#### Methodology of Modeling and Comparing the Use of Direct Air-Cooling for a Supercritical Carbon Dioxide Brayton Cycle and a Steam Rankine Cycle

Patrick J. Hruska, Gregory F. Nellis, Sanford A. Klein

University of Wisconsin – Madison Solar Energy Laboratory Mechanical Engineering Madison, WI, USA



The 5<sup>th</sup> International Symposium – Supercritical CO2 Power Cycles March 28-31, 2016, San Antonio, Texas



## Outline

- Introduction
- Power Generation Cycles
- Air-Cooled Heat Exchanger Model
- Economic Considerations
- Life Cycle Earnings Optimization
- Summary and Conclusions





## Introduction

- Dry air-cooling has become increasingly important for power generation cycles, especially those located in arid regions with restricted water resources
- Compare feasibility of dry air-cooling with S-CO2 precooler to traditional steam condenser
- Complete cycle and heat exchanger models allow for a proper comparison
- Economic analysis developed to predict the cost of the heat rejection unit based on material costs and actual quoted heat exchangers





# **Power Generation Cycles**

- S-CO2 Brayton Cycle vs. Steam Rankine Cycle
- Single source of regeneration
- Pressure drop only considered in the heat rejection units
- Cycles are defined in order to determine the required performance for the heat rejection units





#### Supercritical Carbon Dioxide Brayton Cycle







#### **Steam Rankine Cycle**







# Air-Cooled Heat Exchanger Model

- S-CO2 Precooler vs. Steam Condenser
- Modeled as finned tube heat exchanger using Engineering Equation Solver (EES) software
- Equate physical size of cooling unit to required performance from cycle model
- Heat exchanger is directly integrated with cycle models
- Investigate the effect of size of cooling unit and the required fan power on the efficiency of the cycles and the cost of these units





## **Modeling Methodology**







## **Economic Considerations**

- Analysis includes earnings from generating electricity, cost of providing thermal energy to the cycle, and capital cost of the cooling heat exchanger
- Calculate life cycle earnings from P1-P2 methodology
- Heat exchanger costing model created from predicting overall cost from tubing and fin material costs
- Estimated cost of heat exchanger is calculated using a power law model developed from obtaining two quotes for air-cooled heat exchangers





		Brayton Cycle	Rankine Cycle
	Working Fluid	Supercritical Carbon Dioxide	Steam
Life Cvcle Earnings	Compact Heat Exchanger	Finned circular tubes, surface CF-7.34	
On the least law	Cycle Inputs		
Optimization	Total Net Power	10 MW	
Parameters fc_tubes_sCF-734	Hot Temperature	700° C	
	High Side Pressure	25 MPa	22 MPa
	Cold Temperature	Variable	
	Low Side Pressure	8 MPa	Saturation
	Turbine Efficiency	85%	
23.37mm + 24.77mm 23.37mm + 24.77mm 20.32mm - 3.505mm - 0.4572mm	Compressor/Pump Efficiency	85%	60%
	Recuperator Conductance	1500 kW/K	-
	Extraction Pressure	-	1.9 MPa
	Cooler Pressure Drop	2%	
	Air Side Inputs		
	Ambient Temperature	30° C	
	Ambient Pressure	1 atm	
	Fan Power	Optimized (LCE)	
	Fan Efficiency	50%	
	Pressure Drop	200 Pa	
	Economic Parameters		
	Number of Years for Analysis	5	
	Fuel Inflation Rate	2%	
	Market Discount Rate	3.25%	
	Cost of Electricity	0.05 \$/kW-hr	
	Cost of Thermal Energy	0.465 \$/therm	





#### Life Cycle Earnings Optimization Fan Power







#### Life Cycle Earnings Optimization Results







# Summary and Conclusions

- Cycle models for S-CO2 Brayton cycle and steam Rankine cycle
- Dry air-cooling crossflow heat exchanger models for S-CO2 precooler and steam condenser
- Economic comparison and life cycle earnings analysis
- S-CO2 Brayton cycle is superior to the steam Rankine cycle for use with dry air-cooling in terms of both cycle efficiency and the physical size of the cooling heat exchanger







#### **QUESTIONS?**





College of Engineering UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON



- Dobson, M. K., and Chato, J. C., 'Condensation in Smooth Horizontal Tubes,' ASME J. Heat Transfer, 120, pp. 193-213, (1998).
- Duffie, J.A., & Beckman, W.A., Solar Engineering of Thermal Processes, 4th ed., Wiley, New York, (2013).
- Dyreby, J., *Modeling the Supercritical Carbon Dioxide Brayton Cycle with Recompression*, Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, (2014).
- Gnielinski, V., Equations for calculating heat transfer in single tube rows and banks of tubes in transverse flow, *International Journal of Chemical Engineering*, Vol. 19, pp. 380–390, (1979).
- Hruska, P., M.S. Thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, (2016).
- Kays, W.M., & London, A.L., Compact heat exchangers, 3rd ed., McGraw Hill, New York, (1984).
- Klein, S.A., & Nellis, G., Thermodynamics, Cambridge University Press, (2009).
- Klein, S.A., Engineering Equation Solver, F-Chart Software, http://fchart.com, (2015).
- M.B. Ould Didi, N. Kattan, J.R. Thome, *Prediction of Two-Phase Pressure Gradients of Refrigerants in Horizontal Tubes*, International Journal of Refrgieration, Vol 25, pp. 935-947, (2002).
- Nellis, G., & Klein, S.A., *Heat Transfer*, Cambridge University Press, (2009).
- OnlineMetals, access online: http://www.onlinemetals.com, (2015).
- Zigrang, D.J. & Sylvester, N.D., "Explicit approximations to the solution of Colebrook's friction factor equation," *AIChE Journal*, Vol. 28, pp. 514-515, (1982).





### Heat Exchanger Cost Model

#### **Aluminum Fins Stainless Steel Tubing** 7 0.16 Cost per linear inch (\$/in) Cost per area (\$/in<sup>2</sup>) 0.12 0.08 3 2 0.04 0 0 1.2 0.4 0.8 2 1.6 0 0 0.04 0.08 0.12 0.16 0.2 Cross sectional area (in<sup>2</sup>) Thickness (in) $C_{tubing} = 4.1163 (A_{tubing})^{0.6349}$ $C_{fins} = 0.5576 th_{fin} + 0.0352$

#### **Heat Exchanger Cost**

$$C_{HX} = 2.887 \left( C_{HX,p} \right)^{0.8297}$$

\*Material costing from OnlineMetals (2015)



