

10-23/5

FINAL REPORT

PROJECT A-2348

DISH STIRLING SOLAR RECEIVER
DESIGN REPORT

By

S. H. Bomar, Jr.
R. D. Chelf
T. B. Elfe
J. N. Harris
J. H. Murphy

September 1979

Prepared for

Fairchild Stratos Division
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Engineering Experiment Station
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

SECTION 2.0

OPTICAL AND THERMAL ANALYSIS

2.1 OPTICAL ANALYSIS2.1.1 Sun Model Verification

A series of optical analysis runs was made to determine whether a significant error is being introduced by using solar rays emanating from the center of a ring 12 to 16 feet from sun center to represent the outermost sun rays. The optical analysis program was modified so that the third ring (formerly the 12 to 16-foot ring) extended from 12 to 15.5 feet. A fourth ring (15.5 to 16 feet) was added, and any ill effects of the previous approximation were magnified by considering that rays from the fourth ring originated at 16 feet.

Runs were made on the focal plane and on the receiver surface for 2, 3, and 4 milliradian slope errors, using the Advanced Concentrator parameters. The results are summarized in Tables 2-I and 2-II. Despite minor differences, it appears that the original sun model is sufficiently accurate to be used for the remainder of the design work.

2.1.2 Test Bed Concentrator Model

The optical analysis program was modified to model the Test Bed Concentrator. In this model, it was assumed that the

Table 2-1. Flux Density (kw/m²) on Focal Plane for
14' and 16' Sun Models

Sun Extremity (radius, in.)	= 2mRad		= 3mRad		= 4mRad	
	14'	16'	14'	16'	14'	16'
0	11180	11036	6433	6327	4187	3783
1	7616	7632	4923	4894	3296	3369
2	2741	2749	2719	2742	2239	2242
3	556	539	1117	1127	1263	1263
4	61	68	356	346	606	601
5			74	82	241	242
6			15	10	85	84
7					20	21

Table 2-2. Flux Density (kw/m²) on 55# Cone 0.353 m Focal
Plane-Vertex Spacing for 14' and 16' Sun Models

Sun Extremity (radius, in.)	= 2mRad		= 3mRad		= 4mRad	
	14'	16'	14'	16'	14'	16'
1	126	130	187	182	234	229
2	258	253	247	241	243	231
3	336	327	332	318	320	299
4	382	381	383	375	389	377
5	378	373	392	385	394	385
6	424	427	395	396	362	364
7	417	414	364	354	304	296
8	259	260	254	265	255	260
9	71	76	95	105	125	138
10	18	20	29	31	43	48
11	3		14	14	18	20
12					9	10

normal at the center of each facet would coincide with the normal of a paraboloid having a focal length of 6.6 meters, and an f/D ratio of 0.6. Systematic slope errors, which arise because the facets are spherical, rather than paraboloidal, were calculated for points on the edge of each facet. Systematic errors for other points on a facet were derived by parabolic interpolation. The normal at each point on the concentrator was then assigned a slope error which was the vector sum of the systematic error and a randomly directed error, having a standard deviation of 1 milliradian.

Since the Georgia Tech optical analysis program treats points along a plane curve on the concentrator and assumes a symmetric flux pattern, it was decided that points along three "lines," horizontal, vertical, and diagonal, should be averaged to arrive at a more realistic flux pattern. This is essentially similar to the logic which would have been used, had the analysis program been expanded to a true 3-dimensional program, which time did not permit. Since the Test Bed Concentrator provides considerably more flux than the Advanced Concentrator, the model was set up to analyze a masked Test Bed Concentrator. This was done by modifying the weighting function which weighs rays according to their points of origin on the concentrator.

Figure 2-1 shows the masked Test Bed Concentrator flux pattern on the receiver surface. It also shows the Advanced Concentrator flux pattern for reference.

2-4




Figure 2-1. Flux Pattern From Test Bed Concentrator

SOL-R025

2.2 THERMAL ANALYSIS

Several improvements were made to the thermal analysis model. The need for some of these improvements was apparent before PDR, but time did not permit them to be made at that time. These improvements included taking into account the different values of reflectivity and emissivity of the various surfaces in the receiver and devising a technique for converting the rectangular tube model to a circular one.

2.2.1 Reflectivity Considerations

The pre-PDR thermal model implicitly assumed zero reflectivity for all receiver surfaces. A short computer program was written to read solar and combustor heat input and reflectivity for each node from a data file. For a given node, the absorbed flux is accumulated, reflected flux is distributed to the other nodes, according to the same view factors which are used to calculate radiation conductors, and reflected flux which arrives at aperture nodes is permanently lost. This absorption and re-reflection process is continued until the flux which is still "bouncing around" is less than 0.1 percent of the original incident flux. Modified heat input for each node is written to a file, which is later edited into the MITAS input file.

Several important features are seen in runs made with the improved model. Approximately 2.5 percent of the incident flux is reflected from the aperture plate and from internal surfaces

through the aperture. The aperture plate and center plug do not run as hot as the pre-PDR runs indicated. Heat into the receiver is redistributed, and efficiency and temperatures can be manipulated somewhat by blackening or whitening certain surfaces.

2.2.2 Emissivity Considerations

The modification to include individual emissivities for the various nodes was straightforward. The radiation conductances, which are generated by an auxiliary computer program, are modified by the emissivities of the transmitting and receiving nodes. In the process of making this modification, it was found that in concentrating on proper modeling of the cavity interior, the radiation from the aperture plate into space had been overlooked. This was corrected, resulting in a slight loss of efficiency.

2.2.3 Improved Model of Tubing

In the pre-PDR models, it was difficult to calculate gradients in the Inconel tubing for two reasons. First, the model treated the tubing as rectangular, and second, the circumferential spacing between all nodes was proportional to the cone circumference. The latter had the effect of having too few nodes in the outer area of the cone.

The improved model uses an octagonal tube. It also maintains a constant node spacing in the tube area, letting the spacing between nodes in the copper expand with the geometry of the

cone. In addition, the definition is further improved by taking temperatures in the copper at a constant distance from the tube center and using these temperatures as boundary node temperatures in a series of two-dimensional radial models. Since the effects of radiation and convection are "built into" the copper boundary temperatures, these two-dimensional models must only treat conduction.

2.2.4 Isothermal Maps

The temperatures derived from the combined large model - two dimensional radial model runs were used to make the isothermal plots shown in Figures 2-2 (a-g) and 2-3 (a-g). The isotherms in Figure 2-2 (a-g) are for a helium temperature of 1200°F, while those in Figure 2-3 (a-g) are for a temperature of 1500°F.

2.2.5 Efficiency and Temperature

A number of small model (17 node) runs were made to ascertain the effect of various parameters on receiver efficiency and temperature. In general, lower helium temperature results in higher receiver efficiency. It should also be noted that the convection losses are expected to be much lower than predicted by the MITAS convection model. Therefore, the values presented should not be taken as absolute. For this reason, heat into helium is used as a comparison standard. Flux incident on the receiver was 67 kW in in all cases. Table 2-III shows the result of these runs.

Cone Radius - 2.38"




Figure 2-2a. Plane 1

2-9

Cone Radius = 3.06"




Figure 2-2b, Plane 2

SOL-R025

Cone Radius = 4.36"




Figure 2-2c. Plane 3

2-11

Cone Radius = 5.87"




Figure 2-2d. Plane 4

SOL-R025




Figure 2-2e. Plane 5




Figure 2-2f. Plane 6




Figure 2-2g. Plane 7

1830

	INCONEL
	COPPER
	INCONEL


Cone Radius = 2.38"

Figure 2-3a. Plane 1

2-16

Cone Radius = 3.06"

Figure 2-3b, Plane 2



SOL-R025

2-17

Cone Radius = 4.36"




Figure 2-3c. Plane 3

SOL-R025

2-18

Cone Radius = 5.87"




Figure 2-3d. Plane 4

SOL-R025

2-19

1670

INCONEL

1660

COPPER

1620

1630

INCONEL

Cone Radius = 7.38"


INCONEL


1650

1640

Figure 2-3e, Plane 5

SOL-R025





1800

INCONEL

COPPER

Cone Radius 8.85"

INCONEL

2-20

Figure 2-3f. Plane 6

SOL-R025

2-21




Figure 2-3g. Plane 7

SOL-R025

Table 2-III Efficiency and Temperature Comparisons

The °F	Aperture Dia. (cm)	Aper- ture Plate Color	Plug Color	Cylinder Wall Color	T Cone Max (°F)	Aperture Plate Temp. (°F)	Plug Temp (°F)	Q _{He} (Kbtu/hr)
1328	28	White	White	Black	1693	1216	1985	190
1328	28	White	White	White	1721	1163	2003	195
1500	28	White	White	Black	1832	1321	2041	181
1328	28	White	Black	Black	1686	1248	3614	187
1328	28	Black	White	Black	1676	1657	1988	184
1200	21	White	White	Black	1577	1219	1963	191
1200	23	White	White	Black	1590	1195	1964	194
1200	24	White	White	Black	1592	1182	1970	195
1200	25	White	White	Black	1588	1170	1964	193
1200	27	White	White	Black	1587	1149	1949	193
1200	29	White	White	Black	1581	1129	1934	191
1200	31	White	White	Black	1572	1105	1916	190
1200	28	White	White	Black	1525	1160*	1838	195*

*Estimated values for masked TBQ.

The receiver performance indicated in Table 2-III are somewhat lower than those presented at PDR for several reasons. First, the improvements to the model result in a lower efficiency prediction, primarily because of reflected solar flux and the correction to the aperture plate radiation conductance. Second, the helium passages do not extend quite as far out in the cone as the earlier design, and there is no longer double tubing beyond a 5.5. inches radius. This change in tubing configuration was clearly necessary, but it has resulted in a slightly lower efficiency. This may be less significant for the masked Test Bed Concentrator, which has a smaller flux pattern.

The other point of interest in Table 2-III is that the optimum aperture diameter is 24 cm instead of the 28-cm size indicated by the pre-PDR runs. This is true because the solar radiation reflected from the receiver depends upon aperture size.

2.3 DESIGN OF APERTURE PLATE AND CERAMIC PLUG

2.3.1 Aperture Plate

2.3.1.1 Materials

Slip-cast fused silica is the best material for the aperture plate. This material is relatively inexpensive and the plate will be easy to fabricate. Most importantly, it has been tested at very high solar flux levels in the focal plane of the French solar furnace, where it was undamaged in a 1-minute exposure.

The use of a clear fused silica plate as the inner portion of the aperture plate was considered. This would have the advantage of allowing more solar radiation to enter the receiver because of the high solar transmittance of clear fused silica. Synthetic clear fused silicas have better than 90-percent transmission from 0.23 μm to 2.7 μm . At 2.7 μm transmission goes to zero; it then rises from zero at 2.8 μm to 77 percent at 3.2 μm , then gradually tails off to zero between 4 and 5 μm . The synthetic vitreous silicas are produced by hydrolyzation of SiCl_4 in an oxygen-hydrogen flame or in a water-vapor-free plasma flame. Trade names for the materials produced in the O_2H_2 flame are: (1) Suprasil from the Amersil Division of Englehard Industries, (2) Spectrosil from the Thermal American Fused Quartz Company, and (3) Corning 7940 from the Corning Glass Company. Trade names for the water-vapor-free materials are Suprasil W, Spectrosil WF and Corning 7943. These fused silica glasses are extremely expensive and it is not likely to be feasible to purchase relatively large, thick sections of this material for use as an insert in a larger opaque fused silica aperture plate.

Normal fused quartz glass is prepared by electrical fusion under vacuum or an inert gas atmosphere of natural quartz. It may also be produced from quartz crystal powder in a flame fusion (Verneuille) process. Commercial names for the electrically fused products are: Infrasil (Amersil-Englehard), IR-Vitreosil (Thermal American) and General Electric's 105, 201 and 204. Commercial

2-25




Figure 2-4. Percent Transmission of Entering Energy Excluding Surface Reflections (Measurements Made Through a 10-MM Thickness in Each Instance - Wavelength in Microns) Furnished by Englehard Industries, Inc.

SOL-R025

flame-fused materials are: Herasil, Homosil, Optosil (Amersil-Englehard), O.G. Vitreosil (Thermal-American) and GE 104. The natural fused quartz materials have an absorption edge of $0.24 \mu\text{m}$ and reach 90 percent transmission at about $0.28 \mu\text{m}$. There is a small absorption peak between 2.4 and $2.5 \mu\text{m}$, but transmission drops only to 86 percent in this region, then returns to 92 percent. Figure 2-4 shows transmission for these different types of fused silica for ten mm thick specimens.

Beder, et al, [1] measured the transmissivity of fused quartz between 0.22 and $3.5 \mu\text{m}$ from room temperature to 1500°C . They found that the interval of virtual transparency (transmissivity ≥ 85 percent) of each type of vitreous silica was reduced by heating caused by a shift in both the long and short wave length absorption edges. At 500° and 750°C transmissivity dropped below 85 percent at $2.4 \mu\text{m}$. The 750°C heated material dropped to 0 transmissivity at $3.5 \mu\text{m}$ at a much more rapid rate than the 500°C heated material. Even with this drop in transmissivity, a cavity radiating at 1400°F would lose about 23 percent of the energy through the transparent fused silica. Some of the radiation loss could be reduced by metallizing the back face, as suggested in the JPL report [2]; however it is believed that the input energy gained by using a transparent center section is not worth the economic cost caused by complicating the design of the aperture plate. An aggregate cast fused silica plate $3/4$ -inch (1.9 cm) thick would be expected to transmit a very negligible




Figure 2-5. Spectral transmittance of 0.25-cm (0.10-in.) thick models of different slip-cast configurations made from GE 204 fused silica




Figure 2-6 Spectral transmittance of 0.51-cm (0.20-in.) thick models of different slip-cast configurations made from GE 204 fused silica

amount of radiation, based on the Martin-Marietta measurements on high purity slip-cast fused silica specimens 0.1 and 0.2-inch thick [3]. These measurements are shown in Figures 2-5 and 2-6. It can be seen that the maximum spectral transmittance for the continuous distribution material for 0.10-inch material was 7 percent at 2.1 μm and was 2-1/2 percent for the 0.20-inch material at 2.0 μm . An extrapolation to 3/4-inch thick material would indicate almost no transmission. From the standpoint of economics, there is no questioning the fact that the aggregate cast plate would be much less costly than a clear fused silica plate. One unknown factor in the use of the aggregate cast plate is the effect of absorbed moisture, since the plate will have some porosity. With the plate facing downward, it should not get extremely wet from rain but, sufficient moisture could be absorbed to cause fracturing from steam pressure under very high heating rates. Since heating takes place on a diurnal cycle and temperature of the plate is expected to reach temperatures of the order of 1000°F, there is no economically effective way of sealing the plate against moisture penetration.

The Fairchild drawing indicates an approximate 1/2-inch-thick aperture plate. A 1/2-inch thick plate of aggregate cast fused silica, approximately 30-inches in diameter, would be very difficult to handle because of its low strength in the dry state. Even if it could be successfully transferred to the kiln, the chances are that it would severely warp during sintering.

The minimum thickness, by the fabrication constraints, will be between 3/4 and 1-inch. Every effort will be made to keep the thickness to 3/4-inch. To make the plate with rounded corners, as shown in the Fairchild drawing, would require an expensive machining operation. To keep the aperture thin, the plate can be cast with a tapered center plug to give the shape shown in Figure 2-7.

2.3.1.2 Attaching Aperture Plate to Remainder of Structure

The simplest method of holding the plate to the remainder of the structure is to provide a continuous metal rim around the periphery of the metal plate, overlapping the silica 1/2 inch. The metal "Z" section forming this lip must be detachable for insertion or removal of the silica aperture plate. A detail of this rim formed from 1/8-inch steel is shown in Figure 2-8.

Thermal expansion differences between the silica and the metal require that some method must be provided to keep the silica plate properly located and tightly held in position at ambient and operating temperatures. A 1/2-inch-thick, 3-lb/ft³ (pcf) alumino-silicate fiber blanket, such as Kaowool or Fibrefax, should be wrapped around the edge of the plate. A gasket of the same material, 3/4-inch-thick, should be placed on top of the plate in the area to be covered by the metal rim. Bolting the metal "Z" section in place will require a total force of about 150 to 220





Figure 2-7. Aperture Plate (Advanced Concentrator)



FULL SCALE

Figure 2-8. Aperture
Mounting Arrangement

pounds to compress the ceramic fiber blanket to 1/4-inch thickness. This will firmly hold the aggregate cast fused silica aperture plate in position.

An estimate of the diametral expansion difference between the metal rim and the silica plate for a 200°F temperature rise is:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\alpha_{\text{steel}} \times \Delta T \times D_{\text{steel rim}}) - (\alpha_{\text{SiO}_2} \times \Delta T \times D_{\text{aperture plate}}) \\ & \left(\frac{8 \times 10^{-6}}{^{\circ}\text{F}} \times 200^{\circ}\text{F} \times 30.2 \text{ in.} \right) - \left(\frac{3 \times 10^{-7}}{^{\circ}\text{F}} \times 200^{\circ}\text{F} \times 29.5 \text{ in.} \right) \\ & = 0.045 \text{ in.} \end{aligned}$$

The compressed fiber blanket on the edge of the plate should have sufficient resilience to handle this small expansion and keep the aperture plate centered.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Expansion in the vertical direction should be negligible:} \\ & (8 \times 10^{-6} \times 200 \times 1) - (3 \times 10^{-7} \times 200 \times 0.75) \\ & = 0.0016 \text{ inch.} \end{aligned}$$

2.3.2 Ceramic Plug

The design shown in the Fairchild drawing needs minor modification. This area will receive a lot of heat and the bolt head will need protection. The major problem with the design is a method to keep the plug from becoming loose from the thermal expansion of the bolt. Because of space limitations on the underside, the only method of maintaining tension on the bolt is to

place a waved washer under the bolt head. This must be of a material which will retain "springiness" at the operating temperature of the ceramic plug.

It is recommended that the slot in the ceramic plug be cut slightly to accommodate the waved washer(s). It might be advisable to fabricate a ceramic part to fit in the slot above the bolt head. This part should be of the same material as the ceramic plug so that thermal expansions match. The plug must fit snugly to prevent radiation from reaching the bolt head, but must be relatively easy to remove to allow tightening or removal of the bolt. The bolt and waved washers must be fabricated from refractory metals such as stainless steel and Tantalloy to withstand the potential 1800° to 1900°F temperature that may be reached within the plug during operation. If Tantalloy is used for the waved washers, they will have to be plated. FSD Report No. SOL-R017, page 2-82, suggests that the center plug be of fused silica with Sialon as a back-up. The report does not specify the type of fused silica, but clear fused silica would be unacceptable for the same reasons as delineated for the aperture plate. Slipcaste or aggregate cast fused silica should be satisfactory for this plug, provided there are no large physical stresses unknown at this time. Sialon is unacceptable because of its dark color, hence high absorptivity. It would operate at a much higher temperature than the slip-cast fused silica (SCFS). Also Sialon is reported to have a thermal conductivity of 12 Btu/ft-hr-°F^[5], which is about 24 times that of SCFS

(0.5 Btu/ft-hr-°F)[6]. This would result in excessive heating of the mounting bolt and washers.

Experience at the French solar furnace in April showed that a 1-inch-diameter x 1/2-inch-thick GE Sialon material failed rapidly in thermal shock. Under a solar incident flux of 226 cal/cm²-s, the Sialon surface "exploded" in 0.7 seconds with complete failure in 1.6 seconds. Based on previous experience with other solar applications, Cordierite is recommended as the back-up material for the ceramic plug. Cordierite (2MgO·2Al₂O₃·5SiO₂) has a light cream to white color, has a flexural strength of 125 MN/m², a tensile strength of 32MN/m², a thermal conductivity of 0.006 cal/cm·s·°C and a thermal expansion of 1.5 x 10⁻⁶/°C at 100°C, 2.5 x 10⁻⁶/°C at 500°C. The combination of strength and low thermal expansion and conductivity make this material resistant to thermal shock. No emissivity data are available but the material is not expected to absorb much solar radiation. Cordierite is a relatively low-priced ceramic and is relatively easy to machine. It can also be slip-cast to rough shape and finished by grinding by Coors Porcelain Company, Golden, Colorado.

The insulation scheme around the ceramic plug shown in the Fairchild PDR drawing appears satisfactory.




Figure 2-9. Cavity Surface Temperatures in
17 Node Model




Figure 2-10. Cavity Surface Temperatures in 17 Node Model

2.4 MITAS MODELS

2.4.1 Comparison of 1200° and 1500°F Helium Temperature Models

Table 2-III does not show a direct comparison of 1200° and 1500°F helium models with a 24-cm diameter, which now appears to be the optimum size. The following Figures 2-9 and 2-10 provide this comparison.

2.4.2 Additional Data from 323 Node Models

The 323-node models predict slightly higher efficiencies than do the 17-node models and, in general, also predict lower temperatures. Confidence in the 323-node model is much higher. Figures 2-11 and 2-12 show temperatures and heat delivered to helium for 1200° and 1500°F helium temperatures.

Unfortunately, these models had 28-cm apertures, so comparison with Figures 2-9 and 2-10 is not quite a direct one. From Table 2-III, the Q_{He} shown on Figures 2-11 and 2-12 would be expected to increase about 2 percent if the aperture size were reduced.

The 323-node models also do a much better job of modeling the area where the helium passage leaves the cone and goes to the cylinder manifold. The portion of the cone inside this point becomes the hottest part in the 1500°F model.




Figure 2-11. Temperatures in 323 Node Model




Figure 2-12. Advanced Concentrator Temperatures in 323 Node Model




Figure 2-13. Advanced Concentrator Temperatures in 323 Node Model

An additional run was made to see if the addition of more copper beyond the radius at which the regenerator tube leaves the cone would be effective. For this model, the copper thickness was doubled beyond the regenerator tubes. The results are shown in Figure 2-13. A comparison of Figures 2-11 and 2-13 indicates that thicker copper will substantially lower the temperatures in the uncooled part of the cone. A slight improvement in efficiency will also be realized.

2.4.3 Critical Bend Area Model

A model was devised to analyze the area where the regenerator tube leaves the cone, primarily to determine the temperature gradients in the high stress areas. This was an extremely difficult model to prepare, even by making the simplification that the tubing bends abruptly and at a 90-degree angle. The tubing bend is actually more than 90 degrees and is not abrupt, so possibly the inaccuracies in the model will have some tendency to cancel. Results are shown in Figure 2-14.

2.4.4 Receiver Performance Specification

On the basis of the optical and thermal analyses, a Receiver Performance Specification was prepared. The numbers in the Table 2-IV were derived from the unthickened 323-node models, with corrections made for aperture size. The following cautions should be applied in using the results of this table:

1. The aperture size should be further reduced if the receiver is to be operated with the masked Test Bed

Table 2-IV. Expected Receiver Performance
 (24-cm Aperture Diameter-Conduction Losses Not Included)
 Advanced Concentrator

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>1200°F He</u>	<u>1500°F He</u>
Incident Flux (kW)	67	67
Aperture Interception	1.4	1.4
Energy into Helium (kW)	58.6	55.4
Energy into Helium (million Btu/hr)	0.2	0.189
Maximum Temperatures (°F)		
Center Plug	1966	2053
Cone	1561	1836
Outer Wall	1555	1725
Aperture Plate	1138	1234
Losses (kW)/(M-Btu/hr)		
Radiation	2.8/0.0096	5.2/0.018
Reflectance	0.9/0.003	0.7/0.002
Convection	3.6/0.0122	4.4/0.0151
Efficiency	0.875	0.827




Figure 2-14. Temperatures in Bend Area (°F)

Concentrator. This has not been studied in detail, but it is expected that a 16-cm aperture size would be more nearly optimum for that concentrator.

2. Because of different flux pattern from the TBC, temperatures and efficiencies will differ from the values presented. From the one 17-node model of this configuration, it appears that the outer part of the cone will be cooler and that the efficiency will be higher.

SECTION 4.0
AIR PREHEATER DESIGN

The air preheater will utilize the hot exhaust gases from the combustor to preheat the incoming combustion air. The preheater concept, shown in Figure 4-1, consists of radial partitions located in the annulus between the inner cavity surface and concentric outer surface. These partitions form a series of alternate passages through which the incoming combustion air and combustion exhaust gases flow. Thus the preheater is a counterflow heat exchanger in which heat is transferred from the combustion exhaust gases to the incoming air through the partition walls. A design analysis was performed in order to determine the required number and size of partitions.

The geometry and nomenclature used for the preheater are shown in Figure 4-1. Details of manifolds which would distribute the exhaust gases and incoming air around the circumference are now shown, but it is assumed that both the incoming air and exit gases are evenly distributed over the series of passages.

The number and size of required partitions is determined from heat transfer consideration. The rate of heat transfer from




Figure 4-1. Air Preheater Design Concept

the exhaust gas to the incoming combustion air is given by the following equation:

$$q = U A_S \overline{\Delta T}$$

where

q = heat transfer rate

U = overall thermal conductance from exhaust gas to incoming air.

A_S = heat transfer area (which is the total surface area of the partitions since heat is transferred through each partition).

$\overline{\Delta T}$ = log mean temperature difference between the exhaust gas and air.

The heat transfer area is given by the number of partitions multiplied by the area of the partition.

$$A_S = (\text{circumference}) N (bL)$$

$$A_S = 2 (13.14 + b/2) NbL,$$

here N is the number of partitions per unit length around the circumference and other symbols are defined in Figure 4-1. The overall thermal conductance can be expressed as:

$$\frac{1}{U} = \left(\frac{1}{h_{\text{air}}}\right) + \left(\frac{t}{k_{\text{partition}}}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{h_{\text{gas}}}\right)$$

The h 's in this expression are convective heat transfer coefficients on the air and exhaust gas sides of a partition and the other term is on the conductive thermal resistance through a partition. It is shown later in this section that the value of h is primarily a function of the gas thermal conductivity and the aspect ratio of

the passage, i.e., the ratio a/b . The value of h increases with increasing thermal conductivity and decreasing aspect ratio.

Consideration of the heat transfer equation reveals that the heat transfer rate can be increased by increasing the number of partitions. Increasing the number of partitions simultaneously increases the heat transfer area and decreases the aspect ratio. Heat transfer rates are also increased by increasing the annulus size, i.e., increasing b which produces the same effect as increasing the number of partitions.

Obviously, several combinations of annulus size, b , number of partitions, N , and partition thickness, t , can be determined for a required heat transfer rate. The following analysis shows a particular combination which results in a reasonable design.

4.1 DESIGN SPECIFICATION

The design is based on the following specifications:

Air:

Mass flow rate = 286 lbs/hr
(3825 standard cu ft/hr)

Inlet temperature = 70°F


Outlet temperature = 1400°F

Exhaust Gas:

Mass flow rate = 289 lbs/hr
(4030 standard cu ft/hr)

Inlet temperature = 1850°F

Properties of the air and the exhaust gas were assumed constant. Air properties were taken directly from published data.[7] Some of the exhaust gas properties (density and specific heat) were determined using the mass fractions of the gas composition. The exhaust gas composition was assumed to be that resulting from the burning of fuel with 10 percent excess air.



Other properties of the exhaust gas (viscosity and thermal conductivity) were estimated from the properties of nitrogen.

4.2 FLOW CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AIR AND THE EXHAUST GAS

Characteristics of flow in the preheater are governed by the Reynolds number of the air and exhaust gas. The Reynolds number for gas flow in a passage is

$$\text{Re} \equiv \frac{\rho v d_e}{\mu}$$

or

$$\text{Re} = \frac{m}{A} \frac{d_e}{\mu}$$

m = mass flow rate

A = flow cross sectional area

μ = viscosity

d_e = an equivalent diameter

= 4 (cross-sectional area/wetted perimeter).

The equivalent diameter for a rectangular passage is given by

$$d_e = 2 a / (1 + \frac{a}{b}).$$

Values for flow rates and the possible number and configuration of flow passages were considered and it was found that for any expected final design the Reynolds numbers would be small. Therefore, the flow of the air and the exhaust gas in the preheater will be laminar.

The expression for pressure drop for flow in a passage is:

$$\Delta P = \frac{L}{de} (4 f) \frac{\rho v^2}{2g} ,$$

f = fanning fraction factor

ρ = gas density

v = velocity

For laminar flow in rectangular passages of low aspect ratio, the friction factor is given by: [8]

$$f = \frac{24}{Re}$$

4.3 HEAT TRANSFER RELATIONS

For laminar flow in a rectangular passage, the convective heat transfer coefficient can be determined from Figure 4-2 which gives the Nusselt number as a function of aspect ratio (Knudsen and Katz). The Nusselt numbers given in Figure 4-2 are based on average heat transfer coefficients over passages which are long in the direction of flow. These values apply when the passage length satisfies the condition.




Figure 4-2. Nusselt Number for Laminar Flow in a Rectangular Duct

$$L > 0.014 \text{ Re Pr de,}$$

where Pr is the Prandtl number of the gas and the other terms are as previously defined. An evaluation of the expected design configuration and flow conditions has shown this relationship is easily satisfied. Note that Figure 4-2 contains two curves, one for constant wall temperature and one for uniform heat flux at the wall. Since probably neither of these conditions exist in the preheater, an average value between the two was used.

In summary, for a given annulus size (b) and number of partitions (N) of thickness (t) the passage width is determined by

$$a = \frac{1}{N} - t.$$

Hence the aspect ratio (a/b) is fixed and the Nusselt number is given by Figure 4-2. The convective heat transfer coefficient is then determined from

$$h = \frac{k}{de} \text{ Nu,}$$

where k is the thermal conductivity of the gas.

4.4 PREHEATER DESIGN

The heat transfer in the preheater is that required to heat the incoming air from 70° to 1,400°F.

$$q = \dot{m} C_p \Delta T$$

$$q = (286)(0.254)(1,330)$$

$$q = 96,617 \text{ Btu/hr.}$$

The value of the air specific heat of 0.254 Btu/lb-°F is that corresponding to the mean air temperature of 735°F.

The above heat transfer rate applies to the exhaust gas. A trial and error procedure was used to determine the change in temperature and the mean temperature for the exhaust gas. It was found that the exhaust gas, which enters the preheater at 1,850°F is 0.309 Btu/lb-°F.

For the above entering and exit temperatures of the air and exhaust gas, the log mean temperature difference for the preheater is 565°F.

As previously stated the heat transfer equation for the preheater is

$$q = UA_S \overline{\Delta T}.$$

Substituting the above values for the heat transfer rate and the log mean temperature difference, this equation gives

$$96,617 = UA_S (565)$$

or

$$UA_S = 171 \text{ Btu/hr-°F}$$

where U = overall thermal conductance, Btu/hr-ft²-°F

A_S = heat transfer area, ft²

The heat transfer area was previously shown to be

$$A_S = 2\pi (13.14 + b/2) NbL.$$

Since the length L of the partitions (preheater) occurs only in this expression for the area, heat transfer rates will be directly proportional to L . The effect of the annulus size, b , is more complex since a change in b will produce a change in both the area A_S and the conductance U .

From manufacturing considerations, the thickness of the metal partitions was selected to be 0.010 inch. Figure 4-3 was constructed by assuming various values of N , the number of partitions per inch, and then determining the area A_S and the conductance U . Three values for the annulus size b were used and Figure 4-3 shows the strong influence of the variable. Only one value of L , 2.5, inch, was used since, as stated above, the curves would be shifted directly proportional to a change in this variable.

A conservative design is 1,200 total partitions (14 per inch) of length $L = 2.5$ inch, width $b = 1$ inch, and thickness $T = 0.010$ inch. The passage width, a , for this design will be 0.064 inch.

4.4.1 Pressure Drop and Blower Requirement

The pressure required to produce the air and exhaust gas flow through the receiver was estimated using the pressure drop equation previously given. Values used in the calculations and the results are presented in Table 4-I. It is seen that an




Figure 4-3. Heat Transfer in Preheater as Function of the Number of Flow Passages

Table 4-I. Pressure Drop for Air and Exhaust Gas Flow

<u>Location</u>	$\frac{4fL}{d}$	<u>Density</u> (lb/ft ³)	<u>Velocity</u> (ft/sec)	<u>Pressure Drop</u> (psi)
Air flow in Inlet Manifold	0.4	0.0748	50	0.0081
Transition from Manifold to Preheater	1.0	0.0748	50 to 4	0.0171
Air Flow in Preheater	14.6	0.0331	9	0.0042
Transition from Preheater to Combustor	0.3	0.02158	14 to 50	0.0017
Gas Flow in Combustor	--	--	--	0.2889*
Transition from Combustor to Preheater	1.0	0.01644	50 to 18	0.0018
Exhaust Gas Flow in Preheater	17.3	0.0215	14	0.0079
Transition to Exit Manifold	0.35	0.0309	10 to 120	0.017
Exhaust Gas Flow in Exit Manifold	0.4	0.0309	120	<u>0.019</u>
			TOTAL	0.3657

* Pressure drop estimate for gas flow in combustor supplied by Fairchild.

4-12

SOL-R025

estimated pressure of approximately 0.4 psi is required. The power to develop this pressure is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Horsepower} &= (\text{pressure (C.F.M.)})/33,000 \\ &= (0.4 \times 144)(3,825/60)/33,000 \\ &= 0.1113 \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that the blower would have an efficiency of 50%, the total power requirement for the gas flow system is 0.223 horsepower.

4.5 HEAT LOSSES

Energy is lost from the combustor zone of the receiver by the transfer of heat through the structure to the surroundings. The heat transfer is estimated by the equation

$$q = \Delta T/R$$

where q is the heat transfer in Btu/hr, ΔT is the temperature difference between the hot gas in the combustor and the surroundings, and R is the total thermal resistance from the hot gas to the surroundings. The total thermal resistance is in general the sum of convection and conduction resistances. Convection resistance is calculated by

$$R = 1/hA$$

where h is a heat transfer coefficient and A the surface area. Conduction resistance is calculated by

$$R = t/k \bar{A},$$

where t is the thickness of the material in the direction of conduction, k is the material thermal conductivity, and \bar{A} is the cross-sectional area through which heat is being conducted. If the cross-sectional area varies along the direction of conduction from say A_1 to A_2 , then \bar{A} is calculated as a log mean area by [9]

$$\bar{A} = (A_1 - A_2) / \ln(A_1/A_2).$$

For the heat transfer calculations, the combustor, as shown in Figure 4-2, can be divided into three zones. In Zone 1, heat is transferred from the hot combustion gases through the ceramic cup to the incoming preheated combustion air. Since the incoming air is mixed and burned with the gas fuel to form the hot combustion gases, heat transfer to the air is not included as an energy loss. However, the heat transfer to the air serves to further increase the incoming air temperature and energy is lost by heat transfer from the preheated air through the insulation and to the surrounding ambient air.

In Zone 2, heat is transferred from the hot combustion gases through the ceramic cup, through the insulation and to the surrounding ambient air. In Zone 3, heat is transferred from the hot combustion gases through the ceramic cup, through the insulation and into the engine structure.

An analysis performed on the combustor [10] indicates that, for the case of 10 percent excess air, the flame temperature is expected to be approximately 3100°F. The hot combustion




Figure 4-4. Combustor Heat Loss Transfer

gas cools to around 1830°F before exiting to the air preheater. Therefore, an average temperature of 2500°F was assumed for the hot gas. The combustion analysis also indicated that the heat coefficient for convection from the hot gas to the ceramic cup would be on the order of 50 Btu/hr-ft²-°F; therefore, this value was assumed for the heat transfer coefficient. The heat transfer coefficients for convection between the incoming combustion air and adjacent surface, and also between the ambient air and the receiver outside surfaces, were assumed to be 20 Btu/hr-ft²-°F. Exact material specifications for the ceramic and the insulation were not available; therefore, the thermal conductivity for the ceramic was assumed to be 2.5 Btu/hr-ft-°F (alumina) and, for the insulation, 0.05 Btu/hr-ft-°F (glass wool).

In the analysis, all of the heat transferred from the hot gas to the ceramic surface by convection was assumed to be conducted through the ceramic. In fact, part of the heat transferred to the ceramic surface by convection is radiated from the surface to the conical heat receiver surface. This radiated energy would therefore subtract from the energy loss. However, this effect was neglected in order to compensate for some additional energy loss by heat transfer to the engine structure.

4.5.1 Heat Transfer in Zone 1

The heat transfer in Zone 1, from the hot gas to the incoming combustion air, is first determined.

$$A_1 = 2 \pi (9.4)(3)/144 = 1.230 \text{ ft}^2$$

$$A_2 = 2 \pi (13)(3)/144 = 1.702 \text{ ft}^2$$

Convection resistance from the hot gas to the ceramic surface is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= 1/(50)(1.230) \\ &= 0.0163 \end{aligned}$$

Conduction resistance through ceramic is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A} &= (1.702 - 1.23)/L_n (1.702/1.23) \\ &= 1.453 \text{ ft}^2 \\ R &= (3.6)/(2.5)(1.453)(12) \\ &= 0.0826 \end{aligned}$$

Convection resistance from the ceramic surface to air is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= 1/(20)(1.702) \\ &= 0.0294 \end{aligned}$$

The total resistance is the sum of these individual resistances, of 0.1283. The hot gas temperature is assumed to be 2500°F and the preheated air is at a temperature of 1400°F; therefore, the heat transfer rate is

$$\begin{aligned} q &= (2500 - 1400)/0.1283 \\ q &= 8574 \text{ Btu/hr} \end{aligned}$$

This heat serves to increase the temperature of the incoming air, which is calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}
 q &= \dot{m} C_p \Delta T \\
 8574 &= (286)(0.2746) \Delta T \\
 \Delta T &= 109.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the incoming air which was heated to 1400°F in the preheater will increase from heat transfer through the ceramic cone.

The energy loss in Zone 1 is that resulting from heat transfer from the air at an average temperature of 1450°F through the insulation to ambient air at a temperature of 70°F.

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_1 &= 2 \pi (14)(5.7)/144 \\
 &= 3.482 \text{ ft}^2 \\
 A_2 &= 2 \pi (14.5)(5.7)/144 \\
 &= 3.606 \text{ ft}^2 \\
 \bar{A} &= \frac{3.606 - 3.482}{\ln (3.606/3.482)} \\
 \bar{A} &= 3.544 \text{ ft}^2
 \end{aligned}$$

Convection resistance on the inside is

$$\begin{aligned}
 R &= 1/(20)(3.482) \\
 &= 0.01436.
 \end{aligned}$$

Conduction resistance through the insulation

$$\begin{aligned}
 R &= (0.5)/(0.05)(3.544)(12) \\
 &= 0.2351
 \end{aligned}$$

Convection resistance on the outside is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= 1/(20)(3.606) \\ &= 0.01386 \end{aligned}$$

The total thermal resistance is therefore 0.2633 and the heat loss in Zone 1 is

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 &= (1450-70)/0.2633 \\ q_1 &= 5290 \text{ Btu/hr} \end{aligned}$$

4.5.2 Heat Transfer in Zone 2

The heat transfer in Zone 2 is from the hot gas to the ambient air. The convection resistance from the hot gas to the ceramic core is

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= [\pi(9.4)^2 - \pi(8.5)^2]/144 \\ &= 0.3515 \text{ ft}^2 \\ R &= 1/(30)(0.3515) \\ &= 0.0569. \end{aligned}$$

The conduction resistance through the ceramic cone is

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= [\pi(14.5)^2 - \pi(8.5)^2]/144 \\ &= 3.017 \\ \bar{A} &= (3.0107 - 0.3515)/L_n(3.0107/0.3515) \\ &= 1.238 \text{ ft}^2 \\ R &= (1.5)/(0.5)(1.2382)(12) \\ &= 0.0404. \end{aligned}$$

Conduction resistance through the insulation is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= (1.5)/(0.05)(3.0107)(12) \\ &= 0.8304 \end{aligned}$$

Convection resistance to the ambient air is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= 1/(20)(3.0107) \\ &= 0.0569. \end{aligned}$$

The total resistance is then 0.9443 and the heat loss in Zone 2 is

$$\begin{aligned} q_2 &= (2500-70)/0.9443 \\ q_2 &= 2573 \text{ Btu/hr.} \end{aligned}$$

4.5.3 Heat Transfer in Zone 3

The heat transfer in Zone 3 is from the hot gas to the engine structure.

$$\begin{aligned} A &= [\pi(8.5)^2 - \pi(6)^2]/144 \\ &= 0.7909 \text{ ft}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Convection resistance from the hot gas to the ceramic cone is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= 1/(50)(0.7909) \\ &= 0.0253. \end{aligned}$$

Conduction resistance through the ceramic is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= (0.6)/(2.5)(0.7909)(12) \\ &= 0.0253 \end{aligned}$$

Conduction resistance through the insulation is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= (0.3)/(0.05)(0.7905)(12) \\ &= 0.6322. \end{aligned}$$

The total thermal resistance is therefore 0.6828 and the heat loss in Zone 3 (assuming the engine structure to be at 500°F) is

$$\begin{aligned} q_3 &= (2500-500)/0.6828 \\ q_3 &= 2929 \text{ Btu/hr.} \end{aligned}$$

Total heat loss from the combustion is the sum of q_1 , q_2 , q_3 , or 10,792 Btu/hr.