Investigation of Fire Growth and Spread in a Model-Scale Railcar Using an Applied Approach
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ABSTRACT

Fire is a potential hazard in public transportation facilities such as subways or road tunnels due to its contribution to high number of deaths. To provide an insight into fire development behavior in tunnels which can serve as the basis for emergency ventilation design, model-scale railcar fire is explored numerically in this research. Fire growth and its spread are investigated by analyzing the HRR curve as the representative of fire behavior in different stages. Fire development has been predicted through a new approach using an Arrhenius-based pyrolysis model, established to predict the decomposition behavior of solid flammable materials exposed to heat flux. Using this approach, model-scale railcar fire curve is obtained and compared with experimental data. Reasonable agreement is achieved in two important stages of flashover and fully developed fire, confirming the accuracy of the presented approach. Moreover, effects of railcar material type, amount of available air, and surrounding are also discussed. Detailed illustrations of physical phenomena and flow structures have been provided and justified with experimental findings for better description of railcar fire behavior. The presented approach can be further used in other applications such as investigation of fire spread in a compartment, studying fire spread from a burning vehicle to another and reconstruction of fire incidents.
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NOMENCLATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_i$</td>
<td>pre-exponential factor (s$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_p$</td>
<td>specific heat capacity (J kg$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_S$</td>
<td>Smagorinsky constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D'$</td>
<td>characteristic diameter (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>activation energy (J mol$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>gravitational acceleration (m s$^{-2}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_i$</td>
<td>radiation intensity at wavelength $\lambda$ (W m$^{-2}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$</td>
<td>conductivity (W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$MW$</td>
<td>molecular weight (gr mol$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>pressure (Pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Pr$</td>
<td>Prandtl number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_o$</td>
<td>background pressure (Pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^*$</td>
<td>reduced pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q$</td>
<td>fire heat release rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q_{ch}$</td>
<td>heat release rate of chemical reaction (W m$^{-3}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q_r$</td>
<td>radiative heat transfer (W m$^{-3}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>universal gas constant (J mol$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>number of carbon atoms in the fuel molecule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_i, x, y, z$</td>
<td>Cartesian coordinate (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^{(2)}$</td>
<td>number of carbon atoms in the fuel molecule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>species mass fraction (kg$^{-1}$ kg$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>mixture fraction (kg$^{-1}$ kg$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_i, \delta_x, \delta_y, \delta_z$</td>
<td>cell size (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_j$</td>
<td>Kronecker delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>wavelength (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>density (kg m$^{-3}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>Stefan–Boltzmann constant (W m$^{-2}$ K$^{-4}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>mixing time scale (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{ij}$</td>
<td>stress tensor component (Pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{ij}$</td>
<td>sub-grid Reynolds stress (Pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>dynamic viscosity (N s m$^{-2}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>stoichiometric coefficients in chemical reaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superscripts
Common methods to study fire and smoke spread are full-scale and reduced-scale experiments, numerical models and analytical methods. In full-scale experiments, passenger railcar fires are performed in both real tunnels and outdoors. The EUREKA 499 project (Haack, 1998), Second Benelux Tunnel fire experiments (Lemaire and Kenyon, 2006) and work by Peacock et al. (2004) are examples. Such tests are rare since they are expensive, time-consuming and complex to perform. Reduced-scale experiments can be considered as an alternative, due to difficulties in performing full-scale tests. These experiments are often carried out by using Froude scaling technique and reveal main aspects of real situation with less cost and in a shorter time. Chow et al. (2010) investigated smoke movement in a tilted road tunnel using experiments in a 1:50 scaled tunnel. Hu et al. (2010) studied distribution of carbon monoxide and smoke temperature along the tunnel by series of experimental tests. Ingason (2007) investigated fire spread along with influencing factors in passenger railcars and measured heat release rate. He also applied simple theoretical equations used for estimating HRR in a compartment fire to predict peak HRR in a railcar fire. Most and Saulnier (2011) studied the behavior of a strongly contained wall fire in an enclosure during the post-flashover period in a laboratory scale experimental setup. They explored the fire intensity decay up to extinction of a wall fire due to lack of oxygen and the probability of the back-draft phenomenon.

Although reduced-scale tests have fewer limitations than full-scale ones, obtained results cannot be completely converted to real fire results. This is due to lack of complete similarity between model and real samples. Furthermore, the theoretical methods are too restricted and only useful in simple geometries. These limitations along with major revolution in computer processing ability have persuaded the researchers to use numerical modeling as a powerful tool to study fire phenomena in recent years. As an early numerical work, Emmons’s study (1979) can be noted in which he developed one of the first models for simulating fire in residential apartments. Nowadays, by increasing the accuracy and reliability of numerical models, advanced CFD models for simulating fires are being used in several fields such as smoke management, emergency ventilation systems performance, and material behavior exposed to fire.

Wang (2009) used CFD to predict soot and carbon monoxide production in a ventilated tunnel fire. Brahim et al. (2013) examined performance of two ventilation systems by comparing temperature distribution and pollutant stratification inside a road tunnel. Jia et al. (1999) studied pyrolysis process of non-charring materials and applied the results to predict fire spread within a compartment. Moghtaderi et al. (1997) developed a one-dimensional integral model for the transient pyrolysis of solid materials and estimated mass loss rate of materials exposed to heat flux. The behavior of a railcar fire has high importance for the ventilation designer as it is the basis for design of smoke management systems in subways. System designer must be provided with information such as growth rate and peak heat release rate. It is also important to know about the effect of ventilation air on fire spread of and its intensification or retarding. Although many numerical researches have been performed on smoke movement, temperature distribution and toxic gases concentration, direct estimation of heat release rate and fire propagation in complicated fires by means of numerical simulation is still rare in literature. Zhang et al. (2007) numerically investigated fire spread and smoke movement in an underground car park. Fire source was designed by letting surface densities of the liquid fuel on top of the cars. Chiam (2005) simulated a metro train fire and estimated the heat release rate in different fire scenarios in subway tunnels. Hu et al. (2012) investigated the fire spread in a passenger rail car compartment using an enhanced flame spread model. As observed by Peacock et al. (1999; 2002; 2004), heat release rate determines the emergency ventilation requirements; thus, it directly affects passenger train safety in fire incidents. It is thereby required to carry out more comprehensive research on fire spread and influencing parameters to ensure safety in real fires. To meet the goal, fire behavior of a railcar in different stages is predicted using a novel approach in this research. Arrhenius equation pyrolysis model is utilized through a new approach in order to estimate HRR and investigate the influence of certain parameters, such as interior material type and geometry of the openings. Physical assessment of flow structures and temperature and velocity distributions has been performed to visualize the results. Accuracy
of the presented approach is verified by experimental data on model-scale fire tests.

FDS 5.5.3 code is used in this study, due to its ability to well simulate the spread of fire-induced smoke. Mathematical models and CFD simulation parameters are described in Section 3.

1.1. Railcar Fire

To form a basis prior to discussions, a review of phenomena in railcar fires and more generally, compartment fires, have been provided. Enclosure fires can be represented by the temperature development in the compartment as shown in Fig. 1 for a typical geometry (Karlsson and Quintrie, 1999). It shows a typical time variation of temperature with five stages of uncontrolled fire growth. The stages include ignition, growth, flashover, fully developed fire and decay. Among the stages, flashover and fully developed stages are of the most importance.

![Fig.1 General description of uncontrolled compartment fire (Karlsson and Quintiere, 1999)](image)

In the growth period, ignited fuel heats up the surrounding combustibles to a temperature in which they can release volatiles that can burn. The first minutes are usually spent in heating and not combustion. Flashover is a term used to describe a phenomenon where this locally burning fire transitions rapidly to a condition in which the whole compartment is involved in fire, causing a rapid increase in the size and intensity of fire. The ignition of all un-burnt combustibles, flame propagation through enclosure openings and rapid increase in temperature are the different phenomena associated with flashover. Gas temperatures of 500 to 600 °C have been generally reported during flashover (Karlsson and Quintrie, 1999; Walton and Thomas, 2002).

The second important stage is the post-flashover or fully developed fire. During this stage, the heat release rate (HRR) of the fire and the compartment temperature are the highest. In this period, the amount of air reaching the fire is insufficient for burning all the volatiles vapors as the whole compartment openings have limited areas. The fire in such conditions is called ventilation-controlled, against fuel-controlled fire. The excess burning outside the compartment due to flames extension through the openings is the result of high temperature unburned fuel reaction with outside air. The average gas temperature in the enclosure during fully developed stage is very high, often in the range of 700 to 1200 °C depending on environment within the compartment (Karlsson and Quintiere, 1999; Walton and Thomas, 2002).

A similar curve to that shown in Fig.1 can be used for heat release rate. It is the rate at which energy is produced from combustion process. Similar to temperature, HRR increases very slowly in the pre-flashover and suddenly increases to post-flashover peak value in the flashover period. Therefore, either curve may totally represent the fire behavior.

The two described stages of flashover and fully developed fire have the highest importance in design of emergency ventilation systems. Ventilation engineers must know about the time to flashover and the peak fire intensity. Smoke extraction capacities depend directly on the peak HRR while passenger evacuation strategies rely on the flashover time.

This paper mainly emphasizes the peak fire intensity to help design efficient ventilation systems. The presented findings and procedures may also be used in design or pre-fabrication phase, prior to construction of railcar body, for reducing its fire propagation characteristics as the manufacturers must meet the standard requirements of high fire ratings.

2. PROPOSED METHOD DESCRIPTION

Predicting fire behavior of a railcar relies on solid combustibles’ pyrolysis estimations. The problem of describing the pyrolysis of a solid material is to define the reaction or reactions converting virgin material to final products, and to obtain the kinetic parameters, A, E, and n, for each reaction (Vaari et al., 2012). Therefore, specification of the kinetic parameters and reaction scheme in solid phase is vital to estimate production of gas volatiles and fire behavior. The mentioned parameters are not material properties but model constants which depend directly on the specified reaction scheme (Shen et al., 2007; Matala et al., 2008). Thereby, unique values are not found directly in literature.

As an alternative proposed method (Matala et al., 2008), a reaction scheme is defined first and reliable experimental data, such as thermogravimetric analysis (TGA), on the decomposition process of the specified material are gathered. In the second stage, a satisfactory fit between the model and experimental data is obtained using numerical methods. Suitable kinematic parameters will be found via the described procedure.

Reaction schemes for wood and PVC are explored here as they will be used in this study. For wood pyrolysis, four reaction schemes, shown in Table 1, have been investigated (Matala et al., 2008). The analysis indicated that for all reaction schemes except scheme 1, a reasonable fit between model
Table 1 Reaction schemes for wood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme 1:</th>
<th>Virgin Material</th>
<th>Intermediate Components</th>
<th>Final Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cellulose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lignin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hemicellulose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 2:</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 3:</td>
<td>Solid 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solid 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 4:</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

between model and experiment can be obtained. Scheme 4 is chosen as the wood decomposition reaction in this research.

PVC is an intumescent polymer which leaves char after pyrolysis (Shi and Chew, 2013). Therefore, in the current work, a single reaction scheme is used for PVC in which there is no intermediate component and virgin material converts to gas volatiles and char directly.

In this research, a new approach by using cone-calorimetry tests data is developed, as an extension to Hietaniemi et al. (2004) and Chiam (2005), in order to improve the accuracy of fire behavior estimations during a complex fire accident. The main basis of this approach is to predict the accurate behavior of solid flammable materials exposed to heat flux using a pyrolysis model based on Arrhenius equation. Upon this basis, the HRR fire curve may be estimated in different stages; flashover and fully developed fire. Obtained results may serve as feed data for safety and ventilation engineers. The proposed method is described by the following four steps:

1) Specifying flammable materials with high heats of combustion inside the railroad car.
2) Conducting numerical simulation of cone calorimeter experiments for all materials specified in step 1 with determined solid phase reaction schemes.
3) Determination of kinetic parameters values in pyrolysis equation, Eq. (25), in order to obtain best fit to experimental HRR curves from cone calorimeter tests of step 2.
4) Simulating railroad fire using the parameters obtained in step 3.

3. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

3.1. CFD Tool

Version 5.5.3 of the Fire Dynamics Simulator (FDS) is used for numerical simulation in this study which is developed by the U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). FDS is widely used as a powerful numerical tool in fire and smoke spread related researches. Its reliability has been validated in many former fire related researches (Hu et al, 2010; Roh et al., 2007).

The core algorithm of the code is an explicit predictor-corrector scheme that is second order accurate in space and time. The partial derivatives of the conservation equations are discretized by finite difference method (FDM), and the solution is updated in time on a three-dimensional, rectilinear grid using an explicit second-order Runge-Kutta scheme. Thermal radiation is computed using a finite volume technique on the same grid as the flow solver. Staggered grid storage is incorporated (McGrattan et al., 2010).

3.2. Physical Phenomena and Mathematical Models

In order to study dominant physical phenomena in a fire, governing equations for fluid flow, combustion in gas phase, decomposition of solid flammable materials and radiation should be solved simultaneously.

3.2.1 Fluid Flow

Filtering governing equations of continuity, momentum, energy and state in Cartesian coordinate system with filter width of Aving Favre averaging yields(Poinso and Veynante, 2001; McGrattan et al, 2010; Peters, 2000):

\[
\frac{\partial \rho \bar{u}_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\rho \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j) = 0 \quad (1)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\rho \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j) = -\frac{\bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j} \left[ \bar{\rho} \left( \bar{u}_i - \bar{u}_j \right) \right] \quad (2)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ \rho \bar{u}_i \left( \bar{u}_i - \bar{u}_j \right) \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j} \right)
\]

(3)
The Smagorinsky constant, \( C_s \), is set to be 0.2 (Kim et al. 2008; McGrattan et al. 2010). A main assumption is made to simplify the governing equations of fluid flow. It is the low Mach number assumption as the resulting velocities from buoyant plume are low. However, high density variations are expected due to high temperature changes. The low Mach number denotes that the time scale associated with the fire growth and resultant fluid motion is usually long compared with the transit time of an acoustic signal. Therefore, flow equations may be characterized by a spatially uniform mean pressure (background pressure) with a spatially non-uniform portion of the pressure (reduced pressure). The former, being a function of time, appears in both the energy equation and the equation of state while the latter only appears in the momentum equation (Rehm and Baum, 1978; McGrattan et al. 2010). Stoichiometric coefficients are obtained using Eq. (16):

\[
\begin{align*}
V_{N_2} &= \frac{a}{2} \\
V_{O_2} &= V_{CO} + V_{H_2O} - z \\
V_{soot} &= \frac{MW_{F}}{MW_{soot}} \gamma_{soot} \\
V_M &= b \\
V_{H,O} &= \frac{y}{2} - X_H V_{soot} \\
V_{CO} &= \frac{MW_{F}}{MW_{CO}} \gamma_{CO} \\
V_{CO_2} &= x - V_{CO} - (1 - X_H) V_{soot} \\
MW_{soot} &= X_H MW_{H} + (1 - X_H) MW_C
\end{align*}
\]

\( \gamma_{CO} \) and \( \gamma_{soot} \) are carbon monoxide and soot yields existing in the post-flame \( X_s \) is the atom fraction of hydrogen in the soot. Moreover, \( a, b, x \) and \( y \) are determined from the specification of the fuel molecule in Eq. (15)(Floyd and McGrattan, 2009).

For an under-ventilated fire, local extinction may occur due to oxygen depletion. The following correlation, between the oxygen mass fraction and the adiabatic temperature rise of the control volume,

\[
\begin{align*}
P(x,t) &= P_n(z,t) + P^\prime(x,t) \\
\end{align*}
\]
is used to determine the possibility of combustion (Vaari et al., 2012):

\[
Y_{O_2} = \frac{\tau(T_{lim,i} - T_o)}{\Delta H / \rho_o} \tag{17}
\]

In which, \(T_o\) is the temperature of the control volume and \(\Delta H/\rho_o\) is the heat release of fuel per 1 kg of oxygen consumption. Considering a critical flame temperature of 1700 K and an average specific heat of 1.2 kJ/kg.K (Senecal, 2005; McGrattan et al., 2010), approximate expression for the limiting oxygen mass fraction as a function of temperature will become:

\[
Y_{O_2,lim} = \frac{1.2 \times (1700 - T_m)}{13100} = 0.156 \tag{18}
\]

It can be inferred from Eq. (18) that, at 293 K, the limiting oxygen concentration (mass fraction) is 0.129, and falls linearly to zero at 1700 K. Based on SFPE handbook (Beyler, 2002), other researchers have reported limiting oxygen volume concentrations from 12 to 15 %. A value of 0.15 is considered in this research (McGrattan et al., 2010; Vaari et al., 2012).

A two-parameter mixture fraction, \(Z_1\) and \(Z_2\) such that \(Z_1 + Z_2 = 1\), is used to calculate species concentrations capable of tracking fuel and products. Transport equations, similar to Eq. (14), are required for both \(Z_1\), representing fuel, and \(Z_2\), representing combustion products.

\[
Z_1 = \frac{M_{W_F}Y_F}{x_{MW_{CO2}}Y_{CO2}} + \frac{M_{W_F}Y_F}{x_{MW_CO}Y_{CO}} + \frac{M_{W_F}Y_F}{x_{MW_Soot}Y_{Soot}} \tag{19}
\]

If combustion occurs, \(Z_1\) converts to \(Z_2\) representing the conversion of fuel to products. Mass fractions of species can be obtained by state relations after computing mixture fractions, \(Z_1\) and \(Z_2\), in the computational domain. State relation is the correlation between mixture fraction and mass fraction of each species. A detailed description of state relations along with the numerical approach are presented in Refs (Floyd and McGrattan, 2009; McGrattan et al., 2010).

The heat release rate from chemical reaction is computed in each cell:

\[
\dot{q}_r = \rho \min \left( \frac{Y_F, V_o, Y_{O_2}, M_{W_0} \rho_o}{M_{W_F}} \right) \Delta H \tag{20}
\]

In which, \(\tau\) is the mixing time scale:

\[
\tau = \frac{C_l (\delta x \delta y \delta z)^2}{D_{LES}} \tag{21}
\]

The constant \(C_l\) is assumed to be 0.1 (Kim et al., 2008; McGrattan et al., 2010). \(\Delta H\) in Eq. (20) is the heat released in complete combustion of unit mass of fuel.

### 3.2.3 Radiation Model

Radiation has an important role in heating the walls and pyrolyzing the combustibles. Radiation transport equation (RTE) has the following form for an absorbing, emitting and scattering medium (Siegel and Howell, 2002):

\[
s \cdot \nabla I_j(x, s) = - \left[ \kappa(x, \lambda) + \sigma_s(x, \lambda) \right] I_j(x, s) + B(x, \lambda) + \frac{\sigma_s(x, \lambda)}{4\pi} \int \Phi(s, s') I_j(x, s') ds' \tag{22}
\]

It may be simplified assuming a non-scattering gas:

\[
s \cdot \nabla I_j(x, s) = \kappa(x, \lambda) \left[ I_j(x) - I_j(x, s) \right] \tag{23}
\]

\(s\) denotes direction vector and \(I_0(x)\) is the source term given by the Planck black-body model, i.e. \(I_0(x) = \sigma T^4 / \pi\). The radiation transport equation must be solved by dividing the radiation spectrum into a relatively small number of bands. The current study does not consider the spectral dependence by assuming a gray medium with soot as the radiating gas. This is true as soot is the most important combustion product controlling the thermal radiation from the fire and hot smoke while its radiation spectrum is continuous.

### 3.2.4 Pyrolysis Model

Decomposition rate of a material in solid phase reactions is (McGrattan et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2011):

\[
\frac{\partial Y_s}{\partial t} = - \sum_j r_j ; \quad Y_s = \frac{Y_{F,0}}{\rho_o} \tag{24}
\]

The term \(r_j\) denotes the rate of \(j\) the reaction at temperature \(T_e\), which is calculated based on the Arrhenius model:

\[
r_j = A_j Y_s^{n_j} \exp \left(- \frac{E_j}{RT_e} \right) \tag{25}
\]

\(A_j\) and \(E_j\) are the pre-exponential factor and activation energy, respectively. \(n_j\) is the reaction order, \(\rho_{i,0}\) is the initial density of the solid material layer and \(\rho_i\) denotes the mass of the remaining material (which is not decomposed) divided by layer’s initial volume.

The assumption behind the pyrolysis model used in this research is that given a solid composing of \(N\) material components, the reaction rate converting component \(i\) to another substance (either an intermediate or a final product) can be written in Arrhenius form, Eq. (25) (Vaari et al., 2012). To calculate in-depth temperature at each combustible solid boundary, heat conduction is solved taking into account the solid decomposition reaction energy.
3.3. Description of Fire Scenarios

Using the proposed approach described in Section 2, fire spread in a railcar is studied and heat release rate is estimated in different cases. Four fire scenarios are simulated as described in Table 2. Case 1 is carried out based on Ingason’s model-scale railcar fire test (2007) to verify the accuracy of the approach. Fig. 2 shows the railcar geometry in all simulation cases (except in scenario 3 with variations in openings arrangement), that is just similar to Ingason’s setup.

The railcar ceiling and walls are covered by plywood and the seats are modeled with wood timbers in the first scenario. The door and all the windows of the railcar are open. In the second scenario, the effect of railcar interior material type on fire spread is investigated by changing the material from plywood in scenario 1 to PVC. In the third scenario, total area for air penetration through windows and doors is changed and the effect of air flow rate through the openings on fire spread and HRR is investigated. In the fourth scenario, railcar fire is simulated in two tunnels with different cross-sections.

The body of model-scale railcar is constructed using noncombustible board. The ignition source consists of a 2×2×2 cm³ fiberboard cube placed on the floor, adjacent to the wall in front of the door. It is modeled with a constant HRR of 2 kW on the top surface of the cube and duration of 4 minutes.

3.4. Simulation Setup and Boundary Conditions

The computational domain for the fire in outdoor environment is a space with length of 3, width of 1.5 and height of 1.2 meters. The railcar is located in the middle of the domain. Pressure boundary condition is implemented for all boundaries meaning that air and smoke are free to enter or leave the domain. In case of fire simulation inside the tunnel, similar pressure boundary is used for both tunnel entrances while transient conductive heat transfer into the tunnel side-walls is considered. They heat up via radiation and give back some part of the inflow heat via radiation and convection mechanisms. The ambient temperature and the initial temperature of all solid boundaries are considered to be 18 ºC in all cases. Railcar body is considered to form wall boundaries with no slip condition and is heated up via conduction. It is composed of combustible sections that burn and noncombustible sections that only get warm. The boundary condition for the fire source is mass inlet of the gas fuel. The mass flow is adjusted for the required power.

One-dimensional heat conduction is solved to calculate in-depth temperature at each solid boundary with a uniform solid mesh grid. The heat conduction is solved each time step.

The chemical formulae of gas volatiles for wood and PVC used in gas phase combustion, Eq. (15), are considered as $C_{3.4}H_{6.2}O_{2.5}$ and $C_2H_3Cl$, respectively (Hietaniemi et al., 2004). Furthermore, 12000 and 13000 kJ per kilogram of oxygen are assumed as heats of combustion for wood and PVC (Hietaniemi et al., 2004). The railcar fire is oxygen-lean; therefore, post-flame soot yield is supposed to be 0.12 for wood combustion and 0.17 in case of PVC. Carbon monoxide yield is specified to be 0.05 for both
materials (Hietaniemi et al., 2004; Tewarson, 2002).

In order to discretize the radiation transport equation, 100 solid angles are used (Feng and Lin, 2010; Lin et al., 2009).

The domain is longitudinally separated into three parts in the tunnel fire study. Mesh cells are finer in the section that contains the railcar and are coarser in the two other sections. Uniform grid is used in case of outdoor fire.

3.5. Grid Study

A characteristic length named characteristic fire diameter ($D'$) is defined (McGrattan et al., 1998) to check the ability of grid resolution to capture main aspects of fire behavior:

$$D' = \left( \frac{Q}{\rho f^3 \phi_p \sqrt{g}} \right)^{2/5}$$

(26)

It is recommended to sweep this characteristic length with four to sixteen mesh cells ($D'/\delta x$) near fire source (McGrattan et al., 1998). As the HRR is not known in advance and varies with time due to fire spread throughout the railcar, and also solid phase reactions are involved, grid sensitivity test is performed in order to capture acceptable resolution of flow field. Three outdoor fire simulations with uniform grid of different cell sizes are carried out to check the sensitivity of the results to grid distribution. It must be noted that the geometry of the railcar is modified against Fig. 2 so all the dimensions are multiples of coarsest mesh cell. This prevents any deformation in the geometry between different grids.

The fire curve or variations of HRR is selected for mesh study procedure as it can well represent the physical phenomena within a railcar fire. The results from the three grids are shown in Fig. 3. The medium grid may be chosen as the optimal case.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Basic Simulation

Calculated heat release rate for the railcar fire is shown in Fig. 4 and compared to experimental results of Ingason (2007). The result in major parts such as fire growth, flashover and post-flashover regions follows these experimental data. However, there is a mismatch in fire decay stage. In order to investigate the reason, cone calorimeter test for plywood is explored in more detail.

Fig. 5 shows the heat release rate of plywood in cone calorimetry and the best-fitted curve obtained. The large st deviation from experimental data occurs in fire decay stage. The fire stops sooner in present work compared to actual conditions. Charring process and smoldering fire which is responsible for late extinction of fire is not captured well in the numerical model. Therefore, some decomposition mechanisms of flammable materials inside the railcar are not estimated exactly and these results in the mismatch observed in fire decay stage of railcar fire.

Revisiting Fig. 4, it can be noted that the total energy released from two railcar fire tests are similar. This is done by integrating the curve over time to calculate a value of about 95 MJ. Therefore, the proposed reaction mechanisms consume the flammable materials faster which leads to earlier extinction. As mentioned before, the flashover and fully developed stages are of highest importance. Thus, efforts are focused to capture physics in these stages and satisfactory agreements are achieved.

4.2. Physical Discussions

The HRR fire curve contains many physical phenomena and can well represent the behavior of a compartment fire. Different stages of railcar fire according to this curve are deeply investigated in this section.
The first examination is the onset of flashover. As previously described, flashover is a transition from a local fire to a fully developed fire. As it can be seen in fire curve of Fig. 4, flashover occurs between minutes 3.5 to 5 as HRR increases rapidly in a short time. The rate of fire growth is slow before this time. In this regard, temperature contours are plotted in the first five minutes from ignition. Results are presented in Fig. 6. Temperature contours are averages of ten seconds. As it can be seen, no significant temperature increase is observed within the first three minutes except that the smoke has filled a larger portion of the enclosure. However, around minute 4, temperature starts to rise significantly. At minute 5, temperature in almost all of the compartment space has increased to about 400°C and above. As explained before, the dominant transfer phenomena in the beginning of a fire is thermal radiation. The environment is heated gradually and releases gas volatiles until their flow rate is enough to support combustion. In this moment, the fire propagates rapidly to the whole compartment.

Air entrainment through openings plays an important role in compartment fire development as such fires are generally ventilation-controlled. Openings allow for fresh air entrance and smoke exit to facilitate the combustion process. Fig. 7 presents the time variation of inflow and outflow through openings, that is, the single door and all the 18 windows as seen in Fig. 2, for the railcar fire. As can be seen, windows mainly contribute to outflow of smoke rather than inflow of fresh air while the door has similar amounts of in and out flows. The windows handle a high portion of outgoing smoke, about five times the share of the door.

This can be attributed to the fact that density variations inside the hot enclosure induce pressure gradients in the direction of gravity. Windows being located in higher levels, mainly contribute to smoke outflow. It must be mentioned that the windows have a total area of about 6 times the area of the door in the railcar geometry complying with the relative shares of the windows and the doors in outflow as previously stated. Also, summation of the inflows and outflows results in a net mass flow out of the compartment. This can be justified by the fact that enclosure heating pushes some air outwards due to density reductions. Fig. 7 also describes the flashover phenomenon. As can be seen, a sudden increase in smoke outflow occurs in about minute 4. This is due to flashover occurrence which yields to sudden temperature increase and a high production rate of hot smoke. Above observations comply with descriptions provided by Karlsson and Quintiere (1999). Quantitative discussion on air entrainment is presented in Section 4.4.
temperatures. The vector plots in Fig. 8 are 30 second averages in the fully developed stage of fire.

The final interesting point is the excess burning outside the compartment. As previously described, this happens because some unburned volatiles exit the compartment while mixed with outgoing combustion products. They catch fire as they reach oxygen at onset of discharge through the openings. This phenomenon is depicted Fig. 9 which presents a snapshot of temperature contour in the fully developed stage. High temperatures, about 500 ºC, are observed in the window discharge showing the flame existence. Similar findings are reported in other researches (Ingason, 2007; Hammarström et al., 2008; Hietaniemi et al., 2004).

4.3. Effect of Interior Material Type

The influence of flammable material type on the railcar fire has been investigated in this section. For this purpose, plywood is replaced by PVC and the heat release rate curves are compared. Fig. 10 shows the result.

According to the figure, the fully developed stages of the two curves are similar, even though the types of flammable materials and the corresponding cone calorimetry behaviors are different. Maximum heat release rate of PVC in cone calorimeter test is approximately 145 kW/m² compared with 420 kW/m² for plywood (NIST, 1999; Chow et al., 2004; Hietaniemi et al., 2004). This is similar to the result obtained by Ingason (2007) that observed the same peak HRR in his railcar fire tests with two different internal materials (3.5 mm plywood and 13 mm corrugated cardboard).

The reason can be associated with the air entrainment and ventilation conditions. As stated before, railcar fires are controlled by the ventilation rate as the amount of supply air reaching the fire is insufficient for burning all the fuels. Therefore, limited ventilation does not support large fires despite using different combustibles. The material type only affects the growth and flashover stages. PVC has lower fire ratings compared to wood; therefore, the PVC railcar catches fire more easily and fully develops in a shorter time.

4.4. Effect of Ventilation on HRR

In previous sections, ventilation has been proved to be a key parameter affecting compartment fire behavior. Influence of ventilation availability on railcar fires is investigated in this section. Based on Rocket’s research (1976), air mass flow rate through the openings for ventilation-controlled fires near the flashover and post-flashover regions, is proportional to ventilation factor, Eq. (27):

\[ \dot{m}_{\text{air}} \propto A \sqrt{H_0} \]  

(27)
Table 3 Railcar ventilation conditions and the resulting fire intensities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Ventilation factor, Ψ (m²)</th>
<th>$Q = 1500A_0\sqrt{H_0}$ (kW)</th>
<th>Maximum observed HRR (kW)</th>
<th>Correction factor, $\eta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$H_0$ and $A_0$ are height and area of openings, respectively. The effect of opening height as mentioned previously appears in this correlation quantitatively.

By considering the mass fraction of oxygen in air as 0.23, and heat release per unit mass of consumed oxygen as 13000 kJ, the maximum HRR in ventilation-controlled fires is obtained (Ingason, 2007):

$$Q_{\text{max}} = \eta 1500A_0\sqrt{H_0} \quad (28)$$

$\eta$ is the correction factor responsible for additional fuel burning outside of the openings.

To study the effect of excess air reaching the fire due to failure of windows, correction factors in seven different arrangements of openings are estimated. The railcar geometry is similar to the first scenario, with different total area of openings. Table 3 shows the summery of seven simulations including the HRR estimation from Eq. (28) and the values of HRR and correction factor from railcar fire simulations.

As seen in Table 3, correction factor grows as ventilation factor increases. This is similar to the result obtained by Bullen and Thomas (1979). It can also be deduced that, the peak HRR in this railcar fire drastically depends on the amount of ventilation; i.e., with a higher rate than estimated by Eq. (28).

To more deeply investigate the air entrainment effect, ventilation factors are normalized by the maximum possible ventilation factor for the railcar geometry in Fig. 2. Correction factor variations with normalized ventilation factor along with the best fitted curve are shown in Fig. 11. A regression may be proposed from the plot as follows:

$$\eta = (1640)\Psi^3 - (444)\Psi^2 + (50.7)\Psi - 0.0532 \quad (29)$$

In which, $\Psi$ is the normalized ventilation factor.

The correction factor for fire in a railcar, with similar geometry as Fig. 2, can be obtained from Eq. (29). In this way, fully developed fire characteristics can be estimated without any further simulations or experiments. Further, the similarity correlations (Ingason, 2007) may be used to upscale the results in order to predict full scale fire conditions.

Fig. 11 also shows the three correction factors obtained by Ingason (2007) in his model-scale railcar fire test. The acceptable agreement confirms the accuracy of presented correlation to predict fully developed peak HRR in ventilation-controlled fires for a railcar of similar geometry.

![Fig. 11. Correction factor based on dimension less ventilation factor.](image)

4.5. Fire in Tunnels

In this section, simulation of railcar fire inside tunnels with natural ventilation is carried out. The railcar geometry and its interior flammable materials are just the same as the first scenario. In order to study the effect of tunnel geometry on HRR, simulations are conducted in two tunnels with different cross-sections shown in Fig. 12. In both simulations, the tunnel length is 8 m.

Calculated HRR curves are shown in Fig. 13. Comparison of tunnel A’s fire behavior with the outdoor fire, Fig. 4, reveals that the initial rate of fire growth and flashover are the same. But the fully developed stages are dissimilar and the peak HRR for the case of fire inside the tunnel is lower than that of the outside fire. The reason lies behind the fact that smoke and hot gases occupy the upper parts of the tunnel as they travel longitudinally under ceiling in order to exit the tunnel. For the low height tunnel, this limits the ventilation conditions.
of the railcar fire. It must be noted that in naturally vented tunnels, opposite flows of upper smoke layer and lower fresh air layer occur leading to significant mixing at the interface. For the same reason, the fuel-controlled initial stages of fire are therefore for both conditions.

![Fig.12. Cross sections of the two tunnels used in simulations.](image1)

Simulations results showed that the railcar fires, both inside and outside the tunnel, were ventilation-controlled in the fully developed stage. Therefore, the peak HRR was a strong function of air supplied to the fire source from the openings and did not depend considerably on the internal flammable materials type. The type of combustible material was however important in initial fuel-controlled stages and affected the time to flashover significantly. It was also observed that the geometry of tunnel entrances played a significant role in fire spread and determined the maximum heat release rate.

Since the presented approach can well estimate the initiation of fire and its growth, it can be found useful in further applications. These applications include studying fire spread in a compartment, spread mechanism from a burning vehicle to another, reconstruction of fire incidents and estimation of critical ventilation velocity in a real tunnel railcar fire. Also, it must be mentioned that major efforts in current research were focused on flashover and fully developed stages as the basis for design of emergency ventilation; improvement of the method for better estimation of fire behavior in decay stage may be considered as a developing future work.

5. CONCLUSION

In this research, a railcar fire in model-scale was studied numerically and the affecting parameters were investigated. The time variation of heat release rate, or fire curve, was mainly explored in this regard as it contains full description of railcar fire conditions in all stages including flashover and fully developed fire. To predict the fire behavior, the concept of materials effective kinetic parameters was developed to be used in Arrhenius equation pyrolysis model, in order to capture the accurate decomposition behavior of solid flammable materials exposed to heat flux. Obtained kinetic parameters for any single material, found via small-scale tests, were incorporated into the full railcar fire with complex geometry. Acceptable agreement with experimental data in fire growth, flashover and fully developed stages, verified the ability of the presented approach, although it predicted a faster fire decay stage compared to experiment. Also, various illustrations of flow structures along with justification with experimental findings were provided to better perceive the physical phenomena during a railcar fire.

![Fig.13. Calculated heat release rate of railcar fire inside tunnel.](image2)
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