Engineering Conferences International ECI Digital Archives

Fluidization XV

Proceedings

5-23-2016

Solid flux in travelling fluidized bed operating in square-nosed slugging regime

Sina Tebianian Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, University of British Columbia, sinatebian@gmail.com

Kristian Dubrawski Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, University of British Columbia

Naoko Ellisa Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, University of British Columbia

John R. Grace Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, University of British Columbia

Thomas W. Leadbeater Positron Imaging Centre, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: http://dc.engconfintl.org/fluidization_xv Part of the <u>Chemical Engineering Commons</u>

Recommended Citation

Sina Tebianian, Kristian Dubrawski, Naoko Ellisa, John R. Grace, Thomas W. Leadbeater, David J. Parker, Rouzbeh Jafari, Jamal Chaouki, Pablo Garcia-Trinanes, and Jonathan P. K. Seville, "Solid flux in travelling fluidized bed operating in square-nosed slugging regime" in "Fluidization XV", Jamal Chaouki, Ecole Polytechnique de Montreal, Canada Franco Berruti, Wewstern University, Canada Xiaotao Bi, UBC, Canada Ray Cocco, PSRI Inc. USA Eds, ECI Symposium Series, (2016). http://dc.engconfintl.org/fluidization_xv/ 20

This Abstract and Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by the Proceedings at ECI Digital Archives. It has been accepted for inclusion in Fluidization XV by an authorized administrator of ECI Digital Archives. For more information, please contact franco@bepress.com.

Authors

Sina Tebianian, Kristian Dubrawski, Naoko Ellisa, John R. Grace, Thomas W. Leadbeater, David J. Parker, Rouzbeh Jafari, Jamal Chaouki, Pablo Garcia-Trinanes, and Jonathan P. K. Seville

Solid Flux in Travelling Fluidized Bed Operating in the Square-Nosed Slugging Flow Regime

S. Tebianian¹, K. Dubrawski¹, N. Ellis¹, T. Leadbeater², D. Parker², J. Chaouki³, R. Jafari³, P. Garcia-Trinanes⁴, J. Seville⁴ and J. Grace¹

¹ UBC; ² U. Birmingham; ³ Ecole Polytechnique; ⁴U. Surrey



Fluidization XV

Montebello, Quebec, May 2016

Travelling Fluidized Bed Premise

- Many measurement techniques, some sophisticated (e.g. RPT, PEPT, borescopy, tomography, probes) for measuring key fluidized bed hydrodynamic properties.
- All columns and most particles are one-offs: Direct comparisons are almost impossible.
- Invasive vs non-invasive techniques.
- Comprehensive database needed, with estimates of experimental error, for validation of CFD and other models.

Travelling Fluidized Bed: Objectives

- 1. Compare measurement techniques under identical operating conditions.
- 2. Intrusive vs non-intrusive measurements.
- 3. Provide a comprehensive database for validation of models.
- 4. Educational tool.
- 5. Promote collaboration.

Participants

- Column designed & constructed to travel. Initial funding to 5 Canadian Universities:
- UBC (Grace, Bi, Ellis, Lim)
- Univ. of Calgary (Kantsas)
- Ecole Polytechnique (Chaouki, Patience)
- Univ. of Saskatchewan (Pugsley)
- Univ. of Western Ontario (Zhu)
- Later 3 additional collaborating organizations:
- PSRI (Cocco, Hays, Karri)
- University College London (Lettieri)
- Univ. Birmingham (Parker, Seville, Leadbeater).



Design and Construction

Input from each Participating Institution on their requirements (e.g. ceiling height, instrumentation allowable dimensions.)

Coanda R&D carried out the design and commissioning, working with UBC.

Design included all elements: column, structure, transport boxes, instruments, particles, tools for quick assembly, computer.

FCC and sand particles travel also.



Travelling fluidized bed and transport boxes in UBC's Clean Energy Laboratory

Assembly: 1 working day Disassembly including packing: ~ 4 hours

Repeatable Operating Conditions

- Extra-dry (RH=3%) air at T=25°C as the fluidizing gas.
- Atmospheric temperature and pressure.
- FCC ($d_{sv} \approx 100 \ \mu m$, Group A) and Silica sand ($d_{sv} = 312 \ \mu m$, Group B). $H_o = 0.8 \ m$.
- Radial profiles at 3 measurement heights.
- Bubbling and turbulent flow regimes,
 U = 0.30, 0.40, 0.50, 0.60 m/s.

----Sand - before experiments ----Sand - after experiments -- FCC - before experiments -- FCC - after experiments



Techniques Compared – Solids Flux

Non-invasive:

- Radioactive particle tracing (RPT)
- Positron emission particle tracking (PEPT)

Invasive:

• Borescope: not found to be acceptable due to uncertain depth of field.



Radioactive Particle Tracking at the Ecole Polytechnique, Montreal

10





Positron Emission Particle Tracking at the University of Birmingham, England

Properties of Sand and Tracer Particles

	Bulk sand	RPT tracer	PEPT
			tracer
$d_{p}(\mu m)$	332	400	300
ρ (kg/m ³)	2644	2000	3000
Shape	Irregular	Spherical	Irregular
$v_{\rm T}$ (m/s)	0.73	2.35	0.91

Methodology: If the tracer particle is truly representative of the bulk bed particles, then the number of times the tracer crosses a measurement plane during a long time interval can be used to estimate the solids flux across that plane.

Square-Nosed Slug Flow Regime

- This flow regime is of little practical interest. It is found in smooth-walled columns of limited diameter with group B or D solids.
- The regime facilitates comparison of both experimental techniques and of models.

△ RPT upward
▽ RPT downward
▲ PEPT upward
▼ PEPT downward

Radial profiles of upward and downward timeaverage solids mass flux at three levels for sand fluidized at 0.40 m/s.



200

△ **RPT** upward ▽ RPT downward ▲ PEPT upward PEPT downward

Radial profiles of upward and downward timeaverage solids mass flux at three levels for sand fluidized at 0.60 m/s.

1.0

solids flux, kg/m²s ime-mean





RPT × PEPT

Time-average sand net mass flux (over entire measurement time period: 3.5 h for PEPT, 8 h for RPT) at three levels for three gas velocities.

Factors Contributing to Differences between RPT and PEPT data:

- Tracer particles differed from each other and from the bulk bed particles.
- PEPT, with variable and, in some cases, faster sampling than RPT, captured raining particles more often than RPT.
- Possible saturation of RPT detectors when the tracer particle was in the wall region, reducing sensitivity and producing unphysical data near the wall.

Summary of Findings for Solids Flux

- The two tracking techniques are in reasonable qualitative agreement, but there are significant quantitative differences in measurements.
- Factors contributing to the differences include:
 Tracer particles differ from bulk properties.
 Limited spatial resolution in particle tracking.
- Probe intrusiveness is less important than excellent matching of tracer particle properties.

Acknowledgements

- Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC)
- Helpers and colleagues at each of the partner universities.