradiation. It is presumed that the temperature excursion was due to unexpectedly high flux resulting from the insertion of the KiJang Research Reactor (KJRR) experiment in the Northeast Flux Trap during the same irradiation cycle as AGC-4. After irradiation was completed, the capsule was removed from the ATR and transferred to the Materials and Fuels Complex Hot Fuel Examination Facility (HFEF) on May 15, 2020. The experiment was unloaded from the shipping cask into the HFEF Decon Cell through Penetration 2D on February 26, 2021. It was moved to the HFEF Main Cell Window 3M for disassembly on March 15, 2021. Disassembly and specimen extraction began March 18, 2021 and packaging of the graphite specimens into transfer tubes to be loaded into the shielded shipping drum was completed April 16, 2021. During preparations for shipping the samples to the INL Carbon Laboratory it was observed that radiological dose rates of the packaged samples exceeded those measured for previous experiments by at least an order of magnitude. This report summarizes the disassembly and packaging of the AGC-4 graphite specimens.

Calculation of heating rates and expected fluence was performed in ECAR-5345, As-Run Physics Analysis for the AGC-4 Experiment Irradiated in the ATR. (Davenport 2021) The following is excerpted from that document:

The AGC-4 as-run specimen neutron fast fluence ($E > 0.1$ MeV), DPA, and material heat rate calculations were performed using a general-purpose Monte Carlo N-Particle (MCNP) code.

Heating Rates:

The average East lobe power across all eight cycles was 20.8 MW, used to scale the average heating results.

In comparing the heating rates of the AGC-4 graphite samples with and without the KJRR experiment inserted, the heating rates across Cycle 158A, with the KiJang Research Reactor experiment (KJRR) inserted within the Northeast Flux Trap (NEFT), were calculated to be approximately 5% higher at core centerline for Stack 2 and Stack 3 (the two graphite stacks closest to the NEFT), tapering off to about 1.5% higher toward the axial ends of the core. The heating rates for Stack 7 (center stack) were calculated to be higher by approximately 4% at core centerline.

Although KJRR increased the heating rates of the graphite samples within the AGC-4 experiment during Cycle 158A with a maximum East lobe power of 23.67MW, the absolute maximum heating occurred during Cycle 162A wherein the East lobe experienced a spike of 24.31MW.

Fluence:

At the end of the eighth cycle, the graphite samples incurred a fluence that ranged between $2.5 \times 10^{21} \frac{n}{cm^2}$ and $2.5 \times 10^{22} \frac{n}{cm^2}$ depending on the location of the sample axially within the EFT of the ATR.

Predicted sample dose in terms of effective full-power days and megawatt-days is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Cycle Number, Effective Full-Power Days (EFPD), and Cumulative Megawatt-days

| Cycle | East Lobe Power [Ave/Max] (MW) | EFPDs | Cumulative EFPDs | MW | MWd | Cumulative MWd |
|--------|--------------------------------|-------|------------------|-------|--------|----------------|
| 157D-1 | 21.1 / 22.6 | 59.7 | 59.7 | 21.05 | 1256.7 | 1256.7 |
| 158A-1 | 22.1 / 23.1 | 52.2 | 111.9 | 22.12 | 1154.7 | 2475.2 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| <i>162A-1</i> | <i>22.2 / 23.5</i> | <i>62.0</i> | <i>173.9</i> | <i>22.22</i> | <i>1377.6</i> | <i>3864.1</i> |
| <i>162B-1</i> | <i>18.7 / 20.0</i> | <i>38.5</i> | <i>212.4</i> | <i>18.65</i> | <i>718.0</i> | <i>3961.3</i> |
| <i>164A-1</i> | <i>20.0 / 21.4</i> | <i>54.9</i> | <i>267.3</i> | <i>20.04</i> | <i>1100.2</i> | <i>5356.7</i> |
| <i>164B-1</i> | <i>20.0 / 21.8</i> | <i>64.1</i> | <i>331.4</i> | <i>20.03</i> | <i>1283.9</i> | <i>6637.9</i> |
| <i>166A-1</i> | <i>21.3 / 38.1</i> | <i>62.5</i> | <i>393.9</i> | <i>21.34</i> | <i>1333.8</i> | <i>8405.8</i> |
| <i>166B-1</i> | <i>21.2 / 22.0</i> | <i>60.0</i> | <i>453.9</i> | <i>21.17</i> | <i>1270.2</i> | <i>9609.1</i> |

2.1 Pre-irradiation Examination of AGC-4 Samples

A complete pre-irradiation testing and characterization program was conducted in 2012 on all graphite samples inserted into AGC-4 capsule. The properties measured were bulk density and electrical resistivity as well as elastic constants including dynamic Young's modulus (fundamental frequency method), sonic elastic constants including Young's modulus, shear modulus, and Poisson's ratio; ambient temperature thermal conductivity and thermal expansion (from room temperature [RT] to 800°C). (Swank, 2012)

2.2 Disassembly of AGC-4 Capsule

After irradiation was completed, the AGC-4 capsule was stored in the ATR Canal to allow the activity of the steel pressure tube section of the capsule to decay to acceptable shipping levels. After radiological cooling, the ends of the pressure boundary were cut off to remove the upper pneumatic ram compressive loading components and the lower pressure tube, including the stack stirring pneumatic bellows. The sectioning was performed using a remotely-operated band saw in the ATR Dry Transfer Cubicle (DTC). Once the AGC-4 test train was sectioned to remove the mechanical loading components (i.e., top pneumatic ram and bottom bellow sections) the steel pressure boundary section with irradiated graphite specimens was loaded into the Dry Transfer Cubicle Cask Insert (DTCCI). The DTCCI is a shielded packaged which was designed to contain dry experiments while they are moved inside ATR from the DTC to a shipping container for transport to another facility. The DTCCI was designed to fit into the GE-2000 cask which would provide additional shielding and structure for over-the-road transport. Due to cost and availability issues, the GE-2000 was replaced by the DTCCI Overpack Adapter (DOA), which is a shielded package that was designed and fabricated specifically by the ART program for onsite INL shipments. This transfer package was designed to simplify loading and handling of the DTCCI and optimize mating to the HFEF cells for experiment movement into the cell. The AGC-4 graphite test train was the first irradiated experiment shipped from ATR to MFC using the DOA system.

Unfortunately, the rescue hoist within the HFEF Main Cell failed in October 2020. This is the primary hoist used to replace electromechanical manipulators (EMM) and crane components in the HFEF Main Cell. The hoist was engaged on an EMM carriage when the motor brake failed to engage the load. Because the HFEF Main Cell operations are highly interdependent, only limited in-cell activities could be performed and severely restricted AGC-4 disassembly activities. EMMs are required to move components to the operating windows, and when one of the two in cell is out of service, the other is typically reserved to supplement repair functions. Hence, the AGC-4 experiment and disassembly equipment could not be moved to an operating window until the hoist was repaired. Due to the complexity of performing the repair, the hoist was not declared operational until February 2021. Disassembly activity was initiated mid-March 2021.

The interior of the AGC-4 capsule was constructed of two graphite body sections approximately 2 inches in diameter by 20 inches long (for a total length of approximately 49 inches before irradiation), held together by bayonet joints. Seven channels were bored axially down the length of the graphite body: one central channel and six on the outer radius surrounding the central channel. Graphite samples in the six radial channels of the upper half of the graphite body were compressively stressed while the graphite

samples in the lower half were left unloaded as control samples. The samples in the central channel, upper and lower halves, were unstressed. Twenty-six spacer samples containing flux wires were located in upper, middle, and lower positions within the six radial channels to ascertain the accumulated dose in the samples throughout the capsule. The top and bottom halves were separated at the graphite body centerline and pistons between each half transmit the pneumatic force from the stack stirring pneumatic bellows to allow the test samples in each stack to be stirred during reactor shutdown and outages. A center channel running the entire length of the graphite body contained unstressed piggyback samples that consisted of a multiplicity of small thermal test buttons of the five main graphite grades, experimental graphite grades, and Highly Oriented Pyrolytic Graphite (HOPG) specimens. Details of the generic AGC capsule are shown on INL Drawing 630430. Specifics of the AGC-4 design are shown in INL Drawings 604551 through 604555. Specifics of the assembly and irradiation of AGC-4 are found in the data package DP-AGC-4. (Davenport, 2019)

Difficulties were encountered during sample pushout for all stacks (radial and center stacks). All samples from the outer perimeter stacks were eventually pushed out but required significantly higher force than previously experienced with disassembly of past AGC test trains. Pushout of center stack samples was not successful (the maximum designed pushing force of 75 pounds was exceeded). Alternatives for pushout were considered, but it was concluded that the least destructive approach was to mill through the graphite body to release the samples in the center channel. All flux wire samples were recovered and are to be transferred to another facility for gamma counting following initial investigation of the excessive dose rates that have been observed within the graphite samples. The graphite body debris will be discarded.

2.2.1 AGC-4 Capsule Disassembly Activities

Due to the high-radiation levels from the steel pressure tube and other metal components of the test train, the AGC-4 test train capsule was disassembled in the HFEF main hot cell. A summary of the AGC-4 disassembly highlights is presented in this section.

The general AGC-4 disassembly task sequence was planned as follows:

1. Remove the graphite body containing the samples from the steel pressure boundary tube
2. Remove the gas lines that provided helium and neon gas flow for temperature control and actuated the stack stirring bellows
3. Remove the accessible thermocouples that penetrate each elevation in the graphite body
4. Separate the two graphite body sections and push out the 0.25-inch-thick piggyback samples from the center position of the graphite body
5. Push the individual radial position creep samples into a sorting station for visual identification by sample number
6. Separate the spacers containing the flux wires from the test specimens for individual analysis
7. Insert all graphite specimens into a Lexan tube to protect the samples from contamination in the HFEF Main Cell and prevent damage during transport to the CCL
8. Perform physical measurement of the graphite body. Measure the length of each graphite body section length

AGC-4 disassembly began March 17, 2021 when the test train capsule was removed from its shipping basket and moved to the disassembly table at HFEF Main Cell Window 3M. Visual examination of the exterior of the pressure boundary tube showed no noticeable blemishes or defects.

The test train was clamped in the collet of the pipe cutter attachment to remove the outer steel pressure tube. Based upon lessons learned from AGC-2 disassembly, seen in Figure 3, the cutter was

attached to make a cut approximately 1-3/8 inches above (to the right in the image) the steel bottom cap. The cap remained connected to the thermocouples and gas lines and the heat shield was intact. Operators encountered interference in inserting the test train into the cutter collet due to tighter than expected tolerances in the newly-acquired 2.5-inch inside diameter (ID) collet. As a workaround, a 2.75-inch collet that was available in the hot cell was fitted with a split-shell spacer to allow more convenient insertion and clamping in the cutter. This approach allowed cutting to proceed, although when the cut reached its final stage, the remaining thin layer of steel tended to catch on the cutter bits, requiring the cutter to be reversed and restarted several times. The cap was eventually separated by severing the remaining thin layer manually. A general view of the cut end of the experiment is shown in Figure 4. Figure 5 shows the nominal cut line location for removing the end cap.





Figure 3. Above: AGC-type test train being lifted from the basket with a lifting fixture cap installed. Below: The AGC-4 test train on the HFEF 3M table, lying horizontally, cutting table in the center of table.




Figure 4. The top (cut) end of AGC-type test train




Figure 5. Specified cut point for bottom end cap cut.

The steel pressure tube was removed by sliding the tube laterally off the graphite body, as shown in Figure 6 first manually using the master-slave manipulators, then by reversing the components (flipping end for end) and using the leadscrew drive to pull the tube off in sequential clamping and repositioning of the clamp carriages. (Clamp the tube in the left [stationary] carriage, clamp the end cap in the right [driven] carriage and operate the leadscrew with the pneumatic drive to pull the cap and graphite body out of the steel tube.)




Figure 6. Sliding graphite body out of pressure tube.

To remove the graphite body, the steel tube was mounted in the right carriage, and using the table leadscrew, driven to the left carriage which was locked in position on the rail. The left carriage right clamp had the pushout probe installed, and the graphite body was extruded with minimal drama. Insertion of sequential probe pieces into the pressure tube allowed the graphite body to be pushed out to the point where manual pulling with the manipulator was sufficient to complete removal of the graphite body from the pressure tube. The open end of the pressure tube was capped to prevent loss of samples during the lateral movement. Except for separation at the bottom cap where the cut was made, the steel heat shield remained in place for the entire lateral move of the steel tube. Some dimpling was visible at a section joint in the graphite body.

Once the pressure tube was separated, it was tipped into a catch tray to verify that no loose pieces had fallen into the tube during the removal process.

Because the heat shield was intact, a tweezer tip was slipped under the steel foil to tear the foil. The tear was manipulated until the entire graphite body was exposed.

When the heat shield was removed, it was apparent that the center joint of the graphite body had separated approximately 1/8 inch. The graphite body was placed in the carriage clamps on the cutter table using the 2.5-inch outside diameter (OD) to 2-inch ID spacers. A catch pan was placed under the joint to catch any wayward items.

The catch pans used were an updated design that mounted to the test train section carriage clamps.

Due to simplification of the table design, the leadscrew mount did not include an integrated pushout plug for the graphite body. A separate 1.9-inch OD x 4-inch long plug was fabricated and mounted in the left carriage clamp.

The graphite body sections were then separated using a variation of the clamping and leadscrew pulling process used for removing the graphite body from the steel pressure tube as illustrated in Figure 7. The samples in the lower section (left side) of the graphite body were free to slide out at the joint and, due to the vibration of the pneumatic drive on the leadscrew, required frequent attention to push back in until the gas lines and thermocouples (TCs) could be removed. Another view of the separation showing the thermocouples and samples is Figure 8.




Figure 7. Separating graphite body sections prior to TC and gas line removal. Upper section pistons are visible on the right. Piggyback samples are visible in the catch tray.

The gas lines and thermocouples were accessible following separation and were removed from the graphite body by manually pulling with the master-slave manipulators.




Figure 8. Upper section pistons are visible on the right. Piggyback samples are visible in the catch tray.

The piggyback samples that had fallen out at the center joint were retrieved and identified visually as seen in the example in Figure 9.




Figure 9. Loose piggyback sample identification.

Once the graphite body sections were removed from the pressure tube, they were individually lifted with the master-slave manipulator and transferred to the radial position insert of the sorting table. Once secured on the sorting table, a receiving tube was mounted onto the receiving end of the sorting table tray to receive specimens pushed out from the graphite body.

Attempts were made to push out the center stack of piggyback samples, but there was no success. Unlike previous experiments in which care was required to prevent piggybacks from falling out, the sorting table force gauge indicated greater than 50 pounds, and no movement was achieved. Efforts were redirected to the radial stacks.

Difficulties were encountered during pushout of radial stacks, as the lower section stacks required greater than 30 pounds force (indicated on the sorting table force gauge) to get the stacks to move. Eventually, the lower stacks were removed, identified and transferred to the shipping tubes. Attempts to push out the upper section stacks were directed from the left to right with the graphite body section oriented with the previously “up” section to the right. This meant that the stack was being pushed against the shuttle pistons, which were in their partially extended position. Following consultation, it was determined that it should be possible to reverse the graphite body orientation and push against the shuttle pistons to remove the stacks. After repositioning, the pushout was performed successfully, although requiring approximately 60 pounds force to break the stacks loose to allow movement.

As the radial stacks were pushed out, the spacers that contained the flux wires were identified and separated for later fluence capsule recovery as shown in Figure 10. All graphite specimens contained within each uniquely identified transfer tube were identified and listed in the appendix of the operating procedure.




Figure 10. Transferring creep samples into the transfer tube.

Flux wires were removed from the spacers and placed in small cryo-vials for shipping and direct gamma ray counting. All flux wires will be analyzed to verify the accumulated dose calculations.

Following removal of the creep and unstressed radial channel samples, attention was brought to bear upon the center stack samples. Pushing was not successful, exceeding the maximum indicated value of 75 pounds per the sorting table. Only six to ten of the piggyback samples were free enough to fall out when the graphite body was raised to the vertical position in either end orientation.

Alternatives for pushout were considered, but it was concluded that the least destructive approach was to mill through the graphite body to release the samples in the center channel. The HFEF Main Cell has a modified, remotely-operable Wabeco F1210 milling machine with digital position readout that is stationed on the 3M table. The unit has lateral travel of 20 inches and front to back movement of 6 inches. It was developed for fabricating tensile and bend test samples of irradiated cladding. The unit has a suction unit that can collect fines to prevent spread of contamination. Figure 11 shows the mill in operation. Because it was located at the same window where AGC-4 was being disassembled, it was concluded that the 3/8-inch OD mill bits that are primarily used on the machine could be used to mill a slot over the length of the graphite body sections to allow access to the center stack. Two slots were machined in line with radial channels that were 120 degrees apart. Two passes were used to get to near the center channel wall depth. Milling depth was controlled to no closer than 0.030 inches to assure that the samples were not contacted by the mill bit.




Figure 11. Milling graphite body to expose center channel

After the two slots had been completed, the 120-degree sector was broken out of the graphite body section by prying with a small screwdriver. The exposed samples were generally intact and were moved out of the channel manually by using a tweezer. The piggyback samples appeared to be restricted from movement by the type of can used for HOPG samples.



Figure 12. 240-degree sector of graphite body with exposed center section. Shiny samples are can design used for HOPG.

In the lower section, the graphite body broke across its diameter into two pieces while removing the steel gas control rings from the section. The two pieces were machined separately, and the 120-degree sectors were removed with minimal effort. Once exposed, some fairly gnarled-looking samples were observed, but most were generally intact, with visible identification numbers. In the lower piece of the lower section, one recalcitrant graphite can was not removable with tweezers. The can was eventually recovered after the other samples were removed.

An attempt was made to machine the 26-inch long upper section as a single piece, which required lateral reclamping to achieve the full traverse. At least one thermocouple was encountered by the mill during the cut. During the second of the long cuts, the graphite body section separated at the slot for the gas control ring, leaving the 120-degree sector intact while severing the 240-degree lower piece.

Once opened, the sectors revealed at least two stuck graphite cans in the longer of the two sections, but all were removable when tweezer effort was applied. Some surfaces were damaged to the extent that only partial identification was possible.

Despite indications that the HOPG sample containers (cans) caused interference during specimen pushout, the cans remained closed due to the screw-top container design. AGC-1 and -2 used a slip-fit lid that tended to separate during sample removal, allowing the HOPG specimen to fall out.

To minimize potential for contamination from the HFEF Main Cell, each transfer tube was covered with three layers of polyethylene sleeving, allowing a layer to be removed as the tubes are moved from

different contamination zones. One layer is removed when transferred from the main cell to the decon cell, one is removed for transfer from decon cell to the Hot Repair Area, and one is removed when the tube is transferred into a new heat-sealed sleeve as it is transferred out of the Hot Repair Area and placed in the shielded shipping drum.

The radiation levels of all transport tubes containing the graphite test specimens were surveyed at the sample station at decon cell Window 4D prior to movement to the Hot Repair Area. The maximum individual tube dose rate was reported as 3000 mR/hr. The lowest individual tube value was approximately 1000 mR/hr. The minimum values are approximately ten times that seen for AGC-1, 2, or 3.

First impressions suggested that the transfer tubes might be contaminated due to exposure to conditions in the HFEF Main Cell. The transfer tubes were decontaminated using window cleaner in the decon cell, and all of the survey smears counted as clean. The dose rates were measured using a Ludlum Model 7 ion chamber with a mid-range 0 to 20,000 mR/hr detector. To determine potential for using shielding to individual tubes were also surveyed with a 1/2-inch thick steel plate and a 1/2-inch acrylic plate between the source and the detector. This test indicated only that the steel-acrylic combination only reduced the indicated dose rate at most by a factor of four, as shown in Figure 13. The contact value is shown in the blue box with DR in the upper section. The values shown have been corrected by the Survey Report program by multiplying the raw instrument reading by three for conservatism. Note that none of the surveys made in the decon cell can be considered to be quantitative because the nominal background dose is approximately 500 mR/hr in the cell.

VSDS Standard Map Survey Report




Figure 13. AGC-4 shipping tubes survey with and without shielding

After removing all graphite specimens and flux wire spacers, the graphite body sections were reassembled to the extent possible and dimensional measurements were performed, as shown in Table 2. The various sections were placed on the sorting table tray, and the Vernier caliper was used to check each section's length, seen in Figure 14. The sections were measured however possible based on sector orientation.



Figure 14. Image of the caliper measuring the graphite body

Table 2. Graphite body physical measurements.

| Graphite Body | Dimension (in) |
|---|---------------------|
| Length | 47.537 |
| Upper sections | 8.937, 12.955 |
| Lower sections | 8.569, 9.215, 7.861 |
| Break (bottom) end to first gas ring slot | 8.365 |

2.2.2 Dose Rate Evaluations

At the time of this report (July 13, 2021), the following efforts have been made:

- Survey of tubes of packaged creep and piggyback samples
- Decontamination of the tubes to the level that smears indicate no removable contamination
- Measurement of non-specimen components (shuttle pistons) using the HFEF Main Cell Precision Gamma Scanner (five shuttle pistons in a Lexan shipping tube were non-detectable)
- Measurement of one of the highest activity tubes of creep specimens using the Precision Gamma Scanner indicated the presence of ^{60}Co as seen in Figure 15 below. No explicit quantitation was performed.

| Isotope | Channel | Energy | Background | Net Counts | Count Rate | | | X Position | Z Position | File Name |
|---------|---------|---------|------------|------------|------------|-------|--------|------------|------------|--|
| CO-60 | 4280.66 | 1173.79 | 301 | 6477 | 0.386 | 1.36 | 1.903 | 5.44 | 22 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0001.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.78 | 1173.82 | 324 | 6248 | 0.372 | 1.41 | 1.903 | 5.44 | 22.875 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0002.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.69 | 1173.8 | 68 | 302 | 0.018 | 7.99 | 2.036 | 5.44 | 23.75 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0003.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.8 | 1173.83 | 86 | 1402 | 0.083 | 3 | 1.878 | 5.44 | 24.625 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0004.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.79 | 1173.82 | 2099 | 47176 | 2.808 | 0.51 | 1.895 | 5.44 | 25.5 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0005.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.92 | 1173.86 | 480 | 10137 | 0.603 | 1.09 | 1.907 | 5.44 | 26.375 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0006.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.93 | 1173.86 | 65 | 705 | 0.042 | 4.35 | 1.799 | 5.44 | 27.25 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0007.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.19 | 1173.66 | 61 | 437 | 0.026 | 5.94 | 1.717 | 5.44 | 28.125 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0008.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.97 | 1173.87 | 58 | 946 | 0.056 | 3.66 | 1.87 | 5.44 | 29 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0009.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.88 | 1173.85 | 96 | 1226 | 0.073 | 3.29 | 2.054 | 5.44 | 29.875 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0010.chn |
| CO-60 | 4280.87 | 1173.84 | 55 | 208 | 0.012 | 9.5 | 2.074 | 5.44 | 30.75 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0011.chn |
| CS-137 | 2413.81 | 662.04 | 115 | 71 | 0.004 | 28.01 | 1.718s | 5.44 | 31.625 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0007.chn |
| MN-54 | 3045.66 | 835.26 | 320 | 111 | 0.007 | 28.7 | 1.872s | 5.44 | 32.5 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0002.chn |
| MN-54 | 3047.37 | 835.73 | 2617 | 395 | 0.024 | 23.33 | 1.793s | 5.44 | 33.375 | 20210603-162311-AGC4_875profile_0005.chn |




Figure 15. Preliminary results precision gamma scanner creep specimens (Hawkins, 2021)

- One creep specimen from each of three of the highest activity transfer tubes was removed and packaged to be shipped to the MFC Analytical Laboratory (AL) for gamma spectrometry measurement in a low-background shielded system to measure all detectable gamma emitters and their quantities.
- In addition to the high-activity creep samples, one flux wire (fluence capsule) will also be shipped to the MFC AL for comparison to previous flux wire values (AGC-2) to ascertain whether unexpected flux levels were achieved during irradiation.
- The above-mentioned samples have been transferred to the MFC AL, and the dose rates at the time of transfer were reported as 25 R/hr contact and 500 mR/hr at 30 cm, indicating a bias toward beta emissions.
- Analysis currently proposed for determining the source the unexpected dose rates includes gamma spectrometry as well as laser induced breakdown spectrometry (LIBS)/time-of-flight mass spectrometry (TOF-MS) to identify and measure isotopes that are exclusive beta emitters such as ^{63}Ni .

3. Conclusions from AGC-4 Capsule Disassembly Activities

The pipe cutter appears to have some slight difference in centerline height compared to the carriage clamps. This leads to a challenge in getting the collet completely tight to prevent the test train from rotating when the cutter blade pulls up a curl that is greater than the friction the collet can hold. This was a particular problem at the very end of the cut above the cap joint. One blade had apparently broken off its edge, but it was possible to complete the cut after manually repositioning the other blade. To minimize the problem of raising a large curl, the cutter was operated in the mode where the cutter advance lever was engaged for two rotations of the cutter drive, then disengaged for one rotation, allowing the cutters to

clear the curls and break any large pieces prior to continuing the cut. The pipe cutter will be utilized for future AGC capsule disassembly activities. It may be desirable to have a reversible drive for the cutter to ease the process of disengaging the cutters following the cut, as well as to allow the cutter to back up from a point where the blade has caught.

The graphite body length caliper appears to work well and needs no modification. The biggest challenge in the length determination is identification of specific datums from which to make measurements. The top cut is not a precisely controlled process, so measurement must be made from one of the separation joints, the most definitive of which are the slots that are machined to hold gas sector control ring. The bottom and middle section separations occurred due to mechanical stresses when milling, meaning that more separate parts resulted from disassembly than were originally manufactured, hence the multiple length values in the table above.

The anomalous dose rates have caused several lines of speculation to be considered, mostly having to do with identifying a mechanism by which an activation product such as ^{60}Co could have entered the specimens. At such time that the data are available, it may be possible to transfer some or all of the creep and piggyback samples to CCL for further post-irradiation examination. Operations in CCL may require procedural or engineering modifications to minimize personnel dose.

3.1 Visual Inspection, Inventory, and Storage of AGC-4 Specimens

Not performed at the date of this report due to inability to ship specimens to the CCL because of unexplained high dose rates. Sample transfer tubes containing the AGC-4 inventory will remain in the HFEF Decon Cell until further decisions are made.

4. REFERENCES

- Davenport, M.E., "DP-AGC-4, Data Package for AGC-4," Advanced Reactor Technologies (ART) August 2019.
- Davenport, M.E., ECAR-5345, "As-Run Physics Analysis for the AGC-4 Experiment Irradiated in the ATR," January 2021.
- Hawkins, K.A., email transmission of PGS data, June, 22, 2021.
- Drawing 630430, Advanced Graphite Capsule, Capsule Facility Assemblies.
- Drawing 604554 ATR Advanced Graphite Capsule (AGC-4) Test Train Facility Assembly.
- Swank, W. D., "Graphite Specimen Preirradiation Characterization Plan PLN-4239", INL, August 2012.
- Windes, W.E., T. Burchell, and R. Bratton, "Graphite Technology Development Plan," PLN-2497, Rev. 1., October 2010.