

NUMERICAL MODELING OF PROPELLANT BOIL-OFF IN A CRYOGENIC STORAGE TANK

A.K. Majumdar¹, T.E. Steadman², J.L. Maroney², J.P. Sass³ and J.E. Fesmire³

¹NASA Marshall Space Flight Center, ER43
Huntsville, AL, 35812, USA

²Jacobs Engineering, ESTS Group
Huntsville, AL, 35806, USA

³NASA Kennedy Space Center, KT-E
Kennedy Space Center, FL, 32899, USA

ABSTRACT

A numerical model to predict boil-off of stored propellant in large spherical cryogenic tanks has been developed. Accurate prediction of tank boil-off rates for different thermal insulation systems was the goal of this collaborative effort. The Generalized Fluid System Simulation Program, which integrates flow analysis and conjugate heat transfer for solving complex fluid system problems, was used to create the model. Calculation of tank boil-off rate requires simultaneous simulation of heat transfer processes among liquid propellant, vapor ullage space, and tank structure. The reference tank for the boil-off model was the 850,000 gallon liquid hydrogen tank at Launch Complex 39B (LC-39B) at Kennedy Space Center, which is under study for future infrastructure improvements to support the Constellation program. The methodology employed in the numerical model was validated using a sub-scale model and tank. Experimental test data from a 1/15th scale version of the LC-39B tank using both liquid hydrogen and liquid nitrogen were used to anchor the analytical predictions of the sub-scale model. Favorable correlations between sub-scale model and experimental test data have provided confidence in full-scale tank boil-off predictions. These methods are now being used in the preliminary design for other cases including future launch vehicles.

KEYWORDS: Cryogenic tanks, thermal insulation, propellant boil-off, finite volume method, conjugate heat transfer

INTRODUCTION

The cost of loss of propellants due to boil-off in large cryogenic storage tanks is on the order of one million dollars per year. One way to reduce this cost is to design a new tank or refurbish existing tanks by using bulk-fill insulation material with improved thermal performance. Such an effort was undertaken by the Cryogenics Test Laboratory of Kennedy Space Center (KSC) to reduce the propellant boil-off in cryogenic storage tanks at Launch Complex 39 (LC-39) at KSC. The cryogenic storage tanks (FIGURE 1) at KSC were built in the early 1960's. The evacuated annulus space between the inner and outer spheres of each storage tank is filled with Perlite insulation. Perlite is susceptible to compaction after repeated thermal cycles. It is widely believed that an insulation void, possibly caused by compaction and settling, has led to decreased thermal performance of the LC-39 Pad B liquid hydrogen tank.

Fesmire and Augustynowicz [1] have measured apparent thermal conductivity of several bulk-fill insulation materials and have found that the thermal conductivity of Glass Bubbles is 33% less than Perlite at 1 millitorr vacuum. In another study, Fesmire et al [2] studied the vibration and thermal cycling effects on several bulk-fill insulation materials and found that Glass Bubbles are not susceptible to compaction due to thermal cycling. As a part of the Independent Research and Development (IRAD) Project entitled, *Cost-Efficient Storage & Transfer of Cryogenics* (CESAT), KSC [3] has built two 1000 liter Demonstration Tanks (FIGURE 2) and employed them in evaluating the performance of Perlite and Glass Bubble insulation using both liquid nitrogen and hydrogen as the cryogenic fluid.

The purpose of the present paper is to develop a numerical model of the boil-off for cryogenic storage tanks at KSC. The model developments were carried out in two phases. First, the model was verified with the test data resulting from the Demonstration Tank testing using Liquid Nitrogen and Hydrogen. The verified model was then extended to model the full-scale storage tank and the predictions were compared with field data. A general purpose flow network computer code, Generalized Fluid System Simulation Program (GFSSP) [4,5] was used to develop the numerical models.

NUMERICAL APPROACH

Boil-off calculation requires the calculation of heat leak through the metal walls and the insulation. A simple one-dimensional calculation of heat conduction through a composite layer consisting of metal and insulation is not adequate for estimating the boil-off because the heat leak process is not entirely one dimensional. The tanks are partially filled with vapor at a temperature higher than the liquid propellant. This vapor space, called the ullage, is also stratified due to gravitational effects. In addition to heat conduction through metal and insulation, the thermodynamics and fluid mechanics of the propellant also play a role in determining boil-off rate. Therefore, it is essential to use a code that has the capability to model all of the processes that influence boil-off.

The Generalized Fluid System Simulation Program (GFSSP), developed at Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC), has been used to develop the thermal models for estimating boil-off in the Demonstration tanks and the Liquid Hydrogen Storage tank at LC-39. GFSSP is a finite volume based computer code for analyzing fluid flow and heat transfer in a complex network of fluid and solid systems. GFSSP was first

developed for analyzing flow networks using “node” and “branch” control volumes. After constructing the flow network with the “node” and “branch” control volumes, the program solves for mass and energy conservation in “node” control volumes and momentum conservation in “branch” control volumes. The code has been subsequently upgraded to model simultaneously the fluid and solid network along with conjugate heat transfer. This methodology allows the calculation of solid temperatures via convection and radiation heat transfer with fluid nodes and via conduction and radiation heat transfer with other solid nodes.

DESCRIPTION OF CRYOGENIC PROPELLANT TANKS

Two identical 1/15th scale demonstration test tanks were manufactured for the CESAT test program [6]. Both tanks (FIGURE 1, right side) were constructed with stainless steel inner and outer spheres. The annular space between the two spheres in each tank can be filled with an insulating material and the pressure can be reduced to vacuum conditions. Both tanks include fill/drain lines, vent lines, support structures and anti-rotation systems that could contribute to heat leak. Both tanks are heavily instrumented with identical measurements in identical locations. Two methods were used to measure boil-off during CESAT testing: direct measurement using two flow meters installed on the vent line and by evaluating the rate of change in total weight of the tank during testing. Temperature was measured at several locations on both the inner and outer sphere.

There are two full scale liquid hydrogen tanks located at KSC LC-39. Both tanks were built in the early 1960’s for the Apollo program and fabricated by Chicago Bridge and Iron. The inner sphere was constructed with austenitic stainless steel and the outer sphere was constructed with carbon steel. The annular space between the two spheres in each tank can be filled with an insulating material and the pressure can be reduced to vacuum conditions. Both tanks include fill lines, vent lines, and support structures that contribute to total heat leak.



Figure 1. Liquid Hydrogen Storage Tank at Launch Complex 39, Kennedy Space Center




Figure 2. The CESAT Demonstration Tanks at Kennedy Space Center

NUMERICAL MODEL DEVELOPMENT

FIGURE 3 shows a schematic that illustrates the technique that was developed for modeling the CESAT demonstration tanks. The figure shows that the heat path from ambient to propellant was broken into an ullage path and a propellant path. The heat transferred through the ullage path into the ullage space (Q_{a-u}) is used to calculate the ullage temperature, which is then used to calculate the heat transfer between the ullage and propellant (Q_{u-p}). The heat transferred through the propellant path (Q_{a-p}) is calculated independently. The heat transferred through the structure (Q_{s-p}) is assumed as a constant value from a separate calculation. Q_{u-p} , Q_{a-p} and Q_{s-p} are summed to determine the total heat transferred to the propellant. The total heat transfer is then used to calculate the propellant boil-off rate. FIGURE 4 shows the GFSSP model that was developed based on this modeling technique. The model consists of five fluid nodes connected by three fluid branches, as well as one ambient and twelve solid nodes joined to the fluid nodes and each other by twenty conductors.

The effective thermal conductance of insulation materials (Perlite and Glass Bubbles) in the annulus for both demonstration tank and full scale tanks was taken from the experimental study of Fesmire and Augustynowicz [1] at 1 millitorr vacuum. The numerical models did not account for the effect of compaction and radiation heat transfer.




Figure 3. Schematic Illustrating Boil-Off Modeling Technique and the Fill Level Assessed




Figure 4. GFSSP Model of CESAT Demonstration Tank

While the model shown in FIGURE 4 was appropriate for modeling the CESAT demonstration tanks, it was found to be inadequate for modeling the LC-39 cryogenic storage tanks. Because of the difference in scale between the demonstration and full scale tank ullage spaces, using a single node to represent the ullage space led to unrealistic ullage temperature predictions. Therefore, the ullage space was subdivided into eight nodes to simulate the stratified environment. This next level of fidelity increased the model complexity and execution time. Additional code enhancements were later implemented to improve the execution time. The complete details of the numerical models presented in this paper are described in reference 7.

NUMERICAL MODEL RESULTS

All GFSSP predictions were performed at a fill level of 85% of the tank height (approximately 94% of the total tank volume) which is a reasonable assumption for a “full” storage tank. All predictions were first made as pre-test predictions. After testing was complete, each data set was examined to determine which boil-off test had initial conditions (ambient conditions and fill level) closest to the GFSSP predictions. The specific test results for those individual tests were then compared with the GFSSP predictions. These comparisons are shown in TABLE 1 for different liquid and insulation configurations.

The ullage space skin temperature (inner sphere) that is predicted using GFSSP is lower than the test data for all four cases. The differences are believed to be due to the fidelity of the model because the test data is a point temperature measurement while GFSSP is calculating the average skin temperature for the entire ullage-exposed inner sphere. The test data indicated a temperature variation in the ullage due to stratification where as much closer agreement is obtained for liquid skin temperature since the temperature of the liquid propellant does not vary significantly with depth.

The predicted boil-off rates for the two liquid nitrogen comparisons are consistently lower than the measured test data. One factor in these discrepancies was uncertainty in the ullage-wall and ullage-propellant heat transfer coefficients, which were not adjusted to match the test data. Another possible factor is that the anti-rotation devices for both test tanks may have been in partial contact during liquid nitrogen testing. The predicted boil-off rates for the two liquid hydrogen comparisons match very well with measured test data. Initially, the liquid hydrogen comparisons

were predicting much higher boil-off rates than those seen in testing. It was found that the ullage-propellant heat transfer was disproportionately high for these GFSSP predictions. Because temperature stratification in the ullage of a liquid hydrogen tank is more pronounced than that of a liquid nitrogen tank, the effect of natural convection is negligible in a liquid hydrogen tank. Therefore, it was assumed that ullage to propellant heat transfer, Q_{u-p} (FIGURE 3) was governed solely by conduction heat transfer for the liquid hydrogen predictions.

Based on the results of the small-scale CESAT work, a GFSSP model was developed for the LC-39 liquid hydrogen storage tanks. The Full Scale Perlite GFSSP model predicts a boil-off of 258 gallons/day. This compares well to the field measurement (approximately 300 gal/day) at Pad A [3]. The main reasons for the discrepancy are a) possible Perlite compaction, b) uncertainty in the ullage to propellant heat transfer coefficient due to the size differences between CESAT and the full scale storage tanks. Using the GFSSP model, the predicted boil-off for the full scale liquid hydrogen storage tank insulated with Glass Bubbles would be 182 gallons/day. FIGURE 5 shows the stratified ullage temperature prediction from GFSSP for the full scale model with Glass Bubbles. The heights from the propellant surface to the “top” of each node location are noted in the figure. GFSSP predicts a 90 K differential between the ullage temperature at the propellant surface and the ullage temperature at the top of the tank.

Table 1. Comparison of GFSSP Predictions with Test Data

		Boil-off Rate (scm)		$T_{skin,ullage}$ (K)		$T_{skin,propellant}$ (K)	
		Test Data	GFSSP Prediction	Test Data	GFSSP Prediction	Test Data	GFSSP Prediction
Nitrogen	Perlite	3899	3468	91	81	77	76
	Glass Bubble	3230	2493	92	80	77	76
Hydrogen	Perlite	20414	20980	34	21	20	20
	Glass Bubble	13396	12920	31	21	20	20

CONCLUSIONS

A novel numerical modeling technique has been developed using GFSSP to predict boil-off rate from a spherical cryogenic storage tank. The separation of the liquid and vapor space in the tank is modeled and appropriately solved for mass, momentum and energy conservation equations in conjunction with heat transfer equations through metallic walls and insulation material. A numerical model has been built for the Demonstration Tanks developed at KSC. The numerical predictions have compared favorably with test data using liquid nitrogen and liquid hydrogen with Perlite and Glass Bubble insulation. With the experience gained from the Demonstration Tank model, a separate numerical model was developed for the LC-39 Liquid Hydrogen Storage Tank at KSC. Multiple nodes in the ullage space were used in this model to account for the effect of stratification. The numerical model of the full scale tank was then run using Perlite and Glass Bubble insulation. The boil-off rate using Perlite Insulation is in agreement with field data. When using Glass Bubble instead of Perlite as insulation, the numerical model predicts a) 28% reduction in boil-off rate in the Demonstration Tank using Liquid Nitrogen, b) 38% reduction in boil-off rate in the Demonstration Tank using Liquid Hydrogen, and c) 30% reduction in boil-off in the LC-39 Liquid Hydrogen Storage Tank at KSC.




Figure 5. Stratified Ullage Temperature Prediction for the Launch Complex 39 Liquid Hydrogen Storage Tank with Glass Bubbles Insulation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding was provided by the NASA Space Operations Mission Directorate under the Internal Research and Development project *Cost-Efficient Storage & Transfer of Cryogens* (CESAT). The authors would like to acknowledge Steve Sojourner and Zoltan Nagy of Cryogenic Test Laboratory at Kennedy Space Center for their valuable contribution to this effort through many Technical Interchange Meetings and discussions of Test Data.

REFERENCES

1. Fesmire, J. E., Augustynowicz, S. D., "Thermal Performance Testing of Glass Microspheres under Cryogenic Vacuum Conditions," *Advances in Cryogenic Engineering: Transaction of the Cryogenic Engineering Conference*, **49**, pp. 612-618, 2004.
2. Fesmire, J. E., Augustynowicz, S. D., Nagy, Z.F. , Sojourner, S. J. and Morris, D. L., "Vibration and Thermal Cycling Effects on Bulk-Fill Insulation Materials for Cryogenic Tanks," *Advances in Cryogenic Engineering: Transaction of the Cryogenic Engineering Conference*, Volume **51**, pp 1359-1366, 2006.
3. Fesmire, J.E., Sass, J.P., Nagy, Z.F., Sojourner, S.J., Morris, D.L. and Augustynowicz, S.D., "Cost-Efficient Storage of Cryogens," *Cryogenic Engineering Conference (CEC)*, July 16-20, 2007 in Chattanooga, TN, USA
4. Majumdar, A. K., "A Second Law Based Unstructured Finite Volume Procedure for Generalized Flow Simulation," Paper No. AIAA 99-0934, 37th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting Conference and Exhibit, January 11-14, 1999, Reno, Nevada.
5. Majumdar, A. K. and Steadman, T., "Numerical Modeling of Pressurization of a Propellant Tank," *Journal of Propulsion and Power*, Vol. 17, No.2 pp 385-391, March-April, 2001.
6. Sass, J.P., Fesmire, J.E., Nagy, Z.F., Sojourner, S.J., Morris, D.L., & Augustynowicz, S.D., "Thermal Performance Comparison of Glass Microsphere and Perlite Insulation Systems for Liquid Hydrogen Storage Tanks," *Cryogenic Engineering Conference (CEC)*, July 16-20, 2007 in Chattanooga, TN, USA
7. Majumdar, Alok, Steadman Todd & Maroney, Johnny, "Numerical Modeling of Propellant Boil-off in Cryogenic Storage Tank," *National Aeronautics and Space Administration*, Washington, DC 20546-0001, NASA/TM, 2007-215131, November 2007.