## **Combustor for Direct-Fired** Supercritical CO<sub>2</sub> Cycle

Mark Winquist (gti) **Institute Engineer Energy Supply and Conversion** 





## Agenda

- sCO<sub>2</sub> cycle summary
- Comparison to rockets
- Flame temperature impacts (non-CO<sub>2</sub> species)
- Pressure drop impacts (cycle efficiency)
- Design window
- Conflicting requirements
  - Combustion efficiency vs. species composition
  - Stability vs.  $\Delta P$
  - Combustion efficiency vs.  $\Delta P$
  - Mixing (temperature uniformity) vs. wall cooling
- Conclusion

# sCO<sub>2</sub> Cycle on CO<sub>2</sub> T-S Diagram

- sCO<sub>2</sub> cycle\* ٠
  - High density compression to ~300 bar (4400 psia)
  - Temperature increase \_\_\_\_ through series of recuperators
  - Heat input from oxy burner
  - Expansion through turbine
  - Cooling through recuperators
  - Pre-compression and chiller to pumps
    - Just above critical point
    - High density yields lower compression loads



\* Weiland, N.T. and White, C.W. (2019). Performance and Cost Assessment of a Natural Gas-Fueled Direct sCO2 Power Plant. NETL-PUB-22274

## Direct-Fired sCO<sub>2</sub> Burner Operating **Conditions Compared to Rocket Engine**

- *"The RS-25 evolved from Aerojet"* Rocketdyne's Space Shuttle Main Engine (SSME) that successfully powered 135 flights of the Space Shuttle. ... Between the shuttle program and the SLS program, the RS-25 and SSME engines have collectively experienced more than 1.1 million seconds of use."\*
- 1.1 millions sec < 13 days •
- Power plant sCO<sub>2</sub> combustor operating • conditions are similar to rocket engine pressures and heat fluxes, but must operate for much longer durations



\*https://rocket.com/space/liquid-engines/rs-25-engine



### **Critical Coax Injector Element Design** Parameters

- Pressure drop (manifold burner)
- Injection velocity and momentum ratios
  - Fuel to oxidizer
- Flame temperature
- Combustion stability
  - Flame, acoustic, reactant supply
- Burner wall compatibility
- Turbine inlet flow uniformity (mixing)



## Non-CO<sub>2</sub> Species Reduce Cycle Efficiency

- To control flame temperatures, pre-mix  $CO_2$  with  $O_2$ 
  - Higher CO<sub>2</sub> content lowers flame temp and reduces CO, OH and  $O_2$ concentrations





The 7th International Supercritical CO<sub>2</sub> Power Cycles • February 21 – 24, 2022 • San Antonio, TX, USA

### Higher flame temperatures results in more non-CO<sub>2</sub> species Higher compression loading

Exhibit 6-10. Effects of combustor bypass fraction on flame temperature, CO and O2 exit mole fractions, plant efficiency, and cycle efficiency 0.035 Flame temp 0.030 ---- O2 0.025 -----CO 0.020 🛱 0.015 🖻 ó 0.010 g 0.005 0.000 58.5 58.0 -Plant eff 57.5 Cycle eff 57.0 💍 56.5 0.8 1.0 0.4 0.6 sCO<sub>2</sub> combustor bypass fraction

Weiland, N.T. and White, C.W. (2019). Performance and Cost Assessment of a Natural Gas-Fueled Direct sCO2 Power Plant. NETL-PUB-22274

### Increased Injector Pressure Drop Reduces Cycle Efficiency

- Injection velocities determined by element geometry and pressure drop
  - Higher fuel-side injection velocities yield shorter mixing lengths
    - Better mixing and performance
  - Higher injector ∆P requires more compression loading
    - Reduced cycle efficiency



## Pressure Drop and Flame Temperature Limits Define Design Window

- Example for design limits of <100 psid and <3400 F</li>
  - Need > 33% of injector CO<sub>2</sub> to meet temperature limit
  - Need 73% of injector  $CO_2$  to meet  $\Delta P$  limit for low velocity ratio (VR) element
    - Longer mixing length, longer burner
  - Need 47% lbm/sec of injector  $CO_2$ to meet  $\Delta P$  limit for higher velocity ratio (VR) element
    - Shorter mixing length





# Burner with CO<sub>2</sub> Coolant and Diluent

- CO<sub>2</sub> not routed to injector is used as boundary layer coolant (BLC) and diluent
  - BLC designed to cool wall so mixes poorly
  - Diluent injection designed to maximize mixing but provides minimal wall protection
    - NASA mixing tool utilized for diluent injection design





## **Conflicting Design Requirements**

Design Feature	Parameter	If Design Feature Too High
Flame Temperature	Species Composition	Excess non-CO <sub>2</sub> species and cycle efficiency loss
Velocity Ratio	Stability	Potential flame instability, high ∆P, cycle efficiency loss
Pressure Drop	Combustion Efficiency	High ∆P and cycle efficiency loss
BLC and Diluent Injection Mixing	Turbine Inlet Gas Uniformity	Poor mixing with combustion gases and non-uniform turbine inlet temps



### If Design Feature Too Low

High injector  $CO_2$  yields high  $\Delta P$  and cycle efficiency loss

Potential low frequency combustion instability, poor mixing

Low velocity ratio, poor element mixing and longer burner

Overheated wall and short life and/or wall damage

## Conclusion

- High pressure direct-fired sCO<sub>2</sub> burners have many design challenges
- Conflicting requirements often result in small design windows
- An injector/ burner combination that navigates those design requirements to meet system cycle performance has been created