## RD-03-89 ~D-03-89

 $\bullet$ 

1909 שבס ~תשמ"ט, י(יאך *9 19*

87-1-85-I.C 'on nnn > לכ' חוזה ממ' C <sup>~</sup>7-1-85-B

מכון ייצמן למד<mark>ע, רחוב</mark>ות

בוצע ע"י משה לוי

ריפורמרים צינוריים בקולט אנכי

 $\bullet$  .

ענגל ר<mark>יפור</mark>פר/מתנטור בהספק של 20 קילויט בתנור השמש:

ינור חום כימי טולרי



 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\lambda$ 

ו*ו*גף מחקר ופיתוח

משרד האנרגיה והתשתיה  $\mathbf{u}$ 

 $85$  p  $-e$ 

....

INIS-mf—13906 INIS-mf--13906 . נוו' • "! J -';,'!ןש'

מדינת ישראל

משרד האנרגיה יהתשתית

ipnn אגף מחקר יפיתיח

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$  . Then

ציניר חים כימי סילרי

**oiit?>p 20 >w paona ^1\^JJ^o/^OTJD>^** מעגל ריפורמר/מתנסיר בהספק של 20 קילייס בתניר השמש ריפירמרים ציניריים בקילס אנכי

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z})$ 

ביצע ע"י משה ליי

**87-1-85-1 C 'on nri n** לפי חיזה מס' C87-1-85-1

מכין ייצמן למדע, רחובות

**1989** שבס התשמ"ס, יניאר 1989

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 

#### **o > j >** העניניס **j y n** תרכו

 $\bullet$ 

¥,

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

תקציר בעברית

 $\bullet$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

תקציר באנגלית

ריפךרםרים ציניריים בקילט אנכי (אנגלית)  $\ddotsc$ 

דף תיערד פרסים (אנגלית)

## <mark>ת ק צ י ר</mark>

ריאקטורים קטליטיים צינוריים בתוך קולט אנכי הופעלו בתנור והשמ<mark>ש על שם ש</mark>פר. הריאקטורים שימשו לחימום CO<sub>1</sub> ולריאקצית. COa.-n T i>y lotjpj on^>p 3.8 .Ji'mnnjd n **Reforming-n** ה- rmingס~ Re האנדיתרמית. 3.8 קילייט נקלטי על יד ה- .z0:C• האנרגיה המכסימלית שנקלטה על ידי הריאקציה היתה 6.9 קילווט<mark>,</mark> עם הפיכה (קונברסיה) של מתן של 38%. הפיכה של 84% התקבלה בזרימה נמוכה של מגיבים. | קורלציה למעבר חום | עבור | הריאקטורים | חושבה מתוך התוצאות הנסיוניות. הותאמו תנאי הפעלת הריפורמר , בהם הרכב גזי התיצרת מתאים להזנה ישירה למתנטיר.

.nta **itisn** muy n ba onion סיכים מפירט של העבידה מצירר בזה.

#### ABSTRACT

Tubular catalytic reactors were tested in a vertical receiver in the Schaeffer Solar Furnace. The reactors were used for heating  $\omega_2$  and for the endothermal reforming reaction. 3.8 KW were absorbed by the  $\omega_2$  The maximum energy absorbed by the reforming reaction was 6.9 KW, with methane conversion of 38%. Conversion of 84% was obtained with low reactant flow rates.

The heat transfer correlation for the reactors was calculated from the experimental data.

Reformer operating conditions in which the product gas can be fed directly to a methanator, were found.

The complete report is hereby submitted.

The Weizmann Institute of Science Department of Materials Research

 $\ddot{\cdot}$ 

## Tubular Reformers in the Vertical Solar Receiver

Report No. 3 January 1989

 $\bullet\bullet\bullet$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

Moshe Levy Rachel Levitan Rachandm Rubin Hadassa Rosin

# **Contents**

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\cdot$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

## List of Tables

- Table 1  $\omega_2$  Flowrates and gas temperatures
- Table 2  $\omega_2$  Reactor wall temperatures
- Table 3  $\omega_2$  Receiver temepratures and average wall and gas temperatures
- Table 4  $\omega_2$  Temperature differences, energy input and flux
- Table 5  $\omega_2$  Heat transfer coefficients and dimensionless groups
- Tables 1-2V 5-2V and 1-UV-4UV, Reforming
- Table 1-2V Reactant flow rates
- Table 2-2V Radiation, door opening, gas and wall tenperatures
- Table 3-2V Radiation, door opening and receiver tenperatures
- Table 4-2V Composition, conversion and energy input
- Table  $5-2V$  Heat transfer data
- Table 1-UV Reactant flow rates
- Table 2-UV Radiation, door opening and tenperatures
- Table 3-UV Composition, conversion and energy input

 $-1.1$ 

Table 4-UV - Heat transfer data

#### List of Figures

- Figure 1 The Chemical Heat Pipe
- Figure A Reactor 2V in the Receiver
- Figure B Reactor UV in the Receiver
- Figure C Feed flow, one day
- Figure D Radiation and temperature, one day
- Figure E Data flow sheet
- Figures  $C1-C6$  Heating  $CO<sub>2</sub>$
- Figure Cl Temperature profiles
- Figure C2 Temperature profiles
- Figure  $C3$  Energy input along the reactor  $1V$ ,  $2V$
- Figure O4 Energy input along reactor UV
- Figure C5 Heat flux along the reactors IV, 2V
- Figure C6 Heat flux along the reactors IV, UV
- Figure C7 Heat flux vs. Re
- Figures P1-P4 and 2-15 Reforming
- Figure PI Temperature profiles, reactor 2V, high Re
- Figure P2 Temperature profiles, reactor 2V, low Re
- Figure P3 Temperature profiles, reactor UV
- Figure P4 Temperature profiles, reactor UV
- Figure 2 Product gas temperature vs. Re
- Figure 3 Product gas temperature vs. wall temperature
- Figure 4 Total energy input vs. Re
- Figure 5 Total energy input vs. product gas temeprature, reactor 2V

III

- Figure 6 Total energy input vs. product gas temeprature, reactor UV
- Figure 7 Total energy input vs. Re
- Figure 8 Reaction rate vs. product gas temeprature, reactor 2V
- Figure 9 Reaction rate vs. Re
- Figure 10 Reaction rate vs. product gas temperature, reactor UV
- Figure 11 Methane conversion vs. product gas temperature, reactor 2V
- Figure 12 Methane conversion vs. product gas temperature, reactor UV
- Figure 13 Methane conversion vs. Re, reactor UV
- Figure 14 Ratio of sensible heat to reaction enthalpy vs. Re
- Figure 15 Ratio of reaction enthalpy to sensible heat, vs. methane conversion
- Figure 16 General heat transfer correlation
- Figure 17 Experimental Nu vs. estimated values

#### 1. Summary

1.1 Three types of catalytic reactors in a new vertical receiver were tested in the Shaeffer Solar Furnace:

Reactor IV - 60 cm length, 20 mm ID.

Reactor 2V - U shaped, 115 cm length, 20 mm ID.

Reactor UV - U shaped, 93 cm length, 12.7 mm ID

The vertical receiver was expected to be much more efficient In using the energy supplied by the solar furnace, compared with the horizontal tubular receiver previously used. This should be achieved by better energy distribution inside the receiver and by smaller heat loss.

Heat was absorbed by heating  $\omega_2$  and by the endothermic reforming reaction  $(\text{CH}_4+\text{CO}_2)$ 

The flow of  $O_2$  was in the range of 800 to 8400 l/hour (Re=300 to 1800), and the maximal energy input to the gas was 3.8 KW.

The flow of the reaction mixture  $(CH<sub>A</sub>+CO<sub>2</sub>)$  was in the range of 1000 to  $11000$   $1/h$ our (Re=200-1600) and the maximum energy absorbed was  $6.9$  Kw, in the Reactor 2V, with methane conversion of 38%. Maximum methane conversion of 84% was obtained with low Re numbers. Heat flux reached 110 Kw/m<sup>2</sup>. The operation of the reformers was limited by two restrictions:

(a) The reactor wall temperature can not exceed 950\* (safe limit for the Inconel 600).

 $\mathbf{1}$ 

(b) The flow of reactants is limited by the size of the flow controllers used at that time.

The heat transfer correlation was obtained from 328 runs in the three reactors, including both reforming and  $\omega_2$  heating. The equation is

$$
Nu = 0.534 \text{ Re}^{0.5} \text{ Pr}^{0.7}
$$

1.2 Preliminary calculation were made for the design of a Reformer of 50-100 Kw, to be constructed and operated in the Solar Tower.

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

#### 2. Introduction

The principle of the chemical heat pipe was previously described (1,2) (see Figure 1).

The work presented in this report was aimed at two main points:

- a) Evaluation of the performance of directly heated solar reformers/receivers.
- b) Obtaining data for the chemical reaction and heat transfer in different reactors in a vertical receiver.

Results obtained in this work will be used for the design of a 80 Kw Reformer planned to be operated in the Solar Tower.

The reaction system was similar to the one previously described for the Sodium Receiver (2). The mode of data flow (acquisition, storage and transformation) is shown in Figure E.

## 3. The Vertical receiver and reactors

Figures A and B show the reactors 2V and UV in the vertical receiver. The reactor IV is made of the same tube as 2V, but is only 60 cm long and the exit of the product gas is at the lower end of the receiver.

All the reactors are made of Inconel 600; the dimensions are given below:



The temperatures of the reactor wall are measured by Thermocouples inserted into wells, made of 3 mm inconel tubing and welded to the reactor wall. Measurements are taken on the front and back walls, at points 15 cm apart.

The gas temperatures are measured at intervals of 15 cm, by a multipoint thermocouple and additional single thermocouples.

The catalyst is 0.5% Rh on 1/8" Alumina pellets (same as previously used).

The receiver is an aluminum box, with all the walls insulated by a 5 cm thick Fiberfrax Durablanket alumina blanket. The inside dimensions are: 30 x 30 x 60 cm. The opening on the front wall, facing the concentrator, is of 10 cm diameter.

The first experiments in the Solar Furnace were done with a horizontal receiver reformer (3), the reactor being a U tube with gas inlet and outlet at the back of the receiver. In this configuration very ununiform heating of the reactor was obtained; overheating was observed at the front of the receiver, were the middle of the reactor was directly irradiated, and toward the exit of the reactor the gas cooled down, leading to a back reaction. As the wall temperature must be limitted at 950-970\*, parts of the reactor wall could not be heated enough to allow the necessary heat transfer to the reacting gas, thus limiting the total energy input possible.

We built the vertical receiver in order to overcome these difficulties, mainly planning to get uniform heating of the reactor walls. The vertical receiver/reformer should also serve as a model for the larger scale reactor to be used in the Solar Tower, where a vertical secondary concentrator will probably be added to the receiver.

The receiver was placed with the opening in the focal plane, and the reactor was fit into the receiver at a distance of 18 cm from the opening. In this position, the whole length of the reactor is "illuminated", but the central part of the reactor, facing the opening, gets more concentrated radiation. Therefore, we get 2 "peaks" on the temperature profiles of the

front reactor wall (see Figures P1-P4), at about 30 and 100 cm of the reactor length. At these points, especially at 30 cm, we got the highest temperature difference between the front and back reactor wall (about 100\*, compared to 20-30\* at the other points).

As in the horizontal receiver, the peak wall temperatures limited the possibility of heating the whole reactor to a high enough temperature. In order to prevent this overheating of the front wall, we put in the receiver twa vertical ceramic tubes of 15.5 mm CD, located between the opening and the reactor in order to protect the reactor wall from direct radiation. The tubes were at 80 mm distance from the opening and 110 mm from the reactor.

With this configuration, the temperature differences between front and back reactor wall decreased to 0-30\* but the hot peaks did not totally disappear.

In the heat transfer calculations, the wall temperatures (TWa) were taken as average between front and back wall temperatures.

## 4. Heating  $\omega_2$  (Figures C1-C7)

## 4.1 Purpose

By heating  $\omega_2$  gas at various flow rates and energy inputs we obtained useful information about the thermal performance of the receiver and the various reactors used. Temperature profiles are presented, heat fluxes along the reactor are calculated, and energy input data are combined with data from the reformer for the construction of the heat transfer correlation.

Part of the data are presented in Tables  $1-\omega_2$  to  $5-\omega_2$ . All the other data are available on computer disks.

### 4.2 Temperature profiles

In Figure Cl the wall and gas temperatures along the reactor are shown. 3 runs where chosen, in which the wall temperatures at the end of the  $reactor - 100$  and  $115$  cm - were similar and high:  $\sim 900^\circ$ , and the Re numbers were different, as shown. (The wall temperatures depicted are the averages between front and back wall). At 15 cm reactor length, the wall temperature was already 730, and rised monotoneously to 900 at 115 cm.

The gas temperature profiles for the 3 runs are very similar in trend. The gas always reached the wall temperature, and, as expected, this temperature was reached earliest at the lowest Re (line 1, at 70 cm). In the last part of the reactor, the temperature differences between wall and

gas is only 40-60", and practically no heat transfer occurs. Even at the highest Re (line 3), nost of the heat is absorbed in about 75% of the reactor length.

The total amount of heat absorbed was limited by the gas flow rate, which reached the maximum allowed by the Flow Controllers used.

The wall temperature profile for reactor IV (60 cm) is shown for comparison. The trend in the temperature rise is very similar. The reactor IV is somewhat hotter than reactor 2V, possibly because of its position in the middle of the receiver. Figure C2 shows, for reactor UV, temperature behaviour very similar to that described for reactor 2V.

### 4.3 Energy input

Figures C3 and C4 show the energy input along the reactor, for the three reactors used. The expected dependency of heat transfer on Re is clearly observed, for all the reactors.

In Figure C4, the effect of the wall temperature on energy input is observed by comparing line 1 (wall temperature = 911) to lines 2-4.

Line 1 also shows that in the first half of the reactor 1.9 Rw were absorbed, whereas in the rest of the reactor - only 0.7 Kw. in the case of low Re - line  $4$  - at half of the reactor the  $\infty$  practically reached the wall temperature and no more energy input occurs.

Figures C5 and C6 show the heat fluxes along the reactor, again comparing the three reactors used.

Each point on the graph is the average heat flux on the relevant segment, and is located at the point on the "reactor length" axis which is the middle of the segment.

The division into segments for the 3 reactors is as follows:





The highest fluxes are always observed at 30-40 cm reactor length; this is the region where the wall temperature increases sharply whereas the gas temperature is still low. The trend is similar for all the reactors and different Be numbers. Fluxes are markedly increased as Re increase, the limit being, as previously mentioned, the maximal flow possible in our flow control system. The highest heat fluxes we obtained in our system, for  $O_2$ 

heating, were 60-70 Kw/m<sup>2</sup> (Fig. C5). This maximum, obtained at wall temperature of 911\*, can be increased by heating the wall to 950-960 or by increasing gas flow rate. Figure C7 shows the dependence of the heat flux on Re for reactor UV, at four points along the reactor. The relation is linear in the range of temperatures and Re measured. Fluxes are very low at Re under 800, and drop to  $\langle 10 \text{ Kw/m}^2$  in the last part of the reactor.

## 5. Reforming (Figures F, G, P1-P4, 2-15)

The reforming reaction was conducted at various flow rates and energy inputs into the receiver. We controlled the input by the size of the door opening, limitations being, of course, the direct solar radiation and the reflectivity of the Heliostat and the concentrator.

The obtained temperature profiles on the reactor wall and in the gas are presented below. The methane conversions, average fluxes, energy inputs as chemical enthalpy and sensible heat, as well as a general heat transfer correlation were computed.

The range of the reaction parameters and results for the three reactors tested is given below.<sup>\*</sup> Figures F and G show the conditions for one day of Reforming: solar radiation, flow rates and temperatures.

Additional detailed results for Reactor IV will be summarized separately.

#### Reaction Parameters

Wall temperature, at the hottest point: 960°. Reaction temperature (product gas temperature): 580-840\*. System pressure: 4 atm. Feed flow: 1000-11000 I/hour. Reynolds Number: 200-1600. GHSV 8000-50000  $hr^{-1}$ .

### Results (maximum values)

CH4 conversion: 84% Reaction rate:  $12.5$  1 CH<sub>A</sub>/ml catalyst.hour Total energy input: 6.8 Kw Average heat flux:  $100$  Kw/m<sup>2</sup>.

Part of the data are presented in tables 1-2V to 5-2V and 1-UV to 4UV. All the other data are available on computer disks.

As previously mentioned, the maximal energy input into the reactor was limited by two factors:

- (a) The reactor wall temperature could not exceed 950-960\*C (material constraint, the limit for Inconel 600 is 1050\*).
- (b) The throughput of our flow controllers was limited at 100 1/min.

In the range of flows available, we could still increase the Reynolds number and thus increase total energy input; but at high flow rates the gas

temperature decreases, the pressure increases, causing a drop in the equilibrium conversion; thus most of the energy absorbed will be converted into sensible heat and not into chemical energy, making the high flow rates nonpractical in our system.

#### 5.3 Temperature profiles

• Figures PI and P2 show the temperature profiles for two runs in reactor 2V. In spite of the inhanogeneous increase in the wall temperature (discussed previously in section 3), we note a homogeneous increase in the gas temperature, at high and low Re number as well.

The wall temperature profiles shown here are markedly different than those in Figures Cl and C2, where no reaction takes place and  $O_2$  is only heated: two maxima are clearly seen in Figures PI and P2 at the position on the reactor facing the opening in the receiver. In both Figures the temperature difference between wall and gas at the reactor exit is quite high (100-140\*), indicating that the whole reactor surface is used efficiently for heat transfer. Thus, the drop in wall temperature in the range which is not directly heated (60 to 80 cm) cannot be compensated entirely by reradiation from the receiver wall.

Another significant observation is the wall temperature at 15-20 cm reactor length: even at the higher gas flow rates (Re-863, Figure PI), the wall at 20 cm has already 700°, which is only about 100° less than the hottest point on the wall. Thus, we have a quite uniform temperature on

most of the reactor wall, resembling the configuration of the indirect heated receiver, e.g. through sodium. At the low flow rates (Figure P2), the reactor wall temperature is almost uniform from 15 to 115 cm length.

Figure P3 shows that for reactor UV, the trend of gas and wall temperatures is similar to that in reactor 2V. At about 20 an reactor length, the wall already reaches almost its final tenperature, the difference between TWa 92 and IWa 20 being only about 30\*.

However, as expected, the temperature difference between wall and gas is generally smaller in reactor UV than in the bigger reactor 2V.

Figure P4 shows two runs for which the gas temperature profiles are very similar. As the gas flow rates are different, it is clearly seen that at the high Re (line b), the wall temperature must be kept about 120\* higher than for the low Re (line a) in order to obtain similar gas temperatures in both runs.

### 5.2 Product gas temperatures

In Figure 2 we present the product gas tenperature related to Re, for various wall temperatures In reactor 2V.

For the whole range of Re, the product gas tenperature depends strongly on the reactor wall tenperature (TW100 is the wall tenperature at the hottest point of the reactor, i.e. at 100 cm length of catalyst bed). At Re=800 the highest amount of energy was absorbed (6.8KW), when the wall

temperature was 940-960\*, whereas at 720-760", the product gas temperature drops to 540°, and very low conversions of  $CH<sub>A</sub>$  could be obtained.

The slope of the gas temperature vs. Re line decreases with increasing Re; this results from the fractional exponent of Re in the relation of the heat transfer coefficient to Re:

$$
N_{\rm U} \propto R e^{0.5}
$$

The extrapolations (broken lines), show the approach of the gas temperatures to the range of the wall temperatures at lower to zero flow.

Figure 3 shows the near to linear relation between the product gas temperature and the highest wall temperature, for all the three ranges of Re.

The lines are for reactor UV, and additional points are given, for comparison, for reactor 2V at similar ranges of Re. As similar Re for both reactors mean a much higher flow rate in the big reactor (2V), it is obvious that the temperatures reached in reactor 2V are considerable lower. (Note that when we compare the two reactors at the same Re, the increase in heat transfer surface from UV to 2V is smaller than the increase in mass flow rates of the gas).

## 5.3 Energy input (Figures 4,5,6,7,14 and 15)

As expected, the highest values for energy absorption were obtained at highest Re numbers (best heat transfer) and at the highest wall and gas

temperatures. This holds for both reactors 2V and UV, and is shown in figures  $4.5$  (2V) and  $6.7$  (UV).

Since TW 100 of 940-960\* is the highest temperature allowed (from material consideration), the line at this temperature (black points in Figure 2) is the line of highest energy absorption in the range of Re investigated.

As seen from the graphs, energy absorption might be increased even more by increasing the feed flow rates.

As the main purpose of the Reforming system is the conversion of solar energy into chemical energy (through the endothermic reaction), we are not interested in absorption of energy in the form of sensible heat alone. As previously seen, above a certain value of feed flow rates, the product gas temperature drops to such a value where equilibrium conversion is very low. By increasing the length of the reactor this difficulty could be overcome. In runs where Re is high, we observe that there is a considerable difference between wall and product gas temperature: in this case we could increase the catalyst bed length by adding catalyst up to 130 cm, and this would lead to increase in product gas temperature and methane conversion.

Figure 14 shows the sharp increase in the ratio of  $Q_{\text{heat}}$  to  $Q_{\text{react}}$  with increase of Re over 900. Ihls point should indeed be the practical limit of flow rates in our system.

The chemical enthalpy and the sensible heat are equal at Re=1100 (Tw 79 = 800-830), and at Re=1300 (when the wall temperature is at its maximum 900-940\*). Evidently this equality is obtained at lower Re numbers in reactor 2V (2 points shown in Figure 14). From the data in Figure 15, we can find the methane conversion for any ratio of Q<sub>react</sub>/Q<sub>heat</sub> that we choose to maintain in the system (f.i. at around 80% conversion about two thirds of the energy absorbed is converted into chemical energy).

#### 5.4 Reaction rates and methane conversion (Figures 8-13)

Figures 8 and 10 show the dependence of reaction rate (liter  $CH_A$  reacted per ml catalyst per hour) on the product gas temperatures, for reactors 2V and UV, at different groups of Re numbers.

The reaction rate increases with the product gas temeprature and Re.

Figure 9 was constructed from the data of Figure 8, using the average Re for each group. As seen, the gas temperature of 800\* could be obtained in reactor 2V only at Re up to  $300$ , and  $700^\circ$  - up to 550. At higher Re, the product gas temperature does not rise to 700\*, even when the wall temperature was at its maximum (950\*). As previously mentioned, we did not increase the feed flow over the values that gave about 650\* in the product gas, which is the limit for reasonable methane conversions and not too low reaction rates (about 2.5 1 CH $_A$ /ml cat.hour, for reactor 2V, see Figure 9).

Similar reaction rates were obtained in both reactors, when compared for the same temperatures and the same range of Re. For instance, line 1 in Figure 8 can be compared with line 2 in Figure 10, for the range of Re=715-865.

Data for Re=400-450 (not shown in the graph for 2V) also indicate similarity of reaction rates in both reactors. At this range of Re, the methane conversion approaches nearly the equilibrium conversion in both reactors, as shown in Figures 11 and 12.

Comparing Figure 11 with 12, we observe a clear dependence of methane conversion on Re for reactor UV, whereas in reactor 2V the data are scattered near the equilibrium conversion line, not showing a dependency on Re in the range of Re measured.

In reactor UV it was possible to work with Re numbers up to 1480, without decreasing too much the product gas temperatures (line 1 in Figure 10). Reaction rates of up to 12.5 liters methane reacted per hour per ml catalyst could be obtained, but conversions were markedly lower than the equilibrium ones (line 4 in Figure 12). Perhaps at high flow rates the reaction rate becomes the limiting factor for the process. In general, it can be expected that reaction rates, at high flows, might be lower in reactor UV, because of "channeling" effect of the gas in the vicinity of the wall, which is much nore expressed in narrow tubes.

As previously mentioned, in the chemical heat pipe it is important to convert most of the solar energy into chemical enthalpy. Thus, not less than 70-80% conversion of methane are required. For this level of

conversions, even when equilibrium conversion is reached, the tenperature of the exit gas must be over 750°, and the wall temperature must be kept >900°, in order to supply sufficient heat fluxes.

In reactor 2V we obtained these conditions only at Re  $<$  300, whereas in reactor UV, tenperature of 800\* in the product gas was obtained even at Re=1200. This indicates that for a tube in the size of reactor 2V, the catalyst bed length should be increased. Ihis will be discussed in detail in section 7 below.

### 6. Ite Heat Transfer Correlation (Figures 16 and 17)

An important topic in the evaluation of the directly heated reformers is to derive the heat transfer correlation, which relates the heat transfer capability of the system to the flow properties of the feed and to its physical properties at the reaction temperatures.

The general form of the correlation is:

$$
Nu = a Rem Prn
$$

The dimensionless terms being defined as:

$$
Nu = \frac{\alpha \ Dp}{\lambda} \qquad Re = \frac{G \cdot Dp}{\mu} \qquad Pr = \frac{Qp \cdot \mu}{\lambda}
$$

We obtain the experimental Nu numbers from the heat transfer coefficient  $\alpha$ , which is calculated directly from the total energy input into the reactor and the average temperature difference between wall and gas.

Data are taken from all the three reactors, for  $\infty$ <sub>2</sub> heating and for the reforming reaction.  $\alpha$  values for  $\omega_2$  heating were calculated for the whole reactor and also for segments of 15 cm length along the catalyst bed in reactor 2V and segments of 23, 24, 22 and 13 cm along the reactor  $W$ .

The values of m and n are found analitically from the experimental values. The value of a is found by linear regression, using 328 experimental points.

The equation obtained is:

$$
Nu = 0.534 \text{ Re}^{0.5} \text{ Pr}^{0.7}
$$

with a scatter of  $\pm 14$ % ( $\mathbb{R}^2$  = 0.72). The experimental data with the correlation line are shown in Figure 16.

The experimental Nu numbers vs. the estimated values (calculated from the equation) are shown in Figure 17, where the scatter around the "y=x" line is observed.

### 7. Reformer scale up considerations

From the results presented in the previous sections, it is evident that the heat transfer to the catalyst bed is the main limiting factor in the reforming process, when the directly heated reactor is used. This factor becomes more significant with the increase of the reactor diameter. In our reactor 2V, the product gas temperatures and, correspondingly, methane conversions, were low: thus, at the highest allowed wall temperature (950\*), at flow rates giving Re>700, the product gas temperature was about 670\* and the methane conversion - not more than 24%. To increase these values, the length of the reactor must be increased. Note that the efficiency of the existing reactor 2V (20 mm inside diameter) might be increased by adding catalyst to a length of 130 cm, the wall temperature at 130 cm being high enough (related to the product gas temeperature) to enable more heat input at high Re numbers. Replacing the reactor material by a higher grade alloy (f.i. Inconel 800) might also be considered, in order to allow for higher reactor wall temperatures.

Using the heat transfer correlation derived from the experimental data, and the wall temperature profiles measured, it is possible to calculate the reactor length and the process parameters for any desired tube size and flow rate, using a computer model. Work on this subject is in progress.

In this chapter we present some simple calculations, giving general data related to the design of the 50-100 Kw reformer to be operated in the Solar Tower.

The configuration of the reaction site in the Solar Tower allows for a vertical receiver of 2-2.2 m height. Thus, a reactor of 2 m length can be directly irradiated. If a U shape will be used, 4 m reactor length will be available. The use of a vertical-two-dimensional secondary concentrator is considered.

#### 7.1 Calculation

For any given combination of flow condition (Re number) and wall temperatures, we can use the experimental data in order to calculate the length of a bigger reactor, which will give the same results (product temperature and methane conversion). The relationship to be used is (3):

$$
L = \frac{D_i^2 \cdot 1 \cdot d_{av}}{D_{av} \cdot d_i}
$$

1,  $d_i$ ,  $d_{av}$  - length, inside diameter and average diameter of the reactor in which the experimental data were obtained.

L,  $D_i$ ,  $D_{av}$  - the respective values for the calculated reactor.

Thus, in order to obtain in a 2" tube the same results as in 1" tube of 115 cm length, a reactor of 2.4 m length is needed. The real diameters of the tubes mentioned are: "1 inch" -  $OD=24$  mm;  $ID=20$  mm. "2 inch" -  $OD=44$ mm; ID=40 mm.

 $\bullet$  .

One example is run 71605, in reactor 2V, where the energy absorbed was 6.8 Rw at methane conversion of 37%. If this run would be conducted in a 2" reactor of 2.4 m length, the energy obtained will be:

(For equal Re, in a tube with twice the diameter, the mass flow rate is 4 times bigger).

In a reactor of 4 m length, increase of conversion to about 65-70% might be expected, taking in account the decrease in heat fluxes when product gas temperature is higher (lower AT between wall and gas). Thus, the energy absorbed will be about 40 Kw.

A second example taken was run 101321, in reactor UV (where 3.5 Kw were absorbed at 64% conversion). To conduct this experiment in a 2" tube, 2.9 m length are required in order to obtain the same conversion of 64% at Re=718. Since the increase in mass flow rate is  $0.04^2/0.0128^2 = 9.8$ , the energy absorbed in the 2.9 m will be:

 $3.5 \times 9.8 = 34.2$  Kw

If 4 m length will be used, the conversion will increase in the last 1.1 m, and it might be estimated that about 40 Kw will be absorbed.

A similar calculation for this run was done for a long reactor of 1" tube. The length of catalyst bed required is 1.5 m. The increase in energy from run 101321 to this reactor is:

$$
0.02^2/0.0128^2 = 2.44 \text{ times},
$$

and the energy absorbed will be:

$$
3.5 \times 2.44 = 8.5 \text{ Kw.}
$$

Considering increase in conversion, on 2 m reactor length 10-11 Kw might be expected. Thus, 4 tubes of 2 meter are required for 40 Kw

The use of  $4 \text{ m}$  length of a  $1$ " tube is not practical, because the temperature of 800\* in the product gas can be reached in a shorter reactor. In addition, increase in Re number might lead to a high pressure drop on the catalyst bed.

In a 2" reactor, the problem of pressure drop, if occuring, might be solved by using a larger size of catalyst pellets (6 mm, instead of 3 mn used in the small reactors).

## **7.2 Results and conclusions "**

In the following table we summarize the results of the preliminary **calculations described.**



# **Reactor Scale-up**

 $L = \frac{D_i^2 \times l \times d_{av}}{D_{av} \times d_i^2}$ 

 $\mathbf{a}$ 

٠.

The optimal combination seems to be the use of 2 U shaped tubes, 4 m length each. Absorption of about 80 Kw is estimated, at Re=~730. However, the availability of 80 Kw from the Hellostat field, at the reaction site located at the 20 m level in the solar tower, depends on several factors: a) The number of Heliostats useful for the 20 m level.

b) The type and size of the secondary concentrator that will be used.

c) The season of the year.

The combined effect of these factors is being evaluated, using the MIRVAL computer program (4) and data on secondary concentrators.

#### 8. Acknowledgement

Itshak Levy did the mechanical design of the vertical Receiver. lie is also responsible for the proper functioning of the mechanical systems in the Solar Furnace.

Oshia Mirel assisted In the construction and assembly of the reaction systems.

Their participation in the project is much appreciated.

• Nomenclature and Units

- -' Fluid heat capacity, Kj/Kg- \*C  $c_p$
- ፌ - Equivalent diameter of the catalyst particle, m.
- $D_i$ ,  $d_i$  Reactor tube inner diameter, m.
- $D_{av}$ ,  $d_{av}$  Reactor tube average diameter, m.
- F Average heat flux from the reactor wall to the fluid,  $Kw/m^{2*}$
- G Mass flew rate, based on the cross section area of the empty reactor:  $Kg/m^2$ -sec.
- L,  $1 -$  Length of the packed (catalyst) bed in the reactor m.

Nu - Nusselt number,  $\alpha d_p / \lambda$ , dimensionless.

- Pr Prandtel number,  $C_0\mu/\lambda$ , dimensionless.
- $\Omega_{h}$  Sensible heat, absorbed for heating the fluid, Watt.

 $\Omega_{\text{react}}$  - Energy absorbed for the endothermal reaction. Watt.

 $Q_t$  - The total energy absorbed by the fluid per hour, Watt.

- $r -$  Reaction rate, liter CH<sub>4</sub>/ml catalyst  $\cdot$  hour.
- Re Reynolds number,  $G_d/\mu$ , dimensionless.
- Tg Fluid temperature<sup>\*\*</sup>
- Tw Reactor front wall temperature.

*isie* All the energies are calculated for 1 hour. All the temperatures are in "C.
- Twb Reactor back wall temperature.
- Tr Receiver wall temperature.
- $\alpha$  Heat transfer coefficient from reactor wall to the fluid,  $\text{watt/m}^2 \cdot \text{°C}.$
- $x -$  Heat conductivity of the fluid, watt/m $\cdot$  °C
- $\mu$  Dynamic viscosity of the fluid, Kg/m·sec.

#### References

- 1. D. Fraenkel, R. Levitan and M. Levy. International J. Hydrogen Energy, 11, 267 (1986).
- 2. H. Rosin, R. Levltan and M. Levy. Report No. 2, The Weizmann Institute of Science, March 1966.
- 3. R. Levitan, H. Rosin and M. Levy. Reforming in the Solar FUrnace, Report • No. 1., The Waizmann Institute of Science, July 1987.
- 4. P.L. Leary and J.D. Hanklns. MIRVAL A Computer Code for Comparing Designs of Ileliostat-Receiver Optics for Central Receiver Power Plants. Sandia Report #SAND77-8280.

# FLOW RATES AND GAS TEMPERATURES

**BEATING CO2** 

REACTOR 27

 $7 - 5, 6, 10, 11 - 1988$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\ddotsc$ 

 $\alpha$ 

٠.

### THEIR  $2 - 002$

 $\dddot{\cdot}$ 

٠

 $\bullet$ 

#### SEGETOS VALL TERPERATURES

 $\cdots$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

#### TABLE 1 - CO2

#### ECCELTER TELEVISIONES EN ITENSE TELL IN CAS TELEVISIONES

۰.



 $\ddotsc$ 

 $\omega_{\rm{in}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 

- 
- 
- 

#### 71111 4 - 002

 $\mathbb{Z}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\Delta$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

#### THRERATORE DIFFEEFICES, EDERET IDPOT AND PLOT

 $\sim$ 

**JULIUS CO2** 



\*) 97: (årg) tesp. difference between soll and goe in segment<br>Télf: Can tesp. difference betoen exit and injot of sugmath

 $\sim 10^{11}$  and  $\sim 10^{11}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\ddot{\cdot}$ 

 $7-5, 6, 10, 11-190$ 

1210702 27

#### TABLE 5 - CO2

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

#### ERAT TRANSFER CORFFICIERTS AND DIREKSIONLESS GROUPS

÷.



 $4$  |  $1, 2, 3, 4, 5$  - fragments along the Catalyst bed

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

**HATIJG CO2** 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

٠

 $\ddot{\cdot}$ 

 $7-5, 6, 10, 11-1901$ 

**SEACTOR 27** 

# TABLE 1-2V - REFORMING

 $\epsilon$ 

 $\mathbf{I}$ 

1

 $\mathbf{v}$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$   $\sim$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

REACTANT FLOW RATES

 $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}_2}$ 

 $7 - 0 - 86$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\sim 10$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

REACTOR 2V

 $\mathcal{L}$ 



#### .<br>| 71JLI 2-27 - 117ORIJIN

÷.

 $\cdot$ 

## LIBRITION, DOOR OPENESE AND TERRITATIONS  $\overline{a}$

 $1 - 11$  *mem if* 

 $\cdot$  $\mathbf{r}$ 



# THBLE 3-2V - REFORMING

RHOIATION, DOOR OPENING AND RECEIVER TEMPERATURES

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\Delta$ 

7-8-88 REACTOR 2V

 $\cdot$ 



\*> R»c»ivnr, **Tenp»r\*tur», measured** by **an** IR Pyrometer

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

#### **TnSLE 4-2V - REFORMING**

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\Delta$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ ÷.

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\sim$  .

 $\ddotsc$ 

#### **COMPOSITION, CONVERSION RNO ENERGY INPUT**



 $\cdot$ 

## TROLE 5-2V - REFORMING

HEAT TRANSFER DATA

**REACTOR 2V 7, 9-88** 

 $\ddotsc$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\bullet$  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm}$ 



(\*) Energy input from the point where the gas temperature is 480<br>\*\*) Total temperature difference for heat transfer

# THOLE 5-2V - REFORMING (continued)

## HEAT TRANSFER OATA

**Sales State** 

 $\sim$  .

REACTOR 2V 7, 9-88

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 



x) Energy input from the point where the gas temperature is 480<br>xx) Total temperature difference for heat transfer

# TRBLE 1-UV - REFURNING

المستحم

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\mathbf{z}_k$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

# REACTANT FLOW RATES

 $10-13-88$  REACTOR UV

 $\sim$   $\alpha$ 



 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\blacksquare$  <br>  $\blacksquare$  <br>  $\blacksquare$  <br>  $\blacksquare$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

**BABIATION, OCCUPRENT INTERFERENT** 

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

ł,

10-13-88 MACTON OF

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\frac{2}{3}$ 

#### **TRBLE 3-UV - REFORMING**

 $\sim$ 

 $\alpha$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\bar{1}$ 

### COMPOSITION, CONVERSION AND ENERGY INPUT

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{r}}$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim 10$ 



### TRBLE 4-UV - REFORMING

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\bullet$ 

 $\bullet$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\mathcal{F}^{\pm}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

#### REACTOR UV 10-89

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim 10$ 

### HEAT TRANSFER DATA



\*) Energy input from the point where the gas temperature is 480

 $\sim$ 

واستعفيتها المناد

 $\sim 10^{11}$ 

 $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ 

 $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$  .

 $\mathbf{v}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\bullet$ 



Figure 1

The Chemical Heat Pipe

 $\lambda$ 

 $\gamma$ 





A. Gas sample; B. Gas temperature; C. Front wall temperature; D. Back wall temperature; E. Alumina pellets; F. Catalyst.



Reactor UV (ID=12 mm) in the Receiver A. Gas temperature; B. Front wall tenperature; C. Back wall temperature; D. Catalyst; E. Alumina pellets.



(spupsnoy])<br>|∕hour

Feed flow



Data for one day. Radiation and temperatures.





**Data aquisition, reduction and storage**



Figure Cl

Heating  $\omega_2$ 

Tenperature profiles, Reactors IV and 2V.

1-3 Product gas temperature. Reactor 2V

- 1. Re =  $444$ <br>2. Re = 819
- 2. Re = 819<br>3. Re = 1091
- $Re = 1091$
- A, Wall teqperature. Reactor 2V
- 5. Wall temperature, Reactor 1V



Figure C2

Heating  $\omega_2$ 

Temperature profiles. Reactor UV

1-3 Product gas tenperature. Reactor 2V

- 1. Re = 417
- 2. Re = 786
- 3. Re = 1449<br>4. Wall temp
- Wall temperature







Figure C7

Heating  $\omega_2$ 

Heat Flux vs. Re in Reactor W, at various locations along the reactor. Catalyst bed length, cm: 1. 40; 2. 50; 3. 60; 4. 80. Wall temperature: 770-780.



Reforming

Temperature Profiles, Reactor 2V, Re=863



Figure P2

Reforming

Temperature Profiles, Reactor 2V, Re=270



Figure P3

Reforming

Temperature Profiles, Reactor UV, Re=442



#### Figure P4

## Reforming

Temperature Profiles, Reactor Uv

- 1. Average wall tenperature, Re=1242
- 2. Average wall temperature, Re= 446
- 3. Product gas temperature, Re= 446
- 4. Product gas temperature, Re=1242



Figure 2

Reforming

Product gas temperature vs. Re, for 3 different wall temperatures (the hottest point on the wall is taken)



## Figure 3

Reforming

Product gas temperature related to the highest wall temperature, for different ranges of Re. For reactor 2V only points are shown (see text)



ż.

Reforming

Total energy input vs. Re. TW 100 is the hottest point on the reactor wall








Reforming

Reaction rate vs. product gas temperature

1. Re = 790-865 2. Re = 500-570 3. Re = 300-380 4. Re \* 200-275



Reforming

Reaction rate vs. Re, at different product gas temperatures 1. 800\* 2. 750° 3. 700\* 4. 650\* 5. 600\*



Reaction rate vs. product gas temperature

1. Re \* 1200-1480 *7.* RP s 715-ECO





Reforming

Methane conversion vs. product gas temperature. The points are for 9 different runs, and the equilibrium conversion line is shown.

**U**



Reforming

Methane conversion vs. product gas temperature

- 1. Equilibrium conversion
- 2. Re. = 400-460
- 3. Re \* 715-820
- 4. Re \* 1240-1440



Figure 13

Reforming

Methane conversion vs. Re, at different product gas tenperatures

1. 850\* 2. 800\* 3. 750\* 4. 700" 5. 650\*



Reforming

Ratio of sensible heat to heat of reaction vs. Re. 7he 2 lines for reactor UV are for the 2 wall tenperatures indicated 2 points for reactor 2V are shown (see text).



Reforming

Ratio of reaction enthalpy to sensible heat vs. methane conversion. Points for 2 reactors.



 $\overline{a}$ 

General heat transfer correlation, three reactors,<br>reforming and  $\omega_2$  heating.

 $\vec{z}$ 



Nu, experimental points vs. Nu calculated from the correlation equation:<br>Nu = 0.534 Re<sup>0,5</sup> x Pr<sup>0,7</sup>. The line " $y = x$ " is shown.

## **PUBLICATION DOCUMENTATION PABE**

 $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ 



 $\sim$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\mathbb{R}^2$  $\sqrt{2}$