

### Exponent

# Performance comparison between co-current and counter-flow ACC tubes

Bill Davies, PhD, PE

Oct 13, 2021

### Outline

- Background and motivation
- Visualization of liquid flow
  - Co-current
  - Counter-flow
- Cooling performance
  - Co-Current
  - Counter-Flow
    - Effect of Flooding
- Pressure drop
- Summary



### Introduction



# Background

### • A-frame forced-draft condensers with flattened steel tubes



### • Are liquid flow patterns similar?

• Are cooling capacities equivalent?

### Experimental pressures: 52-108 kPa [7.5-15.7 psi]



# Visualization



# Co-Current: Visualization along Length of Tube (10.7 m)



ACCUG 2021 6



### Half tube inlet w/ flanges (no PC window)





# Flow Pattern Observed while Varying Tube Inclination











# $q'' = 12 \text{ kW m}^{-2}$

Exponent

### Co-Current Tube: $\varphi = 75^{\circ}$





# 5.7 m Tubes: Co-Current and Counterflow







### 5.7 m Tubes: Co-Current and Counter-Flow







![](_page_10_Picture_5.jpeg)

# Co-Current Tube: $\varphi = 2^{\circ}$

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

indicates annular flow at inlet will quickly become stratified:

![](_page_11_Picture_5.jpeg)

Bravity

![](_page_11_Picture_6.jpeg)

### Counter-Flow Tube: Stratified Flow at Condensate Outlet, $\varphi = 5^{\circ}$

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Counter-Flow Tube, $\varphi = 20^{\circ}$

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

# - Thin liquid film

### Counter-Flow Tube, $\varphi = 5^{\circ}$

• Film depth increases slightly – onset of 'flooding'

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_4.jpeg)

### Counter-Flow Tube, $\varphi = 1.5^{\circ}$

• Film depth increases due to 'flooding'

![](_page_15_Figure_2.jpeg)

View A-A

# **Stratified** condensate

### Counter-Flow Tube, $\phi = 0.5^{\circ}$

• Thicker layer of condensate due to 'flooding'

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_4.jpeg)

# Counter-Flow: Onset of Flooding

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

P = 90 kPa (13 psi) $v_{si} = 8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  (26 fps)  $v_a = 2.5 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ 

### $\phi = 0.5^{\circ}$

Exponent

# Condensate Depth

• Condensate depth is equivalent for co-current and counter-flow condensation

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_5.jpeg)

### Comparison of Forces on Condensate: $\varphi = 3^{\circ}$

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_4.jpeg)

# **Cooling Performance Comparison**

![](_page_21_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_0.jpeg)

Exponent

### Temperature Profile Measured in Air- and Water-Cooled Sections

- Water-cooled section to measure local cooling performance
- Equal heat flux in air- and water-cooled sections Air-Cooled Section

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

Demonstration of thermocouple insertion

![](_page_23_Picture_5.jpeg)

Thermocouple bead covered by epoxy and aluminum tape

![](_page_23_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_8.jpeg)

Fins returned to original shape after assembly Thermocouple wires

### Water-Cooled Section

![](_page_23_Picture_12.jpeg)

### Co-Current: Heat Flux Greatest at Tube Bottom

- $\Delta T$ , q" greatest at bottom of tube
- $q''_{bottom} = 11 \times q''_{top}$

![](_page_24_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_6.jpeg)

Capacity Depends on HTCs, HTCa, ∆Ta-s

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Exponent

![](_page_25_Picture_4.jpeg)

### **Counter-Flow: Heat Flux Greatest at Tube Bottom**

•  $\Delta T$ , q" similar to co-current

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_6.jpeg)

### Equal Capacity in Co-Current and Counter-Flow Tubes

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

Exponent

# Flooding of Counterflow Tubes Reduces Capacity

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

# Flooding of Counterflow Tubes Reduces Capacity

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

Exponent

# Flooding Reduces Capacity due to Condensate Accumulation

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Pressure Drop Comparison

- Co-current
  - Total pressure drop decreases as inclination increases due to:
    - Increase in gravitational pressure ( $\Delta Pg$ ) recovery
    - Decrease in frictional pressure drop  $(\Delta P_f)$
- Counter-flow
  - Total pressure drop constant as inclination increases due to
    - Increase in gravitational pressure drop  $(\Delta Pg)$

![](_page_32_Figure_8.jpeg)

Counter-Flow

### Co-Current

### Exponent<sup>®</sup>

### Summary

- Co-current and counter-flow tubes have similar flow patterns and condensate accumulation
- Co-current and counter-flow tubes have equivalent capacities at typical inclination angles
  - Flooding reduces capacity in counter-flow tubes at low inclinations
- Co-current and counter-flow tubes have highest heat transfer at the air inlet (bottom of tube cross-section)
- Pressure Drop
  - Co-Current pressure drop decreases as tube inclination increases
  - Counter-Flow pressure drop increases as tube inclination increases

![](_page_33_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Questions? wdavies@exponent.com

![](_page_34_Picture_3.jpeg)