

LIBRARY REFERENCE ONLY

THE LIBRARY
FIRE RESEARCH STATION
BOLTON ROAD
LEICESTER
LEICESTERSHIRE
LEICESTER
NO 999 FR. N 1016



Fire Research Note No 1016

THE EFFECT OF A SPRINKLER ON THE STABILITY
OF A SMOKE LAYER BENEATH A CEILING

by

M L Bullen

July 1974

FIRE
RESEARCH
STATION

51931

**Fire Research Station
BOREHAMWOOD
Hertfordshire WD6 2BL
Tel: 01 953 6177**

THE EFFECT OF A SPRINKLER ON THE STABILITY OF A
SMOKE LAYER BENEATH A CEILING

by

M L Bullen

SUMMARY

A study has been made of the action of sprinkler sprays on hot buoyant smoke layers, with particular reference to covered shopping complexes, to quantify the possible danger of bringing smoke down to a low level and thus impeding or preventing the escape of occupants.

A theory has been developed for the interaction of the spray and buoyant gases. Graphs derived from the theory are presented which enable the conditions under which smoke-logging by the spray is likely to occur to be obtained. The experimental data available at present support this theory.

Where the smoke layer is deep (~ 1 m) it can be shown that a layer which is hot enough to set off sprinkler heads will have sufficient buoyancy to withstand the downward drag of the sprinkler spray. Downflow may only occur later in the course of the fire when the layer is cooler, by which time the occupants should have escaped.

The effect of sprinklers on thin smoke layers is discussed.

Crown copyright

This report has not been published and should be considered advance research information. No reference should be made to it in any publication without the written consent of the Head of Fire Research

THE EFFECT OF A SPRINKLER ON THE STABILITY OF A
SMOKE LAYER BENEATH A CEILING

by

M L Bullen

1. INTRODUCTION

The hazards of smoke spread in enclosed shopping complexes have been considered in previous reports^{1,2,3,4}. Experimental and theoretical studies of the behaviour of smoke in such complexes have shown that it is not usually practicable to prevent the spread of smoke from a fire in a shop into the adjoining mall. However, this work has also shown that the smoke flowing into the mall almost always forms a stratified layer beneath the ceiling. By sub-dividing the mall into smoke reservoirs and extracting from them either by natural or mechanical ventilation, it is possible to keep the lower level of the mall relatively smoke-free and to prevent smoke travel over long distances. If the layer is disturbed or allowed to cool too much, mixing with the cooler air beneath may occur. This can produce extensive smoke logging and reduce the effectiveness of the extraction system; escape and fire-fighting will be hindered.

It is normal practice at present to fit automatic sprinklers to all parts of enclosed shopping complexes, including the malls. Although sprinklers will substantially reduce the hazard if combustible materials are present in the malls, there appeared to be a danger that in some cases the downward flow of water through the smoke could overcome the stratification of the layer and cause smoke logging. Thus where malls are kept clear of combustibles and serve only for access so that the sprinklers do not have to contend with a fire originating within the mall there might be a danger that their installation would increase the hazard to the occupants.

Smoke logging caused by sprinklers has been noted in a number of tests, at the Fire Research Station and elsewhere. In some experimental car-park fires in Berne, Basle and Geneva⁵, conditions in the test areas were fairly clear initially. However, in all the test series severe smoke logging at low levels occurred rapidly when sprinklers were operated. The value of sprinklers acting on the burning material and reducing the quantity of smoke produced at the seat of the fire was shown in the 'Operation School Burning' tests⁶ carried out by the Los Angeles Fire Department in schools awaiting demolition. Although the

interaction between the sprinkler spray and hot smoke layer away from the fire was not considered in detail it was noted in Test J4 that 'Operation of sprinklers drove smoke to floors and resulted in the generation of steam'. In most tests the corridor became 'untenable' (based on optical density and temperature measurements) before any sprinklers operated or before vents opened, and in these cases any further deterioration caused by the sprinklers would not necessarily be noted and would not necessarily be relevant to the purpose of the experiments. The report makes it clear that sprinklers in the corridors did not assist in smoke clearance, eg in Test C2 'smoke did not clear even though five heads ultimately were operating', and in Test D2 'untenable smoke conditions did not clear even though eight sprinklers were operating'.

Preliminary tests in the large-scale experimental mall at the Fire Research Station showed that under some conditions the smoke layer could be brought down by a manually operated sprinkler spray, smoke logging then occurring rapidly, with a high smoke density at low level. However, under other conditions the smoke layer was not disturbed by a sprinkler spray. It is therefore important to know what affects the likelihood of smoke-logging happening in this situation.

A theory to model the interaction of the sprinkler discharge and hot smoke layer is described in this report and shown to be in satisfactory agreement with the results of experiments. The practical implications of this work are discussed.

2. THEORY

(A nomenclature is given in Section 9). Consider the vertical velocity component of a spherical water drop falling in air (Fig.1a). The drop will be subject to a drag force $D(x)$, given by⁷

$$D(x) = -kv^2 \text{ (assuming turbulent drag)}$$

where $k = C_D \cdot \frac{1}{2} \rho_a A$, C_D being a constant. In practice C_D is a function of the Reynolds Number based on the drop diameter $\left(\frac{\rho_a dv}{\mu_a}\right)$. In this analysis C_D is assumed not to vary with displacement x (and hence velocity). The form of the relationship of C_D with Reynolds Number is considered in detail elsewhere⁸, in a turbulent flow situation (which occurs fairly soon after starting from rest for a drop of the size occurring here) C_D becomes insensitive to changes in velocity. The variation of C_D with drop diameter is allowed for in the analysis. The equation of motion of the drop is thus:

$$mg - kv^2 = m \frac{dv}{dt} = mv \frac{dv}{dx}$$

⁰ It is assumed that the initial vertical momentum of the water leaving the

sprinkler is destroyed by the striker plate, so that the initial vertical velocity component of the drop is zero. This assumption is thought to be reasonable, although the author is unaware of any workers who have investigated this. The solution to the differential equation of motion is thus

$$v^2 = \frac{mg}{k} \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{2kx}{m}\right) \right) \quad (1)$$

The down-thrust on the hot layer is given by the sum of the drag forces on all the drops if all the momentum is assumed to be transferred parallel to the direction of motion of the drops.

The number of drops in an element of the layer (Fig.1b) is equal to

$$\frac{\text{water mass flow rate} \times \delta x}{\text{mass of 1 drop} \times v} \\ = \frac{\dot{M} \delta x}{mv}$$

The drag exerted on one drop as it falls through the layer is:

$$\int_0^h D(x) \cdot dx$$

and the total drag (D) exerted on all the drops is

$$D = \frac{\dot{M}k}{m} \int_0^h v \, dx, \text{ for constant } \dot{M}, k, m$$

Substituting from (1)

$$D = \dot{M} \left(\frac{kg}{m}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^h \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{2kx}{m}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dx$$

This can be solved by a substitution of the form:

$$z^2 = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{2kx}{m}\right)$$

giving the drag force

$$D = \dot{M} \left(\frac{mg}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{1 + \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{2kh}{m}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 - \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{2kh}{m}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right] - \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{2kh}{m}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \quad (2)$$

The downward drag force on the layer will be countered by the upward buoyancy force. Considering the volume of gas through which the discharge of the sprinkler passes, and assuming a parabolic envelope containing hot smoke at a constant temperature,

$$\text{Buoyancy force } B = (\rho_o - \rho)g \cdot \text{Volume}$$

The volume of revolution of a parabola is given by (Fig.1b)

$$\text{Vol.} = \int_0^h \pi y^2 dx$$

and $y^2 = Cx$ where C is a constant

$$\therefore \text{Vol} = \frac{\pi C h^2}{2}$$

Manufacturers' data and experimental observations indicate that the wetted area at 3 m below the ceiling level is a circle of approximate radius 3 m

$$\therefore C = 3m$$

$$\text{and thus Vol} = \frac{3\pi h^2}{2} \quad m^3$$

The buoyancy force is

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \frac{3}{2} (\rho_o - \rho) g \pi h^2 \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \pi g \frac{\rho_o}{T} \theta h^2 \quad N \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Combining equations (2) and (3) gives a criterion for the break-up of the hot layer ; ie the layer will be pulled down if $D > B$

$$\text{ie, } \dot{M} \left(\frac{m g}{k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{1 + (1 - \exp(-\frac{2kh}{m}))^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 - (1 - \exp(-\frac{2kh}{m}))^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right] - (1 - \exp(-\frac{2kh}{m}))^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} > \frac{3}{2} \pi g \frac{\rho_o}{T} \theta h^2$$

$$\text{or } \frac{D}{B} = \frac{2}{3 \rho_o \pi g^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\dot{M} T}{\theta h^2} \left(\frac{m}{k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{1 + (1 - \exp(-\frac{2kh}{m}))^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 - (1 - \exp(-\frac{2kh}{m}))^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right] - (1 - \exp(-\frac{2kh}{m}))^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} > 1 \quad (4)$$

3. RESULTS

In order to obtain values of the drag/buoyancy (D/B) ratio, the discharge characteristics of the sprinkler must be considered.

The mass flow rate through the sprinkler is

\dot{M} = water density x nozzle area x discharge coefficient x ideal velocity

$$= \rho_w \cdot \text{Area} \cdot C_d \left(\frac{2 p_w}{\rho_w} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

For the sprinkler used in the large scale tests (15 mm nominal, spray type)

$$\dot{M} = 3.29 \times 10^{-3} p_w^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ kg/s } (p_w \text{ in N/m}^2) \quad (5)$$

k/m is given by

$$\frac{k}{m} = \frac{C_D \cdot \frac{1}{8} \rho_a \pi d_w^2}{\frac{1}{6} \pi d_w^3 \rho_w} \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{3 \rho_o T_o C_D}{4 \rho_w d_w T}$$

Since the drag coefficient C_D is a function of Reynolds Number based on drop diameter, for any given drop size C_D varies with velocity which itself is a function of height (and of C_D). A mean value of C_D for each drop size was found by successive approximation. For drop sizes in the range 0.3 to 2.6 mm the mean value of C_D in this situation was calculated and found to be given by the approximate empirical relation

$$C_D = \frac{-\ln d_w - 4.6}{3.1} \quad (d_w \text{ in metres}) \quad (7)$$

The variation of C_D with temperature is smaller than the variation with drop size and has been neglected here.

The sprinkler produces a range of drop sizes. Information on the drop size distribution for a half-inch 'Reliable' upright sprinkler is given in a paper by Yao and Kalelkar⁹ and a weight distribution graph is reproduced in Fig.2.

The D/B ratios were evaluated by dividing the drop distribution into 10 per cent weight ranges. The drag contribution of the mean drop size in each of the ten weight ranges was evaluated and added to give the total drag, ie

$$\frac{D}{B} = \frac{0.2 \dot{M} T}{3 \rho_o g^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi \theta h^2} \sum_{i=1}^{10} \left(\frac{m_i}{k_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{1 + (1 - \exp(-\frac{2k_i h}{m_i}))^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 - (1 - \exp(-\frac{2k_i h}{m_i}))^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right] - (1 - \exp(-\frac{2k_i h}{m_i}))^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \quad (8)$$

Thus combining equations 5, 6, 7 and 8 the D/B ratios for different values of p_w , θ and h were calculated. Ambient temperature was taken as 288K and ambient density 1.25 kg/m^3 .

Figures 3-6 show the relationship between the drag/buoyancy force ratio and the temperature of the hot layer, for various values of layer depth and for four water pressures in the range 70 kN/m^2 (10 psi) to 830 kN/m^2 (120 psi). An alternative presentation of the data is given in Fig.7 where the critical temperature θ_c , defined as the layer temperature when the drag and buoyancy forces are equal, is plotted against layer depth for the four values of water pressure. Although the information available from this graph is limited, it gives an indication of whether the drag is greater or less than the buoyancy for given conditions of temperature, layer depth and water pressure.

If further D/B values are required, a reasonable agreement (D/B within 15 per cent of the results given here) is obtained by substituting an average drop diameter in equation (4). Since the drop diameters in the spray have a skewed distribution it is difficult to decide which of the possible average values is most meaningful. Although the mass-median diameter is often used in this context it was found that in this case the arithmetic mean of mean drop diameters in each decile of the distribution gave results closest to those given here. For water pressures in the range 70 to 830 kN/m^2 , the mean drop diameter is a function of the water pressure and from the data in Fig.2 is given approximately by the relation

$$\bar{d}_w = \frac{16 - \ln p_w}{3400} \quad (p_w \text{ in } \text{N/m}^2, \bar{d}_w \text{ in metres}) \quad (9)$$

Thus equations (6), (7) and (9) substituted in equation (4) give the drag/buoyancy ratio for given values of p_w , θ + h .

4. COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENTAL DATA

Three test fires carried out in the experimental mall have given results that can be compared with the theory. In each of the tests the layer depth and temperature were different and in each the layer was allowed to stabilise before the sprinkler was (manually) operated. Although the Swiss car park tests⁵, do not provide a great deal of data on the depth and temperature profiles of the smoke layers, in one case it was possible to compute the D/B ratio. A summary of the results from these 4 tests are given in Table 1.

Table 1

Test Ref. No.	Observations	Water pressure bar (psi)	Average layer depth (m)		Average layer temperature rise (degC)		D/B	θ/θ_c
			When sprinkler operated	When plume formed	When sprinkler operated	When plume formed		
150	Downward smoke plume did not form when the sprinkler was operated. A plume was noticed 8 min later after the layer had cooled	2.8 (40)	0.3	0.45	60	15	0.6 2.0	1.7 0.5
152	The sprinkler was operated later than in 150 and the layer was cooler. A plume formed immediately and smoke was pulled down to floor level	5.5 (80)	0.75	0.75	12	12	3.0	0.3
153	The layer was deeper than in the above tests and a plume formed immediately	5.5 (80)	1.25	1.25	25	25	1.1	0.8
-	Experimental car park fire in Berne. Ignition of a simulated petrol spillage under a car. Sprinkler manually set off 30 s after ignition and severe smoke logging occurred at once	5.0 (73)	0.5-0.75	0.5-0.75	30	30	1.1-1.5	0.7-0.8

In all the tests the drag was greater than the upward buoyancy force when the layer was brought down, and the corresponding θ/θ_c less than 1. In the one case where the layer remained stable the D/B ratio was less than 1. Whilst these results cannot be said to provide a highly critical test for the accuracy of the theory, the agreement is good enough for design purposes.

5. DISCUSSION

Because of the complexity of the problem, several of the assumptions made in the analysis only approximately reflect what occurs in practice. In particular

the assumption that the drag force acts over the whole of the area within the envelope of the sprinkler does not correspond accurately to the momentum transfer between individual drops and the surrounding air. Other assumptions, viz spherical water drops and a uniform constant temperature gas layer may not occur in practice. However, deviations in these respects from the ideal case assumed should affect the magnitude of the final answer rather than the form of the drag/buoyancy equation. Since the theory gives results which are in agreement with the experimental data at present available, it is thought that despite these simplifications the theory gives a viable indication of the likelihood of smoke down-flow from a sprinkler.

One aspect of the effect of the sprinkler on the hot layer has not been considered in the analysis. This is the cooling effect of the spray as it passes through the smoke layer. In a relatively stagnant part of the layer - for instance at a position in a smoke reservoir well away from the fire - local cooling of the layer may cause a down-flow even though the temperature in the bulk of the layer is greater than θ_c^* . However, if a down-flow started in this situation, warmer smoke would flow into the spray envelope to replace that descending; this smoke would have to be cooled before the down-flow could restart. Thus the down-flow is likely to be much less than if the bulk temperature is below θ_c .

The likely effect of a sprinkler can now be obtained. The FOC rules for automatic sprinkler installations¹⁰ state that 'for normal conditions in temperate climates ratings of 68/74°C will be generally suitable' but in some circumstances higher ratings may be required.

For the rates of fire development in the experiments of O'Dogherty et al¹¹ the gas temperature rise at operation of a 68°C rated sprinkler bulb was in the region of 90-115 degC because of the thermal inertia of the sprinkler head. Whilst a sprinkler would operate more quickly with a faster developing fire, the gas temperature which would lead to its operation would be even higher.

In single storey shopping complexes we are concerned with smoke layers a metre or more deep. Thus entering Fig 6 (830 kN/m², 120 psi) with $\theta = 90$ degC rise and $h = 1$ m we obtain a drag-buoyancy ratio of 0.5, much less that would be required to bring smoke down to a low level. This pressure would represent conditions close to the upper pressure limit for sprinkler installations¹⁰ (10 bar at valve, ie 1000 kN/m²). For lower pressures the drag/buoyancy ratio is lower.

*But well away from the fire the layer may have cooled so much that sprinklers would not operate.

Thus for smoke layers of the thickness likely in shopping complexes, the conclusion is basically that if the layer is hot enough to set off sprinklers then it will be buoyant enough to remain as a layer. Later on as the thermal and smoke output from the fire is reduced by sprinkler action in the shop the layer in the mall will become cooler and a point should be reached where those sprinklers which were set off earlier will be able to drag smoke down to a low level. This may happen quite suddenly but would be a problem mainly for the fire brigade, since the occupants should have been able to escape before this happens.

In any situations (other than shopping complexes) where the smoke layer may be much thinner than a metre or so, (ie much thinner than may be expected in a covered shopping complex), there is a possibility of smoke logging due to sprinklers and in some circumstances this could possibly create a hazard, but the theory developed indicates the possible solutions. Firstly the temperature rating of the sprinkler heads away from the likely seat of the fire (ie escape routes and low hazard rating areas) could be raised above that of the sprinkler heads in the higher risk area. Fewer sprinkler heads should then operate away from the fire and downflow is less likely to occur with more buoyant gas beneath any sprinkler set off. Secondly, if the effect of water pressure on drop size is neglected in comparison with its effect on the mass flow rate, the drag/buoyancy ratio is proportional to the square root of the water pressure. Thus sprinklers operating at low pressures are less likely to cause a down-flow of smoke. Thirdly a thick smoke layer will be pulled down less easily than a thin one, at the same temperature, so that where the height of the building permits it is an advantage to have deep smoke reservoirs (smoke extraction is also more efficiently carried out with deeper layers).

Alternatively, if the circulation areas and escape routes contain no materials that would allow fire spread the use of sprinklers could be restricted to areas where there is a known fire hazard, such as display or exhibition areas, and refuse disposal areas. In this way there would be no loss of coverage in areas of known risk, but there would be less likelihood of smoke-logging by the operation of sprinklers distant from the seat of the fire.

Clearly, considerations such as these are far more wide-ranging than can be covered by the scope of this report; other aspects of fire and smoke control in enclosed shopping complexes interact with the problem of preventing smoke-logging and any remedial measures must be made with respect to the total problem.

6. CONCLUSIONS

1. The likelihood of a sprinkler discharge causing a hot smoke layer to break up and form a plume flowing downwards into the clear area beneath is dependent on the operating pressure of the sprinkler and the temperature and depth of the hot smoke layer.
2. Where the smoke layer is reasonably thick (~ 1 m) as in enclosed shopping complexes, a layer which is hot enough to set off a sprinkler will be buoyant enough to remain as a layer at the time of operation of the sprinkler. Downflow will then only occur later as the fire is reduced by sprinklers, and should only be a problem to the Fire Brigade.
3. For thin smoke layers (thinner than may be expected in enclosed shopping complexes) smoke logging can occur but would be less likely if high temperature rating sprinkler heads and a medium or low water pressure were used.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The theoretical analysis is based on an idea by H P Morgan.

The experiments quoted are part of a study of fire problems in pedestrian precincts being undertaken by the Fire in Buildings Section of the Fire Research Station.

8. REFERENCES

1. HINKLEY, P L. A preliminary note on the movement of smoke in an enclosed shopping mall. Joint Fire Research Organisation Fire Research Note No.806, 1970.
2. HINKLEY, P L. Some notes on the control of smoke in enclosed shopping centres. Joint Fire Research Organisation Fire Research Note No.875, 1971.
3. HESELDEN, A J M. Fire problems of pedestrian precincts. Part 1. The smoke production of various materials. Joint Fire Research Organisation Fire Research Note No.856, 1971.
4. HESELDEN, A J M, WRAIGHT, H G H and WATTS, P R H. Fire problems in pedestrian precincts. Part 2. Large scale experiments with a shaft vent. Joint Fire Research Organisation Fire Research Note No.954, 1972.

5. D'AURIA, C. Protection against fire in garages. Anticendio e Protezione Civile, 9/73, 640-642.
6. Operation School Burning, Los Angeles Fire Department. National Fire Protection Association, Boston, Mass. Vol 1, 1959, Vol 2 1961.
7. MASSEY, B S. Mechanics of Fluids. Van Nostrand, 1968.
8. MORGAN, H P and BULLEN, M L. The extraction of smoke by a ducted water spray. Joint Fire Research Organisation Fire Research Note No.1010, 1974.
9. YAO, C and KALELKAR, A S. Effect of drop size on sprinkler performance. 74th Annual Meeting, National Fire Protection Association, Toronto, Canada. May 1970.
10. Rules for Automatic Sprinkler Installations. 29th Edition. Fire Offices Committee, London 1968.
11. O'DOGHERTY, M J, NASH, P and YOUNG, R A. A study of the performance of automatic sprinkler systems. Joint Fire Research Organisation Fire Research Technical Paper No. 17.

9. NOMENCLATURE

A	Cross-sectional area of drop	m^2
B	Buoyancy force	N
C_D	Drag coefficient	-
C_d	Discharge coefficient	-
D	Drag force	N
d	Drop diameter	m
h	Depth of hot layer	m
k	Drag constant of proportionality	kg/m
\dot{M}	Mass flow rate of water	kg/s
m	Mass of drop	kg
p	Pressure	N/m^2
T	Absolute temperature	K
v	Velocity of drop	m/s
γ	Absolute coefficient of viscosity	Ns/m^2
ρ	Density	kg/m^3
θ	Temperature difference	degC

Suffixes

a	Referring to air
c	Referring to the condition when the drag and buoyancy forces are equal
o	Referring to ambient datum conditions
w	Referring to water




Figure 1a Motion of a spherical drop falling vertically under gravity




Figure 1b Sprinkler discharge through the hot layer




Figure 2 Drop size distribution curves for a half-inch 'Reliable' upright sprinkler head⁶




Figure 3 Drag/Buoyancy ratio against gas temperature rise -- sprinkler pressure 69 kN/m² (10 lbf/in²)




Figure 4 Drag/Buoyancy ratio against gas temperature rise –
sprinkler pressure 193 kN/m^2 (28 lbf/in^2)




Figure 5 Drag/Buoyancy ratio against gas temperature rise –
sprinkler pressure 420 kN/m^2 (61 lbf/in^2)




Figure 6 Drag/Buoyancy ratio against gas temperature rise—
sprinkler pressure 830 kN/m^2 (120 lbf/in^2)




Figure 7 Critical temperature rise against hot layer depth
(for a given layer depth, if the temperature is
greater than θ_c , the layer will tend to remain
stable)

