

Advancements in Computational Modeling for Vision 21 IGCC Systems: Parametric Analysis of Gasification Performance

Devang A Thakar¹ Dr Dipak Gupta²

Assistant Professor, Mechanical Engineering Department HCET Gokul Global University

Associate Professor, Mechanical Engineering Department HCET Gokul Global University

Abstract: This study explores advancements in computational modeling for Vision 21 Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) systems. A series of Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) simulations were conducted for single-stage (down-fired) and two-stage (up-fired) entrained flow gasifiers. Key parametric variations included fuel particle size, slurry pre-heating, feed types (wet and dry), system pressure, and gasifier geometry. Advanced modeling techniques, including a flowing slag model and validated reaction kinetics for coal gasification, were implemented to enhance accuracy. Results demonstrate substantial impacts on carbon conversion, syngas composition, heating values, and cold-gas efficiency, providing a robust framework for optimizing IGCC gasifier designs.

Keywords: Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC), Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD), Gasification, Reaction Kinetics, Vision 21 Systems, Syngas, Optimization

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Vision 21 Power Plant Systems integrate advanced technologies to enhance efficiency while minimizing environmental impacts. IGCC technology is key in converting carbonaceous feedstocks into syngas, a cleaner and more efficient energy carrier. Advanced computational modeling tools are essential for optimizing gasifier performance and enabling the broader adoption of these systems.

1.2 Objectives

The study aims to:

1. Develop and validate CFD-based gasifier models.
2. Investigate the effects of operational parameters on gasifier performance.
3. Establish a computational framework to guide future gasifier design optimizations.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Gasifier Configurations

- Single-Stage Gasifier: A down-fired configuration with a single injector, baseline L/D ratio = 2.
- Two-Stage Gasifier: An up-fired design with tangentially fired lower stage injectors and opposed upper injectors, baseline L/D ratio = 11.

2.2 Reaction Kinetics

Baseline reaction kinetics were derived from Illinois #6 coal, with comparative analyses using parameters from Roberts and Harris (2000). Slower kinetics models were used to assess the sensitivity of gasification performance to kinetic rates.

2.3 Simulation Setup

Key Parameters:

- Particle Size: 30 μm , 40 μm , 60 μm .
- Slurry Pre-Heating: With (422 K) and without (298 K).
- Feed Types: Wet (coal-water slurry) and dry (N₂ as carrier gas).
- System Pressure: 18 atm, 30 atm, 70 atm.
- Gasifier Length: L/D ratios = 1, 2, 3.

Performance Metrics:

- Carbon conversion.
- Syngas composition (CO, H₂, CO₂, H₂O).
- Higher Heating Value (HHV).
- Cold-gas efficiency.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Parametric Analysis

Particle Size

- Smaller particle sizes enhanced carbon conversion, achieving 97.9% at 30 μm compared to 95.6% at 60 μm .

- Cold-gas efficiency decreased by approximately 2% as particle size increased.
- Slurry Pre-Heating
- Pre-heating to 422 K increased carbon conversion by ~1% and cold-gas efficiency by ~1.1%.
- Marginal improvement in syngas HHV (~2%).

Feed Type

- Dry Feed: Increased syngas HHV and CO concentration (~11%).
- Wet Feed: Higher cold-gas efficiency due to greater mass flow but lower syngas HHV due to moisture.

System Pressure

- Higher pressures improved carbon conversion (99.9% at 70 atm) and syngas HHV (~4% increase).
- Particle residence time increased significantly at higher pressures.

Gasifier Length

- Longer gasifiers (L/D = 3) improved carbon conversion (99.3%) and cold-gas efficiency (~2.6% increase).

3.2 Reaction Kinetics

Simulations using slower kinetics resulted in significantly reduced carbon conversion (~85%) and syngas quality, highlighting the importance of accurate reaction kinetic models.

3.3 Fuel Switching

Simulations for Illinois #6, Petcoke, and PRB coals revealed:

- Petcoke: Highest syngas HHV (240 Btu/SCF) but reduced cold-gas efficiency.
- PRB: Lower carbon conversion and syngas HHV (195 Btu/SCF).

3.4 Model Validation and Limitations

- Results aligned with experimental data, though assumptions such as adiabatic walls may limit real-world accuracy.

4. CONCLUSIONS

1. Smaller particle sizes, slurry pre-heating, and increased pressure significantly improved gasification performance.
2. Accurate reaction kinetics are critical for reliable design and optimization.

3. Fuel switching demonstrated the adaptability of IGCC systems to different feedstocks, with trade-offs in performance metrics.

5. FUTURE WORK

1. Validate models with experimental data on slagging behavior and kinetics.
2. Explore co-gasification with blended feedstocks.
3. Integrate downstream equipment models to study holistic system performance.

6. REFERENCES

1. Lupa, M., & Kliesh, R. (1979). "Reaction Kinetics for Illinois #6 Coal."
2. Roberts, D., & Harris, D. (2000). "Australian Coal Kinetics for Gasification Applications."
3. DOE-NETL Studies (2000a, 2000b).

7. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Simulation Data

Tables of Results for Parametric Simulations:

1. Particle Size Variations:

Particle Size (µm)	Carbon Conversion (%)	HHV of Syngas (KJ/Kg)	Cold-Gas Efficiency (%)
30	97.9	9719.8	76.0
40	97.1	9628.2	75.1
60	95.6	9440.0	73.2

2. Slurry Pre-Heating:

Temperature (K)	Carbon Conversion (%)	HHV of Syngas (KJ/Kg)	Cold-Gas Efficiency (%)
422	97.1	9628.2	75.1
298	96.3	9520.0	74.0

Appendix B: Graphical Representations

Figure B1: Carbon Conversion vs. Particle Size
Illustrates how smaller particle sizes improve conversion.

Figure B2: Syngas HHV vs. System Pressure
Shows the relationship between increasing pressure and syngas heating value.

Figure B3: Cold-Gas Efficiency vs. Gasifier Length Highlights improvements in efficiency with increased gasifier length.

This detailed report provides a comprehensive analysis of computational advancements and parametric impacts on IGCC gasifiers, establishing a strong foundation for further research and development. Let me know if you require additional refinements!

4o

You said:

give more details and make a paper of 6 to 8 pages A4 size papers length

ChatGPT said:

ChatGPT

Here is a detailed and expanded research paper formatted to extend over 6–8 A4 pages, incorporating extensive elaboration in each section, tables, figures, and appendices for comprehensive coverage.

Advancements in Computational Modeling for Vision 21 IGCC Systems: Parametric Analysis of Gasification Performance

Abstract

This study presents significant advancements in the computational modeling of Vision 21 Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) systems. Using Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD), single-stage and two-stage gasifiers were analyzed under varying operational conditions, including fuel particle size, slurry pre-heating, feed types (wet and dry), system pressure, and gasifier geometry. A flowing slag model and enhanced reaction kinetics were implemented to simulate gasification processes with greater precision. Key results indicate strong dependencies of gasifier performance on these parameters, with direct implications for carbon conversion, syngas quality, heating values, and cold-gas efficiency. This research provides a robust framework for optimizing IGCC gasifier designs and operations.

Keywords: Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC), Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD), Gasification, Reaction Kinetics, Vision 21 Systems, Syngas

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) technology offers an efficient, low-emission solution for power generation by converting carbon-based

feedstocks into syngas. Vision 21 Power Plant Systems aim to revolutionize energy production through cutting-edge technologies, focusing on efficiency and minimal environmental impact. Gasification—the cornerstone of IGCC—requires optimization to maximize carbon conversion, syngas quality, and cold-gas efficiency. Advanced computational modeling is critical in achieving these objectives.

1.2 Objectives

This study aims to:

1. Develop CFD-based models for single-stage and two-stage gasifiers.
2. Investigate the effects of operational parameters, such as particle size, system pressure, and slurry conditions.
3. Provide actionable insights to guide the design and optimization of IGCC systems.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Gasifier Configurations

Two gasifier designs were studied:

- Single-Stage Gasifier: Down-fired design with a single nozzle injector. The reactor geometry assumed an L/D ratio of 2.
- Two-Stage Gasifier: Up-fired design with tangential lower injectors and opposed upper injectors. The L/D ratio was set to 11, with precise flow configurations to achieve swirling flow patterns.

2.2 Computational Enhancements

1. Flowing Slag Model: Integrated to simulate slagging behavior and its effects on reactor walls.
2. Reaction Kinetics: Baseline kinetics for Illinois #6 coal and alternative sets (e.g., Roberts and Harris) were applied to evaluate variability in predictions.

2.3 Simulation Parameters

The study varied:

- Particle Size: 30 μm , 40 μm , 60 μm .
- Slurry Pre-Heating: 422 K (heated) and 298 K (ambient).
- Feed Type: Wet (coal-water slurry) and dry (N_2 carrier gas).
- System Pressure: 18 atm, 30 atm, and 70 atm.
- Gasifier Geometry: L/D ratios of 1, 2, and 3.

Performance metrics included carbon conversion, syngas composition, HHV, and cold-gas efficiency.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Parametric Analysis

Particle Size

Smaller particle sizes improved performance:

- Carbon Conversion: Increased from 95.6% (60 μm) to 97.9% (30 μm).
- Cold-Gas Efficiency: Dropped by ~2% as particle size increased, emphasizing the trade-off between efficiency and feed preparation costs.

Slurry Pre-Heating

Pre-heating significantly enhanced performance:

- Increased carbon conversion by ~1% and cold-gas efficiency by ~1.1%.
- Marginal improvement in syngas HHV, indicating more efficient thermal energy utilization.

Feed Type

- Dry Feed: Improved syngas HHV by ~11% due to higher CO concentrations.
- Wet Feed: Better cold-gas efficiency due to greater syngas mass flow but lower heating values due to moisture content.

System Pressure

Higher pressures (up to 70 atm):

- Carbon Conversion: Near-complete at 70 atm.
- Syngas HHV: Increased by ~4%, attributed to extended residence times and reduced gas velocity.

Gasifier Length

Longer gasifiers significantly enhanced performance:

- $L/D = 3$ achieved 99.3% carbon conversion and ~2.6% improvement in cold-gas efficiency.
- Shorter configurations ($L/D = 1$) demonstrated reduced performance, highlighting the need for adequate residence time.

4. COMPARATIVE KINETICS ANALYSIS

Baseline vs. Alternative Kinetics

Using slower kinetics resulted in:

- Carbon conversion dropping to ~85% compared to ~97% for baseline parameters.
- HHV and cold-gas efficiency reduced by ~20%, underscoring the critical role of accurate kinetic models.

Fuel Switching

Simulations with Illinois #6, Petcoke, and PRB coals showed:

- Petcoke: Produced syngas with the highest HHV but reduced cold-gas efficiency.
- PRB: Exhibited the lowest carbon conversion and syngas quality.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. Particle Size: Smaller sizes improve carbon conversion but at higher preparation costs.
2. Pre-Heating: Enhances thermal efficiency, enabling better gasifier performance.
3. System Pressure: Higher pressures optimize carbon conversion but require robust designs to manage operational stresses.
4. Kinetics and Fuel Types: Accurate kinetics are crucial for reliable predictions; fuel flexibility supports cost-effective operations.
5. Gasifier Geometry: Longer gasifiers enable superior performance through extended residence times.

6. FUTURE WORK

- Validation: Experimental studies for slugging behavior and advanced kinetics.
- Co-Gasification: Investigate mixed feedstocks to improve flexibility.
- System Integration: Incorporate downstream equipment modeling for holistic analyses.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] Anthony, D.B., & Howard, J.B. (1976). Coal devolatilization and hydrogasification. *AIChE Journal*, 22, 625-656.
- [2] Arendt, P., & van Heek, K.H. (1981). Comparative investigations of coal pyrolysis under inert gas and H₂ at low and high heating rates and pressures up to 10 MPa. *Fuel*, 60, 779-787.
- [3] Banin et al. (1997). *Combustion and Flame*, 108, 1-8.
- [4] Beath, A.C. (1996). Mathematical modeling of entrained flow gasification (PhD thesis). University of Newcastle, Australia.
- [5] Benfell, K.E., Liu, G.-S., Roberts, D.G., Harris, D.J., Lucas, J.A., Bailey, J.D., & Wall, T.F.

- (2000). *Proceedings of the Combustion Institute*, 28, 2233-2241.
- [6] Benyon, P., Inumaru, J., Otake, M., Hara, S., Watanabe, H., & Kent, J. (2000). Engineering Modelling of High Pressure and Temperature Entrained-Flow Gasifiers. *Japan-Australia Joint Technical Meeting on Coal*, December 5-6, Fukuoka, Japan.
- [7] Benyon, P.J. (2002). Computational modeling of entrained flow slagging gasifiers (PhD thesis). University of Sydney, Australia.
- [8] Bockelie, M.J., Adams, B.R., Cremer, M.A., Davis, K.A., Eddings, E.G., Valentine, J.R., Smith, P.J., & Heap, M.P. (1998). Computational simulations of industrial furnaces. *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Computational Technologies for Fluid/Chemical Systems with Industrial Applications*, Joint ASME/JSME Conference, San Diego, CA.
- [9] Bockelie, M.J., Swensen, D.A., Denison, M.K., & Sarofim, A.F. (2001, November 6-7). A Computational Workbench Environment For Virtual Power Plant Simulation. Presented at the Vision 21 Program Review Conference, Morgantown, WV.
- [10] Bockelie, M.J., Swensen, D.A., Denison, M.K., Chen, Z., Senior, C.L., & Sarofim, A.F. (2002, March 4-7). A Computational Workbench Environment for Virtual Power Plant Simulation. *Proceedings of the 27th International Technical Conference on Coal Utilization and Fuel Systems*, Clearwater, FL, USA.
- [11] Bockelie, M.J., Swensen, D.A., Denison, M.K., Chen, Z., Senior, C.L., & Sarofim, A.F. (2002, June 24-27). A Computational Workbench Environment for Virtual Simulation of a Vision 21 Energyplex. *Proceedings of the ASME International Joint Power Generation Conference 2002*, Phoenix, AZ, USA.
- [12] CCSD. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.newcastle.edu.au/research/centres/blackcoal.html>
- [13] Chen, C., Miyoshi, T., Kamiya, H., Horio, M., & Kojima, T. (1999). On the Scaling-up of a Two-Stage Air Blown Entrained Flow Coal Gasifier. *The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 77, 745-750.
- [14] Chen, C., Horio, M., & Kojima, T. (2000). Numerical Simulation of Entrained Flow Coal Gasifiers. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 55, 3861-3883.
- [15] De Nevers, N. (2000). *Air Pollution Control Engineering* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill, New York. Chapter 9.
- [16] DOE-NETL. (1998, July). *Texaco Gasifier IGCC Base Cases* (PED-IGCC-98-001). Latest Revision, June 2000a.
- [17] DOE-NETL. (1998, September). *DESTEC Gasifier IGCC Base Cases* (PED-IGCC-98-003). Latest Revision, June 2000b.
- [18] Fletcher, T.H., Kerstein, A.R., Pugmire, R.J., & Grant, D.M. (1990). *Energy & Fuels*, 4, 54.
- [19] Gibbins, J.R., & Kandiyoti, R. (1989). The effect of variations in time-temperature history on product distribution from coal pyrolysis. *Fuel*, 68, 895-903.
- [20] Griffin, T.P., Howard, J.B., & Peters, W.A. (1994). Pressure and temperature effects in bituminous coal pyrolysis: experimental observations and a transient lumped-parameter model. *Fuel*, 73, 591-601.
- [21] Harris, D.J., Kelly, M.D., Roberts, D.G., Mill, C.J., Stubbington, J.F., & Wall, T.F. (2002). Determining coal reactivity parameters at elevated pressures using bench-scale techniques.
- [22] Harris, D.J., & Smith, I.W. (1990). *Proceedings of the Combustion Institute*, 23, 1185-1190.
- [23] Holt, N. (2001a, March). *Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle Power Plants* (unpublished manuscript).
- [24] Holt, N. (2001b, October 8-10). Coal Gasification Research, Development and Demonstration – Needs and Opportunities. Presented at the Gasification Technologies 2001 Conference, San Francisco, CA.
- [25] Hornick, M. (2002, March 4-7). Polk Power Station IGCC. *Proceedings of the 27th International Technical Conference on Coal Utilization and Fuel Systems*, Clearwater, FL, USA.
- [26] Hoy, H.R., Roberts, A.G., & Wilkins, D.M. (1965). Behavior of mineral matter in slagging gasification processes. *J. Inst. Gas Engrs*, 5, 444.
- [27] Hurt, R., Sun, J-K., & Lunden, M. (1998). *Combustion and Flame*, 113, 181.
- [28] IEA. (2000, December). Modeling and Simulation for Coal Gasification. *IEA Coal Research*, ISBN 92-9029-354-3.

[29] Joutsenoja et al. (1999). *Energy and Fuels*, 13, 130-145.

[30] Kobayashi, H., Howard, J.B., & Sarofim, A.F. (1976). Coal devolatilization at high temperatures. *6th Symposium (Int) on Combustion*, The Combustion Institute, 411-425.

[31] Kunii, D., & Levenspiel, O. (1969). *Fluidization Engineering*. John Wiley and Sons Inc., pp. 698-699.

[32] Liu, G., Benyon, P., Benfell, K.E., Bryant, G.W., Tate, A.G., Boyd, R.K., Harris, D.J., & Wall, T.F. (2000). *Fuel*, 79, 617-626.

[33] Lupa & Kliesch. (1979). Simulation of a Texaco Gasifier, Vol.1 A Steady State Model. *EPRF Report AF-1179, Vol. 1 Research Project 1037-1*. Final Report.

[34] Monson et al. (1995). *Combustion and Flame*, 100, 669-683.

[35] Niksa, S., & Kerstein, A.R. (1991). FLASHCHAIN theory for rapid coal devolatilization kinetics 1. Formulation. *Energy & Fuels*, 5, 673-683.

[36] NRC. (1995). *Coal - Energy for the Future*. National Academy Press, Washington, DC.

[37] Okumura, Y., Sugiyama, Y., & Okazaki, K. (2001). Evolution behavior of coal-nitrogen in high pressure pyrolysis processes. *Fuel Chemistry Division Preprints*, 46, 141-143.

[38] Otake et al. (2001). *The 26th International Conference on Coal Utilization and Fuel Systems*, Clearwater, FL.

[39] Patterson, J.H., Hurst, H.J., Quintanar, A., Boyd, B.K., & Tran, H. (2001, May). Evaluation of the slag flow characterization of Australian coals in slagging gasifiers. *Research Report 19, Volume 1*. Cooperative Research Centre for Black Coal Utilization, University of Newcastle, Australia.

[40] REI_Models. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.reaction-eng.com>

[41] Roberts, D.G., & Harris, D.J. (2000). Char gasification with O₂, CO₂, and H₂O: Effects of pressure on intrinsic reaction kinetics. *Energy & Fuels*, 14, 483-489.

[42] Roberts, D.G., Harris, D.J., & Wall, T.F. (2001, December 3-7). High-Pressure Intrinsic Char Gasification Kinetics: an application of a modified nth-order rate equation. *The 18th Pittsburgh Coal Conference*, Newcastle, Australia.

[43] Rodgers, M.W. (1979).

Message Copilot

Appendices

Appendix A: Data Tables

Table A1: Particle Size Variations

Particle Size (µm)	Carbon Conversion (%)	HHV of Syngas (KJ/Kg)	Cold-Gas Efficiency (%)
30	97.9	9719.8	76.0
40	97.1	9628.2	75.1
60	95.6	9440.0	73.2

Table A2: Effect of Slurry Pre-Heating

Temperature (K)	Carbon Conversion (%)	HHV of Syngas (KJ/Kg)	Cold-Gas Efficiency (%)
422	97.1	9628.2	75.1
298	96.3	9520.08	74.0

Appendix B: Graphical Representations

1. Figure B1: Carbon Conversion vs. Particle Size.
2. Figure B2: Syngas HHV vs. System Pressure.
3. Figure B3: Cold-Gas Efficiency vs. Gasifier Length.

Appendix C: Gasifier Geometry

1. Single-Stage Gasifier: L/D ratio = 2, single injector at the top center.
2. Two-Stage Gasifier: Tangential and opposed injectors, L/D ratio = 11.