

## **Simulation Of Unique Pressure Changing Steps And Situations In Psa Processes**

Armin D. Ebner, Amal Mehrotra, James C. Knox, M. Douglas LeVan, and James A. Ritter

Department of Chemical Engineering, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC  
([ritter@engr.sc.edu](mailto:ritter@engr.sc.edu))

Marshall Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration,  
Huntsville, AL, USA

Department of Chemical Engineering, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA

A more rigorous cyclic adsorption process simulator is being developed for use in the development and understanding of new and existing PSA processes. Unique features of this new version of the simulator that Ritter and co-workers have been developing for the past decade or so include: multiple absorbent layers in each bed, pressure drop in the column, valves for entering and exiting flows and predicting real-time pressurization and depressurization rates, ability to account for choked flow conditions, ability to pressurize and depressurize simultaneously from both ends of the columns, ability to equalize between multiple pairs of columns, ability to equalize simultaneously from both ends of pairs of columns, and ability to handle very large pressure ratios and hence velocities associated with deep vacuum systems. These changes to the simulator now provide for unique opportunities to study the effects of novel pressure changing steps and extreme process conditions on the performance of virtually any commercial or developmental PSA process.

This presentation will provide an overview of the cyclic adsorption process simulator equations and algorithms used in the new adaptation. It will focus primarily on the novel pressure changing steps and their effects on the performance of a PSA system that epitomizes the extremes of PSA process design and operation. This PSA process is a sorbent-based atmosphere revitalization (SBAR) system that NASA is developing for new manned exploration vehicles.

This SBAR system consists of a 2-bed 3-step 3-layer system that operates between atmospheric pressure and the vacuum of space, evacuates from both ends of the column simultaneously, experiences choked flow conditions during pressure changing steps, and experiences a continuously changing feed composition, as it removes metabolic CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O from a closed and fixed volume, i.e., the spacecraft cabin. Important process performance indicators of this SBAR system are size, and the corresponding CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O removal efficiencies, and N<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> loss rates. Results of the fundamental behavior of this PSA process during extreme operating conditions will be presented and discussed.

# **Simulation of Unique Pressure Changing Steps and Situations in PSA Processes**

Armin D. Ebner,<sup>1</sup> Amal Mehrotra,<sup>1</sup> James C. Knox,<sup>3</sup> M. Douglas LeVan,<sup>2</sup> and James A. Ritter<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Chemical Engineering, University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC

<sup>2</sup>Department of Chemical Engineering, Vanderbilt University  
Nashville, TN

<sup>3</sup>Marshall Space Flight Center, NASA  
Huntsville, AL

**AIChE 2007 Annual Meeting  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
November 6, 2007**

# Introduction

1. Rigorous cyclic adsorption process simulator (Ddaspk-Fortran) being developed to assist in the design, development and understanding of new and existing PSA processes.
2. Unique features of this simulator include:
  - Multiple absorbent layers and columns
  - Pressure drop in the column
  - Entering and exiting flows defined by constant flow, valve equations, or choke flow approaches (Isentropic, Fanno, etc.)
  - Interaction with other processes: cabin, distillation units, etc.
  - Simultaneous feed, exit, pressure varying steps through multiple ports
  - Ability to handle large P ratios and v's associated with deep vacuum systems.
  - Equalization between pairs of columns (single and dual ended) in progress.

**These features provide for unique opportunities to study the performance of virtually any commercial or developmental PSA process under extreme process conditions.**

# Objectives

- Focus primarily on a particular PSA system that NASA is developing: referred to as the sorbent-based atmosphere revitalization (SBAR) system
    - ❖ **this PSA system is unique because it uses deep space vacuum for regeneration *in lieu* of processed air as purge**
- 
- Describe NASA's PSA System, with emphasis on the alternative regenerative steps that NASA has developed to further improve performance: single, dual, and triple ended blowdown
  - Show validation of the PSA process simulator against NASA's experimental data of an 8.8 L dual blowdown system
  - Use the simulator to discuss the role of these regenerative steps on PSA performance in terms of H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiencies

This SBAR system might be used in a new Crew Exploration Vehicle (CEV) to remove metabolic H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> from cabin air.

# Schematic of Base Case Column Simulated for Water and Carbon Dioxide Removal from Cabin Air

## MSFC SBAR

### Experimental System

$$V_b = 8.88 \text{ L}$$

$$L_b = 0.2654 \text{ m}$$


$$r_b = 0.1032 \text{ m}$$

$$\text{HCT} = 450 \text{ s}$$



Zeolite 13X

Zeolite 5A

F (10-14.5 SCFM)



# Schematic Diagram and Cycle Sequencing of VSA Cycle Used for Air Revitalization



## SBAR Cycle Step Times

$$t_F = 420 \text{ s}$$


$$t_{SEB} = 30 \text{ s}$$

$$t_{SEB} = 420 \text{ s}$$

$$t_{FP} = 30 \text{ s}$$

SEB: single ended blowdown

# Schematic Diagram and Cycle Sequencing of VSA Cycle Used for Air Revitalization



## SBAR Cycle Step Times

$$t_F = 420 \text{ s}$$


$$t_{SEB} = 30 \text{ s}$$

$$t_{DEB} = 420 \text{ s}$$

$$t_{FP} = 30 \text{ s}$$

SEB: single ended blowdown  
DEB: dual ended blowdown

# Schematic Diagram and Cycle Sequencing of VSA Cycle Used for Air Revitalization



SEB: single ended blowdown  
TEB: triple ended blowdown



# Simulator Input


## Bed Characteristics and Transport Properties

### MSFC SBAR Experimental System




	13X	5A
bed layer fraction (%)	66%	34%
porosity	0.26	0.35
pellet density (kg m <sup>-3</sup> )	1100	1201
heat capacity (kJ kg <sup>-1</sup> K <sup>-1</sup> )	1.10	0.84
heat transfer coefficient (kW m <sup>-2</sup> K <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>a</sup>	0.0017	0.0017
mass transfer coefficients (s <sup>-1</sup> )		
H <sub>2</sub> O	0.00550	0.00310
CO <sub>2</sub>	0.00150	0.00067
O <sub>2</sub>	0.001	0.001
N <sub>2</sub>	0.001	0.001
$r_{p,eff}^b$ (mm)	3.3	2.1

# Motivation: Single vs Dual Ended Blowdown

## Pressure profiles @ End of Blowdown Step




15 SCFM




# Motivation: Single vs Dual Ended Blowdown Cycle Performance Parameters Zeolite System

## 15 SCFM

### Single




### Dual



# Modeling the SBAR DEB Experimental System

## Temperature History Profiles at Three Bed Locations


120 h  
F = 13.5 SCFM  
 $V_b = 8.88$  L  
HCT = 450 s  
 $t_F = 420$  s  
 $t_{SEB} = 30$  s  
 $t_{DEB} = 420$  s  
 $t_{FP} = 30$  s



# Modeling the SBAR DEB Experimental System

## Pressure History Profiles at Three Bed Locations


120 h  
F = 13.5 SCFM  
 $V_b = 8.88$  L  
HCT = 450 s  
 $t_F = 420$  s  
 $t_{SEB} = 30$  s  
 $t_{DEB} = 420$  s  
 $t_{FP} = 30$  s



# Modeling the SBAR DEB Experimental System

## $P_{CO_2}$ History Profiles at Two Bed Locations





120 h  
F = 13.5 SCFM  
 $V_b = 8.88$  L  
HCT = 450 s  
 $t_F = 420$  s  
 $t_{SEB} = 30$  s  
 $t_{DEB} = 420$  s  
 $t_{FP} = 30$  s



# Modeling the SBAR DEB Experimental System

## Bed Profiles at End of Steps for P, T, P<sub>H2O</sub> and P<sub>CO2</sub>

**120 h**  
**F = 13.5 SCFM**  
**V<sub>b</sub> = 8.88 L**  
**HCT = 450 s**  
**t<sub>F</sub> = 420 s**  
**t<sub>SEB</sub> = 30 s**  
**t<sub>DEB</sub> = 420 s**  
**t<sub>FP</sub> = 30 s**



# Modeling the SBAR DEB Experimental System

## Summary of Modeling vs Experimental Results of Eight Different Test Runs

Test Point	Experimental Conditions							Experimental Results					Modeling Results						
	Bed Size, L	Half cycle Time, min	DED Time, min	Inlet ppCO <sub>2</sub> , torr	Inlet ppH <sub>2</sub> O, torr	Flow Rate, scfm	Inlet Temp, degF	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal, lb/hr	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal Eff	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal, lb/hr	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal Eff	Bed Temp High, degf	Bed Temp Low, degf	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal, lb/hr	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal Eff	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal, lb/hr	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal Eff	Mid Bed Temp High, degf	Mid Bed Temp Low, degf
12	8.88	7.5	7.0	5.0	9.1	12.0	67.8	0.45	0.76	0.44	1.00	78.9	48.4	0.48	0.83	0.44	1.00	76.1	50.5
18	8.88	7.5	7.0	5.0	9.1	13.5	69.9	0.48	0.72	0.50	1.00	81.4	57.8	0.49	0.74	0.49	1.00	82.3	50.1
20	8.88	7.5	7.0	5.1	9.1	14.0	69.6	0.47	0.68	0.51	1.00	81.4	57.6	0.50	0.69	0.51	1.00	86.2	56.6
23	8.88	7.5	7.0	5.0	9.1	14.5	70.0	0.35	0.49	0.53	1.00	81.6	56.8	0.48	0.68	0.53	1.00	84.2	51.0
42	8.88	7.5	6.0	7.0	13.1	10.0	77.0	0.52	0.75	0.53	1.00	85.3	73.3	0.52	0.84	0.57	1.00	83.9	61.1
43	8.88	7.5	6.0	3.0	13.1	10.0	79.2	0.20	0.68	0.53	1.00	88.2	76.4	0.26	0.87	0.51	1.00	97.0	62.1
52	8.88	7.5	6.0	7.0	9.1	13.5	70.0	0.70	0.75	0.50	1.00	85.1	44.6	0.65	0.71	0.49	1.00	80.2	49.6
54	8.88	7.5	6.0	3.0	9.1	13.5	70.4	0.26	0.64	0.50	1.00	86.0	51.6	0.32	0.81	0.49	1.00	87.1	49.7



# Modeling the SBAR DEB Experimental System


## Summary of Modeling vs Experimental Results of Eight Different Test Runs: H<sub>2</sub>O Removal

Test Point	Experimental Conditions							Experimental Results						Modeling Results					
	Bed Size, L	Half cycle Time, min	DED Time, min	Inlet ppCO <sub>2</sub> , torr	Inlet ppH <sub>2</sub> O, torr	Flow Rate, scfm	Inlet Temp, degF	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal, lb/hr	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal Eff	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal, lb/hr	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal Eff	Bed Temp High, degf	Bed Temp Low, degf	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal, lb/hr	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal Eff	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal, lb/hr	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal Eff	Mid Bed Temp High, degf	Mid Bed Temp Low, degf
12	8.88	7.5	7.0	5.0	9.1	12.0	67.8	0.45	0.76	0.44	1.00	78.9	48.4	0.48	0.83	0.44	1.00	76.1	50.5
18	8.88	7.5	7.0	5.0	9.1	13.5	69.9	0.48	0.72	0.50	1.00	81.4	57.8	0.49	0.74	0.49	1.00	82.3	50.1
20	8.88	7.5	7.0	5.1	9.1	14.0	69.6	0.47	0.68	0.51	1.00	81.4	57.6	0.50	0.69	0.51	1.00	86.2	56.6
23	8.88	7.5	7.0	5.0	9.1	14.5	70.0	0.35	0.49	0.53	1.00	81.6	56.8	0.48	0.68	0.53	1.00	84.2	51.0
42	8.88	7.5	6.0	7.0	13.1	10.0	77.0	0.52	0.75	0.53	1.00	85.3	73.3	0.52	0.84	0.57	1.00	83.9	61.1
43	8.88	7.5	6.0	3.0	13.1	10.0	79.2	0.20	0.68	0.53	1.00	88.2	76.4	0.26	0.87	0.51	1.00	97.0	62.1
52	8.88	7.5	6.0	7.0	9.1	13.5	70.0	0.70	0.75	0.50	1.00	85.1	44.6	0.65	0.71	0.49	1.00	80.2	49.6
54	8.88	7.5	6.0	3.0	9.1	13.5	70.4	0.26	0.64	0.50	1.00	86.0	51.6	0.32	0.81	0.49	1.00	87.1	49.7


# Modeling the SBAR DEB Experimental System

## Summary of Modeling vs Experimental Results of Eight Different Test Runs

### CO<sub>2</sub> Removal




### Cycle Bed Temperatures



# Triple Ended Blowdown

## Effect of Location of Third Exhaust Port



### Test Run 18

<b>F</b>	<b>= 13.5 SCFM</b>
<b>V<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>= 8.88 L</b>
<b>HCT</b>	<b>= 450 s</b>
<b>t<sub>F</sub></b>	<b>= 420 s</b>
<b>t<sub>SED</sub></b>	<b>= 30 s</b>
<b>t<sub>DED</sub></b>	<b>= 420 s</b>
<b>t<sub>FP</sub></b>	<b>= 30 s</b>

### Third Port Location


**$z/L = 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, \text{ or } 0.5$**

# Triple vs Dual Ended Blowdown

Bed Pressure Profiles at the End of the Blowdown step

Significant Increase of Driving Force

Feed or Heavy Product End





Light Product End

# Triple vs Dual Ended Blowdown

## History of H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> Removal Per Cycle

DUAL

Triple,  $z/L=0.50$





# Triple vs Dual Ended Blowdown

## History of H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> Removal Per Cycle

DUAL

Triple,  $z/L=0.40$





# Triple vs Dual Ended Blowdown

## History of H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> Removal Per Cycle

DUAL

Triple,  $z/L=0.30$





# Triple vs Dual Ended Blowdown

## History of H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> Removal per Cycle

DUAL

Triple,  $z/L=0.20$





# Triple vs Dual Ended Blowdown

## H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> Removal after 120 hr

### Optimal Third Port Location

Test Point	Conditions									Modeling Results			
	Third Port location z/L	Bed Size, L	Half cycle Time, min	DED Time, min	TED Time, min	Inlet ppCO <sub>2</sub> , torr	Inlet ppH <sub>2</sub> O, torr	Flow Rate, scfm	Inlet Temp, degF	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal, lb/hr	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal Eff	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal, lb/hr	H <sub>2</sub> O Removal Eff
18 Triple		8.88	7.5	7.0	-	5.0	9.1	13.5	69.9	0.47	0.74	0.49	1.00
	0.5	8.88	7.5	-	7.0	5.0	9.1	13.5	69.9	0.50	0.79	0.49	1.00
	0.4	8.88	7.5	-	7.0	5.0	9.1	13.5	69.9	0.53	0.83	0.49	1.00
	0.3	8.88	7.5	-	7.0	5.0	9.1	13.5	69.9	0.55	0.86	0.49	1.00
	0.2	8.88	7.5	-	7.0	5.0	9.1	13.5	69.9	0.54	0.85	0.49	1.00

# Conclusions

- A description of the new NASA SBAR PSA system for H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> removal, with particular emphasis on its purgeless deep vacuum regenerative steps has been given
- Regeneration consisted of blowdown steps subject to deep vacuum through an increasing number of evacuation ports, i.e., single, dual and triple ended blowdown was studied.
- The USC PSA process simulator, for which adsorbent and adsorbate properties were independently obtained, successfully predicted NASA's experimental results of a dual ended system.
- The USC PSA process simulator was also used to discern the role of the regenerative steps on the performance of NASA's SBAR PSA system.

The USC PSA process simulator is currently being used in other projects of equal complexity.

# Acknowledgements

Funding being provided by the  
NASA MSFC  
is greatly appreciated!

Thank You!

?