# Non Catalytic NO<sub>x</sub> Removal from Gas Turbine Exhaust with Cyanuric Acid in a Recirculating Reactor

Michael Streichsbier and Robert W. Dibble

Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of California at Berkeley

Berkeley, California 94720, USA

**Robert A. Perry** 

Technor, Inc., Livermore, California 94550, USA

#### Abstract

A novel technique to remove oxides of nitrogen  $(NO_x)$  from stationary gas turbine exhaust has been investigated. The technique employs the use of cyanuric acid (CYA), a non-toxic, dry powder, combined with the injection of auxiliary turbine fuel and recirculation. Recirculation minimizes the auxiliary fuel consumption, reduces residence time and reactor size and enhances NO removal chemistry. This selective non-catalytic method is decoupled from the combustion source and could also be applied to other exhaust gas producers.

Exhaust gases, generated by a 150 kW gas turbine, are treated in an insulated recirculation reactor, with a mean residence time of 0.65 to 0.71 seconds and a pressure drop of 660 Pa. In the reactor, autoignition of injected auxiliary gas turbine fuel raises the flue gas temperature to an operating temperature of 700 to 800°C. The auxiliary fuel increases the overall system fuel consumption by 14 to 30%.

Temperature rise and  $NO_x$  reduction occur simultaneously, which reduces residence time. At all temperatures, significant  $NO_x$  reduction from initial concentrations of 106 to 124 ppm to as low

reactor temperature and increasing CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio. Load following has been achieved. The process generates  $N_2O$  emissions, which vary from 45 to 163 ppm, increasing with increasing CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio. These high emissions are a process concern since  $N_2O$  is a stable strong greenhouse gas.

The performance of CYA ((HNCO)<sub>3</sub>) is compared to that of ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) and urea ((NH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>CO). When injected under the same conditions as CYA, NH<sub>3</sub> is entirely consumed and forms NO<sub>x</sub>. Urea exhibits hybrid behavior, combining the characteristics of NH<sub>3</sub> and CYA. At a reactor temperature of 800°C, NO<sub>x</sub> concentration increases while 20% NO<sub>x</sub> reduction is achieved at 715°C. No significant N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are detected with NH<sub>3</sub>, while urea yields 17 to 83 ppm N<sub>2</sub>O, increasing with urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio.

A numerical model, which combines a detailed chemical kinetic mechanism with recirculation, has been developed. It describes hydrocarbon autoignition and concurrent  $NO_x$  removal in an ideal, adiabatic environment. The model captures all observed trends well and is an invaluable guide to improved understanding of the interactive  $NO_x$  removal process.

While excellent qualitative agreement is achieved, disparities in absolute values of  $NO_x$  reduction, N<sub>2</sub>O formation and autoignition times exist. Autoignition delay discrepancies might be reconciled with the advent of more complete chemical kinetic hydrocarbon mechanisms. N<sub>2</sub>O formation and NO<sub>x</sub> reduction disparities are assumed to stem from the incomplete model for decomposition of CYA.

Future results from this work are expected to improve process efficiency, reduce observed  $N_2O$  emissions and to be of practical significance for the application to stationary gas turbines of as much as 20 MW capacity.

## Introduction

In recent years public concern about air pollution and its side effects have resulted in a variety of regulations and standards (e.g. 1990 Clean Air Act) limiting pollutant concentrations in exhaust produced by combustion processes. Particular attention has been given to NO<sub>x</sub>, the oxides of

nitrogen.  $NO_x$  play an important role in photochemical smog, acid rain and in the stratospheric ozone chemistry [1]. Consequently various methods have been introduced in order to reduce the amount of  $NO_x$  emitted.

In general one can distinguish between pre-combustion fuel treatment, combustion modification and post-combustion exhaust gas treatment. Fuel treatment has led to cleaner, reformulated fuels eliminating the problem of fuel bound nitrogen. Combustion modification attacks the production of thermal  $NO_x$  generally by lowering the peak temperature inside the engine or burner. Among the post combustion techniques a distinction is made between catalytic and non catalytic processes.

An example of a catalytic exhaust gas treatment is the catalyst used in the exhaust of a spark ignited modern automotive engine. In it NO<sub>x</sub> is reduced and CO oxidized as long as stoichiometric conditions ( $\Phi \approx 1$ ) exist. Selective catalytic processes do not have this requirement and employ a catalytic converter in combination with a process reagent, generally ammonia, to reduce nitrogen oxides [2]. Under overall lean conditions such as in the flue gas stream of a gas turbine or a Diesel engine selective non catalytic reduction (SNCR) techniques are often preferred. These methods rely on gas phase reactions to selectively reduce NO<sub>x</sub> with a process reagent. Currently three main process reagents are used: Ammonia [3], Urea [4] and Cyanuric acid (CYA) [5]. They are similar in requiring a minimum temperature (800 to 1400 K), necessary to obtain a sufficient concentration of specific radicals which initiate the desired chain of reactions but differ in the corresponding reaction path. Beyond a certain maximum temperature NO<sub>x</sub> is produced by oxidation of the process reagent. Their efficiency varies with exhaust gas composition and the addition of hydrocarbons. CYA for example has been found to become more efficient in reducing NO with high O<sub>2</sub> and CO concentrations in the exhaust gases while for NH<sub>3</sub> the opposite is true [6]. Urea is essentially a mixture of both.

The drawbacks of these processes find their origin in the temperature requirement. Exhaust gases generally have to be heated up, which leads to potential energy losses and can limit the ability to follow load. In addition concerns about reagent slip and  $N_2O$  formation [7] exist.  $N_2O$  is considered a strong greenhouse gas and is believed to play a role in stratospheric ozone chemistry.

The object of this research is to explore the applicability of a SNCR post combustion treatment process using CYA as process reagent to the exhaust gases produced by a stationary gas turbine.

# **Process description**

The process reagent CYA (HNCO<sub>3</sub>) is a non toxic solid and can be used where the presence of a hazardous substance such as ammonia cannot be tolerated (i.e. on an oil platform or in certain residential areas). In this process CYA is administered directly into the gas turbine exhaust as a water based slurry. CYA sublimes at approximately 330°C and cracks upon further heating to HNCO. The NO removal chemistry is described by :

 $HNCO + OH \Rightarrow NCO + H_2O$  $NCO + NO \Rightarrow N_2 + CO_2$  $NCO + NO \Rightarrow N_2O + CO$ 

Peak stationary gas turbine exhaust temperatures range between approximately 550°C and 650°C. Previous work with CYA on Diesel engines [8] showed high NO<sub>x</sub> reduction at an operating temperature of 700-800°C. The necessary temperature boost to this range is achieved here by autoignition of fuel injected into the exhaust gases. The point of injection is next to that of the process reagent. Recirculation provides mixing of hot combustion products with the incoming cooler, less reactive, stream. The subsequent temperature rise combined with the increased concentration of radicals triggers the combustion of the mixture to so establish a stable reaction zone and enhance the concurrent NO<sub>x</sub> reduction chemistry. Achieving temperature rise and NO<sub>x</sub> reduction simultaneously has the advantage of minimizing residence time and reactor size.

Typically a variety of bluff bodies or vanes are used to induce recirculation. The immersion of such objects in the flow introduces a pressure drop. Since any applied back pressure constitutes an additional load on a gas turbine and therefore reduces its efficiency recirculation was here achieved by manipulating the flow geometry while minimizing the corresponding restriction.

# **Numerical Modeling**

The model used in this study assumes all mixing processes to be ideal such that they can be represented by a combination of perfectly stirred and plug flow reactors (PSR and PFR). This

simplification allows for the use of detailed chemical kinetic mechanisms. Since the oxidation chemistry of higher order hydrocarbons ( > C3 ) is not as well understood a mechanism based on Westbrook and Pitz [9] for propane and propene oxidation was used to model the reheating process (i.e. the addition of turbine fuel). A mechanism by Miller and Perry [10] modeled the CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> as HNCO/NO<sub>x</sub> chemistry. In combination a total of 69 species and 311 elementary reactions were considered.

To explore the effect of recirculation on the autoignition process a combination of PSR and PFR with a back mixing option was developed. The so called PSRPFRX algorithm is schematized in Figure 1.



**Figure 1:** Schematic of the PSRPFRX Algorithm. A part of the output from the combination of PSR and PFR is injected into the PSR alongside of the incoming stream.

In the PSR incoming flue gases are mixed with gases coming out of the plug flow reactor according to a variable ratio X. Residence times in the PSR are short (1-3 ms). Most of the chemistry therefore occurs in the PFR. Initial conditions for the back mixed component can be input. This allows simulation of cold ignition as well as extinction of a hot, burning process. The program iterates until a steady state is obtained. Results from these calculations can be used to determine the theoretical minimum residence time inside of a reactor to induce autoignition or once ignited, to operate at steady state. This is demonstrated in Figure 2.



**Figure2:** Ignition and Extinction Behavior of a Recirculating Reactor at 30% Recirculation and a Final Temperature of 1050 K.

In Figure 2 the recirculation ratio is held constant at 30% while intake temperature is varied. The initial exhaust gas contains 15% O<sub>2</sub>, 3.6% H<sub>2</sub>O, 4% CO<sub>2</sub> and 200 ppm CO with the remainder being nitrogen. The amount of propane added varied from case to case to reach the same final temperature of approximately 1050 K. The corresponding equivalence ratios were 0.047 for 850 K, 0.055 and 0.061 for 875 K and 900 K respectively. Ignition residence times are larger for lower temperatures and are shorter at higher temperatures ranging from 11 seconds at 850 K to 4.4 seconds at 900 K. The size of the obtained ignition extinction hysteresis plots are found to increase with decreasing intake temperature. At 900 K the time difference between ignition and extinction is about 0.2 seconds while at 850 K almost 2.5 seconds are recorded. This sensitivity of propane oxidation to temperature in this range under the given conditions emphasizes the need for recirculation in any practical system.



Figure 3: Schematic of the Experimental Setup (top view)

An experimental apparatus has been built, using a 150 kW rated gas turbine (~800 kW thermal) as an exhaust gas producer. This turbine operates on a variety of liquid fuels at constant speed. A controllable load is applied by a dynamometer. Flue gas temperature and composition are varied up to a maximum of 640°C at approximately 15% O<sub>2</sub>. The exhaust gases are treated in an internally insulated recirculating reactor with a mean residence time of 0.75 seconds variable up to 2 seconds at an operating temperature of 750°C. Autoignition of additionally injected gas turbine



Figure 4: Schematic of the Reaction Chamber (side view)

fuel boosts the flue gas temperature to the desired range. CYA is injected as a slurry with a rotating or an air assisted injector both designed particularly to accommodate a wide range of feed rates reliably. Control mechanisms are being employed to allow load following and  $NO_x$  content based variation of these injection rates. Both CYA and the additional fuel are injected directly into the exhaust gas stream as it leaves the turbine and mixed in the highly turbulent flow through a 30 cm pipe connecting the engine to the reactor. Operating temperatures in this recirculating reactor are controlled between 700 and 800°C.  $NO_x$  content is varied to match emissions from commonly used gas turbines.

In addition to numerical simulation a scale water model has been used to optimize recirculation, mixing and reduce the associated maximum pressure drop across the reactor to 660 Pa. The reaction chamber contains movable ceramic partitions which allow changing of flow geometry and residence time. Thermocouples, pressure tabs as well as a water cooled suction probe are inserted though the insulated walls. See Figures 3 and 4.

Gas analysis is performed with UHC (flame ionization), an  $O_2$  (magneto pneumatic), a set of infrared CO and CO<sub>2</sub> as well as chemiluminescent NO<sub>x</sub> analyzer. The sample stream is filtered and dried in the gas phase. All lines, filters and the sample pump are heated to avoid condensation of water. The determination of N<sub>2</sub>O is carried out using samples drawn through a NaOH solution to scrub out any SO<sub>x</sub> and a gas chromatograph with an electron capture detector [11], [12].

There are various techniques available to perform an  $NH_3$  or HNCO analysis. Here a wet chemical approach is chosen using an  $NH_3$  electrode [13]. With it a minimum concentration of approximately 5 - 10 ppm of HNCO in the flue gas stream can be detected depending on the amount of gas sampled.

With the exception of HNCO and  $N_2O$  all temperature and gas composition data are collected at a 1 Hz frequency. Steady state operating conditions at 'full' load can be summarized as follows :

| Turbine Engine:     |                               |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Load                | 90 kW +/- 1 kW                |
| Intake temperature  | 18 – 32°C                     |
| Exhaust temperature | 600 – 630°C                   |
| Fuel consumption    | 1.11 – 1.25 kg/min            |
| Air flow rate       | 0.97 – 1.08 kg/sec (constant) |
|                     |                               |

| Reaction chamber at steady state full load conditions: |                 |  |
|--|-----------------|--|
| Pressure loss  | 660 Pa          |  |
| Mean final reactor temperature                         | 700 – 780°C     |  |
| Auxiliary fuel consumption                             | 150 – 320 g/min |  |
| Residence time in recirculating zone                   | 0.65 - 0.71 sec |  |

| Gas composition       |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
|                       | before reactor                          | after reactor                           |
| <b>O</b> <sub>2</sub> | 15%                                     | 13.4 – 14.7%                            |
| CO <sub>2</sub>       | 3.74 - 4.0%                             | 4.2 – 5.2%                              |
| СО                    | 380 ppm                                 | 30 – 150 ppm (T > 700°C)                |
| NO <sub>x</sub>       | 18 – 23 ppm (@15% O <sub>2</sub> , dry) | 20 – 34 ppm (@15% O <sub>2</sub> , dry) |
| НС                    | 60 -70 ppm                              | < 15 ppm                                |

**Table 1:** Average Turbine and Reactor Operating Conditions (without NO Doping)

# **Discussion of Experimental and Numerical Results**

#### **Reactor Operation**

The reactor temperature was found to be controllable at a mean residence time of 750 ms at full load. The amount of recirculation was determined in a scale water model to be approximately 30%. The desired temperature boost (to 700 to 800°C) was obtained at loads of 50% to 100% resulting in turbine exhaust temperatures of 440°C and 640°C respectively. These observations are in contrast to the predictions of the model for 30% recirculation (Figure 2). Even in the best case the model over predicts minimum residence times by a factor of 5. Besides that, trends seen in the numerical study were verified experimentally. At a load of 30% and a temperature of less than 410°C reactor extinction was observed. The discrepancy between the residence times predicted and observed might find its origin in the simplifications used in the model and the fact that the set of elementary reactions is a comprehensive oxidation mechanism and not necessarily expected to properly predict autoignition at extremely low equivalence ratios of close to 0.05 as in this study. Considering that modeling autoignition itself is difficult the numerical results are reasonable.

Under full load steady state conditions were reached in a matter of minutes. With the decay of thermal transients fuel flow was kept constant thereby controlling the reactor temperature. At

steady state operation CO and unburned HC emissions were found to be reduced from 380 ppm and 70 ppm in the turbine exhaust to between 30 and 120 ppm and less than 4 ppm respectively.



**Figure 5:** Comparison of Experimental and Theoretical Additional Fuel Consumption. The theoretical values were obtained with exhaust gas composition similar to the experiment and an entry temperature of 600  $^{\circ}$ C at adiabatic conditions.

One of the process concerns is the necessity of fuel addition. The numerical model assumes adiabatic conditions and any auxiliary fuel input therefore produces ideal final reactor temperatures. In the experiment, fuel was added such, that the desired process temperature was reached. Figure 5 compares the theoretical, ideal values with those obtained when operating the reactor. Reactor inlet temperature in the model is 600°C, which corresponds to the average inlet temperature observed in the experiments. Under ideal circumstances, i.e. no heat loss, the model predicts between 15.5 and 29% additional fuel injection to heat an exhaust gas stream with an initial temperature of 600°C, to a process temperature of 700 to 791°C, respectively.

In the experiment the auxiliary fuel needed to increase the reactor temperature to 700 to 800°C was 16 to 30% of the turbine fuel consumption. At final temperatures of 740 to 750°C, 5 to 7% more auxiliary fuel is consumed than in the model. With the large surface area of the reactor and an outside surface temperature of 40 to 80°C heat losses of this order are expected. With an overall limited heat loss of 5 to 7%, approximately adiabatic conditions can be claimed.

#### NO<sub>x</sub> Removal with CYA

When comparing experimental and numerical  $NO_x$  reduction with cyanuric acid, the assumption that the thermal decomposition of CYA yields three molecules of isocyanic acid, HNCO, is used. An experimental CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of unity, for example, is compared to a numerical HNCO/NO ratio of 3. In Figure 6, NO<sub>x</sub> concentration versus temperature and reagent/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio are shown. Experimental and numerical curves for constant reagent addition, are similar in shape but shifted.



**Figure 6:** Comparison of Experimental and Numerical  $NO_x$  Reduction with CYA. The solid lines are numerical values while the broken lines represent experimental results. Experimental and numerical reagent/ $NO_x$  ratios are indicated on the left and right respectively.

The NO<sub>x</sub> removal process improves with decreasing temperature and increasing CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio. In the experiment a minimum of 34 ppm NO<sub>x</sub> was observed. This minimum NO<sub>x</sub> concentration corresponds to 71% reduction. Lowest efficiency was observed at a ratio of CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> = 0.95 resulting in a NO<sub>x</sub> concentration of 80 ppm, which equals 32% reduction. In all cases the initial NO<sub>x</sub> concentration was 117 ppm +/- 2 ppm, and all concentrations are adjusted to 15% O<sub>2</sub>.

The experimental  $NO_x$  concentrations are in every case higher than the numerical values, corresponding to an over prediction of  $NO_x$  reduction by 21 to 27%. Besides this obvious

disparity in absolute NO<sub>x</sub> values, the general agreement between the modeled and observed trends is good. Increasing NO<sub>x</sub> removal with increasing reagent injection and the temperature dependence is properly modeled. The model captures the apparent maximum in NO<sub>x</sub> reduction at 740°C for a CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 0.73 (which corresponds to a numerical HNCO/NO ratio of 2.2). The relative differences between the resulting NO<sub>x</sub> concentration at changed temperature and reagent/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio are similarly replicated.



**Figure 7:**  $NO_x$  Removal at Fixed Temperature versus CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> Ratio. Experiments were performed at an average temperature of 750 °C at 100% turbine load.

Figure 7 shows final NO<sub>x</sub> concentration versus CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio at a fixed average temperature of 736 to 750°C. In the experiment NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations decreased with increasing CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio to a minimum of 18 ppm at a CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 1.14 and a temperature of 736°C. The other plotted values were observed at a slightly higher temperature of 750°C. Although numerically obtained NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations are approximately 10 to 20 ppm lower, corresponding to an over prediction in NO<sub>x</sub> removal of 8 to 21%, experimentally observed trends are replicated well by the model. The rate of numerical NO<sub>x</sub> concentration decrease, with respect to CYA/NO<sub>x</sub>, ratio properly matches the experimental observations.

Investigation of the effect of reactor inlet (= turbine exit) temperature on the NO<sub>x</sub> reduction chemistry is central to the issue of turbine load following. The final NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations, obtained by experimental and numerical variation of reactor inlet temperatures, are contrasted in Figure 8. The lowest experimental NO<sub>x</sub> emission of 26 ppm was found at maximum load and the highest CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 1.06. The process efficiency decreases with decreasing intake temperatures. Such a behavior can be explained with less efficient CYA sublimation and cracking to HNCO at lower temperatures.



**Figure 8:**  $NO_x$  Concentration versus Turbine Load; Numerical and Experimental Values. Final reactor temperature remained fixed at 760 °C (+/- 10 °C), while the intake temperature varied with turbine load. A load of 50 and 100% corresponds to 440 °C and 610 °C respectively.

The numerical values are based on initial experimental conditions, such as exhaust gas composition and temperature measured at 50 and 100% turbine load. The numerical differences in NO<sub>x</sub> reduction between initial conditions generated by 50 and 100% load are of the order of 5 to 15%. Experimentally, a much larger discrepancy is observed. The model predicts better than 50 to 90% NO<sub>x</sub> reduction with a CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 0.33 to 1.0, respectively. Similarly to the previous results, the model agrees well with the overall behavior but does not reproduce the exact

 $NO_x$  concentration values. A difference of as much as 47% at the lowest CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio and 20% at the highest CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio, at 100% load, is seen.

#### N<sub>2</sub>O Formation and Reagent Slip

Within the limits of detection uncertainty, CYA (i.e. HNCO) slip was determined to be less than 10 ppm. Thus HNCO and  $NH_3$  slip is negligible in these experiments. In Figure 9, measured  $N_2O$  concentrations with respect to CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio are shown. All plotted values are adjusted to 15%  $O_2$ .



**Figure 9:** Experimental and Numerical  $N_2O$  Emissions versus CYA to  $NO_x$  Ratio. The reagent to NO ratio of the model is adjusted corresponding to CYA = 3 HNCO. Initial conditions such as temperature and exhaust gas composition, are similar.

A clear increase with increasing CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio can be seen. At a molar ratio of CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> = 0.33, 46.5 ppm of N<sub>2</sub>O are found while at a CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 1.08 as much as 166 ppm are observed. When the experimentally obtained N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations are compared to the modeled N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations, agreement between model and experiment is not as good. As shown in Figure 9, N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations deviate by as much as a factor of 3. As before, observed reactor

temperatures are input into the model, so that initial experimental conditions are simulated. The model only in part captures the trend of increasing N<sub>2</sub>O emissions with increasing CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio. Numerical N<sub>2</sub>O emissions appear to plateau at approximately 50 ppm independent of CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio, while the experimental values increase with reagent ratio. The maximum N<sub>2</sub>O concentration measured exceeds the initial NO<sub>x</sub> concentration in the turbine exhaust. Since N<sub>2</sub>O formation is primarily a byproduct of the NO reduction along the NCO + NO pathway, detected N<sub>2</sub>O cannot be a result of conversion of the initial NO concentration alone. Another pathway, to explain these emissions has to be active. Further evidence for the existence of a mechanism not considered by the model is provided by Figure 10. Measured concentrations of "N<sub>2</sub>O formed" versus "NO<sub>x</sub> reduced" are compared to the values determined by the numerical model.



Figure 10: Experimental and Numerical N<sub>2</sub>O Formed versus NO<sub>x</sub> Removed.

Experimental N<sub>2</sub>O emissions follow an approximate 1.5 to 1.0 ratio of "N<sub>2</sub>O formed" to "NO removed". In contrast, modeling results are clustered about a slope of 0.3 to 0.5. The needed CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratios, i.e. 3HNCO/NO<sub>x</sub> ratios, (of ~1), to achieve maximum reduction are significantly higher than the observed CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratios for gaseous isocyanic acid injection [14].

The assumption used by the model is 'perfect' thermal decomposition of cyanuric acid to three molecules of HNCO. The phenomena seen here might be explained by a possible mechanism, that reduces the effective conversion of cyanuric acid to isocyanic acid in a lean-burn environment [15].

$$(HNCO)_3 + OH \Rightarrow (HNCO)_2NCO + H_2O$$
(1)

$$(HNCO)_2NCO + O_2 \Rightarrow (HNCO)_2NCO(O_2) \text{ (Adduct)}$$
(2)

$$(HNCO)_2NCO(O_2) \quad (Adduct) \Rightarrow 2HNCO + NO + CO_2 \tag{3}$$

The proposed mechanism describes CYA decomposition starting with an H abstraction, to a product of NO and HNCO at a ratio of 1-to-2. This mechanism would predict the experimentally needed CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio (of  $\sim$ 1) to reduce NO and the high production of N<sub>2</sub>O when using slurry based CYA injection. To incorporate this alternative decomposition path into the model, additional chemical kinetic data and an associated branching ratio is required.

# In Comparison: Ammonia as a Process Reagent

The experimental use of NH<sub>3</sub> in the recirculating reactor led to a significant increase in NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations in the flue gases, while NH<sub>3</sub> slip was not detected. The observed NO<sub>x</sub> concentration increases are plotted in Figure 11. NH<sub>3</sub> addition to a turbine exhaust gas stream containing 118 ppm NO<sub>x</sub> (at 15% O<sub>2</sub>) at a NH<sub>3</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 1.5 resulted in a 50 ppm increase in NO<sub>x</sub> concentration. To further investigate the apparent thermal oxidation in the recirculation zone, NH<sub>3</sub> was added to the exhaust stream at a temperature range of 620 to 800°C. The formation of NO by NH<sub>3</sub> in the recirculating reactor appears to be weakly related to chamber temperature and to the amount of NH<sub>3</sub> added. Approximately 30% of the added NH<sub>3</sub> decomposed to form NO in a temperature range of 620 to 800°C. Under conditions of no auxiliary fuel consumption, a similar increase of NO<sub>x</sub> was found. This suggests that the oxidation process appears to continue even when no hydrocarbon radicals from the auxiliary fuel combustion are present. It can be concluded that NH<sub>3</sub> thermally decomposes, and, in part, oxidizes, with and without the presence of hydrocarbon radicals in the recirculating reactor.

The numerical model, also shown in Figure 11, replicates these experimental findings. In the PSRPFRX model,  $NH_3$  is entirely consumed and partially oxidized to NO, leading to an increased  $NO_x$  concentration.



**Figure 11:** Experimental and Numerical  $NO_x$  Increase due to Injection of  $NH_3$ . Solid lines represent numerical results while broken lines connect experimental values. The experimental conditions varied in initial  $NO_x$  concentration between 40 and 120 ppm  $NO_x$ ; the absolute increase was found to be solely a function of  $NH_3$  injection rate.

At an addition of 120 ppm of NH<sub>3</sub>, corresponding to a NH<sub>3</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 1, modeled and observed NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations are in very good agreement, with a maximum discrepancy of 15%. At 180 ppm NH<sub>3</sub> addition, or an NH<sub>3</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 1.5, NO<sub>x</sub> increase in the experiment reached a maximum of 55 ppm while the model predicts an 80 ppm increase. Predicted N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are in the single digit ppm range, which agrees with the experimental findings.

The model captures the salient features and properly describes the behavior of  $NH_3$  in a recirculating reactor, the results shows how the interaction with hydrocarbon decomposition can significantly change the performance characteristics of  $NH_3$  as an  $NO_x$  reduction agent.

It can be concluded that the developed model is a valuable tool to predict the behavior of  $NH_3$  when added under the given conditions into a recirculation zone and when used without the addition of fuel or recirculation.

#### In Comparison: Urea as Process Reagent

The performance of urea was tested at three reactor temperatures of 715, 755 and 800°C at 100% turbine load. While the reactor was kept at constant temperature, the amount of urea injection was varied. Injection rates are provided as a molar urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio.

Since it is assumed, that  $(NH_2)_2CO$  decomposes into two molecules, once heated, the effective ratio of reagent to NO<sub>x</sub>, here  $[NH_3 + HNCO]/[NO_x]$ , is simply double the given urea/NO<sub>x</sub> amount. The initial NO<sub>x</sub> concentration was held at 120 ppm (at 15% O<sub>2</sub>). Final NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are plotted in Figure 12. Urea addition was found to increase the NO<sub>x</sub> concentration at the highest test temperature of 800°C and decrease the total amount of NO<sub>x</sub> at both lower test temperatures. Both tendencies, increase and decrease, are increased with increasing urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio.

At a reactor temperature of 800°C, a NO<sub>x</sub> concentration of 133 ppm, was observed at a urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 1.34. The smallest NO<sub>x</sub> increase was recorded with a final NO<sub>x</sub> concentration of 124 ppm at urea/NO<sub>x</sub> = 0.415. At the intermediate temperature of 755°C a moderate, 8 to 19%, NO<sub>x</sub> reduction was observed. The reduction increased with urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio to reach a final NO<sub>x</sub> concentration of 97 ppm at a urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 1.59, corresponding to a 19.2% NO<sub>x</sub> reduction.

The numerical results of the model assuming 'perfect' decomposition of  $(NH_2)_2CO$  into  $NH_3$  and HNCO reproduced the experimental behavior of urea very well. In addition, the assumed decomposition of urea to HNCO and  $NH_3$  also explains the experimental observations. Urea appears to combine the characteristics of both decomposition products when used in the described environment. Moderate  $NO_x$  removal can be attributed to (1) the added NO formed by  $NH_3$  and (2) the simultaneous removal of  $NO_x$  by HNCO. The agreement between model and experiment with respect to the absolute values of  $NO_x$  concentration is good (Figure 12).  $NO_x$  values are under predicted by approximately 5%. The temperature dependence of the NO reduction with urea is in excellent agreement with the model.

The observed increase in  $NO_x$  concentration above 800°C as well as the decrease in  $NO_x$  concentration at 715°C, is replicated by the numerical model. Similarly well captured is the  $NO_x$  removal dependence on urea/ $NO_x$  ratio.



**Figure 12:**  $NO_x$  Concentration with Urea Injection versus Reagent Injection Ratio and Temperature. The lines connecting individual data are isotherms at the indicated temperature (in °C).

In Figure 12, experimental and numerical N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations are compared. In the experiment N<sub>2</sub>O emissions varied from 17 to 82 ppm, depending on reactor temperature and urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio. N<sub>2</sub>O concentration are observed to increase with decreasing temperature and increasing urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio in the investigated temperature range. The N<sub>2</sub>O formation is not as well predicted as the changes in NO<sub>x</sub> concentration, i.e. the model under predicts the experimental values by as much as 57%. The qualitative agreement is better at the higher temperature of 800°C. The numerical values differ from the experimental observations by 34 and 49%, only. At 715°C, the quantitative

difference between model and experiment varies from 57 to 27%. At both temperatures, the model correctly captures the trend of increasing  $N_2O$  emissions with increasing urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio.



**Figure 13:**  $N_2O$  Formation versus Urea Injection and Temperature. Lines connecting data are isotherms at the indicated temperature (in °C). Numerical initial conditions match the experiment.

# **Summary and Conclusions**

#### **Experiment**

A pilot scale operational test stand with an 800 kW thermal input gas turbine and an exhaust reaction chamber was built. At a steady state 100 % load of 90 kW, the turbine generated an average of 1.0 kg exhaust per second at a temperature of 600 to 640°C. The geometry inside the reaction chamber was optimized. The resulting reactor chamber produced approximately 30% recirculation at a pressure drop of 660 Pa. The recirculation provided a stable reaction zone where fuel injected into the exhaust stream, prior to entering the chamber, auto ignited. Autoignition and the associated heat release, allowed temperature control and load following, at intake

temperatures as low as 440°C, corresponding to 50% steady state load. The reactor operating temperature was varied between 700 and 800°C.

The required auxiliary fuel injection, at 100% steady state turbine load, increased the overall fuel consumption by 16 to 30% depending on intake temperature and target operating temperature. Once operating temperature was reached, unburned hydrocarbon and CO emissions, produced by the gas turbine, were significantly reduced from 70 to 4 ppm and 380 to 120 ppm, respectively.

The process reagent, primarily a water slurry of cyanuric acid, was added at the same location as the injected auxiliary fuel. Selective non catalytic reduction of  $NO_x$  from the exhaust gases, at operating temperatures as low as 700°C, was achieved in the recirculation zone of the reactor at 0.65 to 0.71 seconds residence time. Both processes, fuel oxidation with corresponding temperature rise and  $NO_x$  reduction, occurred simultaneously. A positive synergism between hydrocarbon oxidation and  $NO_x$  removal reactions with CYA was found lowering the typical operating temperature by as much as 200°C.

 $NO_x$  concentrations of 106 to 124 ppm in the turbine exhaust were reduced to as low as 18 ppm at 15%  $O_2$ . The  $NO_x$  reduction increased with decreasing reactor temperature and increasing CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio.

The level of nitrous oxide ( $N_2O$ ) produced in the reduction process was found to increase with increasing CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio resulting in values ranging from 46 ppm at a CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 0.33 to 166 ppm at a CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio of 1.06.  $N_2O$  emissions higher than the initial NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations were detected and found to increase with increasing CYA addition. The exacerbated formation of  $N_2O$  is attributed to incomplete decomposition of cyanuric acid when added in solid form.

Similar experiments with  $NH_3$  as process reagent and combined fuel injection showed  $NO_x$  formation rather than destruction. Under the given exhaust gas composition and recirculating conditions,  $NH_3$  was found to completely decompose. Neither  $NH_3$  nor increased amounts of  $N_2O$  were detected in the effluents.  $NO_x$  concentration increase suggested, that approximately 1/3 of the injected  $NH_3$  is converted to NO.

Urea exhibited hybrid behavior, combining the characteristics of  $NH_3$  and CYA. At the highest operating temperature of 800°C,  $NO_x$  concentration increased with urea addition by as much as 10%. At temperatures of 755°C and 715°C, up to 23%  $NO_x$  reduction occurred with a trend, of

increasing NO<sub>x</sub> reduction with increasing urea/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio. N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations of 17 to 80 ppm were measured. The largest amount of N<sub>2</sub>O was formed at the lowest experimental temperature.

#### Numerical Model

A numerical model has been constructed that simulates recirculation. The model combines a PSR and a PFR reactor in series. Part of the exiting PFR gases are recycled into the PSR. A steady state solution is reached by iteration.

A detailed chemical kinetic mechanism combines propane oxidation with nitrogen chemistry. The model assumes rapid sublimation of the CYA solid, followed by ideal decomposition of the cyclic CYA trimer to three molecules of HNCO. Mixing is ideal and instantaneous.

The agreement between model and experiment is good and the observed trends are captured. Disparities have been found predicting ignition delay and matching absolute values of NO and  $N_2O$  concentrations.

Final (outlet)  $NO_x$  concentrations were under predicted, observed  $NO_x$  removal differed from the numerical predictions by a maximum of 27%. At less than 100% turbine load, the experimental trend of decreasing  $NO_x$  removal with decreasing reactor inlet temperature was numerically reproduced. A 50% difference between the numerical and the observed value was found at 50% steady state turbine load.

The model failed to reproduce the experimental  $N_2O$  emissions. Absolute  $N_2O$  values were not matched. The predicted ratio of  $N_2O$  emitted to NO reduced, found in the experiment to be larger than one, varies between 0.3 and 0.5.  $N_2O$  formation in the model increases with HNCO/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio to asymptotically reach a plateau of 50 ppm. The experimental values, in contrast, increased approximately linearly with CYA/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio.

The discrepancies between the observed and the numerical  $N_2O$  concentrations are primarily attributed to the model assumption of "perfect" CYA decomposition to HNCO. A possible mechanism, that could reconcile the apparent disparity, is proposed. The proposal describes the pyrolysis of one CYA molecule into two molecules of HNCO and one molecule NO.

The model was successful in predicting the behavior of ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) and urea ((NH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>CO) and observed trends were captured. Absolute values of NO<sub>x</sub> removal in the case of urea injection were well matched while N<sub>2</sub>O emitted was under predicted by up to 60%.

The overall agreement between experimental findings and numerical simulation is good. All trends are properly featured in the model. Given that the model does not consider sublimation and decomposition of the injected reagents and ignores mixing as well as three-dimensional turbulent fluid dynamics, the agreement is remarkable.

The model therefore allows meaningful predictions of  $NO_x$  reduction potential with respect to temperature and reagent injection rate of cyanuric acid as well as that of the most common alternative reagents, urea and ammonia.

# Acknowledgment

This research has been supported by the Minerals Management Service, Department of Interior contract number 14-35-0001-30765.

# References

[1] Seinfeld J.H. and Pandis, S.N., "Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics; From Air Pollution to Climate Change" Wiley - Interscience, ISBN 0-471-17815-2, 1998

[2] Rosenberg H.S. et al. "Post Combustion Methods for Control of NOx Emissions" Prog. Energy Combustion Sci. Vol. 6. pp.287 - 302, 1980

[3] Lyon, R. K., "Method of the Reduction of the Concetration of NO in Combustion Effluents Using Ammonia", U.S. Patent 3,900,554, 1975

[4] Arand, J.K, Muzio, L.J., and Sotter, J.G., "Urea Reduction of NOx in Combustion Effluents", U.S. Patent No. 4,208,386, 1982

[5] Perry, R. A. and Siebers, D. L. :"Rapid reduction of nitrogen oxides in exhaust gas streams", *Nature* Vol. 324, pp. 657, Dec 1986

[6] Siebers, D.L. and Caton, J.A. "Removal of Nitric Oxide from Exhaust Gas with CYA" Combustion and Flame 79; 31-46, 1990

[7] Muzio, L.J., and Kramlich, J.C., "Potential Errors in Grab Sample Measurements of N<sub>2</sub>O from Combustion Sources" Western States Section, The Combustion Institute, Fall 1988

[8] Perry, R.A., "Application of  $RAPRENO_x$  to Diesel Emission Control" Technology Assessment and Research program for Offshore Minerals Operations, U.S. Department of the Interior Minerals Management Service, DOI No. 85K-SC293V, pp 185-190, 1991

[9] Westbrook, C.K. and Pitz, W.J. "A Comprehensive Chemical Kinetic Reaction Mechanism for Oxidation and Pyrolysis of Propane and Propene" Combustion, Science and Technology, Vol. 37, 1984

[10] Miller, J.A., and Perry, R.A., "An Exploratory Investigation of the Use of Alkali Metals in Nitrous Oxide Control" Int. Journal of Chemical Kinetics Vol. 28, 1996

[11] Muzio, L.J., Montgomery, T.A., Samuelsen, G.S., Kramlich, J.C., Lyon, R.K., and Kokkinos, A., "*Formation and Measurement of N<sub>2</sub>O in Combustion Systems*" Twenty Third (International) Symposium on Combustion, The Combustion Institute, pp. 245-250, 1990

[12] Mosier, A.R., and Mack, L., "Gas Chromatographic System for Precise, Rapid Analysis of Nitrous Oxide" Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. Vol. 44, 1980

[13] Elsener, M. and Koebel, M., "Analyse von Isocyansaeure, Blausaeure, Ammoniak und Lachgas in den Abgasen von Entstickungsprozessen", [Analysis of HNCO, HCN, NH<sub>3</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O in Effluents from NO<sub>x</sub> Reduction Processes], Paul Scherrer Institut (Verbrennungstechnik), Reg. No. TM-51-89-21, Jul. 1989

[14] Perry, R.A., "Application of  $RAPRENO_x$  to  $NO_x$  Control in Diesel Generators", First Int. on Combustion Technologies for a Clean Environment, Lisbon, Portugal, 1991

[15] Streichsbier, M., Dibble, R.W., and Perry, R.A., "*Non-Catalytic NO<sub>x</sub> Removal from Gas Turbine Exhaust with CYA in a Recirculating Reactor*", AIChE, Proceedings of the 1997 Annual Meeting, Paper No. 256a, 1997