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## ABSTRACT

Multipass fractionating trays are vapor-liquid contacting devices with high liquid handling capabilities which can be economically used in large fractionating towers. However, process design engineers in the chemical and petroleum industries seem to have an aversion to specifying multipass trays for their tower designs. This thesis presents the case for using multipass trays as well as methods for their design.

Because multipass trays are not symmetrical, as one and two pass trays are, the liquid and vapor need not split equally between the three or four passes. Equations are developed which enable the vapor and liquid flowrate for each pass to be determined. A computer program is presented which is capable of either rating existing multipass trays or designing multipass trays for new services. Also, techniques for the optimum design of multipass trays are suggested.

The present energy shortage has provided strong incentive to build larger refineries, which means larger capacity fractionation towers are required. This thesis demonstrates how the use of multipass trays can reduce investment costs for these large towers.

The use of the tools presented in this thesis enable process engineers to design multipass trays without relying on the proprietary techniques and programs of others, not readily available to them. It is hoped that this will enable multipass trays to be specified whenever they are economically justified.
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## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

What is a Multipass Tray?
Fractionating columns in the chemical and petroleum industries generally utilize perforated metal trays as the contacting devices. These sieve trays facilitate the countercurrent contacting of vapor and liquid. Liquid flows across the tray and contacts the vapor which is bubbling through the perforations. The liquid passes downward from tray to tray via downcomers.

The most common and simplest type of crossflow tray is the single pass tray. On a single pass tray, the liquid travels in only one path, and there is only one contacting or bubble area on each tray. There is also only one downcomer leaving each tray.

Another common type of crossflow tray is the two pass tray. On this type of tray, there are two different paths in which liquid may flow, as well as two distinct bubble areas. Half of the trays have a single center downcomer while every other tray has two outboard downcomers .

Multipass trays, while not used very often, have distinct ad. vantages over single or two pass trays. Multipass trays generally have three or four passes, although five pass trays have at least been considered (1). Three and four pass trays have three or four different liquid paths and distinct bubble areas on each tray. A threepass tray
has two downcomers on each tray: one outboard and one off-center. Half of the four pass trays have two downcomers - both off-center. Every other tray has three downcomers: two outboard and one center.

The liquid and vapor flow patterns on all four types of trays are depicted in Figure 1.

## Advantages of Multipass Tray Design

The use of multipass trays becomes economically attractive for large towers. A tower's vapor handling capacity increases proportionately to the tower cross sectional area. Therefore, vapor capacity is proportional to the square of the diameter. However, a tower's liquid handling capacity is proportional to the weir length over which the liquid flows on each tray. Therefore, for a one pass tray, the liquid handling capacity is linearly proportional to the tower diameter.

By increasing the number of passes, the weir length per tray is increased. Therefore, a two pass tray will have almost twice the liquid handling capacity of a one pass tray; a three pass tray will have almost three times the liquid handing capacity; and so on. Therefore, using multiple passes helps the liquid capacity increase as rapidly as the vapor capacity.

For example, a 20 foot diameter tower has roughly four times the vapor capacity of a 10 foot diameter tower. However, if both towers are single pass, the 20 foot diameter tower has only twice the liquid capacity. If the 20 foot tower is made two pass, then it will be able

Figure 1
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to handle four times the liquid rate, and four times the vapor rate. If the 10 foot tower was already two pass, then the 20 foot tower would have to be four pass in order to handle four times the vapor and liquid. In such a case, if multipass trays are not used, tower diameter would have to be increased to handle the liquid loading, although it would not be necessary to handle the vapor loading.

Another reason for going to multipass trays is that several capacity correlations indicate that vapor capacity is also dependent on the weir length available for liquid flow (7). The explanation for this is that with a larger weir length, the froth height on a tray is lower. This permits more space for vapor disengaging above the tray, and therefore increased vapor capacity. Because increasing the number of liquid passes decreases the liquid height on each tray, it also decreases the tray pressure drop. This, in turn, decreases the liquid backup in the downcomer. Therefore, multipass trays also provide for designs with lower tray spacings.

The one disadvantage to a multipass tray is that it has a shorter flowpath in which the liquid travels on each tray. There is some evidence that shorter flowpaths reduce tray efficiency (4). But most tray efficiency correlations do not take liquid flowpath into account (8), and it is doubtful that this has much of an effect on large diameter towers, which have large flowpath lengths regardless of the number of liquid passes.

Why Multipass Trays Are Important
The previous section has demonstrated how multipass trays are economically attractive for large towers. With the present energy shortage and the world need for economic expansion of petroleum capacity, there is a strong incentive to build larger and larger refineries. Since single train plants are the most economical, larger capacity fractionating towers are required. For example, atmospheric crude distillation towers in large refineries can be over 30 feet in diameter. With the use of multipass trays, these towers can be designed with smaller diameters, and, therefore, at lower cost.

Another attractive use of multipass trays is in superfractionators. These are towers used to separate close boiling mixtures into high purity components. Some examples are propane/propylene splitters and ethane/ethylene splitters. These difficult separations require a high reflux rate, or liquid loading, and a large number of trays, and, therefore, a larger diameter and a high tower height. In fact, depending on the plant's location and local height restrictions (e.g. if it is - near an airport), the tower may have to be split into two shells. Because, as mentioned in the previous section, multipass trays can decrease tower height and diameter, tower investment for superfractionators can be reduced.

Another reason the use of multipass trays is economically attractive is that it can eliminate the need for special, high cost fractionating devices in some cases. Proprietary devices have been
developed for use especially in heavily liquid loaded services, such as high pressure light ends towers and absorbers and strippers. These devices are marketed at premium prices because they are patented. In some cases, conventional sieve trays designed for three or four liquid passes may have liquid handiing capabilities comparable to such proprietary devices. Because the sieve tray is non-proprietary, no premiums need be paid for patented technology.

## What Has Been Done So Far?

It has been noted that, "There seems to be an aversion in the industry to using multipass trays (4).". This is probably because engineers do not know how to design them. The main problem is that unlike one or two pass trays, multipass trays are not absolutely symmetrical. This makes engineers worry about the hydraulic performance of multipass trays, since the liquid and vapor will not necessarily split into three or four equal parts to travel through each of the passes. Therefore, the design of multipass trays requires a little more work (which may be the real reason engineers shy away from such designs).

Actually, engineers who do not work for a tray vendor have no instructional manual in the design of multipass trays. An investigation of the literature has shown no articles or texts which show how to design multipass trays, although Jamison (4) does make some suggestions, and some tray vendors' manuals do give methods of setting up designs (1). However, most tray vendors consider their detailed design techniques
proprietary, and, therefore, do not make them publicly available.

The main drawback to engineers designing multipass trays is that there is no publicly available program for either rating or designing multipass trays. Tray vendors do have their own proprietary programs which utilize their own special design techniques. But there are various methods of designing multipass trays, and, therefore, each vendor's program uses their own technique.

The purpose of this thesis is to present the various methods of designing three and four pass sieve trays, with the appropriate design equations required. In addition, a computer program is presented for the rating of existing multipass trays and for the design of new multipass trays. This program utilizes publicly available correlations for capacity and pressure drop. These equations can be replaced with the user's own proprietary correlations if he wishes. The remainder of this thesis describes the development of these design methods and the program.

A photograph of a four pass tray is shown in Figure 2.

Although the methodology presented in this thesis can be applied to single and double pass trays, their design is not elaborated on in this work. The design of such trays is common knowledge to most process engineers.

FIGURE 2


Photograph of Four Pass Tray
Courtesy of F.W. Glitsch \& Sons, Inc.

## METHODS OF DESIGNING MULTIPASS TRAYS

Background: One and Two Pass Trays

The design of one and two pass trays for fractionating columns is relatively straightforward. Nearly every chemical process design engineer in the petroleum and chemical industries has done at least one such design. Figures 3 and 4 depict the liquid and vapor flow patterns and pressure drop equations for one and two pass trays, respectively.

On a single pass tray, there is only one path or bubble area for the 1 iquid and the vapor to travel from tray to tray. The vapor rate on the single pass obviously equals the total vapor rate, and the liquid rate on the single tray pass obviously equals the total liquid rate.

On a two pass tray, both the vapor and liquid have a choice of two paths to take in traveling from tray to tray. But as can be seen in Figure 4, a two pass tray is completely symmetrical. The vapor and liquid have no preference as to which path to travel and consequently split equally into the two paths.

The only way the fluids will not split equally is if something such as improper shop fabrication upsets the symmetry of the trays. For example, if there are more perforations on one side of the tray than the other, the vapor will preferentially travel through this side. Since the total tray pressure drop across each side of the tray must be equal, the liquid will preferentially travel across the other side. However,

Figure 3
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Figure 4
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because two pass trays are always designed symmetrically, an unequal split can only occur as a result of holes plugging or improper field construction or shop fabrication.

In determining the vapor and liquid splits on a two pass tray, the four unknowns $\left(V_{A}, V_{B}, L_{A}, L_{B}\right)$ are determined by the following four simple equations:
(1) $\quad V_{A}=V_{B}$
(2) $\quad V_{A}+V_{B}=V_{\text {total }}$
(3) $L_{A}=L_{B}$
(4) $L_{A}+L_{B}=L_{\text {total }}$

Where $V X$ is the vapor rate in cubic feet per second for pass $X, L X$ is the liquid rate in gallons per minute for pass $X$. The subscript total refers to rates for the entire tray. Knowing Vtotal and Lotal, it is obvious that the flowrate through any given pass is equal to one-half the total flowrate.

## Three and Four Pass Trays

The design of three and four pass trays, however, is not as straightforward. Although multipass trays are not symmetrical, there are enough equations to solve for the six unknowns in a three pass design, and the eight unknowns in a four pass design. These equations are presented in the next chapter.

There are several methods of setting up multipass tray designs. Because the liquid and vapor do not necessarily have symmetrical paths to choose from, the liquid and vapor do not split equally. That is,
unless great care is taken in the design, the liquid and vapor flowrate for each pass of a three or four pass tray is not equal to one-third or one-fourth the total flowrate. In order to prevent possible vapor maldis. tribution from propogating itself, trays are of ten designed with passageways for vapor to travel from one pass to another.

The most common method of providing for such vapor crossover is to design the inboard or off-center downcomers (those which are not segmental) as envelope or box downcomers. This is depicted in Figure 5. These downcomers are of almost rectangular shape and are fabricated as two separate downcomers. A space is left between them through which vapor can cross over from one pass to another. If no provision for vapor crossover is desired, the downcomer extends across the entire tray with no separation.

Another method of providing for vapor crossover is to place a horizontal pipe or duct running across the downcomer through which vapor can travel. Jamison (4) has suggested this technique.

Through the use of vapor crossover, the pressure above any tray is equalized. Therefore, trays designed with vapor crossover have a different set of equations than trays designed without vapor crossover. Therefore, four sets of equations for determining liquid and vapor splits are presented in the next chapter: three and four pass trays, with and without vapor crossover.

There are two basic methods of laying out the plan view of three

Figure 5
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Without Vapor Crossover

and four pass trays. The first method consists of designing for equal liquid flow path lengths. That is, equal distances the liquid must travel in its course from downcomer to downcomer. The other method is to design for equal bubbling areas. That is, the perforated area in which vapor-liquid contacting takes place should be the same for each pass. Each of these methods has its own advantages and disadvantages. Neither is generally accepted as the "proper" method because some tray vendors design for equal flowpath length, while others design for equal bubbling areas.

Some vendors probably prefer the equal flowpath length method because it is easy to fabricate. All tray panels can be made of equal widths. Some also claim that since tray efficiency is dependent on flowpath length, such a design provides for equal tray efficiencies. The equal bubble area method is preferred by some because they can then attempt to design for equal liquid and vapor flowrates for each pass. Chapter VI of this thesis describes how the equal bubble area method can be used in the optimum design of multipass trays.

EQUATIONS FOR THREE AND FOUR PASS TRAYS

The liquid and vapor splits for a multipass tray are determined by various pressure drop equations. There are enough equations to solve for each of the unknown liquid and vapor flowrates on a multipass tray. Because vapor crossover affects the tray pressure drop relationships, a separate but related set of equations are necessary for tray designs with vapor crossover. The first section of this chapter presents the pressure drop equations for the four types of multipass tray designs (three and four pass, each with and without vapor crossover) which are necessary and sufficient to completely determine the liquid and vapor flowrates in each pass. The next section presents the derivation of the critical equations. Finally, it is shown that through the use of these equations, the calculated downcomer backup of a downcomer which is shared by two passes of a multipass tray, is indeed the same, regardless of which pass it is calculated for.

## Equations For Determining Liquid and Vapor Splits

Three pass, no vapor crossover. The vapor and liquid flow patterns and pressure drops of a three pass tray are shown in Figure 6. The following six equations (A1 to A6) can be used to determine the three vapor and liquid rates, one for each pass. The first three equations determine the liquid split, and the last three equations determine the vapor split.

Figure 6
THREE-PASS TRAY FLOW PATTERNS AND PRESSURE DROPS

(A1) $L_{A}=L_{C}$
(A2) $\quad \mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HI}_{B}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HT}_{B}$
(A3) $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{L}_{\text {total }}$
(A4) $\quad V_{A}=V_{C}$
(A5) $\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}=2 \times \mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}$
(A6) $V_{A}+V_{B}+V_{C}=V_{\text {total }}$
Where HIX is the inlet head on pass $X$, HDAX is the head loss under the downcomer for pass $X$, and $H T_{X}$ is the total tray pressure drop on pass $X$.

Three pass with vapor crossover. If provision is made for vapor to crossover through the off-center downcomer, equations (A4) and (A5) above can be replaced with the two equations below (B4 and B5). Note that equation (B5) is merely a simplification of equation (A5) knowing (B4) is true.
(B4) $\quad \mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}$
(B5) $H T_{B}=H T_{C} \quad\left(H T_{A}+H T_{C}=2 \times H T_{B}\right)$

Four pass, no vapor crossover. The vapor and liquid flow patterns and pressure drops for a four pass tray are shown in Figure 7. The following eight equations ( Cl to C 8 ) can be used to determine the four liquid and vapor rates, one for each pass. The first four equations determine the liquid split, and the last four equations determine the vapor split.
(C1) $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{C}}$
(C2) $L_{B}=L_{D}$
(C3) $\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HDAC}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{D}}+\mathrm{HDAD}-\mathrm{HT}_{B}$

Figure 7
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(C4) $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{L}_{\text {total }}$
(C5) $V_{A}=V_{C}$
(C6) $V_{B}=V_{D}\left(2 \times V_{A}+2 \times V_{B}=V_{\text {total }}\right)$
(C7) $\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{D}}$
(C8) $V_{A}+V_{B}+V_{C}+V_{D}=V_{\text {total }}$

Four pass with vapor crossover. If provision is made for vapor to crossover through the off-center and center downcomers, equations (D5) to (D8) below replace equations (C5) to (C8) above. Note that equation (D6) is merely a simplification of (C6) once (D5) is true. Also, note that (C6) is a simplification of (D6) once (C5) is true.
(D5) $\quad \mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}$
(D6) $\quad \mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{D}}\left(\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{D}}\right)$
(D7) $2 \times V_{A}+2 \times V_{B}=V_{\text {total }}$
(D8) $2 \times V_{C}+2 \times V_{D}=V_{\text {total }}$

## Derivation of Critical Pressure Drop Equations

Upon studying Figures 6 and 7, most of the equations presented above become obvious. However, the four pressure drop equations which determine the critical vapor and liquid splits (A2, A5, C3, C7) are dexived below.

Equation (A2). The critical liquid split on a three pass tray occurs at the bottom of the off-center downcomer. The liquid will split such that the pressure drop it must overcome in each possible path is exactly equal. The pressure it must overcome is equal to the sum of the inlet head of liquid (HI) the head loss it undergoes in going through
the area under the downcomer (HDA), and the pressure level in the chamber it is entering. Therefore,
(E1) $\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{B}}$
Where $P_{X}$ is the pressure level above pass $X$.
The pressure level in the chamber ( $P_{A}, P_{B}$ ) is equal to the pressure level below that chamber ( $P^{\prime} A, P^{\prime} B$ ) minus the tray pressure drop through that pass $\left(H T_{A}, H T_{B}\right)$. That is
(E2) $P_{A}=P_{A}^{\prime}-H T_{A}$
(E3) $P_{B}=P_{B}^{\prime}-H_{B}$
Where $\mathrm{P}^{\prime} \mathrm{X}$ is the pressure level below pass X . Substituting equations (E2) and (E3) into equation (E1),
(E4) $\quad \mathrm{HI}_{C}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{P}^{\prime} \mathrm{A}^{-H T_{A}}=\mathrm{HI}_{\dot{B}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HT}_{B}$
Since the pressures $P^{\prime} A$ and $P^{\prime} B$ are for the same chamber,
(E5) $\quad \mathrm{P}^{\prime} \mathrm{A}=\mathrm{P}^{\prime} \mathrm{B}$
Therefore, substituting (E5) into (E4) gives equation (A2).
(A2) $H I_{C}+H D A C_{C}-\mathrm{HT}_{A}=H I_{B}+\mathrm{HDA}_{B}-\mathrm{HT}_{B}$
Equation (A5). For trays without vapor crossover, we must consider a pressure balance across two trays because for any one tray, one vapor flow chamber is completely closed off from the other chamber. The vapor from the chamber above pass $C$ travels through the chamber above pass A before it returns to another chamber above another pass C. It cannot travel through the chamber above pass $C$, then through the chamber above pass $B$, because $V_{A}=V_{C}$ as defined by equation (A4). Therefore,
(F1) ${H T_{A}}+H T_{C}=H T_{B}+H T_{B}$
(A5) $\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}=2 \times \mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}$

Equation (C3). As with the three pass tray, the critical liquid split occurs at the bottom of the off-center downcomer, and the same type of pressure balance is required:
(G1) $\quad \mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{D}}+\mathrm{HDAD}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{B}}$
(G2) $\quad \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}$
(G3) $P_{B}=P_{B}-H T_{B}$
(G4) $\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HDAC}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{D}}+\mathrm{HDAD}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}$
(G5) $\quad P_{A}^{\prime}=P_{B}^{\prime}$
(C3) $\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HT}_{A}=\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{D}}+\mathrm{HDAD}_{\mathrm{D}}-\mathrm{HT}_{B}$

Equation (C7). As with the three pass tray, consider the pressure balance across two trays. Vapor from the chambers above passes $C$ and $D$, must pass through the chambers above passes $A$ and $B$ respectively. Therefore,
(C7) $\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{D}}$

## Proofs That Shared Downcomers Have Equal Backups.

On multipass trays, liquid from two different passes can flow into a single shared downcomer. For example, liquid from passes $B$ and $C$ on a three pass tray share a common downcomer, as does liquid from passes C and $D$ on a four pass tray. Because the liquid in these downcomers blend and actually form one column of liquid, the downcomer backup (the static head equal to the height of this column) must be the same regardless of which pass it is calculated for. That is, for a three pass tray, $H_{C}$ must
equal $\mathrm{HD}_{\mathrm{B}}$; and for a four pass tray, $\mathrm{HD}_{\mathrm{C}}$ must equal $\mathrm{HD}_{\mathrm{D}}$. This is proven below.

Three pass. By definition, the backup in a downcomer is equal to the sum of the total tray pressure drop (HT), plus the head loss under the downcomer (HDA), plus the inlet head (HI). Therefore,
(H1) $\quad \mathrm{HDC}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{B}}$
(H2) $\quad H D C_{C}=H T_{C}+H D A C+H C_{C}$
Where $H D C_{X}$ is the downcomer filling in the downcomer from pass $X$. For $\mathrm{HDC}_{\mathrm{B}}$ to be equal to $H D C$, the following must hold,
(H3) $\quad \mathrm{HDC}_{B}-\mathrm{HDC}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{O}=\mathrm{HT}_{B}+\mathrm{HDA}_{B}+\mathrm{HI}_{B}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HDAC}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}$
Now from previous equations,
(A5) ${H T_{A}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}=2 \times \mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}$
(H4) $\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}$
Substituting ( H 4 ) into (H3)
(H5) $0=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HDAC}-\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}$
Rearranging, this equation is the same as the identity of equation (A2),
(A2) $H I_{C}+H D A_{C}-H T_{A}=H I_{C}+H D A_{B}-H T_{B}$
Therefore, (H3) is true, and
(H6) $\quad \mathrm{HDC}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{HDC}_{\mathrm{C}}$
Q.E.D.

Four pass. Following the logic used in the derivation for three passes above:
(II) $\mathrm{HDC}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}$
(I2) $\quad H D C_{D}=H T_{D}+H D A_{D}+H I_{D}$

We will prove
(I3) $H D C_{C}-H D C_{D}=0=H T_{C}+H D A C+H I_{C}-H I_{D}-H D A D_{D}-H I_{D}$
Using the following equations:
(C7) $\mathrm{HTA}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{D}}$
(I4) $\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{D}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HTA}$
(I5) $0=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{HDAC}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HDAD}-\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{D}}$
Now (I5) is the same as the identity (C3) rearranged. Therefore, (I3)
is true, and
(I6) $\quad H D C_{C}=H D C_{D}$
Q.E.D.

## COMPUTER PROGRAM FOR RATING AND DESIGNING MULTIPASS TRAYS

A computer program has been written to rate existing multipass trays and to design three and four pass trays for new services. This program uses the equations presented in the preceding chapter to determine the vapor and liquid loadings for each pass.

## Equations Used to Rate Designs

In order to rate or design trays, equations are necessary for the various pressure drops required, as well as for tray capacity and efficiency. This section presents the equations used in this program. Most are published equations although the jet flood capacity equation is not from any single source but is contrived to represent known trends in tower capacity. The equations chosen are not intended to be recommended as the best possible equation available. It is expected that those interested in using this program will substitute some or all of these rating equations with their own proprietary rating equations.

Jet Flood. The jet flood point normally sets the maximum vapor capacity of a sieve tray. Jet flooding is the condition in which liquid entrained from one tray to the next by the vapor jets becomes excessive. Tower pressure drop increases significantly, and the tower may become filled with liquid. Tray efficiency decreases drastically.

Many tower capacity correlations predict the vapor velocity through the bubble area at which jet flooding occurs. This jet flood
point decreases as the liquid rate across the weir increases. This program calculates the percentage of the flood point at which the tray is operating for each pass. A desirable design is generally at about 85 percent of the flood point. This maximizes tower capacity without debiting tower efficiency due to excessive entrainment.

The following equation used in this program to calculate the jet flood point is not taken from any one source. It is a contrived equation based on known trends in tower capacity.
( $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{L}} / \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{B}}$ ) $\mathrm{flood}=$ HFACT1 $\times 0.55-0.035$ (GPHFTWEIR/1000)
where $V_{L}=\operatorname{CFS}_{V} \sqrt{\rho_{V} /\left(\rho_{L}-\rho_{V}\right)}$ and $\mathrm{HFACTI}=\sqrt{\mathrm{H} / 24}$
Where $V_{L}$ is the vapor load in cubic feet per second, $A_{B}$ is the bubble area, $\mathrm{CFS}_{\mathrm{V}}$ is the vapor flowrate in cubic feet per second, $\rho_{\mathrm{V}}$ is the vapor density in pounds per cubic foot, $\rho_{L}$ is the liquid density in pounds per cubic foot, $H$ the tray spacing in inches, HFACTI is a tray spacing capacity factor, and GPHFTWEIR is the liquid weir loading in gallons per hour per foot of weir length.

Allowable downcomer inlet velocity. As the frothy liquid from the tray enters the downcomer, the froth disengages. The liquid goes down through the downcomer to the next lower tray while the vapor goes up through the vapor space to the next higher tray. There is an upper limit to the velocity at which the froth can enter the downcomer and successfully disengage without carrying vapor downward to be recycled to the tray below.

This allowable downcomer inlet velocity increases as the tray spacing increases. As the tray spacing or downcomer height increases, the disengaging residence time increases, and, therefore, the vapor and liquid separate more easily. The allowable velocity also increases as the difference between the $1 i q u i d$ and vapor densities ( $\rho_{L}-\rho_{V}$ ) increases. As the liquid and vapor densities come closer, the two phases are more difficult to separate, and, therefore, a lower downcomer inlet velocity is allowed.

ALLVEL $=$ HFACT2 $\times$ RHOFAC
Where $\mathrm{HFACT} 2=\mathrm{H} / 24$
and RHOFAC $=\mathbf{f}\left(\rho_{L}-\rho_{V}\right)$
Where ALLVEL is the allowable downcomer inlet velocity, HFACT2 is a tray spacing downcomer design factor and RHOFAC is a function of the density difference.

Dry tray pressure drop. The dry tray pressure drop is the pressure drop the vapor would undergo in passing through the tray's perforations if there were no liquid on the tray. This is calculated from a typical velocity head equation. All pressure drop equations used are similar to those presented by Smith (9). To simplify the dry tray pressure drop equation, the constant $C_{V o}$ was set at an average value of 0.70 . The literature gives several methods of predicting CVo, including correlating it with the ratio of hole to bubble area ( $A_{0} / A_{B}$ ) and the ratio of hole diameter to tray thickness ( $\mathrm{D}_{0} / T \mathrm{~T}$ ).
$\mathrm{HH}=0.186\left(1 / \mathrm{CVO}_{\mathrm{V}}\right)^{2} \mathrm{~V}_{0}{ }^{2}\left(\rho_{\mathrm{V}} / \rho_{\mathrm{L}}\right)$
where $\mathrm{V}_{0}=\mathrm{CFSV} / \mathrm{A}_{0}$
and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{VO}}=0.70$
where $H H$ is the $d x y$ tray pressure drop, $V_{0}$ is the vapor velocity through the open area to feet per second, $A_{0}$ is the open area in square feet, and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{v}}$ is a dry tray pressure drop coefficient.

Clear liquid height. The height of the froth on a tray is given as the sum of the weir height, plus the static head of the crest of liquid overflowing the weir (the Francis weir formula). The static head of this froth, as a clear liquid, is equal to the froth height multiplied by an aeration factor ( $\beta$ ) . Some texts give $\beta$ as a function of the weir liquid loading and the ratio of weir length to diameter (9). This program uses average values of 0.70 and 1.00 for $\beta$ and $F_{W}$, respectively.

$$
\mathrm{HL}=\beta \text { (HOW }+\mathrm{HWO})
$$

Where $\beta=0.70$

$$
\text { HOW }=0.48 \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{W}}(\mathrm{GPM} / \mathrm{LWO})^{2 / 3}
$$

and $F_{W}=1.00$
Where $H L$ is the clear liquid height on a tray, HOW is the crest over the weir, HWO is the outlet weir height in inches, $\beta$ is an aeration factor and $F_{W}$ is a weir factor, GPM is liquid flowrate in gallons per minute, and LWO is the weir length in inches.

Total tray pressure drop. The total pressure drop a vapor undergoes in passing from one tray to another (HT) is generally agreed to be equal to the sum of the dry tray pressure drop plus the clear
liquid head on the tray.

$$
\mathrm{HT}=\mathrm{HH}+\mathrm{HL}
$$

Inlet head. The static head of liquid at the tray inlet is used in calculating downcomer filling. It is usually equal to the clear liquid height on a sieve tray (a sieve tray is generally regarded to have no crossflow pressure gradrent) unless there is an inlet weir. If there is an inlet weir, the inlet head is equal to the inlet weir height plus the crest over the inlet weir. Since the liquid at this point is clarified, no aerator factor is necessary (i.e. $\beta=1,00$ ).

Without an inlet weir $\mathrm{HI}=\mathrm{HL}$
With an inlet weir $\mathrm{HI}=0.48 \cdot \mathrm{FW}(G P M / L W I)^{2 / 3} \mathrm{HWI}$
Where HI is the inlet head, LWI is the inlet weir length in inches and HWI is the inlet weir height in inches.

Head loss under downcomer. As the liquid passes through the area under each downcomer, it changes direction from vertical to horizontal. This requires a pressure loss (HDA) which is predicted by the submerged weir formula.

$$
\mathrm{HDA}=0.06(\mathrm{GPM} / \mathrm{AUD})^{2}
$$

Where AUD $=C \times$ LUD
Where AUD is the area under the downcomer in square inches, $C$ is the downcomer clearance in inches, and $L_{U D}$ is the length under the downcomer in inches.

By curving the outlet lip of the downcomer, this head loss is reduced. If a shaped lip downcomer is used, this program calculates
the head loss to be one-half the value calculated by the above equation.

Downcomer filling. A static head of liquid builds up in the downcomer (HDC) to compensate for the pressure drop between trays plus enough head to overcome the tray inlet head and the head loss under the downcomer.
$\mathrm{HDC}=\mathrm{HT}+\mathrm{HI}+\mathrm{HDA}$
If a recessed box or inlet weir is used, HDA is doubled, because the 1iquid makes two turns in leaving the downcomer.

If downcomer filling is excessive, liquid may back up to the tray above and flood the column. Because the froth in the downcomer is not completely clarified, it is generally recommended that the downcomer clear liquid filling not exceed 50 percent of the tray spacing.

Tray efficiency. There are many tray efficiency equations. This program uses a simple correlation of overall tray efficiency with the liquid fluidity on the tray, as presented by Maxwell (8). The liquid fluidity is defined as the reciprocal of the liquid viscosity in centipoises.

Convergence Techniques.
The equations presented in Chapter III are solved simultaneously to determine the liquid and vapor flowrates in each pass. These convergence techniques are summarized in this section.

Three pass, no vapor crossover.

1. Guess $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{L}_{\text {total }} / 3$
$V_{A}=V_{B}=V_{C}=V_{\text {total }} / 3$
2. Calculate HL, HDA, and HI for each pass
3. Calculate HH and HT for each pass
4. Solve for $V_{A}$ such that
$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{B}}$
which is equivalent to equation (A2)
5. Recalculate $V_{C}=V_{A}$

$$
\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{V}_{\text {total }}-\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{C}}
$$

Return to Step 3 until $V_{A}$ is converged.
6. Once $V_{A}$ is converged, solve for $L_{A}$ such that $\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{A}}=2 \times \mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HH}_{\mathrm{A}}$ which is equivalent to equation (A5)
7. Recalculate $L_{C}=L_{A}$

$$
\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{L}_{\text {total }}-\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{C}}
$$

Return to Step 2 until $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$ is converged.

Three pass, with vapor crossover.

1. Guess $L_{A}=L_{B}=L_{C}=L_{\text {total }} / 3$
$\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{V}_{\text {total }} / 3$
2. Calculate HL, HDA, and HI for each pass
3. Solve for $L_{A}$ such that
$\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{HI}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HDA}_{\mathrm{C}}$
which is equivalent to equations (A2) and (B4)
4. Recalculate $L_{C}=L_{A}$

$$
\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{L}_{\text {total }}-\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{C}}
$$

Return to Step 2 until $L_{A}$ is converged
5. Solve for $V_{B}$ such that
$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{B}}$
6. Solve for $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}$ such that
$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{A}}$
which is equivalent to equation (B4)
7. If $V_{A}+V_{B}+V_{C}$ does not equal $V_{\text {total }}$, recalculate $V_{C}=$ $V_{\text {total }}-V_{A}-V_{B}$

Repeat, starting at Step 5, until $V_{A}+V_{B}+V_{C}$ does equal Vtotal

Four pass, no vapor crossover.

1. Guess $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{D}}=$ Ltotal $/ 4$

$$
V_{A}=V_{B}=V_{C}=V_{C}=V_{\text {total }} / 4
$$

2. Calculate HL, HDA, and HI for each pass
3. Solve for $V_{A}$ such that
$H_{A}=H T_{B}+H I_{C}+H D A C_{C}-H L_{A}-H I_{D}-H D A_{D}$
which is equivalent to equation (C3)
4. Recalculate $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}$

$$
\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{D}}=0.5 \mathrm{v}_{\text {total }}-\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{A}}
$$

Return to Step 3 until $V_{A}$ is converged
5. Solve for $L_{A}$ such that
$\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}+\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{D}}-\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{HH}_{\mathrm{A}}$
which is equivalent to equation (C7)
6. Recalculate $L_{C}=L_{A}$

$$
\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{D}}=0.5 \mathrm{~L}_{\text {total }}-\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}
$$

Return to Step 2 until $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$ is converged

Four pass, with vapor crossover.

1. Guess $L_{A}=L_{B}=L_{C}=L_{D}=L_{\text {total }} / 4$

$$
V_{A}=V_{C}=V_{\text {total }} / 4
$$

2. Calculate HL, HDA, and HI for each pass
3. Solve for $L_{C}$ such that
$H I C=H I_{D}+H D A D-H D A C$
which is equivalent to equations (C3) and (D5)
4. Recalculate $L_{A}=L_{C}$

$$
\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{D}}=0.5 \mathrm{~L}_{\text {total }}-\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}
$$

Return to Step 2 until $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$ is converged
5. Recalculate $V_{B}=0.5 V_{\text {total }}-V_{A}$
6. Solve for $V_{A}$ such that
$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{HT}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{A}}$
which is equivalent to equation (D5)
Return to Step 5 until $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}$ is converged
7. Recalculate $V_{D}=0.5 V_{\text {total }}-V_{C}$
8. Solve for $V_{C}$ such that
$H_{H}=H T D_{D}-H_{C}$
which is equivalent to equation (D6)
Return to Step 5 until $V_{C}$ is converged

How to Use the Program
This section describes how to fill out the input form for the eight possible options this program is capable of evaluating. These are three and four pass trays, each with or without vapor crossover,
and each as either a rating or a design case.

The input form for this program is presented on the next page. The input form is, for the most part, selfexplanatory. The following are notes describing the use of this input form, as referenced by the numbers in parentheses on the form. Note that all 14 cards must be submitted for each case. Even if there is no input on a card for a given case, a blank card must still be submitted in its place.

1. Any alphanumeric titles may be placed on these three cards. They will be printed out exactly as submitted.
2. At the present time, this information is not used by the program. It is simply read and printed out as submitted.
3. Omit for a design case. Submit a blank card if entire information on a card is to be omitted.
4. Enter geometry values as described in Figure 8 and Figure 9. All geometry values are in inches.
5. Enter 0.0 or a blank card if another case follows. Enter 1.0 if this is the last case.

## Design Logic.

This section describes the logic that this computer program uses to design three and four pass trays. Given the liquid and vapor loadings and the number of tray passes, the program proceeds to develop a tray design in the manner described below.

Tray spacing is set at 24 inches. This is a typical tray spacing

CARD \#
CARD ${ }^{2}$
CARD 3

CARD $: 4$

CARD *

CARD ${ }^{\text {a } 6}$

CARD 47

CARD * (3,4)
CARD *9 (3.4)

|  | OUTLET WEIR HT |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 12345678910 |
| CARD 10 (3,4) |  |
| CARD ${ }^{11}(3,4)$ |  |
| CARD ${ }^{12}(3,4)$ |  |
| CARD 13 (3,4) |  |
|  | 12315678910 |
| CARD 14 (s) | - |

Figure 8
THREE-PASS TRAY GEOMETRY


Figure 9
FOUR-PASS TRAY GEOMETRY

used in commercial fractionation towers.

A diameter is then selected using double table lookups (see Table 2 and Table 3 in the Fortran computer program presented in the appendix) with vapor load and volumetric liquid rate as parameters. These tables were not developed from any single source, but are based on the data presented by a tray vendor (6). They follow the general trends that vapor capacity increases with tower diameter and decreases with liquid rate.

The minimum diameter for three pass trays is 7 feet, for four pass trays it is 10 feet. This program is incapable of designing three pass trays for liquid rates greater than 5000 GPM, four pass trays for 11 quid rates greater than 6000 GPM , and all trays for vapor loads ( $V_{L}$ ) greater than 100 CFS. These are the limits of the prediction methods used (7).

The program determines the allowable downcomer inlet velocity as described in a previous section (see Table 1 of the program in the appendix). The total downcomer area is then calculated as the area required to maintain the total downcomer inlet velocity exactly at the allowable level. This total downcomer area is then divided into parts for each pass as proposed by a tray vendor ( ). All downcomers are straight. That is, the inlet area is equal to the outlet area.

Now the program has a tower cross-sectional area and a total downcomer area. It then splits the remaining bubble area into three
or four segments with equal flow path length. Although this thesis does not propose that equal flow path length designs are the most desirable, it is a common method of designing multipass trays, and is therefore the only method used by this program.

At this point, the program has the entire plan layout (top view) of the tray. Now the program sets the outlet weir height (HWO) so that the average clear liquid height (HL) is 3 inches. It sets the hole area ( $A_{0}$ ) so that the average dry tray pressure drop (HH) is 2 inches. These are typical design values which should give good operability and efficiency. It then sets the downcomer clearance (C) so that the average head loss under the downcomer (HDA) is 1 inch. The maximum downcomer clearance is 3 inches, and the program will design a shaped lip downcomer if HDA is greater than 1 inch with a 3 inch straight lip downcomer. This yields an average tray pressure drop (HT) of 5 inches and an average downcomer filling of 9 inches, or 37.5 percent of the 24 inch tray spacing.

The following section describes how these suggested values can be adjusted to obtain a more desirable design than is printed out by the program. For example, if the particular circumstances require a low pressure drop (e.g. a low pressure service), low weir heights and higher open areas will reduce both the clear liquid height and the dry tray pressure drop, which, in turn, reduces the total tray pressure drop.

The program does not design for recessed inlet boxes or inlet weirs. A recessed inlet box is a sump below the downcomer to assure that no vapor can enter the downcomer through the clearance. That is, it is a method of providing a positive seal on the downcomer.

## Use of the Program To Improve Initial Design.

It is not proposed that this program will give an optimum design the first time it is run. In fact, the first design the program picks can have several deficiencies. In order to make optimum use of this program as a design tool, the original design case should be altered as necessary and rerun as a rating case. This may have to be done several times until a final optimum design is reached. Several possible deficiencies of a design case are described below.

The program only designs for 24 inch tray spacing. Greater or smaller tray spacings may be chosen to increase tower capacity, reduce downcomer filling or reduce tower height.

The program chooses a tower diameter which can have any value. Very often a company prefers to order tower shells on one foot or half foot diameter increments. Therefore, the diameter chosen by the program should be changed to conform to the specific standard procedures of the user.

Similarly, flow path lengths, downcomer widths, weir heights, and downcomer clearances are often preferred to be specified on some standard increment (say one quarter inch). Since the program chooses any value it
needs to meet its design logic, these values should be changed to conform with specific standard procedures of the user.

The program also sets all weir heights and clearances equal. Therefore, clear liquid heights and other pressure drop values can vary greatly for different passes even though the average value conforms with the design logic of the program. Therefore, it is suggested that the original values be altered to equalize pressure drops somewhat. In particular, the outboard downcomer (the shortest downcomer) clearance should usually be increased and the outboard downcomer weir height should usually be decreased.

Also, alchough the average downcomer velocity is at the allowable Iimit, the velocity for any one downcomer may exceed this limit. The suggestions in the preceding paragraph should help in balancing the downcomer inlet velocities.

Although this program may not give an optimum design on the first trial, good engineering judgment can be used to obtain an economic and well-balanced design with one or two additional trials.

## CHAPTER V

SAMPLE PROBLEMS

This chapter presents sample problems run on the Multipass
Tray Design computer program. Included are input forms and two pages of printout for each of the following eight cases:

1. Four pass rating case, no vapor crossover.
2. Four pass rating case, with vapor crossover.
3. Three pass rating case, no vapor crossover.
4. Three pass rating case, with vapor crossover.
5. Four pass design case, no vapor crossover.
6. Four pass design case, with vapor crossover.
7. Three pass design case, no vapor crossover.
8. Three pass design case, with vapor crossover.

The printouts include all inputted information, tray geometry information, vapor and liquid loadings per pass, pressure drops and downcomer backup in inches of hot liquid, percent of jet flood, downcomer inlet velocity, and overall tray efficiency.

Note that for four pass trays, the downcomer for passes C and D are shared, and, for three pass trays the downcomer for passes B and C are shared. Also, for four pass trays, a single downcomer is used for liquid from two individual passes $B$. On the program printout, these downcomers are split in half, and downcomer inlet velocities per pass are calculated by dividing the liquid flowrate per pass by the area of the "half" downcomer.


CARD 3


| LIOUID RATE HLBS/HR | min. lig. rate mLBS/HR (2) | LIQUIO DENSTTY LB/CUFT | LIQuid viscosity | SURFACE TENSION DYNES/CM (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 123450678910 | 11213141516 17 18:1920 | 2122.23:24.25:26:2720:2930 | 31 32 33344358363738.3940 | 142:43: 44:45:46:4748:4950 |
| 554.6 | $272 \cdot 3$ | 31.55 | $0 \cdot 113$ | 6.16 |


| TEMPERATURE DEGF(2) | PRESSURE P51A (2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12345678910 | (1112 13, 4, 15,16 17,18:19:20 |
| 140 | 125 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. OF PASSES } \\ & 3 \text { OR } 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | HOLE DIAMETER INCHES(2) |  |  |  |  |  | TOWER DIAMETER FEET (3) |  |  |  |  | tray spacing INCHES (3) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12345878910 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21:2723 24.2520 .27 2862930 |  |  |  |  | 31:32, 33, 34, 35.36 37:38:39:40 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | $0 \cdot$ | 38 |  |  |  |  | $3 \cdot 5$ |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |


| WIDTH \#1 | WIDTH \#2 | wIDTH \#3 | WIDTH ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | WIDTH *5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WIDTH ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | WIDTH \#7 | WIDTH 8 | WIDTH \#9 | WIDTH 110 |
| 12345678910 | 1112 1314 15:16:77181920 | 21 22:23 24.25262728 .2930 | 31.3233.34:35 36.37 38.39.40 | 4142 43 44:45:46 47484950 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19.4375 \\ & 19.4375 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.5625 \\ & 26.5625 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.25 \\ & 9.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \cdot 75 \\ & 21 \cdot 75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 400 \\ & 400 \end{aligned}$ |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \& OUTLET WEIR HT HWO \& inlet weir ht HWI \& DC clearance \& hole area AO. SQ FT \& SHAPED LIP \& RECESSED

$=$
1.0 <br>
\hline \& |1234.6:78910 \& 117213141516.17181920 \& 21:22:23.24:25.28.27:28:29:30 \& 31:32:33:34:35:36:37:38:39:40 \& 11.42 13.44.45:46:47. 48.49:50 \& 51:52:53:54 55:56 57.58:59:60 <br>
\hline CARD $100(3,4)$ \& $1 \cdot 25$ \& $\square \square$ \& 1.54 \& 2.39 \& - \&  <br>
\hline CARD $\operatorname{H11}(3,4)$ \& 2.13 \& - $\quad$ : \& 1.0 \& 2.34 \& - $\bullet$ \& $\bigcirc{ }^{1}+$ <br>
\hline CARD 112 (3,4) \& 200 \& 1 $\quad$ ! \& 1.0 \& 2.39 \& $\bullet$ \& - $\quad \vdots$ <br>
\hline CARD 113 (3,4) \& $2 \cdot 0$ \& - \& 1.0 \& 2.39 \& $\cdots$ \& $\bigcirc$ <br>
\hline \&  \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline CARD \#14 (5) \& 0 - \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

VCE TEST RASE: FJOR pASS -ATI,

ve vapjr coossoviz

TPERATING CINDITIN:S

| ML BS/HA VAPJA MAX MLBS/HZ VAPTR MIV |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| LBS/Cij Ft Vapor at cons |  |  |
| tray liquid terperatur | OEG F | 14 |
| operating pressure | PSIA | 12 |
| CFS VAPOR AT COND |  |  |
| vapof loaj | CFS |  |
| tray geometry |  |  |
| DIAMETER | FT | 13.50 |
| tray spacing | IN | 21.00 |
| NUMBER OF PASSES |  | 4.00 |
| hole diameter | IN | 0.38 |
| CROSS SECT AREA | SQ FT | 143.14 |
| BUBBLE/CROSS SECT APEA | PCT | \$6.85 |
| vapor crossover (yes or nou |  | Nu |


|  |  |  | Pass a | OASS ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | PASS C | PASS 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOWVCCMER INLET WIDTH ** | IN |  | 19.438 | 4.050 | 4.625 | 4.625 |
| DOWVCOMER DUTLET HIDTA ** | IN |  | 19.438 | 4.000 | 4.625 | 4.625 |
| flow path length | IN |  | 25.563 | 21.750 | 26.563 | 21.750 |
| CHORD LENGTH AT TUP OF DC | IN |  | 105.295 | 102.018 | 145.884 | 153.558 |
| CHORO LENGTH AT BTM OF DC | IN |  | 105.285 | 152.018 | 145.884 | 153.563 |
| DC Inlet area |  | FT | 9.703 | 4.370 | 4.742 | 4.879 |
| OC OUTLET AREA |  | FT | 0.739 | 4.390 | 4.742 | 4.879 |
| DUTLET WEIR HEIGHT | Iv |  | 1.250 | 2.13) | 2.000 | 2.000 |
| INLET WEIR HEIGHT On tray below | IN |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| dC CLEARANCE to tpay below | IN |  | 1.540 | 1.030 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| SHAPEOLIP IYES CR NJI |  |  | V5. | NO | V | NO |
| RECESSE) 8OX (YES OR NJ) |  |  | * | N3 | Na | No |
| gubale area |  |  | 23.031 | ?4.253 | 23.501 | 24.250 |
| FREF AREA |  |  | 33.303 | $29.0 \div 2$ | 24.343 | 29.128 |
| HOLE ARTA |  |  | 2.709 | 2.390 | 2.390 | 2.390 |
| HOLF/GUABLE AREA | PCT |  | 12.127 | 3.856 | 20.127 | 0.856 |

619.000
303.300
1.403
140.000
125.000
122.357
20.395

$$
\begin{array}{r}
619.000 \\
303.300 \\
1.403 \\
143.000 \\
125.000 \\
122.357 \\
20.395
\end{array}
$$

MLSS/HR LIOJIO MAX
MLES/HR LIQSTO AIN
LOS/CU FT LIDUTO AT ECYO
SURFACE TENSIGA at CRN) SURFALETENSTGAAT liscositr at cund

|  | 544.600 |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | 272.300 |
|  | 31.550 |
| OYVESEM | 5.150 |
| CP | 0.113 |
| GPY | 2151.932 |

544.600
272.300
272.300
31.550


CARD*
CARD *2
CARD *

CARD

ARD


| TEMPERATURE DEGF (2) | pressure PSIA (2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6789 | 112131415961718:19 |
| 140 | 25 |



| WIDTH \#1 | WIDTH ${ }^{2}$ | WIDTH 3 | WIDTH \#4 | WIOTH *5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WIDTH ${ }^{\text {\# }} 6$ | WIDTH 17 | WIDTH *8 | WIDTH 9 | WIDTH 110 |
| 12345678910 | $11.1213141316: 1718.1920$ | 21 22:23: 24:35 2627.28 .2930 | 313233 3435363738.3940 | 414243 44:4546474849 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19.4375 \\ & 19.4375 \end{aligned}$ | 26.5625 26.5625 | $\begin{aligned} & 9.25 \\ & 9.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.75 \\ & 21.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 4.0 \end{aligned}$ |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { OUTLET WEIR HT } \\
& \text { HWO }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& inlet weirht HWI \& dC CLEARANCE \& hole area AO-SO FT \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { SHAPEO LIP } \\
=1.0
\end{gathered}
$$ \& \& RECESSED

$=1.0$ <br>
\hline 12345678910 \& 11121314159617181920 \& 21: 22:23:24:25:20:27]:38:29:30 \& 31:32.33 34.35 36.37 38.39.40 \& 4142,43:44:45:46:47.48.4950 \& \& 2:53,54:55:56:57:58:59:60 <br>
\hline - $1-25$ \& \% $\quad$ ¢ \& 1.354 \& 2.39 \& ¢ \& \& - $\bullet$ <br>
\hline 213 \& $\cdots$ \& 100 \& 2239 \& - \& \& - 0 <br>
\hline 200 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 1.0 \& 2.39 \& - ! e ! \& \& - <br>
\hline $2 \cdot 0$ \& - \& 1.0 \& $2 \cdot 39$ \& - \& \& $\bullet$ - : <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

$\square$

| ML BS／H2 Vioje Max |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MLES／H：VAPJR MIN |  | 30 |
| LBS／CU FT VAPJR AT COND |  |  |
| tray liolid teyperature | DES F | 14 |
| OPERATING PEESSURE． | PSIA | 12 |
| CFS VAPOR AT COMS |  | 12 |
| VAPOE LGAD | CFS | 2 |
| tray geometry |  |  |
| DIAMETER | FT | 13.50 |
| TRAY SPACING | IN | 21.00 |
| NuMBER OF PASSES |  | 4.00 |
| hole oiameter | IN | 0.39 |
| CROSS SECT AREA | SQ FT | 143.14 |
| BUBBLE／CROSS SECT AREA | PCT | 65.86 |
| VApOR CROSSOVER（yES or not |  | YES |


| $61 \div .090$ | MLBS／H2 LIOMID MAX |  | 544.600 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 304.000 | MLBS／HP LIQUIO MIN |  | 272.300 |
| 1.403 | LBS／CU FI LIOUIO AT CJVO |  | 31.550 |
| 140.009 | SURFAC＝TENSION AT CBND | วyvesぐ号 | 6.160 |
| 125．000 | viscusity at cond | $C^{P}$ | 0.113 |
| 122．357 | LIquio flow zate | g．py | 2151.932 |
| 25.306 |  |  |  |

WNCOMER OUTLET WIDTH＊＊
FLOA Path LENGTH
CHURD LENGTH AT TOP OF DC
CHORD LENGTH AT BTM OF OC
DC INLET AREA
DC DUTLET AREA
OUTLET WEIK HEIGHT
NLET WEIR HEIGHT OM TRAY belon
oc clearance to tray belon
SHAPED LID（YES חR NO）
RECESSECN aOX（YES OR NO）

| BUBBLE $+2=4$ | SO Fit | 23.501 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FREE ADEA | SQ FT | 33.373 |
| hole area | SO Ft | 2.300 |
| HCLE／3133t E 1254 | pet | 1.129 |


| 19.438 |
| :---: |
| 19.439 |
| 25.503 |
| 105.285 |
| 105.235 |
| 9.708 |
| 9.708 |
| 1，259 |
| 0.01.54 .3 |
|  |  |
|  |
| Ne |
| 23.501 |
| 33.323 |
| 2.300 |
| 1.127 |


| PASS 8 |
| :---: |
|  |
| 4.000 |
| 4.000 |
| 21.750 |
| 162.018 |
| 162.018 |
| 4.390 |
| 4.390 |
| 2.130 |
| 0.0 |
| 1.030 |
| $N 17$ |
| $N 0$ |
| 24.259 |
| 28.569 |
| 2.390 |
| 9.955 |


| PASS C | PASS D |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| 4.625 | 4.625 |
| 4.625 | 4.625 |
| 26.563 | 21.750 |
| 145.894 | 153.568 |
| 145.884 | 153.568 |
| 4.742 | 4.879 |
| 4.742 | 4.879 |
| 2.000 | 2.060 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.000 | 1.000 |
| 43 | 10 |
| 43 | $N 0$ |
| 33.601 | 24.250 |
| 28.343 | 29.128 |
| 2.390 | 2.390 |
| 10.127 | 9.856 |


| LOADINGS per pass |  |  | DASS A | PASS B | 2ess C | PASS 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GPM LIDUID |  |  | 574.215 | 531.750 | E74.215 | 501.750 |
| GPH/FT WEIR |  |  | 3926.894 | 2229.756 | 2533.079 | 2352.444 |
| CFS Vapor |  |  | 31.387 | 29.792 | 23.316 | 30.852 |
| VAPGr loas |  | - 5 | 6.771 | 6.427 | C.540 | 6.658 |
| VLoditruqble area |  | FPS | 0.287 | 0.265 | 3. 277 | 0.275 |
| VLOADICFS LITUIT |  |  | 5.292 | 5.749 | 5.1:2 | 5.955 |
| DOWNCOMER FILLING CALCULATISNS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| dry tray pressupe drop | (HH) | IV | 2.911. | 2.623 | 2.715 | 2.815 |
| Clear liouio height | ( HL ) | IN | 1.917 | 2.255 | 2.239 | 2.140 |
| total tray pressure drop | ( HT ) | 14 | 4.828 | 4.828 | 4.954 | 4.955 |
| INLET HEAD | (HI) | I* | 2.238 | 2.140 | 1.917 | 2.205 |
| DC HEAD LOSS ? | ( HOA ) | IN | 0.753 | 0.575 | 0.930 | 0.641 |
| DC FILLING ( | ( HOC ) | iv | 7.818 | 7.544 | 7.900 | 7.801 |
| DC Filling |  | DSt | 37.230 | 35.922 | 37.144 | 37.145 |
| adottional cal culations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PERCENT JET Flood |  |  | 75.091 | 50.727 | 66.727 | 63.534 |
| dC Inlet yelocity | . | EPS | 0.132 | 0.255 | 0.270 | 0.229 |
| ALLONABLE DC INLET VELDCity |  | FPS | 0.341 |  |  |  |
| overall tray efficiency |  | PCT | 98.933 |  |  |  |

CARD ${ }^{1}$
CARD *2

|  | vapor rate MLBS/HR |  |  |  |  |  | IN. V | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VAPOR } \\ & \text { LBS/HR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P RATE } \\ & \text { i(2) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { VApor } \\ \text { LB } \end{gathered}$ | R DENS /CU FT |  | O. = NO VAPOR CROSSOVER <br> I. = VAPOR CROSSOVER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 23 | $4{ }_{4}{ }^{5}$ | 567 | B | 910 | [12 1 | 1314 | 41516 | 1718,1920 |  | 27324 | 25:26:27 | 28 |  | 32: 3 | 33 | 35.363 | 37,38 | 39:40 | 114 | 4 | 14. | $5: 46$ |  | 889 |
|  |  | 61 | 80 |  |  |  |  | 1090 |  |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0. |  |  |



| temperature DEGF(2) | PRESSURE PSIA (2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 123450789 | 111213 14:15:16:17:18:19:20 |
| 140. | 125 |


| NO. OF PASSES$3 \text { OR } 4$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{\mathrm{LE}}$ INC | DIAMET CHES (2) |  |  | tower diameter FEET (3) |  |  |  |  |  |  | tray spacing INCHES (3) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 23 | 15 | 67 | 8 |  |  | 112 | , | 4151617 | $18: 3$ |  |  |  | 23.24 | $4 \times$ | 28:27 | 2 | 2930 |  | 32:33:3435 |  |  | 38:39:40 |
|  |  |  | 3. |  |  |  |  |  | $0 \cdot 36$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 210 |  |  |  |


| WIDTH \#1 | WIDTH \#2 | wIoth 3 | WIDTH 4 | WIDTH ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WIDTH \#6 | WIDTH ${ }^{1} 7$ | WIDTH 18 | WIDTH 19 | WIDTH 110 |
| 12345678910 | $11.1213: 141516: 17.18: 19.20$ | $2122: 2324.25$ 26 27 28:29 30 | 31323334.3536373839 .40 | 4142.43 44:45.46 47 48 49.50 |
| 240 | 240 | 21 | 24 | $\geq 4$ |
| 24 | 210 | $\cdots$. | - | $\cdots$ |



NCE TKST CAS: THREE DASS RATING
DESIGVER: P.W.BECKER
NO VAPIUR CROSSOVER

OPERATING EODITIOVS

| MLBS/4k VAPOa max. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MLBS/4D $\triangle A P, 3 E$ MIV |  |  |
| LBS/CU $=T$ Vapgr at cong |  |  |
| Tray lioulu tempepatupe | PEG F |  |
| OPERATING PRESSURE | PSIA |  |
| CFS VAPOR AT COND |  |  |
| VAPJR load | CFS |  |
| tray gedmetay |  |  |
| diameter | FT | 13.50 |
| Tray spacing | 1 N | 21.00 |
| NUMBER OF PASSES |  | 3.00 |
| HOLE DIAMETER | IN | 0.38 |
| CROSS SECT AREA | SQ FT | 143.14 |
| BURBLEJCRESS SECT AREA | PCT | 49.30 |
| VAPOR CROSSOVER (YES JR NOI |  | No |

PASS A
24.000
21.000
24.030
115.332
109.019
13.153
10.854
1.250
0.0
1.540
NO
NO

NO

## $\begin{array}{ll}50 \mathrm{FT} & 22.174\end{array}$ <br> $59 \mathrm{ET} \quad 32.302$ <br> $\begin{array}{lr}\text { SO FT } & 2.390 \\ \text { PCT } & 10.778\end{array}$

619.000
309.000
1.403
140.000
125.000
122.357
26.305
3. 50
3.00 143.14
49.30
4.30
NO
6. 30
onncomer inlet wioth
a no comer ujtlet
CHORD LENGTH AT TOP DF DC CHORD LENGTH AT BTM OF DC
OC INLET AREA
DC DUTLET AREA
OUTLET WEIR HEIGHT
INLET WEIR HEIGHT ON TRAY RELON
CC CLEARANCE TO TRAY QELOM
SHAPEO LIP (YES UN MO)
RECESSES GOX (YES OK NJ)

| BUBSLE AREA | SO F |
| :--- | :--- |
| FREEAREA | SO F |
| HOLE AREA | SJF |
| HOLFIGJSSIF SQEA | PCT |

HOLF/G1391F SQES

4LES/4र LIOUTD MAX
MLSS/HR LIQUID MIM
LBSICUFT LIOUID AT CONO
SURFACE TENSIDN AT CONO
viscosity at cund
LIQUID FLON RATE


| LOADINGS PER dass |  |  | PASS A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GPM LIQUIU |  |  | 710.954 |
| GPH/FT WEI? |  |  | 4475.820 |
| CFS VAPCR |  |  | 39. +31 |
| VAPOF LOAD |  | $\mathrm{c}=5$ | 8.550 |
| VLCAD/BURRLE AFEA |  | FDS | 0.386 |
| VLItancfa ligula |  |  | 5.35? |
| downcomer fillivg calculations |  |  |  |
| DRY TRAY PRESSURE DROP | ( HH ) | I4 | 4.641 |
| CLEAR LIQUIO HEISHT | ( HL ) | IN | 2.012 |
| total tray pressije drap | (HT) | IN | 0.653 |
| inlet head | (HI) | IN | 2.376 |
| DC HEAD LOSS | (HDA) | IN | 1.094 |
| DC FILLING | ( HDC ) | IN | 10.123 |
| OC FILLING |  | PET | 49.207 |
| ADDITIONAL Calculations |  |  |  |
| PERCENT JET FLOUD |  |  | 107.753 |
| DC INLET VELOCITY |  | FPS | 0.121 |
| ALlowable dc inlet velority |  | FPS | 0.241 |
| OVERALL tray efficievey |  | PCT | 98.833 |

CARD ${ }^{11}$
CARD ${ }^{2}$
CARD ${ }^{3}$

CARD ${ }^{4}$


TITLE 1 (1) TITLE 2 (1)

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VAPOR RATE } \\ & \text { MLBS/HR } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | MIN. VAPOR RATE MLBS/HR (2) |  |  |  | vapor density LB/CUFT |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0. = NO VAPOR CROSSOVER <br> 1. = VAPOR CROSSOVER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 23 | 4 | 561 | a | 9 |  | 1112 | \%13141516 | 1718 | $19: 20$ | 2021 | 1122:2 | 23.242 | 8:20:27 | 272 | 28:29: |  |  | 323 | 334 | 35.3 | 36.37 | 3838 | 39:40 | 11 | 4243. | 445 | 45.47 | 7:4848:50 |
|  |  |  | 18. |  |  |  |  | 309 | - |  |  |  |  | . 40 | 03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |


| LIQUID RATE MLBS/HR | MIN. LIO. RATE MLBS/HR (2) |  | LIQUID DENSITY <br> LB/CU FT |  | LIQUID VISCOSITY CP |  | SURFACE TENSION DYNES/CM (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12345 678910 | 11121314151617181920 | 212 |  | 30) |  | 32:3934 $35 \times 36.37 .38 .39: 401$ | 41:42:43.4445;46:47:48:49 |
| 55406 | 27203 |  | $31 \times 5$ |  |  | 0,113 | 6.16 |


| TEmperature DEGF(2) | PRESSURE PSIA (2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12343678910 | 1112931415:16:17 18:19:20 |
| 40 | 125 |




$\begin{array}{r}12345678910 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}$

NCE T-ST CASE: THREE PASS GATIUG
DESIGNER: P.W. BECKER
WITH VAPGR CROSSOVER

## JPERATIAG CONDITIMAS

ML $35 / \mathrm{H}^{\circ}$ VADMK MAX
MLBS/HE VAPOR MIN
LAS/CU FT VAPOR AT COND
tray lioutn temp ecature DPERATIMG PRESSURE
CFS Vapur at cond
vapor loda
tray geometry

| OIAMETER | FT | 13.50 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| TRAY SPACING | IN | 21.00 |
| NUMBER OF PASSES |  | 3.00 |
| HOLE OIAMETER | IN | 0.33 |
| CROSS SECT AREA | SOTFT | 143.14 |
| GUBSLE/CROSS SECT AREA | PCT | 49.30 |
| VAPOR CROSSOVER IYES OR NOI |  | YES |

BUBBLE/CROSS SECT AREA
VAPOR CROSSOVER (YES OR NO)
VAPOR CROSSOVER (YES JR NOI

|  |  | PASS 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOWNCOMER INLET WIDTH ** | IN | 24.000 |
| DOWNCOAER DUTLET WIDTH ** | 1 V | 21.000 |
| FLOw Path length | IN | 24.600 |
| CHORD LENGTH AT TOP JF oc | IN | 115.332 |
| CHDRD LENGTH AT BTY OF DC | IV | 109.019 |
| DC Inlet area | So Ft | 13.168 |
| OC OUTLET AREA | So Ft | 10.854 |
| OHTLET HEIR HEIGHT | IN | 1.259 |
| INLET HEIR HEIGHT ON TRAY RELEW | 1 N | 0.0 |
| dc clearavce to tray belun | I ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.540 |
| SHADED LIP (YES JR WJ) |  | N: |
| recesseg box (yEs OR vol |  | Ni |
| buable meca | SO Ft | 22.174 |
| FREE AREA | SO 5 T | 32.302 |
| Hule arfa | So FT | 2.200 |
| 4TLF/BJARL: AREA | PCT | 12.778 |

MLAS/HR LIOUID MAX
MLBS/HR LIQUID MIN
LAS/CU FT LIGUID AT CONO
surface tensicy at conj
LIquid FLDe qate


CARD 11
CARD.*2
CARD ${ }^{3}$


TITLE 1 (1) TITLE 2 (1) TITLE 3 (1)


| llquid rate MLBS/HR | min. LIG. rate MLBS/HR (2) | LIQUID DENSITY LB/CU FT | LIould viscosity CP | SURFACE TENSION DYNES/CM (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 123456789 | 11)213 14 1516 171819 | 21:2723:24:25:20:37 28: 29:30 | 31:32:3334 35 : $36: 373839300$ | 4 14243 44.45:46:47:48:4950 |
| 554.6 | $272 \cdot 3$ | 31055 | 0.113 | 6.16 |


| TEMPERATURE DEGF (2) | PRESSURE PSIA (2) |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 117213141516:77.18:1920 |
| 140 | 125 |



| WIDTM | WIDTH *2 | widin \#3 | WIDTH 4 | wIDTH 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WIDTH ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | WIOTH 7 | WIDTH 48 | WIDTH 9 | WIDTH \#10 |
| 12345678910 | $11.1213: 1415: 16$ 17 18:19 20 | 21 22:23:24:25:26.27:28:29 30 | 3132333435363738.3940 | 414243 44.454647484950 |
| $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |



```
VE TESTCASF: FJJK PASS DESIGN
gESISVER: P.W. BECKER
yu yapor crossover
```

| MLes/hr vadjr yax |  | 513.070 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MLBS/H2 VApore MIn |  | 30.000 |
| LBS/CU FT VAPJR AT CUND |  | $\pm .403$ |
| tray liduid teyoerature | neg $F$ | 140.003 |
| OPERATING PRESSURE | PSIA | 125.000 |
| CFS Vapor at cona |  | 122,357 |
| YAPOR LUAD | CFS | 25.395 |

tray gejmetry

| DIAMETER | FT | 11.80 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| TRAY SPACING | IN | 24.00 |
| NUMBER OF PASSES |  | 4.00 |
| HOLE DTAMETEQ | IN | 0.38 |
| CROSS SECT AREA | SQFT | 109.45 |
| BUBGLEICRUSS SECT AREA | PCT | 77.40 |
| VAPRR GROSSOVER (YES OR NO) |  | NO |


| DOWNCOMER INLET HIOTH | IN | 8.305 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOWVCTMER DUTLET SIOTH ** | IN | 5.295 |
| FLG* Path levgth | IV | 25.889 |
| ChORE LENGTH AT TOP OF CC | IN | 09.072 |
| CHORD LENGTH AT BTM OF DC | iv | 69.072 |
| OC INLET AREA | SQ FT | 2.804 |
| DC jutlet arga | SO FT | 2.804 |
| DUTLET *EIR HEIGHT | IN | 2.944 |
| INLET WEIR HEIGHT ON tray relow | IN | 2.0 |
| DC CLEARANGE TO TRAY 3ELOM | IN | 1.144 |
| SHADEOLIP (YFS UR VI) |  | N, |
| RECESSES PfX (YES TR NU) |  | *, |
| Bug3l = Anea | 50 FT | 17.549 |
| FREE AマEA | So ft | 2). 3 - 3 |
| HOLE Aर-A | SO FT | 2.361 |
|  | PCt | 13.45: |


| PASS 8 | PASS $C$ | PASS 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.593 | 3.531 | 3.531 |
| 3.593 | 3.531 | 3.531 |
| 25.839 | 25.889 | 25.889 |
| 141.665 | 121.320 | 128.612 |
| 141.665 | 121.320 | 128.612 |
| 3.452 | 3.009 | 3.101 |
| 3.452 | 3.009 | 3.101 |
| 2.944 | 2.944 | 2.944 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.144 | 1.144 | 1.144 |
| NO | N) | NO |
| NO | NO | NO |
| 24.807 | 17.549 | 24.807 |
| 23.259 | 20.559 | 27.909 |
| 3.250 | 2.361 | 3.250 |
| 13.141 | 13.451 | 13.141 |

PAGE 2

|  |  |  | PASS A | PASS ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | PASS C | －ASS 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GDN LIA： |  |  | 495．924 | 590.042 | 495.924 | 590.042 |
| GPhat ：$=:=$ |  |  | 5169.500 | 2948.019 | 2943.150 | 3247.218 |
| CFS Va＝－ |  |  | 25.275 | 35.104 | 25.075 | 35.104 |
| VAP－－－${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  | CFS | 5．200 | 7.789 | 5.409 | 7.789 |
|  |  | FPS | 0.339 | 3.314 | 0.308 | 0.314 |
| VLこムご行－！2 U |  |  | 4.805 | 0．026 | 4.395 | 0.026 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRY TESY F2ESSURE DROO | （HH） | IN | 1.005 | 2.071 | 1．905 | 2.071 |
|  | （HL） | IN | 3.312 | 2.921 | 2.920 | 2.978 |
| TOTAL TXAY PRESSURE DROP | （HT） | IN | 5.215 | 4.991 | 4.825 | 5.049 |
| INLET＋EAO | （HI） | IN | 2.920 | 2.978 | 3.312 | 2.921 |
| DC HES 1055 | （HDA） | IN | 2.363 | 0.769 | 0.755 | 0.933 |
| OC＝HLIng | （ HOC ） | IN | 10.500 | 8.738 | 8.903 | 8.902 |
| DC chalic |  | PCT | 43.749 | 36.410 | 37.094 | 37.093 |
| ADOITIOYAL Catculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PEFCEVT JET FLOOD |  |  | 83.513 | 70.266 | 68.959 | 71.953 |
| OC INET VElocity |  | FPS | 0， 294 | 0.374 | 0.367 | 0.417 |
|  |  | FPS | 0.390 |  |  |  |
|  |  | PCT | 98.833 |  |  |  |

CARD 1
CARD 12
CARD ${ }^{3}$

CARD ${ }^{4}$

CARD *

CARD ${ }^{*}$


TITLE 1 ( 1 )
title 2 (1)
TITLE 3 (1


| liquid rate MLBS/HR | min. LIG. RATE MLBS/HR (2) | LIQUID DENSITY LB/CU FT | LIQUIO VISCOSITY CP | SURFACE TENSION DYNES/CM (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 21:22:2324.25 26:27:38, 29:30 | 31:32:33:34.35 36-37 38:39:40 | 11:42.43-44:45:46:47/484950 |
| 554.6 | $272 \cdot 3$ | $31 \cdot 55$ | 0.113 | 6016 |


| TEMPERATURE DEGF(2) | PRESSURE PSIA (2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 123450:78, | 1112131415961718:1920 |
| 140 | 125 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. OF PASSES } \\ & 3 \text { OR \& } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | HOLE DIAMETER IMCHES (2) |  |  |  |  |  | TOWER DIAMETER FEET (3) |  |  |  |  |  |  | tray spacing inCHES (3) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 23 | 15 | 67 | 8 |  |  | 1112 | 14 | 14151610 | 1718 | 920 |  | 22332 |  | :2 | 27: |  | 29:30 |  | 323 | 4:3 |  | 37 | 8, 39:40 |
|  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.38 |  |  |  |  | - | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



CARD ${ }^{10}(3,4)$
CARD \#11 (3,4)
CARD \#12 (3,4)
CARD \#13 (3,4)

NCF TEST CASE: FOUP DASS RESIGN
DESIGNER: POW, BECKER
WITH VAPUR CRUSSUVER

| MLBS/42 VAPJR max |  |  | 617.000 | MLBS/H2 LIOJIO M 4 |  |  | 544.600 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M 3 / $/ H$ ? VAPIJR MIN |  |  | 309.000 | MLBS/HP LIQUIO MIN |  |  | 272.300 |
| LBS/Cy ${ }^{\text {et Vapgr at cond }}$ |  |  | 1.403 | LAS/CU FT LIOUIO at | covo |  | 31.550 |
| Trar lijulg tempirature D | Deg ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  | 140.000 | SURFACE TENSION AT | Cuno | DYYESISM | 6.160 |
| OPEq-TIAG PRESSURE P | PSIA |  | 125.000 | viscasity at cono |  | $C^{\prime}$ | 0.113 |
| CFS vapir at cono |  |  | 122.357 | LIquid flow rate |  | GPM | 2151.932 |
| VAOJR LJAD CFS | CFS |  | 25.396 |  |  |  |  |
| tray geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DIAMETER F | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRAY SPACING IN | IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Matber df passes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCLE DIAMETER IN | IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CROSS SECT AREA SO | SQ FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| yapor crossover (yes or nol | PCT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | . |  | PASS A | DASS ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | - 0455 C |  | PASS D |
| DOWVCJMER INLET WIOTH ** | IN |  | - 8.396 | 3.593 | 3.531 |  | 3.531 |
| DJ*VEJucr OUflet AIDTH** | IN |  | 3.306 | 3.593 | 3.531 |  | 3.531 |
| FLJ. PATH LENGTH | IN |  | 25.889 | 25.889 | 25.899 |  | 25.889 |
| CHGR L LEMSTH AT TOP JF DC | IN |  | 69.072 | 141.665 | 121.320 |  | 128.612 |
| CHOM L LENGTH AT BTM OF DC | IV |  | 69.072 | 141.665 | 121.320 |  | 128.612 |
| DC INLET AREA |  | FT | 2.804 | 3.452 | 3.009 |  | 3.101 |
| D JUTLET AREA |  | FT | 2.804 | 3.452 | 3.009 |  | 3.101 |
| DJTLET AEIR HEIGHT | IN |  | 2.944 | 2.944 | 2.944 |  | 2.944 |
| INLET WEIR HEIGHT ON TRAY below | OW IN |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| OT Cleazance to tzay below | IV |  | 1.144 | 1.144 | 1.144 |  | 1.144 |
| SHPES LIP (YES JR NO) |  |  | No | NO | 1 |  | NO |
| 「ECESSE) 30X (YES OR N! |  |  | N0 | No | 4 |  | NO |
| $33^{2+1}$ - 42E4 | SO FT |  | 17.549 | 24.837 | 17.549 |  | 24.807 |
| FPEE $\mathrm{AVFA}^{\text {a }}$ |  | FT | 20.353 | 29.259 | 22.558 |  | 27.909 |
| +2= 4 204 | SO FTOCT |  | 2.351 | 3.250 | 2.351 |  | 3.260 |
| +2. $=13336 \mathrm{E}$ M EA |  |  | 13.45! | 13.141 | :3.451 |  | 13.141 |


| LCANINGS PFP DASS |  |  | PAS5 : | PAS 6 | OASS C | PASS 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GPM LIDJID |  |  | 473.539 | 634.953 | 4.70 .798 | 604.969 |
| GPH/FT WEIR |  |  | 4099.652 | 3074.705 | 2795.239 | 3386.761 |
| CFS Vatonz |  |  | 24.43) | 36.608 | 26.119 | 35.060 |
| vapar L? ${ }^{\text {do }}$ |  | CFS | 5. $2^{2} 1$ | 7.917 | 5.035 | 7.563 |
| VLuadi 3ijarle axea |  | FOS | ?.221 | $0.31 ?$ | 0.321 | 0.305 |
| VLOADICES LIPUIO |  |  | 5.032 | 5.373 | 5.369 | 5.411 |
| DGWncsmer fillivg calcilaticus |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRY TRAY PRESSURE DREP | ( HH ) | IN | 1.315 | 2.139 | 2.067 | 1.953 |
| clear liouio height | ( HL, | IN | 3.270 | 2.945 | 2.891 | 3.004 |
| Total tray dressure drop | (HT) | IV | う.085 | 5.085 | 4.957 | 4.957 |
| inlet head | (HI) | IN | 2.891 | 3.004 | 3.270 | 2. 945 |
| DC HEAD LOSS | (HOA) | IN | 2.232 | 0.836 | 0.691 | 1.014 |
| DC FILLING | (HOC) | IN | 10.108 | 8.925 | 8.918 | 8.917 |
| oc filling |  | $p=T$ | 42.115 | 37.183 | 37.158 | 37.153 |
| ADOITIONAL CALCULATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PERCENT JET FLOOO |  |  | 79.577 | 72.139 | 71.008 | 70.663 |
| DC INLET VELOCITY |  | FOS | 0.374. | 0.391 | 0.349 | 0.435 |
| allonarle dc inlet velocity |  | FPS | 0.390 |  |  |  |
| OVERALL TRAY EFFICIENCY |  | PCT | 98.833 |  |  |  |

## multipass tray design progran

## CARD \#1

CARD ${ }^{2}$
CARD *3


TITLE 1 (1)
TITLE 2 (1)
TITLE 3 (1)

CARD $\$$

| vapor rate MLBS/HR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | min. | vapor LBS/H | $\begin{aligned} & R R A \\ & R(2) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { POR } \\ & L B / C \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DENS } \\ \text { CU } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 0. = NO VAPOR CROSSOVER <br> 1. = VAPOR CROSSOVER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 23 | 15 | 67 | 1 | 9 | 10 |  | 12131 | 141518 | 17118 | 8:19:20 | 2021 | 12223 | 2425 | 3227 | 8 | 2930 | 31 | 32:3 | $33: 34$ | 35136 | 37 38 | $38 \cdot 38$ | 3:40 | 4142 | 4344 | 1 | 6:47 |  | 49.50 |
|  |  | 61 | 8. |  |  |  |  |  | 309 |  |  |  |  | 16 | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |



| TEMPERATURE DEGF (2) | Pressure PSIA (2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12345678910 | 11:12 13:1415:6,1718:19 20 |
| 140 | 25: |





|  |
| :---: |
|  |  |

VE: TMST GAS: : THREE PASS OES: OH
JこSIGVER: P.W.BFCKER
v) VApIR cass sover

## OPERATIMG GOMDITIUNS

MLBS/HK VAPIR MAX
MLBS/HR VAPJR MII
LBS/Cl FT VAPOO AT COND
tray lionio temp feature
operating pressure
CFS VAPCR AT GCM?
vapor luad
tray genmetry

## DIAMETER

TRAY SPACING
NUMBER OF PASSES
HOLE OIAMETER
CROSS SECT AREA
BJBBLE/CROSS SECT AREA
VAPOR CROSSTVER (YES OR NO)

|  | 617.029 |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | 309.039 |
| OEGF | 1.403 |
| PSIA | 143.020 |
| CFS | 125.000 |
|  | 122.357 |
|  | 26.39. |


|  |  | PASS A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOWNCOMER INLET WIDTH ** | IN | 10.685 |
| OOWNCOMER DUTLET WIOTH $* *$ | I | 10.685 |
| FL.OW PATM LENGTH | 14 | 37.655 |
| CHORO LENGTH AT TOP OF OC | IN | 75.673 |
| CHORD LENGTH AT GTM DF DC | 14 | 75.693 |
| DC INLET AREA | S) Ft | 3.387 |
| oc gutlet mirea | SO FT | 3.887 |
| DUTLET WEIR HEIGHT | IV | 2.678 |
| InLET deir height on tray belum | IN | 0.0 |
| dC clearance to tray below | Iv | 1.499 |
| SHAPEJ LID (YES OR NO) |  | No. |
| RECESSE. rox (Yej or Nu) |  | N: |
| Bygale hax | S9 FT | 29,192 |
| FHEE AOEA | So FT | 33.073 |
| HOL $=$ A2EA | S3 Ft | 3.485 |
|  | D. F | $11 . \operatorname{Mr~}^{7}$ |


FT 11.94
IN $\quad 24.00$
$\begin{array}{lr}1 \mathrm{~N} & 0.3 \mathrm{~A} \\ \mathrm{SO} \mathrm{FT}\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { SQ FT } 111.89 \\ \text { PC.T } & 77.71\end{array}$
77.71

ML95/42 LIDU10 Max
MLBS/HR LIQUIO MIN
LBS/CU FT LIOUIO AT COVD
SURFACE TENSIOV AT COND VISCOSITY AT CCND LIQUID FLOW RATE

PASS B
PASS C
PASS D
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0

NO
NO
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
544.600
272.300
31.550
6.160
0.113 2151.032

| 4.445 | 4.445 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.445 | 4.445 | 0.0 |
| 37.655 | 37.655 | 0.0 |
| 140.414 | 135.412 | 0.0 |
| 140.414 | 135.412 | 0.0 |
| 4.342 | 4.242 | 0.0 |
| 4.342 | 4.242 | 0.0 |
| 2,578 | 2.678 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.499 | 1.499 | 0.0 |
| N. | N | NO |
| NJ | N7 | NO |
| 29.531 | 29.192 | 0.0 |
| 32.733 | 33.434 | 0.0 |
| 4.272 | 3.485 | 0.0 |
| 14.956 | 11.937 | 0.0 |



CARD $\# 1$
CARD $\# 2$


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { VAPOR RATE } \\ & \text { MLBS/HR } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | MIN. VAPOR RATE MLBS/HR (2) |  |  |  |  | VAPOR DENSITY LB/CUFT |  |  |  |  |  | 0. = MO VAPOR CROSSOVER <br> i. = YAPOR CROSSOVER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 23 | 15 | 67 | 8 | 9 |  | 2131 | 14151611 | 718 | 19.20 |  | 22:23 | 2435 | 27 | 21 | 29:30 | 313 | 32:33 | 334 | 3536 | 36 | 38 | 39.40 | 41. | 42:43 | 13:40:4 | 15:46 |  | 4e:49:50 |
|  |  | 61 | 8. |  |  |  |  | 309 |  |  |  |  | $1{ }^{4}$ | 03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |


| liguid rate MLBS/HR | MIN. LIG. RATE MLBS/HR (2) | LIGUID DENSITY LB/CU FT | LIquid viscosity CP | SURFACE TENSION DYNES/CM (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:345678910 | 11121314181617181920 | 21:22:23:24:25:26:27:28: 2930 | 31 32 32:34 35 35 36:37.38:39:40 | 61:42:43:4445:46:47] 48:49:50 |
| 554 ¢ 6 | 2723 | 31.55 | 0.113 | 6116 |


| TEMPERATURE DEGF (2) | Pressure <br> PSIA (2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12345678900 |  |
| 140 | 125 |





VCE T=ST CASE: THREE PASS DESION

OESIGNEK: P.W. JECKER
Nith vapeo cagssover

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MLBS/LR VAPDR MIN |  |  |
| LBS/CU FT VAPOR AT COVO |  |  |
| tray liquio temperature | OEG F |  |
| OPEQATING PRESSURE | PSIA |  |
| CFS VAPDR at cond |  |  |
| VApOf lija | CFS |  |
| tray geouetry |  |  |
| DIAMETER | FT | 11.94 |
| TRAY SPACING | IN | 24.00 |
| NUMBER OF PASSES |  | 3.00 |
| HOLE OIAMETER | IN | 0.38 |
| CROSS SECT AREA | SO FT | 111.89 |
| BUBBLE/CROSS SECT AREA | PCT | 77.71 |
| VAPJR CROSSOVER (YES JR ND) |  | YES |



[^0]| LOATINGS PEF. PASS |  | PASS A | PASS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | PASS C | PASS 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gom LIould |  | 657.959 | 836.015 | 657.958 | 0.0 |
| GPH/ET NEIO |  | 6253.599 | 4286.844 | 3498.439 | 0.0 |
| CFS VAPOR |  | 35.404 | 47.175 | 39.776 | 0.0 |
| VAPOR LIAD | CFS | 7.634 | 10.177 | 8.521 | 0.0 |
| VLOAO/3!日BLE AREA | FOS | 2.252 | 3.355 | 0.274 | 0.0 |
| VLOAMCES LIJUI) |  | 5.21. | 5.453 | 5.853 | 0.0 |
| DOWVCOMER FILLINS CALCULATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRY TRAY DRESSJRE DRJP (HH) | IN | 1.742 | 2.059 | 2.190 | 0.0 |
| clear liouio height (hl) | IN | 3.296 | 2.979 | 2.339 | 0.0 |
| total tray dressure drop (ht) | IN | 5.039 | 5.038 | 5.039 | 0.0 |
| INLET HEAD (HI) | IN | 2.839 | 2.979 | 3.296 | 0.0 |
| DC HEA) LJSS (HDA) | IN | 2.017 | 0.946 | 0.630 | 0.0 |
| DC FILLING (HDC) | IN | 9.895 | 8.964 | 8.965 | 0.0 |
| dC Emling | PCT | 41.230 | 37.350 | 37.356 | 0.0 |
| ADOITIONAL CALCULATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| PERCENT JET FLOOD |  | 79.056 | 89.091 | 68.751 | 0.0 |
| DC INLET VELOCITY | FPS | 0.377 | 0.429 | 0.346 | 0.0 |
| allowable oc inlet velocity | FPS | 0.390 |  |  |  |
| overall tray efficiency | PCT | 98.833 |  |  |  |

## Discussion of Sample Problem Output

The output for the first two sample problems (four pass rating cases) show that these trays should have no problems operating under the conditions inputted. The highest downcomer filling is about 37 percent, the highest percentage of jet flood is about 76 , and the downcomer velocity for each downcomer is below the allowable value of 0.341 feet per second.

The three pass rating cases do show some potential problems, For both cases, the vapor velocities for passes $A$ and $C$ exceed 100 percent jet flood. This indicates that if the tower were run under these conditions, it is likely to flood. Note, however, that the downcomer velocities are well below the allowable level. Therefore, this tower could be made operable by changing the tray geometry so that the downcomers are smaller (this will increase the downcomer inlet velocities) and the bubbling areas greater. (This will reduce the percentages of jet flood.)

The three and four pass designs are, of course, workable, although downcomer velocities for some individual downcomers are slightly higher than allowable. Methods of balancing and improving such designs are discussed in Chapter IV.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE OPTIMUM DESIGN OF MULTIPASS TRAYS

This chapter presents the techniques recommended for the optimum design of multipass trays. The use of these techniques should provide designs with maximum flexibility and should eliminate those potential problems which have made engineers apprehensive about specifying multipass trays. In summary, the following rules are proposed for the design of multipass trays. They guarantee equal vapor and liquid flow rates for each pass.

1. Design for equal bubble areas and equal hole areas for each tray pass. This will enable each pass to accommodate equal vapor loadings. Equal downcomer areas are not necessary, and downcomers should be designed to meet the other criteria recommended.
2. Equalize weir lengths and lengths under downcomers for each pass, using the techniques depicted in Figure 10. Also, specify equal downcomer clearances and weir lengths for each pass. This will make the resistance to liquid flow the same for each pass.
3. Provide for vapor crossover through the downcomers using either pipes, ducts, or box-type downcomers, depicted in Figure 5. The box-type downcomer may be preferred by tray vendors as it is easier to fabricate. Also, the box-type downcomer provides another means of reducing downcomer weir

Figure 10

## METHODS OF PROVIDING FOR EQUAL DOWNCOMER LENGTHS


length, as in recomendation 2. Vapor crossover will make the total tray pressure drop across each pass equal, and will provide a means of any vapor maldistribution (e.g. due to poor distribution at vapor inlet nozzles) to be corrected.

The first recommendation provides for equal dry tray pressure drops (HH) for each pass. The second recommendation provides for equal clear liquid heights (HL) and equal downcomer head losses (HDA) for each pass. If no inlet weirs or equal inlet weir heights and lengths are used, the tray inlet head (HI) will also be equal for each pass. Therefore, the total tray pressure drop (HT) will be equal for each pass. This is guaranteed by the third recommendation. Based on the equations presented in Chapters III and IV, these three recomendations guarantee equal vapor and liquid flowrates for each pass.

Although such a design may be slightly more difficult to fabricate than an equal flowpath length design (which can utilize tray panels of the same width), it has distinct advantages. An equal flowpath design, or, for that matter, any design, can be specified to provide any desired vapor and liquid split between the three or four passes. However, the desired split will only occur at the design vapor and liquid loadings. If the total vapor and liquid rates vary at all from the design values, the split will vary.

This variation is due to the fact that the clear liquid height equation is dependent on a term which includes the liquid rate, plus
a constant term dependent on the weir height:
$\mathrm{HL}=\beta($ HOW +HWO$)$
Where HWO $=0.48 \times \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{W}}(\mathrm{GPM} / \mathrm{LWO})^{2 / 3}$
The head over the weir (HOW) depends on the liquid rate (GPM), but the weir height (HWO) is a constant.

For example, suppose the total liquid flowrate is 4000 GPM on a four pass tray. If the tray is designed for equal weir length and height, the clear liquid height for each pass will be equal. With weir height set at 2 inches and every weir length set at 200 inches, the clear liquid height for each pass with 1000 GPM is 2.38 inches ( $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{W}}=1.0, \beta=0.7$ ) .

$$
\begin{aligned}
H L & =0.7\left[0.48 \times 1.0 \times(1000 / 200)^{2 / 3}+2.0\right] \\
& =2.38 \text { inches }
\end{aligned}
$$

If one weir length is 240 inches, and another 120 inches, the two clear liquid heights can still be made equal for an equal liquid split by making the longer weir 2.16 inches high and the shorter weir only 1.43 inches high.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{A}} & =0.7\left[0.48 \times 1.0 \times(1000 / 240)^{2 / 3}+2.16\right] \\
& =2.38 \text { inches } \\
\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{B}} & =0.7\left[0.48 \times 1.0 \times(1000 / 120)^{2 / 3}+1.43\right] \\
& =2.38 \text { inches }
\end{aligned}
$$

This example shows how even designs with unequal weir lengths can be made to have equal clear liquid heights for any given set of
loadings. Only the weir height need be varied.

Suppose, however, that during the course of a tower's life, it must be operated at less than design rates. Suppose half rates, or a total liquid rate of 2000 GPM , were run through the tower. The equal weir length design would still have equal clear liquid heights for each pass.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { HL } & =0.7\left[0.48 \times 1.0 \times(500 / 200)^{2 / 3}+2.0\right] \\
& =2.02 \text { inches }
\end{aligned}
$$

However, the unequal weir length design, which gave equal clear liquid heights for the design rates, does not give equal clear liquid heights for half rates.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{A}} & =0.7\left[0.48 \times 1.0 \times(500 / 240)^{2 / 3}+2.16\right] \\
& =2.06 \text { inches } \\
\mathrm{HL}_{\mathrm{B}} & =0.7\left[0.48 \times 1.0 \times(500 / 120)^{2 / 3}+1.43\right] \\
& =1.87 \text { inches }
\end{aligned}
$$

For this reason, if both designs were specified to provide for equal vapor and liquid rates to each pass for the design conditions, only the equal weir length design would have equal splits under all conditions. Only the equal weir length design provides for equal clear liquid heights for all conditions, which, combined with the other recommendations, guarantees equal vapor and liquid splits for each pass. Tray vendors have revealed that equal flowpath length designs have had operability problems due to imbalanced flowrates at other
than design conditions (2).


#### Abstract

The procedures presented in this chapter guarantee symmetrical multipass tray designs. Therefore, using these recommendations, engineers should have no "aversion" to specifying multipass trays in fractionating towers.


CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSIONS

This thesis has presented the case for the usefulness of multipass trays for large fractionating towers. An example will demonstrate how multipass trays are economically attractive.

Holland, et al (3) have stated that the cost of a tower of constant height increases linearly with capacity.

$$
C_{2} / C_{1}=Q_{2} / Q_{1}
$$

Where $C_{2}$ and $C_{1}$ are costs for 2 towers and $Q_{1}$ and $Q_{2}$ are their respec. tive capacities. Because capacity increases linearly with tower cross sectional area, it increases proportionately to the square of the diameter.

$$
Q_{2} / Q_{1}=\left(D_{2} / D_{1}\right)^{2}
$$

Where $D_{2}$ and $D_{1}$ are the required tower diameters for the two towers. Therefore, tower cost increases with the square of tower diameter. $C_{2} / C_{1}=\left(D_{2} / D_{1}\right)^{2}$

Using this relationship we can compare the costs of towers using trays of varying number of liquid passes for a given service. For a system with a liquid load of 2000 GPM and a vapor load ( $V_{\mathrm{L}}$ ) of 37 cubic feet per second, one tray vendor (7) suggests the diameters given below for a typical column with 24 inch tray spacing. If the cost of the four pass design is set at 100 , the relative costs of each of the other designs is given below.

| No. of passes | Diameter (ft) | $\frac{\text { Relative Cost }}{18}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 14.5 | 192 |
| 2 | 13.5 | 124 |
| 3 | 13.0 | 108 |
| 4 | 100 (Base) |  |

As shown in the table above, one, two and three pass designs are 92, 24 and 8 percent more costly than a four pass design. With the cost of large towers running in the six and seven figure range, substantial savings can be realized if multipass trays are used.

Through the use of the equations, recommendations, and computer program presented in this thesis, multipass fractionating tray design should be made easier to those engineers in the chemical and petroleum industries who do not have access to proprietary procedures. Although multipass trays sometimes have slightly lower tray efficiencies than trays with longer flowpath lengths, this effect becomes negligible for large size towers. Therefore, multipass trays are economical for many large tower designs, and should be specified more frequently by process design engineers.

## APPENDIX

Fortran IV Computer Program for Rating and Designing Three and Four Pass Sieve Trays


```
MAIN

```

T=MP, PSIA,

```
T=MP, PSIA,
vP, DunLE, IT, T
vP, DunLE, IT, T
(w(1),I=1,5),
(w(1),I=1,5),
(m(x);
```

(m(x);

```


```

HNC(2), thi(2), C(2), AC(2),SHAPF(2),2FCSOX(2),

```
HNC(2), thi(2), C(2), AC(2),SHAPF(2),2FCSOX(2),
, (3), AC(3), SHADE(3), DEC 3-x(3),
, (3), AC(3), SHADE(3), DEC 3-x(3),
4wO(4), HW[(4), [(4), AO(4),SHADE(4), DEC9N\times(4)
4wO(4), HW[(4), [(4), AO(4),SHADE(4), DEC9N\times(4)
ATAIN
ATAIN
10J2 FNO:AAT
10J2 FNO:AAT
ASAlN
ASAlN
1002 FNO:AT (2F10.3,F10.5,10X,F10.4,1
1002 FNO:AT (2F10.3,F10.5,10X,F10.4,1
F10,3,F10.5,2F10,4,1,
F10,3,F10.5,2F10,4,1,
2F10.3,1,
2F10.3,1,
10.3,3F10.5,1
10.3,3F10.5,1
(5F1004,7),
(5F1004,7),
4(6F10.4,N),
4(6F10.4,N),
F10.4)
F10.4)
mfegmedate calculations: loadings and geometey
mfegmedate calculations: loadings and geometey
ERO = 0.0
ERO = 0.0
ORHOL = RHOL ( (RHOL - RHOV)
ORHOL = RHOL ( (RHOL - RHOV)
VTOT = VADOES /RRHOV * 3.6)
VTOT = VADOES /RRHOV * 3.6)
CFSLL= LIQDES /(RHOL * 3.6)
CFSLL= LIQDES /(RHOL * 3.6)
LTOT = CFSLL* 448.8
LTOT = CFSLL* 448.8
ORHOV = RHOV / \RHOL - RHOV 
ORHOV = RHOV / \RHOL - RHOV 
LTOT = VTOT * SQRT(DRHOV)
LTOT = VTOT * SQRT(DRHOV)
IF (TS.EO.O.0) TS = 24.
IF (TS.EO.O.0) TS = 24.
C
C
DOWNCOMER INLET VELOCITY: A TYPICAL EQUATION
DOWNCOMER INLET VELOCITY: A TYPICAL EQUATION
HFACT2 = TS/24.
HFACT2 = TS/24.
RHOFAC = (RHDL - RHOV)
RHOFAC = (RHDL - RHOV)
IF (RHOFAC.LT.16.)RHDFAC = 15
IF (RHOFAC.LT.16.)RHDFAC = 15
IF (RHOFAC.GT.30.1RHOFAC = 30
IF (RHOFAC.GT.30.1RHOFAC = 30
ALLVEL = STLUIPHDFAC,TABLEI
ALLVEL = STLUIPHDFAC,TABLEI
ALLVEL = ALLVEL * HFACT
ALLVEL = ALLVEL * HFACT
OTOCA = CFSLL/ALLVEL
OTOCA = CFSLL/ALLVEL
F IDT.GT.0.21 GO TO 1003
F IDT.GT.0.21 GO TO 1003
FFLTUT.GT.100. ) GO TO 2154
FFLTUT.GT.100. ) GO TO 2154
F (NO.EQ.3.0) GO TO 1004
F (NO.EQ.3.0) GO TO 1004
c. DESIGN - FIUR PASS
c. DESIGN - FIUR PASS
(FILTOT.GT.6000.) GOTO 216
```

(FILTOT.GT.6000.) GOTO 216

```


```

    T = DTLUTVLTOT,LTOT,TASLE?
    ```
    T = DTLUTVLTOT,LTOT,TASLE?
    ACS =.7.45 % (0T**2.)
    ACS =.7.45 % (0T**2.)
    4-pasS re DESIGN
    4-pasS re DESIGN
    A0D1(1) = 21 * TCTmCA
    A0D1(1) = 21 * TCTmCA
    A)c口(1)=A0CI(I)
    A)c口(1)=A0CI(I)
    (1) = q[SE(100.*AOR[11)/ACS) * 2.12 * !T
    (1) = q[SE(100.*AOR[11)/ACS) * 2.12 * !T
    A(r) = 5.73 # TMTMCA/OT
```

    A(r) = 5.73 # TMTMCA/OT
    ```




```

Fumpen IN Gl {-LEASE 2.0
G% T? 100
%
TRIAL AVD ERFOD FOR VADOR SPLIT
15 V(1)= VTOT/4.
0) 50 1V =1,50
V(2)=0.5*VTOT - V(1)
V(3)=V(1)
V(4)=V(2)
00 20 1=1,4
voli)=V(I) / aO(I)
HED(I)= XCVO
Hr(I) = HC(I) + HED(I)
C CONTMME
HED3=HT(4) +HMD(4) + HI(4) -HC(3) -HJD(3) -HI(3)
HED3=HT(4) +HJO(4) \& HI(4)
VO3 = SORT((HED3*RHCL)/(RHOV*XCVO))
VFARSIV3 * V{3)
VV(1) = AMIN1( (V(3)+V2)), 0.49\#VTOT )
YAPCON=1.0
5 HCl = HT(2) +HT(4) - HT(3) - HED(1)
QLTERM = (HC1-RETA*HWO(1)) (0.48*FW*BETA)
OLT = OLTERM** 1;
101 IF(ABS(QLI-L(1)).LT,0.01) G0 TO 107
IFIQLI.GT.L(I).AND.DELTAL.GE.0.D) DELTAL = -0.4*DELTAL
IFIQLI.LT.L(1).AND.DELTAL.LE.0.0) DELTAL = -0.4*DELTAL
IF(QLI.LT.LII)AND.D
100 (11) = AMIN1(L(1),0.49*LTOT)
LIOCON=1.0
107 IFICPOSS.NE.1.0)GO TO 1.N5
C VAPOR SPLIT - FOUR PASS - WITH VAPOR CROSSOVER
V(1)=VTOT/4.
00 400 I1=1,50
V(2) = 0.50 * vTOT - V(1)
VO(2)=V(2)/AO(2)
HED(2)= XCVO * ((vO(2))**2.) * RHOV / RHOL
HT(2)=HC(2)+HED(2)
HED1 = 4T(2)-HC(1)
HED1 = 4T(2) - HC(1)
Vl = VO1 * AO{1)
IF IABS(VI-VI1)I:LT.0.01) GO To 401
400 VIL)= AMINI(IV(I)+VI)/?.,0.40*VTOT)
VAPCON = 1.0
4V V(3)= VTOT/4.
D) 40? 12=1,50
V(4) = 0.50*VTOT-V(3)
Vn(4) = V(4)/aO(4
"5)(4)=X`VO*((VO(L))**2.) * 4,HOV/RHOL
HT(4) =H:(4) +HET(<.)

```

```

| 225 |  | $v 3=203 * A 73)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 223 |  |  |
| ごら | $\rightarrow 02$ |  |
| 了294． |  | vapean $=1.0$ |
| 3273 | 03 | covtinue． |
| 327 |  | 50 T0 505 |
|  | ${ }_{6}$ | TH25E Pass |
| 3291 | $5: 4$ | （14）$=$ ）．${ }^{\text {（ }}$ |
| 327？ |  | $\mathrm{V}(4)=0.0$ |
| 3273 |  | L（1）$=$ LTOT／3． |
| $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}$ |  |  |
| ［235 |  | no $500 \mathrm{Jl}=1,40$ |
| 2296 |  | 1（3）$=1111$ |
| 3297 |  | L（2）$=$ LTOT－L（3）－L（1） |
| 0209 |  | D0 $516 \mathrm{I}=1,3$ |
| 3297 |  |  |
| 3903 |  | IF（SHADE111611，611，612 |
| 3301 | 311 |  |
| 2302 |  | go T3 513 |
| $\bigcirc 303$ | 512 | HUD（I）$=0.03$（ L（I）（ $C$（II）＊LUD（I）I）＊＊ 2 。 |
| 3304 | 513 | HI（I）$=0.48 *($ LI） 1 LII（1）$) * * 0.667+4 W(1)$ |
| －305 |  | IF（HWI（I）．GE．C（I）．OR．RECBCX（1）．GT．0．0）HUD（I）$=2 *$ HUD（I） |
| 3306 | 515 | continue |
| 0307 |  | IF（HHIII）．GT． 0.0 ）go to 614 |
| Ј308 |  | HIT（1）$=$ HC（3） |
| 0309 |  | H（12）$=$ HC（2） |
| 3310 |  | HI（3）$=$ HC（1） |
| 0311 | 614 | continue |
| 2312 |  | IFICROSS．NE．1．0）Go TO 615 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & c \\ & c \\ & c \end{aligned}$ | three pass－l／v split－with vapor crassover |
| 2313 |  | H13 $=$ HI（ 21 ＋HUO（2）－HUD（3） |
| 0314 |  | IF1HW1（3）．LE．0．0） 60 TQ 703 |
| －${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | OLTEPM $=($ HI3－HW1（3）$) / \mathrm{C} .48$ |
| 3315 |  | OLT＝OLTERM＊＊1．5 |
| 0317 |  | WLI＝OLT＊LWI（3） |
| 3313 |  | 1FIARS（OLI－L（1）．LT．0．01）SO TO 507 |
| 9317 |  | IFI日LI．ST．LII）．AND．0ELTAL．LE．C．O）DELTAL $=-3.4 *$ DELTAL |
| 0320 |  | IFIDLI．LT．L（1）．AND．DELTAL．GE．0．0）DELTAL $=-0.4 *$ DELTAL |
| 3321 |  | L（1）$=111)+$ deltal |
| 2327 |  | Gio TO 600 |
| 3523 | 703 |  |
| 2236 |  | OLT＝OLTERM＊＊1．5 |
| 232 |  | ult＝2LT＊Lwolil |
| 3320 |  |  |
| 7327 |  |  |
| 932\％ |  |  |
| \％30 |  | $1.11)=L(1)+$－L．TAL |
| 3： |  | $3{ }^{3} \times 4$ |
|  | 5 | Vabore 501 l |

```

```

| Frateat IV Si | 2cLEa ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 2.0 Cata cate $=7+125$ | 1415273 | PGSE OM\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2301 |  | $\operatorname{VAPCN}=1.0$ |  |  |
| 0382 | 804 | TRVVT $=V(1)+V(2)+V(3)$ |  |  |
| 0383 |  | if (ARS(tryvt - Vtot).it. .ocl ) ge ro 799 |  |  |
| 0344 | 305 | Cuntrnje |  |  |
| 3395 |  | 90 404 I $=1$, M |  |  |
| 0386 |  | Vofil)=v(I) / An(I) |  |  |
| 1337 |  |  |  |  |
| 239\% | 404 | HT(I) $=$ UED(I) + HC(I) |  |  |
|  | c |  |  |  |
|  | c | OOnveomer fillivg calctulations |  |  |
|  | c |  |  |  |
| 358. | 1.35 | 2) $1251=1,4$ |  |  |
|  | E |  |  |  |
|  | $c$ | ASSume no ligul graneent across tray |  |  |
|  | c |  |  |  |
| 0303 |  | GQAD $=0.0$ |  |  |
| 0391 |  | HO(I) = (HT(I) + +UD(I) $)$ + HIII) + G2AD |  |  |
| 039 ? | 10.6 | covtinue |  |  |
| 2393 |  | กo $3 \mathrm{I}=1, \mathrm{M}$ |  |  |
| 0394 |  | PCTHCII) $=\left(\right.$ HO(11/TS) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (0) |  |  |
| 0395 |  | VLII) $=$ V(I) * SQRTIORHOV ) |  |  |
| 0396 |  | VL(I) $=$ V(T) * SQRT(ORHTVV) |  |  |
| 3307 |  | VLAJII) $=$ VLII) / 4 B (I) |  |  |
| 0393 |  | S(I) $=$ VLII) /(LII)/448.8) |  |  |
| 0399 |  | GPHFTM(I) $=(\mathrm{L}(1) * 60.1 /(\mathrm{LWO}$ (I)/12.) |  |  |
| 3400 | 3 | COMTINUE |  |  |
|  | $c$ |  |  |  |
|  | c | ADOITIONAL CALCULATIONS |  |  |
|  | c |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & c \\ & C \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & c \\ & c \end{aligned}$ | JET FLDOD: A typical equation |  |  |
| 0401 |  | HFACTI = SQRT(TS/24.) |  |  |
| 0402 |  | D) $203 \mathrm{I}=1,4$ |  |  |
| 0403 |  | VSJETII $=$ HFACTI * $0.55-0.035 * 1$ GPHFTW(II/1000.) |  |  |
| 0404 | 203 | DCTjET(I)=(VLAB(I)/VAJET(I)) * 100. |  |  |
| 3405 |  | 0) $2041=1, M$ |  |  |
| 0496 |  | CFSLI 1 ) $=1$ (1)/448.8 |  |  |
| 0407 | 204 | OCVELI $=$ CFSL(I)/ADCI (1) |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & c \\ & c \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | c | TRAY EFFICIENCy |  |  |
|  | $c$ | . | - |  |
| 0408 |  | FLJIS = L./VISC |  |  |
| 2409 |  | IFIFLUIT.GT.14. \| FLUI $=14$. |  |  |
| 0410 |  | EFECY = STLU(FLUID, TABLE4) |  |  |
|  | c | ORINTING RESULTS |  |  |
|  | c |  |  |  |
| 3411 |  | $3911=1,4$ |  |  |
| 3412 |  | +11) = Al PHA(1) |  |  |
| 3113 |  |  |  |  |
| 9414 |  | - (!) =aldall) |  |  |
| 3415 |  |  | $\because \cdot$ | . |
| 9414 |  | Cryflist |  |  |

```

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & & 1'----------1, \\
\hline 3463 & & !F1P.E0.4) 90 T0 2122 \\
\hline 34, \({ }^{3}\) & &  \\
\hline 3453 & &  \\
\hline 0460 & & () T \% 2124 \\
\hline 3467 & 2122 & PRINT 2022,w(1),w(5),W*3, WN \\
\hline 3407 & 2322 &  \\
\hline 0409 & & DRINT \(2023, \mathrm{~W}(6)\), W(10), WW3, Ww 3 \\
\hline 0473 & 2223 &  \\
\hline 0471 & 2124 & Privt 2024,(LFP(I), \(1=1,4\) ) \\
\hline 347? & 2)24 &  \\
\hline 0473 & & PKINT \(2025,(\mathrm{LWO}(1), \mathrm{I}=1,4)\) \\
\hline 3474 & 2)25 &  \\
\hline 0475 & & DQIVt 2J26,(100(1), \(1=1,4\) ) \\
\hline 0476 & 2026 & FJRMAT(1X, 'CHORD LENGTH AT BTM OF DC', 7x, 'IN', \(5 \times, 4(F 10.3,10 \mathrm{X})\) ) \\
\hline 0477 & & PशIMT 2027, (ADCI(I), \(1=1,4\) ) \\
\hline 0478 & 2027 &  \\
\hline 0479 & & PRINT 2028, (ADCO(I), \(1=1,4\) ) \\
\hline 3480 & 2028 &  \\
\hline 0481 & & PRINT 2029,(HWO(1), \(1=1,4\) ) \\
\hline 3482 & 2029 & FJRMATIIX, 'QUTLET WEIR HEIGHT', 14X, 'IN', 5X,4(F10.3,10XI) \\
\hline 9483 & & PRINT 2030, \({ }^{\text {(HWI (I), } 1=1,4)}\) \\
\hline 0484 & 2030 & Formatilx,'InLET WEIR HEIGHt on tray below in', 5x,4ifio.3,10xit \\
\hline 0485 & & PRINT 2031,(CII), \(1=1,4)\) \\
\hline 3486 & 2031 &  \\
\hline 0497 & & PRINT 2032,(A(1), \(1=1,4)\) \\
\hline 0483 & 2032 & FORMAT(1X, 'SHAPED LIP (YES OR NO)',22x,4(A3,17x) \\
\hline 0489 & & PRINT 2033, (8, \(11, I=1,4)\) \\
\hline 0490 & 2033 &  \\
\hline 0491 & & PRIMT 2034, (AR(I), I \(=1,4\) ) \\
\hline 0492 & 2034 &  \\
\hline 0493 & & PRIUT 2035, (AF (1), \(1=1,4\) ) \\
\hline 0494 & 2035 &  \\
\hline 0495 & & PRINT 2036,(AO(1), \(1=1,4\) ) \\
\hline 0495 & 2036 & FORMAT(1X, 'YOLE AREA', 23 X, 'SQ FT', \(2 \mathrm{X}, 4(\mathrm{~F} 10,3,10 \mathrm{C})\) ) \\
\hline 0497 & & PRINT 2037,(AOAR(I), \(1=1,4\) ) \\
\hline 0498 & 2037 & FORMATIIX,'HOLE/BUBBLE AREA',16X, PCT',4X,4(F10.3,10X),//) \\
\hline 0499 & & PRINT 2038 \\
\hline 0503 & 2338 & FORMATIIX, \({ }^{\text {+ }}\) HALF WIOTH FOR PASSES \(\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}, 1\) \\
\hline 0501 & & PRINT 2135 \\
\hline 0502 & 2135 & FigMatilhl,90X, PAGE 2, \\
\hline 0503 & & IFIVAPCON.ST. O.0IGO TO 3001 \\
\hline 0504 & & PKINT 2136 \\
\hline 0505 & 2136 &  \\
\hline 0536 & & gitn 3002 \\
\hline 0507 & 3301 & PQINT 2137 \\
\hline J508 & \[
2137
\] & FOPMATI NOTE: VAPOR SPLIT OID NOT CONVERGE IA: 50 TEIALS - VAPOR SP Lit ar sott tral is U3.in, 1 \\
\hline 0539 & \(3) 02\) &  \\
\hline 0510 & &  \\
\hline 0511 & & Э) Tr 3002 \\
\hline 3512 & 323 - & Privt ? 138 \\
\hline > 313 & 2139 &  \\
\hline & & SPEIT OF 4St TRIAL IS Jjtu', 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \(\mathrm{A}_{B}\) & Bubbling area, square feet. Perforated area in which vapor and liquid contact each other. \\
\hline Allvel & Allowable downcomer inlet velocity, feet per second. \\
\hline \(A_{0}\) & Open area or hole area, square feet. \\
\hline Aud & Area under downcomer, square inches. \\
\hline c & Downcomer clearance, inches. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{CFS}_{V}\) & Vapor rate, cubic feet per second at conditions. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{\text {Vo }}\) & Dry tray pressure drop coefficient, dimensionless. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{0}\) & Hole diameter, inches. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{W}}\) & Weir factor used in clear liquid height equation, dimensionless. \\
\hline GPHFTWEIR & Liquid weir loading, gallons per hour per foot of weir length. \\
\hline GPM & Liquid rate, gallons per minute. \\
\hline H & Tray spacing, inches. \\
\hline HDA & Head loss under the downcomer, inches of liquid at conditions. \\
\hline HDC \(=\mathrm{HD}\) & Downcomer static backup, inches of liquid at conditions. \\
\hline HFACT1 & Tray spacing capacity factor used in jet flood equation, dimensionless. \\
\hline HFACT2 & Tray spacing capacity factor used in allowable downcomer inlet velocity equation, dimensionless. \\
\hline HH & Dry tray pressure drop, inches of liquid at conditions. \\
\hline HI & Inlet head, inches of liquid at conditions. \\
\hline HL & Clear liquid height, inches of liquid at conditions. \\
\hline HOW & Head of crest over weir, inches of liquid at conditions. \\
\hline HT & Total tray pressure drop, inches of liquid at conditions. \\
\hline HWI & Inlet weir height, inches. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline HWO & Outlet weir height, inches. \\
\hline L & Liquid rate, gallons per minute \\
\hline \(L_{\text {UD }}\) & Length of chord at bottom of downcomer, inches. \\
\hline LWI & Length of inlet weir, inches \\
\hline LWO & Length of outlet weir, inches. \\
\hline P & Pressure level in chamber above pass, any pressure dimension. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}^{\prime}\) & Pressure level in chamber below pass, any pressure dimension. \\
\hline RHOFAC & Density difference capacity factor used in calculating allowable downcomer inlet velocity. A function of ( \(\rho_{\mathrm{L}}-\rho \mathrm{V}\) ), dimensionless. \\
\hline TT & Tray thickness, inches \\
\hline v & Vapor rate, cubic feet per second. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{L}}\) & Vapor load \(=\operatorname{CFSV} \sqrt{\rho_{\mathrm{V}} / \rho_{\mathrm{L}}-\rho_{\mathrm{V}}}\), cubic feet per second. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{v}_{0}\) & Vapor velocity through the perforations \(=C F S v / A_{0}\), feet per second. \\
\hline \(\beta\) & Aeration faction used in clear liquid height equation, dimensionless. \\
\hline \(\rho_{\mathrm{V}}\) & Vapor density at conditions, pounds per cubic foot. \\
\hline \(\rho_{L}\) & Liquid density at conditions, pounds per cubic foot. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Subscripts
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\(A, B, C, D\) & Identify variable with one of the tray passes. \\
total & Identifies variable as total value for all passes.
\end{tabular}```


[^0]:    ** HALF WIOTH F"R pASSES 3,C,0

