University of Pennsylvania, School of Engineering and Applied Science Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering 220 South 33rd Street Philadelphia, PA 19104

April 21, 2020

Dear Professor Bruce Vrana and Dr. Sean Holleran,

The enclosed report contains a process design for converting consumer and industrial waste plastic into ethylene and propylene monomers. The process is fed 68.9 imperial tons of a mix of low-density polyethylene, high-density polyethylene, polypropylene, and polystyrene. We initially aimed to follow a patent issued to Plastics Energy, but eventually decided to follow another pathway. In our design, the plastics are washed, dried, extruded, and are then pyrolyzed in two successive rotary kilns. Light gas product is then cracked in a steam cracker and is rapidly quenched to prevent further reactions. The resulting stream is then compressed and finally separated to in order to recover ethylene and propylene.

The plant is designed to be built in Borneo, Indonesia. It is designed to operate on a continuous basis for 24 hours per day, 350 days per year, for fifteen years of total operation. The plant is comprised of five distinct process sections: upstream processing; pyrolysis; steam cracking, quenching, and compression; separations; and a refrigeration system. Ethylene is produced at a rate of 1410 lbs/hr, and a purity of 99.0% by mass, qualifying it to be sold as polymer grade ethylene. Propylene is produced at a rate of 1250 lbs/hr, and a purity of 95.7% by mass, qualifying it to be sold as chemical grade propylene. Each product is sold for \$0.69/lb.

From an economic standpoint, this process is not profitable. The plant requires a total capital investment of \$27.5 MM dollars to achieve the desired conversion of 68.9 tons of plastic waste per day. The Internal Rate of Return (IRR) is -4.47%. While we do not recommend investing in this particular process, we believe that the chemical recycling of plastic waste is a worthy area of research and development, and we offer some modifications and alternatives to our proposed process that may result in a profitable process.

Thank you for your guidance throughout this project.

Sincerely,

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ Promise Adebayo-Ige  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ Sarah Engelhardt

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ Matthew Larson

[Page left intentionally blank]

# **Mixed Plastics Waste to Ethylene and Propylene Feedstocks**

Promise Adebayo-Ige | Sarah Engelhardt | Matthew Larson

Project submitted to Dr. Sean Patrick Holleran and Prof. Bruce Vrana Project proposed by Stephen Tieri

Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering School of Engineering and Applied Science University of Pennsylvania April 21, 2020



# Table of Contents





# **Section 1. Abstract**

Circular recycle of waste plastic holds significant environmental benefit in reducing the need for crude oil feed to produce plastic monomers and in addressing massive global accumulation of plastic waste. A two-stage cracking process is here explored for the reduction of long-chain polyethylene (PE), polypropylene (PP), and polystyrene (PS) to ethylene and propylene. The reaction yields useful byproducts, such as liquid fuel used to sustain the high energy demands of the process, and pressurized steam. A feed of 70 MT/day of PE, PP, and PS is assumed to be treated first in a rotary kiln pyrolysis reactor and secondly in a steam-cracking unit for the formation of short-chain unsaturated hydrocarbons. 41% of the feedstock by weight is converted to either ethylene or propylene. Due to the random nature of cracking, a pilot plant is deemed necessary to better understand this conversion. Heat integration is explored extensively throughout the cracking to employ other process products as fuel sources. A novel separation train and refrigeration cycle are then designed to isolate the two products of interest. The process is found not to be profitable, with an Internal Rate of Return of -4.74%, Net Present Value of - \$18.8MM, and Return on Investment (ROI) in the third year of operation of -2.12%. However, a circular monomers facility holds significant value environmentally, and options are thus explored to potentially reduce the cost or make the process profitable.

# **Section 2. Introduction and Objective-Time Chart**

Plastic has become an essential part of life for people across the globe. With a diverse set of properties that allow it to perform myriad functions, it has become an indispensable material in a number of industries, from medicine to consumer-packaged goods. Unfortunately, with the surge of plastic use over the past few decades, plastic waste has become a huge threat to the environment. It is therefore imperative that a safe, effective, sustainable solution is developed to handle the world's plastic waste.

More than eight million metric tons of plastic waste are dumped into the ocean every year, which can harm marine organisms [2.1]. Plastic waste is equally harmful in an above-water setting. Only a small percent of plastic waste makes it to a recycling bin, let alone to a recycling plant. Countries like China that are equipped with recycling plants have stopped accepting plastic waste, and countries such as Malaysia, Vietnam, and Thailand have become the primary collectors, despite their waste management systems already nearing capacity [2.2]. Burdened with an overwhelming amount of plastic waste, these countries turn to dangerous methods of disposal, including dumping and incinerating waste near residents who are then harmed by these toxic fumes.

Currently, recycling is the most sustainable option for plastic waste disposal, although it is estimated that less than 10% of plastic globally gets recycled [2.3]. There are two main recycling processes for plastic waste: mechanical recycling and chemical recycling. In mechanical recycling, plastic goods are broken down mechanically (i.e. through cutting or shredding) and turned into new products. The chemical structure of the plastic material stays the same, but the function of the material itself changes; for example, polyethylene terephthalate, or PET, which is the material that most plastic bottles are made from, can be mechanically recycled into polyester thread, which can be used to make clothing. While this does reduce the number of plastic bottles being thrown into the ocean, there is a limit to how helpful such a process is; the world only needs so many polyester shirts, and the need for plastic bottles will remain. The production of plastic bottles will continue, and it will outpace the rate of production for polyester shirts. Inevitably, many of those plastic bottles will wind up in the ocean [2.4].

In chemical recycling, plastic goods are broken down using chemical processes. The chemical structure of the plastic material is altered into a new material. For example, polyethylene plastic, which is one of the most prevalent types of plastic, is a polymer. It can be treated chemically so that it breaks down into hydrocarbons of varying lengths. There have been several studies in which plastic waste was converted to natural gas and oil using processes like pyrolysis and supercritical hydrothermal liquefaction on a lab scale [2.5, 2.6]. Natural gas and oil have several important uses, from making fuels to being refined into monomers that can be used as feedstock for plastic production. On an industrial scale, these processes could be used to create a direct path for plastic waste to be returned to new plastic products. As a result, less plastic waste would wind up either in the ocean or in countries unequipped to handle it.

Chemical recycling is not a well-established industry practice. There are strict limitations on what can be recycled. Current processes require plastic to be sorted into the different types before being recycled, which is a time- and energy-consuming endeavor. Plastic waste must also be clean before being processed. These constraints make chemical recycling financially, energetically, and feasibly unattainable; because of this, mechanical recycling and the dangerous aforementioned disposal processes are those most frequently practiced.

# *i. Introduction: Motivation and Goals*

In completing this project, we set out to design a robust method to chemically recycle plastic waste in an affordable and efficient manner. The goal of our project was to convert 70 metric tons of plastic waste per day into clean plastic feedstock monomers—ethylene and propylene—which could then be sold to other facilities producing plastic. The feed would be a mixture of plastic types 2, 4, 5, and 6 (High-Density Polyethylene, Low-Density Polyethylene, Polypropylene, and Polystyrene, respectively). Plastic types 1 and 3 (Polyethylene Terephthalate and Polyvinyl Chloride) are not included in the feed because they contain non-hydrocarbon compounds, which could produce harmful byproducts (for example, chloride from the PVC) and would require extra processing beyond what is required for the specified types. Plastic type 7, which consists of any plastics that do not fall into categories 1-6, is also not included, because it is so ill-defined and would be impossible to predict how it would behave in our process.

We initially modeled our design for this process after a chemical recycling plant created by Plastic Energy, LLC, an English company that develops solutions for recycling plastic waste [5.7]. The process set forth by Plastic Energy, LLC boasted an ability to produce high-quality hydrocarbon fuels including naphtha, kerosene, and diesel from a mix of all plastic types through pyrolysis. From this point, further processing would be required to obtain the plastic feedstock monomers desired for the purposes of this project. Light hydrocarbon oils like naphtha are frequently used as feedstock in the production of short-chain hydrocarbons such as ethylene and propylene monomers, and methods to do so like steam cracking are well-established industrial processes. To successfully complete this project, we would need to unite these two processes within one chemical recycling plant, where a feedstock of plastic waste could be converted to light hydrocarbon oils and then processed further using standard industrial.

Over the course of completing this project, we determined that Plastic Energy, LLC's technology was not suited to our goal in producing ethylene and propylene monomers. However, the overall objective remained the same: to convert plastic waste into material that could then be used to produce ethylene and propylene. Because ethylene and propylene are very short hydrocarbon chains, it would be most desirable for the products from the initial pyrolysis to be as short in length as possible. The products of Plastic Energy, LLC's pyrolysis process were quite long hydrocarbon chains, ranging in length from four to more than twenty carbons. When it became clear that an alternative method of plastic degradation would be required, we turned to existing chemical recycling research and identified that pyrolysis of our plastic waste feedstock in a rotary kiln would provide us with a gas product that was well-suited for further processing into ethylene and propylene monomers.

From an economic perspective, our initial goal was to make this a profitable endeavor. Because our process uses plastic waste as its feed, we assumed that cities or other entities would pay us to collect their plastic waste. An additional goal was to determine the ideal location to build our plant; our choices were California, the Netherlands, and Indonesia. Ultimately, we chose Indonesia as the plant location, and found that the process would not breakeven after fifteen years of operation. The IRR for the plant is -4.47%, and the ROI in the third year of production is - 2.01%.

In this report, we present our design of a chemical recycling plant that produces 33,600 pounds of 99.0 wt% ethylene and 30,000 pounds of 95.7 wt% propylene per day. This corresponds to a 20.67% yield of ethylene and a 19.48% yield of propylene, which is a 40.14% overall yield. The remaining products from the process include hydrogen and various hydrocarbons ranging in length from 1 to 4 carbons, which can be used as fuel for several of the process units. We also provide an economic analysis to determine the profitability of the plant.

# *ii. Introduction: Objective-Time Chart*

Figure 5.1 shows the objective-time chart for the completion of this project.



*Figure 2.1: Objective-Time Chart for the Completion of Mixed Plastic Waste to Ethylene and Propylene Feedstock.*

#### **Section 3. Market and Competitive Analysis**

Ethylene, a volatile organic compound, is the most widely used hydrocarbon in the petrochemicals industry. Ethylene is used to form important chemicals such as ethylbenzene, ethylene glycol, and vinyl chloride. It is also the building blocks of #2 and #4 plastics, HDPE and LDPE. Like ethylene, propylene is a very important product in the petrochemical industry because it is also a feedstock to many B2B and B2C products such as, film fibers, polypropylene, cumene, and butyraldehyde. In 2019 the global ethylene production capacity was 207.58 million tons per annum (mtpa), with North America and Asia being highest producing regions [3.1], and in 2018 the global production capacity of propylene was 120 mtpa [3.2]. The main conventional techniques for ethylene and propylene production are steam cracking and catalytic cracking. In steam cracking, gaseous or liquid hydrocarbons, such as naphtha and liquefied petroleum gas, are diluted with steam and are cracked in a pyrolysis furnace. In catalytic cracking, longer hydrocarbons are cracked in the presence of catalysts at moderate temperatures. Still, both processes produce significant amounts of  $CO_2$  emissions, with steam cracking alone contributing to  $180 - 200$  mtpa of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  emissions worldwide [3.3].

Due to anthropogenic effects on the environment, ethylene and propylene production is shifting to unconventional methods to become more sustainable. This entails the use of biomass and implementing a circular economy within plastic production. Bioethylene, or renewable polyethylene, is made from ethanol after undergoing a dehydration process and also from bioethanol that originates from sugar cane, sugar beet, and wheat grain. The Coca-Cola Company uses this in their PlantBottle<sup>TM</sup> product, which is a polyethylene terephthalate (PET) bottle made from plants. The paraxylene used to create their PET bottles are sourced from bio-based isobutanol [3.4]. Dow Chemical Company has also produced AGILITY™ CE, which is a resin made with 70% recycled LDPE. Fuenix Ecogy Group in the Netherlands also has patent to similar to that of Plastics Energy; in their process mixed plastic waste is burned in two successive pyrolysis furnaces and is then refined for further processing [3.5].

In this report we propose an unconventional process that uses a rotary kiln to pyrolyze 2,4,5,6 plastics. Our downstream process is the same of that in chemical plants that have a steam crackers. Though our ethylene and propylene output is not as large as conventional ethylene production plants, our process is unique because it establishes a circular plastic economy, with the potential for scale up. Currently, there are no industrial-scale chemical plants that process postconsumer and post-industrial plastic waste in a circular process. The unconventional methods mentioned work for specific uses, but they do not convert feedstock to ethylene and propylene. In addition, rather than drilling for feedstock, federal and local governments would pay for us to collect their plastic waste.

# **Section 4. Customer Requirements**

Polyethylene and polypropylene product specifications must meet ISCC+ standards, in which recycling means, "any recovery operation by which materials are reprocessed into products, materials or substances whether for the original or other purposes." Any diesel or fuel coproduct must comply with ASTM D975 or EN590 standards, and the minimum purity for polymer grade ethylene and propylene are both 99.5%. For propylene, the minimum purity for chemical grade is 95.0%.

#### **Section 5. Preliminary Process Synthesis**

- *i. Pyrolysis Process and Alternatives*
	- *a. Goal of Pyrolysis Chemistry*

Existing research and operations regarding treatment of mixed plastic waste focus on the capacity to convert solid feed into liquid fuel, comparable to gasoline, kerosene, or diesel. Limited operations are used for the conversion of plastic waste to short-chain hydrocarbon gas product, and most gas produced is used a natural gas substitute to make cracking operations self-sustaining [5.1]. At present, industrial production of ethylene and propylene employs steam cracking to break hydrocarbons to C2 and C3. Common feeds for this process are ethane, propane, and naphtha, a light oil ranging from C5-C10 hydrocarbons [5.2]. Steam cracking using ethane or propane as feedstock runs the advantage of cheaper, less complex plants with high ethylene and propylene yield [5.1,3]. Additionally, it is well established that cracking of plastic waste produces a gas in the range of C1-C6, and an oil product in the range of C6-C24 [5.1]. The exact compositions of the oil and gas products will be discussed in greater detail in section 15. In the interest of achieving higher product yield and greater plant simplicity, the initial cracking reaction will thus focus on producing short-chain hydrocarbon gas product.

## *b. Considered Methods of Pyrolysis*

Multiple vessels were considered for the primary cracking reaction in this process. As the initial treatment of plastic waste poses perhaps the greatest barrier to circular recovery of monomers, this stage in the process was explored extensively. The options considered as discussed below, and ultimately a decision matrix is used to justify the choice of a rotary kiln.

### Patent Provided in Project Statement

As originally proposed, the project was to make use of a patent for "Conversion of Waste Plastics Material to Fuel" by David McNamara and Michael Murray. Their system employs a novel pyrolysis and contactor system, modeled as a CSTR, to convert dirty plastic feedstock to hydrocarbons ranging from C1-C21 [5.4]. However, due to an absence of available data and conflicting operating conditions, use of this technology was not possible [5.4,5].

### Batch and Continuous Pyrolysis

Simple pyrolysis was considered as an alternative to the novel pyrolysis in the patent due to the abundance of data on the subject. Pyrolysis is the thermal degradation of long-chain polymers to small and less complex molecules through heating to temperatures in the range of 752 – 1472 ⁰F, and is used primarily for the treatment of PE, PP, and PS [5.1]. Pyrolysis produces a gas product, liquid oil product, and solid char product. In practice, the production of liquid oil is often favored for use as a fuel oil due to its high calorific value, and the gaseous product is often used as a fuel source to make the pyrolysis unit self-sustaining [5.6]. Data exist to aid in prediction of products, and the unit is robust in ability to pyrolyze dirty plastic [5.1,6]. Pyrolysis is flexible in manipulation of operating variables to produce desired product, does not require extensive feed sorting, and may not require feed cleaning [5.7]. Notably, pyrolysis data is lacking in study of mixed plastic feed and is susceptible to the random nature of the cracking reaction [5.8].

The batch pyrolysis reactor is most commonly studied in literature. Batch pyrolysis is useful in manipulation of residence time and simplicity of unit design. However, batch pyrolysis suffers from variable product composition, and on the scale of this project, the size of a batch pyrolysis reactor is not realistic (estimated at slightly over  $1,000 \text{ ft}^3$ ) [5.9]. In contrast, when operated continuously, greater consistency in product composition is achieved and capacity increases significantly [10]. Both units require a residence time of 15-60 minutes, which presents obstacles for handling large feed quantities [5.1,6,10].

Pyrolysis runs the major disadvantages of heat transfer and ease of operation. Heat transfer is most commonly achieved via passage of an inert gas on an industrial pilot scale [5.11].

17

However, this process is to focus on the product of gaseous product, and oxygen-rich gas may not be used due to the favorable formation of  $CO$  and  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ , nitrogen gas proposes a complex separations problem, and other carrier gases are too expensive on the required scale [5.1]. Additionally, both types of pyrolysis require high operation cost due to oil and char accumulation, and variable product composition [5.1].

### Liquefaction

Hydrothermal liquefaction is a thermal depolymerization process that converts hydrogenated biomass into oil-like product, often in the presence of a catalyst [5.13]. Liquefaction is used for treatment of plastic waste due to the lower heat requirement (waste need be heated in the range of 300-500  $^{\circ}$ C), robustness of the process to handle multiple types of plastic, and ability to process wet and dirty feedstock [5.12,13]. Liquefaction has been shown to give high yield of oil product (around 90% by weight of feed) and with residence times of 30-60 minutes, which is comparable to pyrolysis. [5.13,14].

However, liquefaction requires high pressures, on the order of 30 atm, which are difficult to achieve in large vessels prior to the production of gaseous product [5.12]. Additionally, the liquefaction process is used primarily to generate oil product, and in the studies here considered gives a maximum gas yield of less than 20% by weight of feedstock [5.12,13,14]. Finally, liquefaction often requires a catalyst for high conversion rates of the feedstock to oil product, which is undesirable for reasons considered in section 13.2.9

# Fluidized Bed

The fluidized bed has the major advantages of efficient heat transfer and short residence time [1]. Additionally, a fluidized bed has been used in previous pilot-scale work termed the Hamburg Process for conversion of plastic waste to fuel gas [5.15]. It has the advantages of moderate maintenance cost, ease of catalyst introduction, and formation of gaseous product (which is favored in our process) [5.1,16]. However, the operation of a fluidized bed for treatment of viscous liquid is complex and requires the bed to be filled often with expensive material [5.17]. Issues arise with plastic melt sticking to the surface of the bed material and the unit and scale up becomes complex [5.18]. Additionally, massive amounts of nitrogen effluent are required, estimated at by calculation, and therefore present significant challenges to achieving product purity. Finally, the fluidized bed is primarily used to form methane gas for use as a natural gas substitute, and conversion of methane to ethene and propene on an industrial scale is unfeasible due to catalyst and electromagnetic radiation requirements [5.1,19].

#### Rotary Kiln

The rotary kiln has little data available and has rarely been used to treat plastic waste. However, under the assumption that the rotary kiln behaves much like a continuous pyrolysis unit, the expected product and composition may be estimated. The rotary kiln may handle large amounts of plastic waste and offers significant control over the residence time as a function of angle. Heat transfer in the kiln is difficult but may occur without introducing an effluent gas and thus reduce the need for complex separation. Additionally, through a cleverly designed indirect fired kiln, the necessary heat transfer may be achieved due to the nature of a moving liquid in the reactor. The rotary kiln is also expected to require minimal maintenance, as the angular nature aids in removal of viscous liquid and char.

#### Evaporator

An evaporator was explored as an alternative due to the desire of forming gaseous product, and their efficient heat transfer. Evaporators are already used in the handling of hydrocarbons, predominately in the fuel industry for removal of water from crude oil. However, the evaporator is not used at the temperatures required for the pyrolysis of plastic waste, is not used in practice for reactions, and presents challenges with transport of viscous fluid.

#### Spouted Bed

The sprouted bed reactor has been explored for treatment of plastic waste as a theoretically sound option for treatment of plastic waste to address the defluidization and bed segregation issues accompanying a fluidized bed [5.20]. It is able additionally to handle the viscous molten plastic without need for significant operating cost associated with cleaning [5.21]. However, the spouted bed reactor is most suitable for producing gasoline-range hydrocarbons in oil form and has a complex design with high pumping requirements [5.22,23]. Additionally, the design requires a catalyst, which is not favorable for industrial scale action [5.24].

# Use of a Catalyst

Catalysts are commonly used in plastic waste pyrolysis for enhancing yield and promoting gasoline-range hydrocarbons. Little work has been done to encourage the formation of gaseous product, but H-ZSM-5 and red mud have emerged as potential catalysts to promote gas formation. The greatest challenge with catalyst uses on the scale of this project is recycle, due to the viscous nature of the plastic and oil product [5.25]. In the case of a fluidized bed, catalyst recycle is feasible, but beyond this system recycle becomes complex and energy consuming.

#### *c. Decision Matrix*

Many characteristics of the mentioned systems were considered and synthesized into a decision matrix (Table 13.1). The rotary kiln option was found to be the only option with no apparent major design challenges and was thus selected for the process.

20





# *ii. Secondary Cracking Operation*

The gaseous product of the rotary kiln does not contain enough ethylene and propylene to separate and sell, thus further cracking is required to obtain desired products. As it is well established in industry and is the traditional method of ethylene and propylene production, steam cracking was selected for the secondary cracking operation. The subsequent operations on the steam cracking product, involving transfer line exchange, quench, and purification were implemented. In practice, this process often uses a caustic tower for the removal of acidic gas (such as sulfur contamination and CO), and a molecular sieve dryer for removal of steam from the product stream. However, given the assumptions of this project, these two units are not necessary.

The chemistry of steam cracking is thankfully well known. The cracking yields were approximated using the distribution provided by Akah [5.41] and given in Table 5.2.



#### Table 5.2 Steam Cracking Yields

To determine the distribution, hydrogen, methane, ethene, and propene were assumed inert in the steam cracker. Ethane, propane, and butane were assumed to crack according to the distribution of table 5.2. Butane was used to represent butane, butadiene, and all C5+ compounds for energy balances and separations. The product composition, given as weight percent from the steam cracker, is therefore given in Table 5.3

Species	% Weight
H <sub>2</sub> and Methane	23.5
Ethane	4.2
Ethene	38.3
Propane	1
Propene	24.9
C4+	8.0

Table 5.3 Steam Cracking Outlet Composition

# *iii. Self-Sustaining Fuel Considerations*

The pyrolytic liquid of the rotary kiln has value as a fuel oil. The composition of the oil and product distribution are estimated in section 15. Due to the partly unknown nature of the compounds in the oil and the major heat requirements of the rotary kiln and steam cracker, all the pyrolytic oil produced is used as fuel. Additionally, due to the small amount of oil produced (1181 lb/hr), a separation train to provide on-specification commercial fuel product is not economically viable.

# *iv. Separation Process and Alternatives*

### *a. Separations Goal*

The goal of the separation process was to achieve a split between our final monomer products, ethylene and propylene, and the rest of the hydrocarbons produced in the steam-cracking unit that were to be used as fuel. Additional separation processes were also considered in conjunction with some of the alternative pyrolysis methods that were considered.

*b. Extractive Distillation*

In certain studies, it was found that a significant amount of aromatic species would be produced in the pyrolytic oil. The aromatic species estimated to be in the pyrolytic oil were benzene, toluene, xylene (BTX), naphthalene, and styrene. We considered using extractive distillation to remove BTX and the other aromatics from the pyrolytic oil, to sell them together or separately. To do this, all products from the rotary kiln will be sent to an extractive distillation column where a solvent would be feed from the top of the column. The aliphatic species would exit in the column overhead, while the aromatic species and solvent would leave in the bottoms and be fed to another tower where they would be separated. The solvent would leave in the overhead of the second column and would be recycled back to the first column. The solvent we considered using was Tetrahexly ammonium-bromide. We decided against this process given that capital costs of trying to separate the aromatics further, and the hazards of having solvent in the light gas stream flowing into the steam cracker.

#### *c. Separation Train Design*

#### One-Stage Flash Alternative

One method that was considered for the separation process was to include a one-stage flash vessel as the first separation event, to remove the lightest components, hydrogen and methane. However, because all of the components being separated are quire light and have low boiling points, achieving this separation in a flash vessel would require either extreme pressures (on the order of 10,000 psia) or extreme temperatures (nearing -425°F). Only at these conditions will the desired products, hydrogen and methane, exist in the vapor phase while the rest of the products stayed in the liquid phase. This approach was also tested using ASPEN, and the simulation confirmed the predicted outcome. It was clear that tray towers would need to be used, which are what is used in industrial petrochemical plants that process similar product streams.

#### Demethanizer Column Design

The separation train configuration was modeled after standard industrial separation processes in ethylene and propylene plants. In the industry, feeds of refined hydrocarbons with hydrogen are sent into a demethanizer column, a type of distillation column that separates the lightest gasses (methane and hydrogen) from heavier hydrocarbons. Demethanizer columns require extremely low temperatures, and designing these columns is much less straightforward than a standard distillation column that can be run at more typical operating conditions.

The separation would occur between the light key, ethylene, and the heavy key, methane; we wanted to recover our hydrogen and methane in our distillate, and all of our hydrocarbons heavier than methane in our bottoms product. We knew that a total condenser would be implausible. The critical temperature of hydrogen is -400ºF, which is less than 100ºF above absolute zero temperature. Clearly, the distillate exiting the demethanizer would be a vapor. So, for our first pass at the design using ASPEN, we initially selected a partial condenser with all vapor distillate and set the column pressure to 450 psia (a reasonable guess for a distillation column with such a light distillate product, per *Seider et al*) [5.26].

Using DSTWU in ASPEN as a first attempt for column design, we found that the required condenser temperature to achieve a successful split between the components (i.e., removing 99% of the light key) was -230ºF. While condensers for demethanizer columns do operate at extremely low temperatures, they usually hover around -130°F; any colder and the energy requirements become too great to be feasible. So, we increased the pressure of the column to bring the temperature of the distillate up to a more reasonable value. Even at an unrealistically high pressure of 1000 psia, the distillate was *still* coming out of the column around -220ºF; it was clear that increasing the pressure of the column would not be sufficient in increasing the distillate temperature.

One reason that the distillate would need to be at such a low temperature was that the other components being separated from the hydrogen and methane were also very light. Ethylene's normal boiling point is -154.7ºF, and that is the lightest of the heavy hydrocarbons. To obtain a split between methane and ethylene, an extremely low temperature would be needed. Rather than increase the pressure to an extremely high number, it would be more sensible to allow some of the ethylene to exit the column from the top of the column, which would increase the temperature required in the condenser. This would also allow us to operate the condenser at a more reasonable pressure of 550 psia. The downside of this is that some of the ethylene product is lost and cannot be recovered (for the same reason that it could not be recovered in this column), but we did not consider this to be a total loss—the ethylene that exits through the top of the demethanizer column could be used as fuel elsewhere in the process and would be valuable to the process in that regard.

To implement this into the design, the demethanizer column was modeled in ASPEN as a RadFrac column using a partial-condenser with vapor and liquid distillate. After some trial-anderror to determine what amount of ethylene would allow the demethanizer condenser temperature to reach a more reasonable value, a distillate flowrate of 1,702 lbs/hr and a vapor fraction of 0.448 was chosen. The vapor distillate also contained 539 lbs/hr of ethylene, though, to increase the temperature of the condenser, as discussed above. Most of our ethylene product (1,437 lbs/hr) exited the column in the liquid distillate stream, meaning that we were recovering a significant portion of the ethylene product in our first distillation event. However, the ethylene recovery stream still contained several other components.

### Deethanizer

The deethanizer column would need to perform a similar function to the demethanizer column—removing the remaining methane from the ethylene recovery stream. The same challenges related to the demethanizer column also held true for the deethanizer column; the condenser would need to operate at a very low temperature to allow for separation between the very light components. Originally, a partial-condenser with vapor and liquid distillate was tested, but upon closer examination, it appeared that the concentration of ethylene became greater lower in the column, so a side-stream was taken off the column instead. This meant that a partialcondenser with all vapor distillate would need to be used. Again, some ethylene was permitted to exit the top of the column to allow for a more reasonable condenser temperature.

#### Depropanizer

The bottoms products from both the demethanizer and deethanizer column are sent to the depropanizer for separations. The remaining components in the separations process were heavy enough that a higher condenser temperature of -29.06ºF could be used. A partial-condenser with vapor and liquid distillate was considered, but, similar to the deethanizer, taking off a side stream resulted in better propylene yield, and a purer propylene product.

One modification to the process that could result in better propylene product yield would be to add the two feed streams to the depropanizer column at different stages based on their composition. In the stream from the demethanizer, there is a higher mass fraction of butane, which is the heaviest component; it would be worth trying to feed this stream at a lower stage than the stream from the deethanizer, which has a higher mass fraction of lighter components. Doing so could potentially reduce the amount of energy required in the separations. Throughout the column, the composition of heavy components increases toward the bottom of the column, and the composition of light components increases toward the top of the column. A feed with more heavy components that is fed to the top of the column will require more energy for separations than if that same feed is fed closer to the bottom of the column, since the upper stages have to do less work separating those heavy components. This logic also applies to feed streams that have more light components—such streams should be fed higher up in the column.

# *v. Material Balances*

Central to understanding the operation of the rotary kiln is determining amount and composition of each of the products exiting the rotary kiln. As the rotary kiln model is new in the treatment of plastic waste, data from batch pyrolysis units will be used to determine the products of the kiln reactor. The following analysis is best considered as a theoretical template exclusively. In practice, the cracking reactions of interest are random in product distribution, and subsequently published data lacks consensus on product distribution. A pilot plant would be necessary to determine the actual composition of the products of the rotary kiln.

The percent of feed converted to gas is of primary interest. The production of gas in the kiln is dependent on pressure, temperature, feedstock, and residence time. High temperature and long residence time are most important for maximizing raw production of gas [5.27]. However, residence time beyond a threshold has minimal impact on gas yield [5.28], and temperatures above 700°C favor the production of hydrogen and methane, which are not useful in forming ethylene and propylene [5.29]. Additionally, pyrolysis is not well studied above temperatures of  $650^{\circ}$ C is not well studied [5.27]. and cracking performed at temperatures above this often use fluidized bed reactors.

We adopt the gas conversion value found by Lopez et. Al. that at  $600\degree\text{C}$ ,  $56.2\%$  of the feed is converted to a gaseous phase, as this study most reflects the pressures we intend to use and the feed composition we propose [5.30].

The residence time is also of interest and expected to play a significant role in the production of gaseous product in the rotary kiln. Again, studies focusing on the residence time are inconclusive, and unfortunately only two studies have analyzed the impact of residence time on non-homogeneous plastic waste samples and gave conflicting results. Adopting the findings of one study and assume that being held at high temperature for up to 30 minutes continues to aid in the formation of gaseous product, but a pilot scale plant would be required to determine the true impact of residence time [5.29].

An additional impacting factor is the heating rate of the plastic feed. In most experiments, a  $20^{\circ}$  C/min heating rate is used. Therefore, the rotary kiln is designed such that the heating rate is at minimum  $20^{\circ}$  C/min, but it is recognized that a heating rate higher than this is achievable and may aid in the production of more gaseous product.

To determine the ultimate amount of gas produced in the rotary kiln, the following assumptions are made. First, the Lopez et. Al. value of 56.2% is used to determine that in heating to  $600^{\circ}$  C, 56.2% of the inlet is converted to a gaseous state. Extrapolating one data set of residence time dependence, it may be expected that after reaching the reaction temperature, maintaining the temperature for 30 minutes will give an overall gaseous yield of 65.9% by weight [5.28]. However, in an optimistic approach, we assume that those reactions which produce gas in the initial 30 minute heating period of the Lopez study repeat in a second 30-minute heating period, and thus 56.2% of the oil produced after 30 minutes is again converted to gaseous phase. This gives an ultimate conversion of 80.3 % weight of the inlet molten plastic to a gaseous state.

The rotary kiln is designed according to the parameters hereby assumed. Ultimately, the assumed conversion is relatively arbitrary, but we expect that in a pilot plant, by controlling residence time, temperature, pressure, and heating rate, that 80.3% conversion to gas is feasible. Thus, the downstream operations need not necessarily be scaled to drastic changes in the outlet of the rotary kiln reactor.

#### **Gaseous product composition**

The gas product exiting the rotary kiln is known to be exclusively short chain (C1-C6) hydrocarbons and hydrogen gas. The exact composition is known to be a function of temperature and residence time (both to a threshold) and is likely dependent on pressure and heating rate as well. The composition used henceforth in this process design is that presented by Lopez. Et. Al. for a reactor temperature of  $600\textdegree$ C and residence time of 0 minutes once said temperature is achieved (table 15.1). Several changes are made to the published distribution. As the Lopez study includes PET in the feed,  $CO$  and  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  are formed. As this is impossible in an oxygen-free rotary kiln, these products are scaled out of the ultimate distribution. Additionally, the Lopez distribution 9.5% by weight of C5 and C6, which is semi-consistent with other published distributions. Due to the availability of steam cracking data, C4-C6 are lumped together as butane for downstream mass balances. Thus, by weight, the gas product distribution is presented in table 5.4.

0.72	Hydrogen
13.36	Methane
10.59	Ethane
19.84	Ethene
10.09	Propane
18.90	Propene
26.52	<b>Butane</b>

Table 5.4 Pyrolytic Gas Composition

# **Liquid product composition:**

The distribution of liquid products is less understood than that of gaseous, due to greater variation in larger carbon chains. For consistency, the Lopez distribution is again used, although this distribution is arbitrary and only important for understand the thermodynamic value of the oil outlet. The distribution accounts for only 78.5% of the oil outlet, and is thus scaled both for the absence of oxygenated compounds and to account for those molecules not otherwise recorded in the study:

Toluene	22.29
ethylbenzene	10.32
xylene	5.73
styrene	41.27
$\alpha$ -methyl-styrene	5.61
naphthalene	8.28
methylnaphthalene	6.50

Table 5.5 Pyrolytic Oil Composition

Using this distribution, the properties of the oil are estimated. Notably, the heat of combustion is taken as a weighted average of the known species as 4289 kJ/mol.

# *vi. Feed Assumptions*

The availability of waste plastic is complex insofar as most plastic is sent to landfills and is not sorted or recycled. For example, an estimated 10% of plastic waste in the United States is recycled, meaning that nearly 27 million tons is annually sent to landfill [5.31]. This plastic is not sustainable as a feedstock. However, there exist Materials Recovery Facilities and private companies which specialize in treatment and recovery of plastic waste. Plastic waste is solid in a variety of forms, potentially as curbside, contaminated waste, processed and cleaned bales, or sorted and shredded shards. Additionally, HDPE, LDPE, PP, and PS are all available in varying amounts. Therefore, a consistent homogenous feedstock is unlikely for this process, and the following assumptions are made.

The composition of the plastic feed is approximated by scaling production data since 1950 to account for just the four types of interest [5.32]. The feedstock is hereby assumed to be composed by weight of the values in Table 5.4, and properties of the feedstock are estimated as a weighted average of the four types of plastic:

Plastic Code	Plastic Type	Percent by weight
Н	High-Density Polyethylene	23.2
IV	Low-Density Polyethylene	279
	Polypropylene	37.2
VI	Polystyrene	11.6

Table 5.6 Plastic Feed Composition

The feedstock is additionally assumed to be pre-washed, pre-dried, and pre-shredded. Plastic waste contains an average of 7% by weight of additives, such as dyes and structural enhancers, which are assumed to remain in the feedstock. The plastic shards are estimated to be

100mm flakes, as is standard for recycled waste [5.33]. The feedstock is likely to arrive in varying amounts of each type of plastic, but this does not impact the process design or operating conditions. As priced from a weighted average of multiple online sources, this feedstock costs an estimated \$0.19/lb [5.34-5.40]. This cost is attributed to the transport, cleaning, sorting, and shredding of the plastic waste. The feed stock is additionally assumed to have density of 58.9 lb/ft<sup>3</sup> and heat capacity of 0.442 BTU/ lb  $^{0}$ F.

Plastic washing, cleaning, drying, sorting, and shredding are well-established processes for which the required units may be purchased as needed to account for different feeds. Companies such as Herbold Meckesheim and MG Machinery offer entire plastic treatment lines which handle all the aforementioned waste treatment steps for industrial purchase, as well as individual line components. Therefore, although this design assumes a shard feedstock, other units may be purchased to account for variability in plastic waste feed.



# **Section 6. Process Flow Diagrams and Stream Tables**

# *i. Block Flow Diagram*

Figure 6.1: Block Flow Diagram

Figure 6.1: Block Flow Diagram












Figure 6.5: Section 300 PFD 5: Section 300 PFD







## **Section 7. Assembly of Database**

## *i. Thermophysical Properties*

The primary chemicals in this process are ethylene, propylene, hydrogen, methane, butane, styrene, and ethylbenzene. Styrene and ethylbenzene are heavily present in the pyrolytic oil, while the rest are present in the process streams. Note that the C4+ species in the process streams were approximated to have the same thermophysical properties of butane. The thermophysical properties of all chemicals were found from the *NIST Chemistry WebBook* and *Engineering Toolbox*. Wherever exact figures were not available, approximate figure were interpolated or extrapolated. Data from these sources were used to approximate heats of combustion, average specific heat capacities, enthalpies, saturation conditions and more.

## *ii. Raw Materials*

The raw materials in this process are the plastic shards that purchased. The price of the raw materials is \$261/MT, where 70MT/day is being fed to the process. The safety information for 2, 4, 5, 6 plastics can be found in Appendix C.

#### **Section 8. Process Description**

#### *i. Process Description: Overall Process*

The process is comprised of four major processing events: upstream processing of the plastic waste, pyrolysis of the clean plastic waste, steam cracking of the pyrolysis gas product, and a separation train to isolate the desired products and hydrocarbon byproducts that can be used as fuel within the process. Assuming a daily feed of 70 MT, the feed to the process is 6,417 lbs/hr of mixed plastic waste, which is 12% polystyrene, 23% high-density polyethylene, 28% low-density polyethylene, and 37% polypropylene. Upstream processing includes shredding, washing, and drying the plastic waste, then feeding the clean, shredded plastic into an extrusion screw to melt the plastic into liquid. Pyrolysis takes place in a rotary kiln, and produces solid char, liquid oil, and a gas product. The pyrolysis gas is refined in a steam cracker unit, then processed to be sent through a separation train. The separation train involves four distillation columns and yields seven product streams, two of which are the desired ethylene and propylene monomer feedstock products.

#### *ii. Section 000: Upstream Processing*

The feed to the process is a mixture of HDPE, LDPE, PP, and PS flakes which arrive in either railcars or shipping containers depending on availability. The composition is described in section 5.6 Feed Assumptions, as is the variability of units in this section. The plastic shards are loaded via a 55 ft bucket elevator into two storage silos, each with a capacity of 10500 ft<sup>3</sup> to account for 3 days' worth of feedstock. The silos are kept at standard temperature and pressure. The silos are designed to hold a combined 6 days' worth of feedstock due to variability in waste availability, and the likelihood that the feed comes from multiple sources. This is enough to prevent a halt in downstream production should waste availability become a bottleneck. A screw conveyor is used to transport the plastic shards to a second bucket elevator of 16ft, from which the shards are emptied into the hopper of the extrusion screw in section 100. The feed rate is assumed a constant 6430 lb/hr through the conveyor and second bucket elevator, as the subsequent sections operate continuously.

### *iii. Section 100: Rotary Kiln Pyrolysis*

The clean and pelletized plastic waste is fed into a standard polymer processing extrusion screw. The screw is used simply as an efficient way to melt the plastic, making use of the friction generated by the screw to reduce heating requirements. The screw relies on an 820 hp motor, as well as scattered heaters, to melt the plastic shards primarily due to friction and pressure created by the screw. The plastic leaves the screw at  $482 \text{ }^{\circ}$ F, at which point it should be entirely liquid. Although the rotary kiln is capable of processing solid plastic waste, the screw is used to ensure efficient heat transfer throughout the kiln. The melted plastic is fed immediately to the rotary kiln, where it is heated inside an inner pressurized chamber of the rotary kiln which is 42 feet long and 2.8 feet in diameter. The plastic waste remains in the kiln for 47.5 minutes, as determined by the angle of the kiln. The plastic is expected to be heated at a rate of  $68^{\circ}$  F/min to  $1112^{\circ}$  F for 17.5 minutes, and then maintained at that temperature for 30 minutes. A screw conveyor moves the plastic and liquid waste through the kiln at a constant speed of 0.0147 ft/sec. The gas buildup in the container ultimately reaches a pressure of 5 bar, in which case a pressure cap allows the gas to pass downstream. This pressure is expected to carry the gas product to the steam cracker at a continuous rate of 5161 lb/hr.

At the far end of the kiln, 1265 lb/hr of a char and oil mix is sent to a small cylindrical vessel where the liquid oil and solid char are separated. This vessel is designed to be 60% full, with a carbon steel grating designed as a baffle positioned in the center. There is one outlet on each side of the baffle, one which removes pure liquid oil at a rate of 1003 lb/hr, and another which removes an oil and char slurry at a rate of 262 lb/hr, assuming that 15% of the oil product remains in the slurry. Two small MOYNO pumps made of temperature may be necessary to continue to drive the wet char and liquid products from the pressure vessel. However, in this process, it is assumed that the pressure of the liquid is enough to force both streams to flow. Regular cleaning of the grating may be necessary. A pilot plant will be used to determine the need for pumps, cleaning, and the flow rates of both streams. The slurry is sent to a storage tank where it is sold for its heating value and for potential applications in road covering for a price equal to that of transporting it. The pure liquid product is split three ways, with 306 lb/hr sent to the heating section of the rotary kiln, 19.9 lb/hr sent to the constant temperature section of the kiln, and 674 lb/hr sent to a storage tank for sale as a fuel oil. The pyrolytic oil is sold for half the price of NAPTHA oil, given its similar heat of combustion but unknown chemical composition.

To the heating section of the rotary kiln, a blower pumps in 2474 lb/hr of air at  $77 \text{ °F}$  and 14.7 psia, while a second blower pumps 161 lb/hr of air to the heating section. In both combustion chambers surrounding the rotary kiln, complete combustion is assumed due to the excess air added. The pressures in each chamber are maintained at 36.8 psia, at which point a pressure cap permits the gas to exit. The combustion gases exit the combustion chambers at  $36.8$  psia and  $1292$  <sup>o</sup>F where there are sold for their heating value at a price assumed equal to that of pumping the gas.

# *iv. Section 200: Steam Cracking, Quenching, and Compression a. Steam Cracker Unit*

The steam cracker pyrolyzes gas feed into smaller carbon chains with a dominant selectivity of propylene and ethylene. Typical feedstocks are naphtha, liquefied petroleum gas, or ethane; though in this design, a mixture of light gases ranging from hydrogen to C4+ species are the feed. Note that the C4+ species are estimated as butane for calculation purposes and the feed was not burned in the presence of oxygen. A stream of 5,163 lb/hr of light gases flows from the rotary kiln to the steam cracker at a pressure of 75 psia and a temperature of 1,112°F. This stream is also diluted with low pressure steam upon entering the cracker. Steam to hydrocarbon ratios depends on the feedstock. For ethane cracking the ratio ranges from  $0.25 - 0.35$  and for naphtha cracking they range from 0.4-0.5. A ratio 0.4 was chosen and the flowrate of steam for the process is 2,066 lb/hr [8.1].



**Figure 8.1:** Conventional energy recovery systems in steam cracker [8.2]

Note that steam crackers are split into three sections: convection, radiant, and the transfer line exchanger (TLE). Though the convection section traditionally performs the functions shown in figure 8.1, for the design in this report, only the heating of the process steam will occur. It is intended that the light gas feed enters the furnace close to the radiant section. Note that the process steam is a recycled stream from the split water stream exiting the Quench Tower (QT-201). The process steam will be preheated from 120°F to 1,112°F, the crossover temperature with the light gas feed.

The cracking of the light gases occurs in the radiant section. The fuel requirement for the radiant section is determined from heat needed to preheat the process steam, the sensible heat needed to raise the temperature of the light gas and steam mixture, and the heat needed to crack the gas into the products. Fuel for the radiant section is drawn from the storage tanks used to store recovered hydrocarbons and from pyrolytic oil product from the rotary kiln. 10% excess air was assumed for complete combustion and hot flue gases will flow up into through the convection section into the stack. See Appendix A for detailed calculations.

Highly reactive cracked gas must be rapidly quenched below critical temperature within very short amounts of time. TLEs can have residence times as short as milliseconds [8.3]. After passing through the furnace the cracked gas flows in a co-current tube in tube TLE with bfw as a coolant. 4,163 lb/hr of bfw is pumped to 470 psi upon before entering the TLE. The bfw undergoes a phase change, reaches its saturation temperature of 460°F, is then superheated to 600°F, and is finally sold as high-pressure steam.

## *b. Transfer Line Exchanger*



**Figure 7.2:** Conventional Furnace and TLE Layout [8.3]

A consideration that was not implemented was that the convection section of the steam cracker could be used to reheat low pressure steam used in the reboilers of distillation columns and elsewhere in the plant. At current capacity, there is still an abundance of fuel recovered from separation processes that can be burned. Just as seen in figure 8.2, systems that incorporate TLEs often have steam drums and economizers to regulate the production of steam. An economizer and steam drum are not needed in this design because heat integration will not be conducted with the steam, and because we assumed that all of the bfw fed to the TLE will undergo a phase change to become steam. The bfw stream would also need to be tested for alkalinity levels, else it will increase fouling in the TLE. Finally more accurate fuel requirements could have been made if calculations incorporated the rate of heat transfer through the Inconel™ tubes in the cracker furnace. Given the time constraints and peculiarity of the semester, we elected to not proceed with these options.

#### *c. Spray Quench Tower*

The quench tower is the second stage of rapid cooling of the cracked gas stream. Cracked gas and process steam will exit the TLE at 752°F and at pressure of 78 psia. 185,480 lb/hr of 90°F cooling water will be used to cool the cracked gas to 100°F. It is assumed that the cracked gases will not contaminate the contacting water because the gases will not condense in the tower conditions. Given the outlet temperature of the gas is below the critical point of water, we assume perfect mixing which results in all of the process steam mixed in with the cracked gas condensing out. Thus the cracked gas exiting the quench tower (CG-1) will have no water in it. We recognize that is not the case in a real tower, but we did not have enough information to carry out necessary calculations.

187,546 lb/hr of water flows through the bottom of the tower and 2066 lb/hr, an amount equivalent to the process steam originally fed, is split and is recycled to steam cracker to be reheated. The rest of the water is then cooled in a heat exchanger, and finally is recycled to the quench tower to be reused for cooling the cracked gas stream. Note that an inventory of water would be supplied to the tower upon startup and the stream will then recycle through.

#### *d. Molecular Sieve Dryer & Caustic Tower (Omitted Units)*

Most ethylene plants will have a caustic tower to remove acidic and sulfuric wastes from the gases. Since we are not recycling PET, PVC, or #7 plastics, we assume that no halides, acids, or sulfur derivatives will enter the process. A molecular sieve dryer would be used to remove water from the cracked gas stream, but it is not needed given the perfect mixing assumption. If molecular sieves were required, two or more sieves would need to be operating parallel. By placing the molecular sieves in parallel, one or more will be operating at regular capacity, while the other units are being cleaned. It should be noted that the dehydration rates of the sieves will not be linear because the mass transfer driving force weakens as more water is absorbed. That being said, molecular sieves should not operate to 100% capacity.

## *e. Compression and Cooling*

Before they can be separated, the cracked gases must be compressed significantly so that their boiling points can increase to feasible temperature for separations purposes. Based on the Section 200 PFD, stream CG-1 enters at 60 psia and stream CG-9 exits at 559.5 psia. Between each compressor there is a cooler unit because the temperature of streams increases after compression, and it takes less work to compress a cooler gas than a hotter one. Four compressors were chosen due to its frequency in the models that we studied, but it would be reasonable to optimize this since the output of this plant is much less than any large ethylene plant.

## *v. Section 300: Separations*

After the cracked gas is quenched and compressed, it is sent to the separations section to isolate the two desired products, ethylene and propylene, as well as the waste hydrocarbons that will be used as fuel for the pyrolysis and steam cracking units. A vapor stream consisting of hydrogen, ethylene, propylene, and other light hydrocarbons is sent into this section at a rate of 5,164 lbs/hr at 142.5°F and 555 psia. Our project goal was to produce ethylene and propylene monomer feedstock. We were able to produce 99.0% pure ethylene product, which qualifies as polymer grade, and 95.7% pure propylene, which qualifies as chemical grade. Each of the four separation processes includes a column, condenser, reflux drum, and kettle-reboiler, as well as pumps for the reflux streams.

### *a. Demethanizer Tray Tower*

The first distillation column, referred to as the demethanizer, is a tray tower that has vapor and liquid distillates and a liquid bottoms product. The vaporous stream from the steam cracking section is fed above stage six at a rate of 5,164 lbs/hr, a temperature of 142.5°F, and pressure of 555 psia. A partial condenser with a vapor/liquid split of 0.448 is used to obtain two distillate products, and a kettle-reboiler is used for the bottoms product. The tray tower has a total of 17 stages, including the partial condenser with a reflux ratio of 5, 15 sieve-trays, and a kettle-reboiler.

The vapor distillate from the demethanizer is a mix of mainly hydrogen, methane, and ethylene at -131.2°F and 550 psia. These extreme operating conditions are necessary to achieve the desired split, because all of the components fed to the column are quite light and volatile. Ideally, only the most volatile components, hydrogen and methane, should come off the top of this column. Unfortunately, this would require an even lower temperature of about -230°F. The amount of energy and refrigerant required to obtain this temperature in the condenser would be an enormous expense and was not a feasible option for the purpose of this project. Instead, we allowed 539 lbs/hr of ethylene to exit the condenser with the vapor distillate, which brought the temperature up to a more reasonable -131.2°F. This means that a significant portion of our ethylene product could not be recovered, but we do not count this as a total loss; the vapor distillate from the demethanizer is fed to the refrigeration system, then used as fuel for other process units in the process. A pressure of 550 psia was selected to increase the temperature of the vapor distillate as well.

The liquid distillate from the demethanizer, referred to as the ethylene recovery stream, exits as a liquid at a rate of 2,098 lbs/hr and is composed mostly of methane, ethylene, ethane, and propylene. It has a temperature of -131.2°F and a pressure of 550 psia. This stream contains all of the ethylene that will be eventually recovered as product, but it also has residual methane that was not removed in the demethanizer column. This stream is fed directly to a second tray column, which we refer to as the deethanizer column. It also has propylene, which must be removed and sent to the depropanizer so that it can be recovered as product. The liquid bottoms product exits at a rate of 1,364 lbs/hr and is composed mostly of propylene, propane, and butane.

#### *b. Deethanizer Tray Tower*

The deethanizer column has a total of 45 stages, including a partial condenser with allvapor distillate, and a reflux ratio of 25; 43 sieve-trays; and a kettle reboiler. The ethylene recovery stream from the demethanizer is fed above stage 29 of the tray tower at 2,098 lbs/hr, and there are three streams that exit the tower: the all-vapor distillate at 120 lbs/hr, which is composed mostly of methane and ethylene; a liquid C2 side-stream that exits from stage 9 at 1,500 lbs/hr and is composed mostly of ethylene and ethane; and a bottoms product at 475 lbs/hr that is composed mostly of ethane, propylene, propane, and butane. The vapor distillate, which leaves the condenser at -129.8°F and 200 psia, is sent to the refrigeration system before being used as fuel for the steam cracking unit. The C2 side-stream exits at -44.2 °F and 203.56 psia, and is fed to the third column, which we refer to as the C2-Splitter. Finally, the bottoms product exits at 57.5°F and 207.2 psia and is fed with the demethanizer bottoms product to the final column, the depropanizer.

A reflux ratio of 25 might sound alarmingly high, but it only corresponds to a reflux rate of 3,000 lbs/hr. This is because the vapor distillate flowrate is quite small compared to the other streams in the process (120 lbs/hr compared to thousands of lbs/hr). If the flowrate of the vapor distillate was on that order, the condenser duty would be unreasonably high at that reflux ratio and temperature, but because the distillate flowrate is low, it is feasible for the purposes of this project. For a higher flowrate on the order of 1,200 lbs, the reflux rate would have been 30,000 lbs/hr and would have over-burdened the condenser. In addition, the original design called for a reflux ratio of 50; 25 seems even more reasonable set against 50!

Because the deethanizer condenser must also operate at an extremely low temperature, it was necessary to allow some ethylene to exit the tower with the vapor distillate. This allowed for a more reasonable condenser temperature. A liquid side-stream was selected rather than using a partial-vapor condenser because it yielded better results. Stage 9 was selected to remove the sidestream because this was determined to be the stage at which the ethylene composition was highest; since the side stream is the stream from which the ultimate ethylene product is removed, it is preferable to have the highest ethylene content possible so that the most ethylene possible is recovered overall.

#### *c. C2-Splitter Tray Tower*

The liquid side-stream from the deethanizer is fed above stage 12 of the C2-Splitter, the third tray tower. This feed has a flowrate of 1,500 lbs/hr, a temperature of -44.2°F, and a pressure of 300 psia. A feed pump is used to bring the feed stream to an appropriate pressure; the feed stream exits the deethanizer at 204 psia but needs to be increased to 300 psia to be fed to the C2- Splitter, which operated at 290 psia. The C2-Splitter has 25 stages, including a partial condenser with all vapor distillate and a reflux ratio of 10, 23 sieve-trays, and a kettle reboiler. A vapor distillate of 99.0% pure ethylene product exits the condenser and is sent to be used as feedstock via gas pipelines at a flowrate of 1,410 lbs/hr, a temperature of -20.6°F, and a pressure of 290 psia. A liquid bottoms product that is 94.5% ethane exits the reboiler and is sent to a tank to be stored and used as fuel for other units in the process at a flowrate of 90 lbs/hr, a temperature of 17.3°F, and 296 psia.

#### *d. Depropanizer Tray Tower*

The bottoms products from both the demethanizer and deethanizer are sent to the final tray tower, which we refer to as the depropanizer. The depropanizer has 42 stages, including a partial condenser with all vapor distillate and a reflux ratio of 42, 40 sieve-trays, and a kettle-reboiler. Both feed streams are fed above stage 23. Three streams exit the C2 splitter: a vapor distillate of 96 lbs/hr at -11.3°F and 150 psia, a liquid propylene side stream or 1250 lbs/hr at 69.2°F and 154 psia exiting at stage 15, and a liquid bottoms product of 495 lbs/hr at 149.1°F and 157 psia.

Similar to the deethanizer, the reflux ratio may seem alarming at first glance. However, the same logic that applies to the deethanizer applies here, too: the reflux rate is 4,032 lbs/hr, which does not cause the condenser duty to be too high. For a larger distillate rate of, say, 1,000 lbs/hr, a reflux ratio on the order of 1 might be selected instead (say, for example, 3); this would correspond to a reflux rate of 3,000 lbs/hr. So, while the reflux ratio does seem quite high, when considering the reflux *rate* (which is what dictates the condenser duty), it makes sense how such a large reflux could be sustained without causing extreme financial burden.

## *vi. Section 400: Refrigeration System*

The condensers of the columns in the separation section of this process operate at extremely low temperatures. To achieve these low temperatures, a refrigeration system is used. Since the vapor distillates of each column come off at very cold temperatures, too, a plate-fin heat exchanger is used in the refrigeration system to "recover" this cold. Apart from the cold distillates that pass through the plate-fin exchanger, the refrigeration system is a closed loop. Ethylene refrigerant enters the refrigeration system at a flowrate of 66,000 lbs/hr, a temperature of 85°F, and a pressure of 30 psia. The refrigerant passes through a condenser, where it reaches 2000 psia, before being fed to the plate-fin exchanger. The refrigerant is then flashed in a flash drum, and vapor product is sent immediately back to the plate-fin exchanger. The liquid product is split into two streams. The first stream, which has a flowrate of 19,000 lbs/hr, a temperature of -29°F, and a pressure of 252 psia, is sent to the condensers of the C2-Splitter and the depropanizer column, whose operating temperatures are -30°F and -10°F, respectively. The second stream is sent to a second flash drum, and the vapor product is sent immediately back to the plate-fin exchanger. The liquid product flows to the demethanizer and deethanizer column at a flowrate of 24,925 lbs/hr, a temperature of - 143.7°F, and a pressure of 21 psia.

The condenser duties for the demethanizer and deethanizer columns are -5MM BTU/hr and -605,000 BTU/hr, respectively. A refrigerant flowrate of 24,925 lbs/hr at the given conditions satisfies the condenser duties of both columns. Then, because the vapor distillates of these columns are so cold (-131°F and -129°F, respectively), they are sent back to the plate-fin exchanger to help cool the refrigerant coming from the condenser. The condenser duties for the C2-Splitter and depropanizer columns are -1.97MM BTU/hr and -702,000 BTU/hr, respectively. A refrigerant flowrate of 19,000 lbs/hr at the given conditions satisfies the condenser duties of both columns.

A plate-fin exchanger was selected as the heat exchanger for this process because it is capable of handling many streams at a given time. As the name implies, a plate-fin exchanger is made of several plates with fins to facilitate heat transfer. In this plate-fin exchanger, several corrugated stainless-steel plates, which serve as the fins, are stacked between flat stainless-steel plates that separate the different streams passing through the exchanger. This plate-fin exchanger handles fourteen streams in total: seven inlet streams, and seven outlet streams. The duty of the plate-fin exchanger is -5.2MM BTU/hr.

For startup, since there would not be cold streams from the column condensers to cool the ethylene after compression, refrigerant is required to supply this duty. This refrigerant can be used to supply the initial -5.2MM BTU/hr of cooling duty in the plate-fin exchanger. Refrigerant at - 30°F can be purchased for \$4/ton-day. One ton-day is equivalent to 12,000 BTU, so 433 ton-days are required. This corresponds to \$1,732/hr worth of -30°F refrigerant for startup. Startup is assumed to take 5 hours—this corresponds to a total cost of \$8,660.

#### **Section 9. Energy Balance and Utility Requirements**

### *i. Section 100: Rotary Kiln Pyrolysis*

The rotary kiln unit is self-sustaining in energy requirement and does not need fuel oil for the heating requirement of the plastic waste. The extrusion screw demands significant energy input with an 820 hp motor. Use of extra pyrolytic oil or steam from downstream in the process was considered, but polymer extrusion screws are not designed for this type of heating. Alternatives to make use of the oil and steam for melting were considered, but due to the nature of solid processing and need for a continuous feed, the extrusion screw is most appealing.

## *ii. Section 200: Steam Cracking, Quenching, and Compression*

Utilities required in the overall process are cooling water, low pressure steam, boiler feed water, refrigerant, and electricity. In the steam cracking portion, boiler feed water and cooling water are used to rapidly quench hot gases, as well as other streams in that section. In the separation train, low pressure steam will be used to heat the reboilers and refrigerant will be used in the refrigeration cycle. Electricity will be needed for pumps, compressors, and blowers throughout the plant. The following tables will provide information on the quantity of utilities being used in the plant.

#### *a. Fuel Requirements*

Fuel to fire the steam cracker furnace will come from recovered fuel from the separation processes and from the pyrolytic oil product from the rotary kiln. The fuel requirement of the steam cracker was completely satisfied with the recycled fuel streams. The fuel that was burned in the steam cracker consists of hydrogen, methane, ethane, ethylene, propane, propylene, butane, and pyrolytic oil which is mostly styrene. The duty of the steam cracker is 34.24 MM BTU/hr.

Compound	<b>Amount (lb/hr)</b>	Tuble 9.2 Puel Specifications % of Furnace Duty	(BTU/lb) LHV	
Hydrogen	607	27.6	51,628	
Methane	599		21,433	
Ethene	582	20 2		

*Table 9.2 Fuel Specifications*

## **Table 9.1:** Utility requirements for units in Section 200



\*The utilities are only required for start-up purposes.

\*\* The utility comes from unit E-303.

## *iii. Section 300: Separations*

*a. Energy Balance*

In the separations part of the process, there are four distillation columns, which each have a condenser with cooling duty. The cooling for each condenser is achieved by streams from the refrigeration cycle. The following table shows the energy balance on each condenser:

	Demethanizer	Deethanizer	C <sub>2</sub> -Splitter	Depropanizer
<b>Condenser Duty</b> (BTU/hr)	$-5,002,048$	$-603,978$	$-1,68,988$	$-702,413$
Condenser Temp	$-131.2$	$-129.8$	$-20.6$	$-11.2$
$\rm ^{\circ}F)$				
<b>Coolant Source</b>	DM-DE	DM-DE	<b>C2-DEPROP-REF</b>	<b>C2-DEPROP-REF</b>
Flowrate of coolant	24,926	24,926	19,000	19,000

*Table 9.3: Energy balance on the condensers of the distillation columns.*

Each column in the separation part of the process also has a reboiler with a heating duty. Low-pressure steam provides heat to the demethanizer, deethanizer, and depropanizer reboilers, while 60°F cooling water provides heat to the C2-Splitter reboiler. The following table shows the energy balance on each reboiler:

	Demethanizer	Deethanizer	C <sub>2</sub> -Splitter	Depropanizer
<b>Reboiler Heat Duty</b> (BTU/hr)	3,599,122	749,516	2,194,171.38	597,034
Reboiler Temp (°F)	205.2	57.5	17.3	149.1
Heat source	50 psig steam	50 psig steam	$60^{\circ}$ F cooling water	50 psig steam
Flowrate of heat source (lbs/hr)	3,946.4	821.84	109,709	655

*Table 9.4: Energy balance on the reboilers of the distillation columns.*

Calculations to determine the required flowrate of heat source are found in the following section.

#### *b. Utilities*

The reboilers of the tray towers each require a utility to provide heat. For the demethanizer, deethanizer, and depropanizer, low-pressure steam is used to provide heating. For the C2-Splitter, cooling water is used to provide heat, because the temperature of the bottoms product is very low at 17°F. The following table summarizes the steam requirements for each column based on the heat duty of the reboiler:

deethanizer, and depropanizer columns				
	Demethanizer	Deethanizer	Depropanizer	
Reboiler Heat Duty (BTU/hr)	3,599,122	749,516	597,034	
Reboiler Temp (°F)	205.2	57.5	149.1	
Steam Pressure required	50	50	50 <sup>°</sup>	
(psig):				
Latent Heat (BTU/hr):	912	912	912	
Required Flowrate (lbs/hr):	3,946.4	821.84	654.64	

*Table 9.5: Low-pressure steam requirements for the reboilers of the demethanizer, deethanizer, and depropanizer columns*

Because the reboiler temperatures are all relatively low, low-pressure steam is required to provide heating.

Interestingly, the reboiler of the C2-Splitter requires cooling water to provide heating. This is because the bottoms product of the C2-Splitter is 17°F. A stream in the range of 60-70°F would be ideal to provide heating, but something hotter would run the risk of causing film boiling. Thus, cooling water was selected as the utility, since it is in that temperature range. The reboiler heat duty is 2,2MM BTU/hr. Since the specific heat capacity of water at that temperature is 1 BTU/lb- °F, the flowrate of cooling water needed is 109,800 lbs/hr.

Whence the cooling water has passed through the reboiler, it will be at a temperature of 40°F, qualifying it as chilled water. Some of this chilled water will be sent to the quench tower at a rate of 80,200 lbs/hr, and the remaining 29,600 lbs/hr will be sold as chilled water.

In addition to the condensers and reboilers in the separations part of the process, there are five pumps that are powered by electricity—four pumps that are used for the reflux streams for each column, and one pump that is used for the feed to the C2-Splitter. The following table summarizes the utilities required for each pump:

Tuble 7.0. Olinings Feguin Chichis for pumps in the separations part of the process					
	Demethanizer	Deethanizer	C <sub>2</sub> -Splitter	Depropanizer	C <sub>2</sub> Feed
	Reflux	Reflux	Reflux	Reflux	
Net Work	$0.297$ hp	$0.5194$ hp	$0.3695$ hp	$0.5079$ hp	.22 <sub>hp</sub>
Electricity	$0.2215$ kW	$0.3876$ kW	$0.2731$ kW	$0.3791$ kW	$0.914 \text{ kW}$
Requirement					

*Table 9.6: Utilities requirements for pumps in the separations part of the process*

#### *iv. Section 400: Refrigeration System*

## *a. Energy Balance*

The refrigeration cycle consists of a compressor, plate-fin exchanger, and two flash vessels, each of which has an associated cooling or heat duty with it. This part of the process has immense energy and utility requirements, and contributes significantly to the annual cost

The compressor compresses 66,000 lbs/hr of ethylene refrigerant from 85 psia to 2,000 psia. Electricity is used to achieve this pressure change; 4,333 kW are needed to power this unit.

The plate-fin exchanger involves 14 streams. It recovers the cold from the vapor distillates from the demethanizer and deethanizer columns, as well as the vapor streams from both flash vessels, and cools the ethylene refrigerant before it goes to the flash vessels. The plate-fin exchanger has a cooling duty of -22.3MM BTU/hr.

The first flash vessel reduces the temperature of the refrigerant from -1.2°F to -29.06°F by dropping the pressure 2000 psia to 252 psia. The Joule-Thompson effect is responsible for this temperature drop. The gas is allowed to expand through a throttle. During this expansion, there is no change in energy, which means that the duty of the flash vessel is zero. This is because for all non-ideal gasses (i.e. gasses other than hydrogen or helium), enthalpy is a function of temperature, so if the enthalpy remains constant, the temperature will, too. Since the gas in the process is *not* an ideal gas (especially since it is at an extremely high pressure), constant enthalpy does not equal constant temperature, so the temperature of the gas drops significantly when the gas is throttled.

The second flash vessel reduces the temperature of the refrigerant from -29.06°F to -143.7°F by dropping the pressure from 252 psia to 21 psia. Similar to the first flash vessel, the Joule-Thompson effect is responsible for the temperature drop. There is no change in energy during throttling, so the duty of the flash vessel is zero.

## b. *Utilities:*

In the refrigeration cycle, the compressor uses 5,810 hp of work and requires 4,333 kW of electricity for power. This amount of electricity is one of the costliest utilities in the entire process, with over \$2.5MM being spent annually. For comparison, the second costliest compressor is in the compression cascade of the steam cracking process, and costs \$162,000 per year.

For startup, 433 ton-day, or \$8,660 worth, of -30°F refrigerant are needed for the plate-fin exchanger; afterwards, the cold streams from the demethanizer and deethanizer condensers are used for cooling.

#### **Section 10. Equipment List and Unit Descriptions**

*i. Section 000: Upstream Processing*

#### **Storage Silos**



The function of T-001 and T-002 is to store three days' worth of feed shard each to prevent production halt. The temperature and pressure are not regulated and are therefore said to be atmospheric. The volume of each silo is  $10500$  ft<sup>3</sup>, found using an assumed shard density of 58.9 lb/ft<sup>3</sup> and a 25% void fraction due to packing. An aspect ratio of 3, common for storage vessels, is used. Each silo has an upper cylindrical section and lower conical section. The purchase cost of each silo is \$45,707. No specification sheet is included.

### **Bucket Elevators**



The function of the bucket elevators is to move plastic shard from the transport units to storage silos, and again from the screw conveyor to the extrusion screw. The units consist of chains of buckets, 12 inches in width and 1.5 feet apart, which move the plastic shard vertically. Due to the nature of the plastic shards, there is no concern that waste sticks to the bucket, and high speeds are usable, but 150 ft/sec is estimated. The speed and bucket volume more importantly depend on unit availability for purchase. The 55-foot bucket elevator has a power requirement of .626 hp, and the 16-foot elevator 0.206 hp, which account for both the mass flow rate and vertical distance travelled. The purchase cost of the 55-foot elevator is \$23,534, and that of the 16-foot elevator is \$11,642. No specification sheet is included.

## **Screw Conveyor**



The screw conveyor is selected for transport of shards due to its ability to regulate volumetric flow capacity and handle particles of small size. The feed rate of the screw is 81.9 ft<sup>3</sup>/hr, which roughly correlates to a 6-inch diameter 50 rpm conveyor. The length of transport is estimated as 40 feet, which is to account for the space occupied by the silos. The power requirement is 0.958 hp, which assumes no elevation change. The purchase cost of the feeder is \$2,883. No specification sheet is included.

## *ii. Section 100: Rotary Kiln Pyrolysis*

## **Rotary Kiln**



The rotary kiln is the first of two cracking units in the process. It degrades the molten plastic waste to a short-chain hydrocarbon gas and a pyrolytic oil product, with the presence of some char. The rotary kiln is considered as two concentric pressure vessels. The inner vessel is 2.8 ft diameter, and feed molten plastic continuously at 6430 lb/hr. The plastic is moved through the inner chamber at a constant rate of 0.0147 ft/s as governed by a carbon steel screw conveyor. The inner chamber is maintained at 73.5 psia, at which point a pressure cap, fitted to not rotate with the kiln, permits gaseous product to exit from the highest point in the kiln. The molten plastic is heated first in the kiln over a length of 15.5 ft a rate of  $68^{\circ}F/min$  to reach  $1112^{\circ}F$ . The plastic is then held at a that temperature for the remaining 26.5 ft. The gaseous product is said to form at a constant rate in the kiln. Over the entire length of the chamber, the energy demand to heat and maintain the plastic temperature is 3.66 x 106 BTU/hr. The inner chamber is made from a 0.25-inch-thick layer of Carbon Steel, which is the thickness as estimated for the pressure vessel, surrounded by 8.4 inches of alumina oxide refractory, which is selected due to its high thermal conductivity, strength, and ability to be exposed to temperatures up to 3000  $^{\circ}$ F. A thermal conductivity of 10.4 BTU/h ft  $^{\circ}$ F is used to estimate the wall thickness to achieve a desired ∆T. Due to the thickness of the refractory layer, the temperatures which carbon steel is exposed to should not cause any deformation of the shell.

There are two chambers outside the alumina oxide refractory, which are separated by a refractory wall, which are used for combustion. Both chambers are operated at 36.8 psia and 2732 <sup>o</sup>F. The feed rate to each chamber of pyrolytic oil and air is dependent on the energy demands of specific section, assuming 40% thermal efficiency. Not-rotating pressure caps are again used to remove the gaseous product. The combustion chamber is 6 inches, with burners located primarily beneath the inner shell to concentrate heat near the molten plastic.

The outermost layer of the rotary kiln is 14.4 inches of alumina oxide refractory covered with 0.25 inches of carbon steel for structural support. This layer should prevent the exposed surface from exceeding 200  $^{\circ}$ F for safety concerns. The reactor is set up at a 1.1 $^{\circ}$  incline from the horizontal. Due to the complex nature of cracking reactions and unknown intermediates, the reactor was not modeled in Aspen except for energy balance purposes.

The electricity demands are estimated as 80 kW to power the rotary kiln, per online estimates, accounting for both the rotation of the vessel at nearly 2 rpm and the screw conveyor. The costing is roughly estimated as summing two horizontal pressure vessels, giving a purchase cost of \$167,171.

#### **Extrusion Screw**



The extrusion screw is purchased directly from a third-party seller. A twin-screw extruder is likely necessary due to the high mass flow rate. The molten plastic is said to be heated from room temperature to  $482^{\circ}$ F, which is  $50^{\circ}$ F greater than the melting point of polystyrene (which has the highest melting point of all three types of plastic involved). The work required is 820 hp, and per online estimate the purchase cost is \$500,000. No specification sheet is included, but a brochure for a potential module is included in the Appendix.

#### **Blower 1**



The blower adds air to the first combustion chamber which supplies heat to raise the temperature of the plastic waste in the rotary kiln. It raises incoming pressure from atmospheric to 36.8 psia. The temperature is said to be atmospheric at both the inlet and outlet of the blower, and thus the blower is made from aluminum. It requires a net work of 26.1 hp due to 88% efficiency. The flow rate through the blower is 539 ft<sup>3</sup>/min, and the purchase cost is an estimated \$8,820.

#### **Blower 2**



Nearly identical to B 101, except a lesser volumetric flow rate of  $35.1 \text{ ft}^3/\text{min}$  is used, creating a work requirement of 3.8 hp and efficiency of 83%. The purchase cost is an estimated \$8,820.

#### **Solid Liquid Splitter**



This unit is largely hypothetical, and a pilot plant would be necessary to determine the feasibility. To remove the char from the liquid oil as best as possible, the solid/liquid slurry flows into the vessel at 1265 lb/hr, driven by the pressure in the rotary kiln. The size is approximated considering how much oil/char mixture enters the unit over the course of one residence time (47.5 minutes), and an assumed aspect ratio of 5. The splitter is said to be 60% full, and still at a pressure of 73.5 psia. There is a fine carbon steel mesh, which is oriented as a baffle, near the center of the vessel. There are two outlets, which have volumetric flow rates of 1003 lb/hr (oil product), and 262 lb/hr (slurry). The ratio of outlet sizes of the tank reflects the ratio of flow rates. The pressure is assumed to be sufficient to drive the operation of this unit. It is possible that MOYNO pumps, capable of low flow rates and sustaining very high temperatures, would be required to drive the flow. The purchase cost is an estimated \$10,628.

## **Oil Storage Tank**



Given a flow rate of oil for sale of 674 lb/hr, an assumed density of 58.3 lb/ft<sup>3</sup>, and a desired capacity to store 6 days of product, a total storage volume of 925 ft<sup>3</sup> is required. Using an assumed aspect ratio of 3, the dimensions of this unit are 7.3 ft diameter and 21.9 ft height. The oil product enters the storage tank at high temperature of 1112 <sup>o</sup>F and pressure of 73.5 psia, but no effort is made to maintain these conditions. The tank is designed as a conical roof storage vessel, and a nitrogen blanket is used to maintain safe oxygen concentration. The purchase cost is an estimated \$24,728.

## **Slurry Storage Tank**



The same approach is taken here to modeling the tank as the pyrolytic oil storage tank, although the inlet flow is now 262 lb/hr. The purchase cost is an estimated \$3404.

## **Steam Cracker**



The steam cracker takes paraffinic light gas mixed with steam and dehydrates, or cracks, the compounds into ethylene and propylene. The steam cracker also preheats 242,480 lb/hr of boiler water and 2,066 lb/hr of water to be used as process steam. Fuel to fire the steam cracker comes from oil product from the rotary kiln, and recovered fuel from separation processes. The steam cracker has severity of 0.66, which corresponds to a 1 second residence time in the furnace. The steam cracker has a convective section and radiation section. The exact dimensions of the steam cracker were not calculated, but a private consultant provided costing data based on its ethylene output.



#### **Transfer Line Exchanger**

The transfer line heat exchanger rapidly quenches the cracked gas to prevent more propagation reactions from occurring. The transfer line exchanger is modeled after a BORSIG tunnelflow exchanger. Hot gases will flow through the tubes and boiler water will flow concurrently in the annulus of the tubes. Within the TLE, the boiler water will undergo a phase change and become high pressure steam.



#### **Quench Tower Heat Exchanger**

The heat exchanger in the quench tower recycle system is a shell and tube heat exchanger, and it cools the recycle spray water stream from 120°F back down to 90°F. The chiled water experiences a temperature change from 40°F to 105°F. Flow in the heat exchanger is countercurrent.

## **Intercooler 1**



The intercooler is modeled as a shell and tube heat exchanger on ASPEN. It cools the stream after COMP-1 from 324°F to 224°F. The gas stream experiences a temperature drop of 100°F in all four intercoolers. The temperature change in the cooling water is 80°F to 120°F, which is the same for all four units. Inter-stage coolers are needed because it takes less work to compress a cooler gas than a hotter gas.
# **Intercooler 2**



# **Intercooler 3**



# **Intercooler 4**



# **Compressor 1**



Compressor 1 is a centrifugal compressor used to increase the pressure of the cracked gas before it undergoes separation. The gas enters the series of compressors at 60 psia and leaves at 559.5 psia. The pressure of this stream needs to be increased so that the boiling point of certain compounds will shift to temperature to a more feasible one for separation. All compressors in Section 200 were modeled on ASPEN. The isentropic efficiency was assumed to be 0.81.

## **Compressor 2**



# **Compressor 3**



## **Compressor 4**



#### **Blower 1**



Blower 1 is used to move fuel gases from the storage tanks to the steam cracker furnace. It was modeled as an isentropic compressor on ASPEN. It is sized to move 606 lb/hr of hydrogen, 599 lb/hr of methane, and 582 lb/hr of ethylene.

# *iv. Section 300: Separations*

## **Tray Towers**

## **Demethanizer Column**



The demethanizer separates a significant portion of the hydrogen and methane gas produced in the steam cracking of the pyrolysis gas from the light hydrocarbons and the heavy hydrocarbons. The feed to the demethanizer is 5,164 lbs/hr of cracked gas, which enters the column at 142.5°F and 555 psia.

According to an ASPEN simulation, 12 theoretical stages are needed to achieve the desired separation, with the feed stream entering above stage 4. Assuming a tray efficiency of 0.7, this means that fifteen real stages are needed, with the feed stream entering above the sixth stage. Given eighteen-inch spacing between each tray, a height of 22.5 ft is obtained. One 3-foot manhole at the feed stage and an additional 3-foot manhole every ten trays are included, as well as a 10-foot sump and 4-ft of height at the top of the column, resulting in a functional height of 42.5 ft. Including a skirt height of 15 ft, the total demethanizer height is 57.5 ft. An L/D aspect ratio of 8 was chosen, yielding a diameter of 5.3 ft.

A reflux ratio of 5 is required. The vapor distillate rate is 1,702 lbs/hr, the liquid distillate rate is 2,098 lbs/hr, and the bottoms rate is 1,364 lbs/hr. The selected material of construction is carbon steel. The temperatures of the columns are extremely cold. Carbon steel is the material of construction for many cryogenic units, including cold boxes, which operate at temperatures similar to those in this process. So, carbon steel is an appropriate choice of material for the columns.

The reflux drum for the demethanizer condenser was sized so that fifteen minutes of accumulation would result in the drum being half-full. Given a volumetric reflux rate of 682 cuft/hr, the reflux drum would need to have a volume of 341 cubic feet for fifteen minutes' worth of accumulation to fill half of the drum. Using an L/D aspect ratio of 4 for a horizontal vessel, a length of 36.2 ft and a diameter of 9.05 ft were determined.

The kettle reboiler for the demethanizer column has a heat duty of 3.6MM BTU/hr, as calculated by ASPEN. Low-pressure steam must be supplied at a flowrate of 3,950 lbs/hr.



#### **Deethanizer Column**

The deethanizer results in three outlet streams: a vapor distillate, which contains the remaining hydrogen and methane, as well as some of the ethylene product; a liquid side stream, which contains both ethylene and ethane hydrocarbons; and the bottoms product, which contains all the hydrocarbons heavier than ethane. The feed to the deethanizer is the 2,098 lbs/hr ethylene recovery stream from the demethanizer, which enters the deethanizer at -131.2°F and 550 psia.

According to an ASPEN simulation, 30 theoretical trays are needed to achieve the desired separation, with the feed stream entering above the twentieth stage. Assuming a tray efficiency of 0.7, this means that 43 real stages are needed, with the feed stream entering above the twenty-ninth stage. Given eighteen-inch spacing between each tray, a height of 64.5 ft is obtained. One 3-foot manhole at the feed stage and an additional 3-foot manhole every ten trays are included, as well as a 10-foot sump and 4-ft of height at the top of the column, resulting in a functional height of 84.5 ft. Including a skirt height of 15 ft, the total demethanizer height is 99.5 ft. An L/D aspect ratio of 10 was chosen, yielding a diameter of 8.45 ft.

A reflux ratio of 25 is required. The distillate rate is 120 lbs/hr, the side stream flow rate is 1,500 lbs/hr, and the bottoms rate is 475 lbs/hr. The selected material of construction is carbon steel. The temperatures of the columns are extremely cold. Carbon steel is the material of construction for many cryogenic units, including cold boxes, which operate at temperatures similar to those in this process. So, carbon steel is an appropriate choice of material for the columns.

The reflux drum for the deethanizer condenser was sized so that fifteen minutes of accumulation would result in the drum being half-full. Given a volumetric reflux rate of 107 cuft/hr, the reflux drum would need to have a volume of 53.5 cubic feet for fifteen minutes' worth of accumulation to fill half of the drum. Using an L/D aspect ratio of 3 for a horizontal vessel, a length of 7.6 ft and a diameter of 2.5 ft were determined.

The kettle reboiler for the deethanizer column has a heat duty of 750,000 BTU/hr, as calculated by ASPEN. Low-pressure steam must be supplied at a flowrate of 822 lbs/hr.

As discussed in the process description in Section 8, a reflux ratio of 25 for the deethanizer column might seem alarmingly high at first. The distillate rate of the deethanizer column is only 120 lbs/hr, and the reflux rate is 3,000 lbs/hr. This corresponds to a cooling duty of -604,000 BTU/hr. This duty is far less than that of either the demethanizer or C2-Splitter condensers, whose reflux ratios are much smaller (5 and 10, respectively) but who have much higher cooling duties on the order of MM BTU/hr because their distillate flowrates (and, thus, their reflux rates) are much higher, even at a relatively low reflux ratio. Clearly, the value of the reflux ratio is not the best indicator of condenser duty, but rather the reflux flowrate is.

#### **C2 Feed Pump**



The side stream that exits the deethanizer to enter the C2-Splitter has a pressure of 204 psia. This is below the operating pressure of the C2-Splitter (290 psia), so the stream must be sent to a pump to increase the pressure. A head of 477.0 ft and net work of 1.22 hp were calculated using ASPEN.

#### **C2-Splitter**



The C2-Splitter separates the recovered ethylene from the other components that exit the deethanizer column in the side-stream. The feed to the C2-Splitter is 1,500 lbs/hr, which enters the column at -44.2°F and 300 psia after passing through the C2 feed pump.

According to an ASPEN simulation, 23 theoretical trays are needed to achieve the desired separation, with the feed stream entering above the twelfth stage. In the industry, C2-Splitters typically have an efficiency of 1.0 or even greater than 1. Assuming a tray efficiency of 1, this means that 23 real stages are needed, with the feed stream entering above the twelfth stage. Given eighteen-inch spacing between each tray, a height of 34.5 ft is obtained. One 3-foot manhole at the feed stage and an additional 3-foot manhole every ten trays are included, as well as a 10-foot sump and 4-ft of height at the top of the column, resulting in a functional height of 54.5 ft. Including a skirt height of 15 ft, the total demethanizer height is 69.5 ft. An L/D aspect ratio of 10 was chosen, yielding a diameter of 5.45 ft.

A reflux ratio of 10 is required. The distillate rate is 1,410 lbs/hr, and the bottoms rate is 90 lbs/hr. The selected material of construction is carbon steel. The temperatures of the columns are extremely cold. Carbon steel is the material of construction for many cryogenic units, including cold boxes, which operate at temperatures similar to those in this process. So, carbon steel is an appropriate choice of material for the columns.

The reflux drum for the C2-Splitter condenser was sized so that fifteen minutes of accumulation would result in the drum being half-full. Given a volumetric reflux rate of 567 cuft/hr, the reflux drum would need to have a volume of 283 cubic feet for fifteen minutes' worth of accumulation to fill half of the drum. Using an L/D aspect ratio of 3 for a horizontal vessel, a length of 30 ft and a diameter of 7.5 ft were determined.

The kettle reboiler for the C2-Splitter column has a heat duty of 2.2MM BTU/hr, as calculated by ASPEN. The bottoms product of the C2-Splitter exits at 17°F, meaning that a heat source around 60°F would be ideal. Cooling water at a temperature of 60°F must be supplied at a flowrate of 110,000 lbs/hr. This cooling water exits the reboiler at a temperature of 40°F, meaning that it can be used as chilled water in other parts of the plant, and the remaining water can be sold as chilled water (which is worth more than the cooling water that would need to be purchased to provide heat to the kettle reboiler).

#### **Depropanizer**



The depropanizer separates the bottoms products from both the demethanizer and deethanizer into three products: a C2-fuel, the 95.7% pure propylene product, and impure butane to be used as fuel. The feed to the depropanizer is 1,839 lbs/hr, which enters the column at -103.3°F and a pressure of 150.0 psia.

According to an ASPEN simulation, 28 theoretical trays are needed to achieve the desired separation, with the feed stream entering above stage 16. Assuming a tray efficiency of 0.7, this means that 40 real stages are needed, with the feed stream entering above stage 23. Given eighteeninch spacing between each tray, a height of 60.0 ft is obtained. One 3-foot manhole at the feed stage and an additional 3-foot manhole every ten trays are included, as well as a 10-foot sump and 4-ft of height at the top of the column, resulting in a functional height of 80.0 ft. Including a skirt height of 15 ft, the total demethanizer height is 95.0 ft. An L/D aspect ratio of 10 was chosen, yielding a diameter of 8.0 ft.

A reflux ratio of 42 is required. The distillate rate is 96 lbs/hr, the propylene-product side stream flowrate is 1,250 lbs/hr, and the bottoms rate is 90 lbs/hr. The selected material of construction is carbon steel. The temperatures of the columns are extremely cold. Carbon steel is the material of construction for many cryogenic units, including cold boxes, which operate at temperatures similar to those in this process. So, carbon steel is an appropriate choice of material for the columns.

The reflux drum for the depropanizer condenser was sized so that fifteen minutes of accumulation would result in the drum being half-full. Given a volumetric reflux rate of 145.5 cuft/hr, the reflux drum would need to have a volume of 72.7 cubic feet for fifteen minutes' worth of accumulation to fill half of the drum. Using an L/D aspect ratio of 3 for a horizontal vessel, a length of 10.3 ft and a diameter of 3.4 ft were determined.

The kettle reboiler for the depropanizer column has a heat duty of 600,000 BTU/hr, as calculated by ASPEN. Low-pressure steam must be supplied at a flowrate of 655 lbs/hr.

As discussed in the process description in Section 8, a reflux ratio of 42 for the depropanizer column might seem alarmingly high at first. However, the same reasoning that is applied to the deethanizer column condenser is relevant here. The distillate rate for the depropanizer column is only 96 lbs/hr, and the reflux rate is only 4,032 lbs/hr. This corresponds to a condenser cooling duty of -597,000 BTU/hr. This duty is far less than that of either the demethanizer or C2-Splitter condensers, whose reflux ratios are much smaller (5 and 10, respectively) but who have much higher cooling duties on the order of MM BTU/hr because their distillate flowrates (and, thus, their reflux rates) are much higher, even at a relatively low reflux ratio. Clearly, the value of the reflux ratio is not the best indicator of condenser duty, but rather the reflux flowrate is.

#### **Reflux Pumps**

The reflux stream that exits the condenser of each column must be pumped back to the top of the demethanizer tower. The pump is not at the same elevation as the condenser; in chemical plants, pumps are placed on the ground to allow for easy access for maintenance. As the reflux stream flows downward to the pump, it gains some pressure. Then, the pump increases the pressure of the stream further to allow it to travel back up to the top of the condenser for reflux. The head of each pump was calculated using the methods discussed in Appendix A.



#### **Demethanizer Reflux Pump**

#### **Deethanizer Reflux Pump**



# **C2-Splitter Reflux Pump**



## **Depropanizer Reflux Pump**



## **Storage Tanks**

Storage tanks are needed for both monomer products, ethylene and propylene, and the hydrocarbon streams that will be stored and used as fuel. Since the products of the steam cracking process are all light hydrocarbons that are gasses as atmospheric pressure, each tank is designed to hold one hour's worth of product. For the ethylene and propylene products, the streams will then be sold and transported to plants via pipeline to be used as monomer feedstock. One hour of storage is needed in case the purchasing plant needs to shut down; in that case, there would be a buffer to allow for gas to stop flowing to the shut-down plant while still being produced until our plant could be properly shut down, too. In such an event, the rotary kiln would be shut off upstream, and the product would accumulate in the storage vessel; one hour is sufficient time for the remaining material in the process to reach the storage vessel, so one hour's worth of storage is needed to contain that material.



#### **Ethylene Product Storage Tank**

The 99.0% pure ethylene product exits the C2-Splitter at a flowrate of 1410 lbs/hr at -20.6°F and 290 psia. At the conditions in the tank, ethylene has a density of 0.079 lbs/cuft, and 134,193 gallons of storage are needed for one hour's worth of product. This gas is then transported to the purchasing plant via gas pipeline.

#### **Propylene Product Storage Tank**



The 95.7% pure propylene product exits the depropanizer at a flowrate of 1250 lbs/hr at 70°F and 154 psia. At these conditions, propylene is a liquid. However, at the conditions in the tank, it will be a vapor whose density is 0.118 lb/cuft. This means that 85,704 gallons of storage are needed to hold one hour's worth of propylene product. This propylene is then transported to the purchasing plant to be used as feedstock via gas pipeline.

## **Fuel Storage Tank**



Five streams are sent to the fuel storage tank to be stored and used as fuel. One hour's worth of fuel is stored in this tank. Because a mix of several different hydrocarbons are stored, each with a different density at these conditions, a weighted average was calculated to determine the density of the gas in the fuel storage tank (which was 0.0645 lbs/cuft). Any streams that exit the column as a liquid will become vapor at these conditions.

# *v. Section 400: Refrigeration System*



#### **Refrigeration System Compressor**

The compressor in the refrigeration system must compress 66,000 lbs/hr of ethylene refrigerant. The ethylene refrigerant comes into the compressor at a temperature of 85°F and a pressure of 30 psia. The compressor uses electricity as its utility and does 5,810 hp of work. The refrigeration system is a closed cycle; the ethylene is compressed, cooled and flashed, and then it is sent to the appropriate compressors to provide cooling, after which it is sent back through the plate-fin exchanger so that it can return to the start of the cycle.

#### **Flash Vessel 1**



Flash Vessel 1 is used in the refrigeration cycle to lower the refrigerant temperature so that it can be used in the condensers of the columns in the separation section of the process. 66,000 lbs/hr of refrigerant are fed into Flash Vessel 1 at 4.6°F and 2000 psia. 8,3971 lbs/hr exit the vessel as vapor and are sent back to the plate-fin exchanger. 57,603 lbs/hr of refrigerant exit the vessel as liquid and are split into two streams: the first stream goes directly to the condensers of the C2- Splitter and the depropanizer, and the second stream is sent to the second flash vessel to lower the temperature further.

The Jules-Thompson effect is responsible for the temperature and pressure change experienced by the ethylene refrigerant. For all gases other than hydrogen and helium, a decrease in pressure due to gas expansion reduces gas temperature.

The vessel was modeled as a vertical pressure vessel. Assuming a residence time of 5 minutes, which is a standard residence time for flash vessels, and given a volumetric flowrate of 2,631 cuft/hr through the vessel, this corresponds to a volume of 1,640 gallons. Using an L/D aspect ratio of 3, this also gives a height of 13.6 ft and a diameter of 4.5 ft.

#### **Flash Vessel 2**



Flash Vessel 2 is used in the refrigeration cycle to further lower the temperature of some of the liquid outlet of the first flash vessel so that it can be used in the condensers of the columns in the separation section of the process. 38,603 lbs/hr of refrigerant are fed into Flash Vessel 2 at -29.06°F and 252 psia. 13,677 lbs/hr exit the vessel as vapor and are sent back to the plate-fin exchanger. 24,926 lbs/hr of refrigerant exit the vessel as liquid and this stream is sent to the separation section of the process to be used in the condensers of the demethanizer and deethanizer columns.

The Jules-Thompson effect is responsible for the temperature and pressure change experienced by the ethylene refrigerant. For all gases other than hydrogen and helium, a decrease in pressure due to gas expansion reduces gas temperature.

The vessel was modeled as a vertical pressure vessel. Assuming a residence time of 5 minutes and given a volumetric flowrate of 1,380 cubic feet per hour through the vessel, this corresponds to a volume of 860 gallons. Using an L/D aspect ratio of 3, this also gives a height of 11.0 ft and a diameter of 3.65 ft.



#### **Plate-Fin Exchanger**

This plate-fin exchanger is based on a model by a Stewart-Warner South Wind plate-fin exchanger. Several corrugated stainless-steel sheets are layered between flat stainless-steel sheets. Seven inlet streams and seven outlet streams flow through this heat exchanger, allowing for the refrigerant to be cooled by the cold distillate streams from the separation section of the process. This model of heat exchanger is very efficient at transferring heat, because there are many opportunities for heat transfer among the various inlet and outlet streams. The refrigerant is then sent to the separation process to be used in the condensers of the separation columns. The duty of the plate-fin exchanger is -4.78MM BTU/hr.

# **Section 11. Specification Sheets**

# *i. Section 100: Rotary Kiln Pyrolysis*













# *ii. Section 200: Steam Cracking, Quenching, and Compression*
























































# *iv. Section 400: Refrigeration System*









# **Section 12. Equipment Cost Summary**

The following table highlights the purchase costs and bare module costs of all equipment in this process. Design specifications of equipment were determined from ASPEN simulations and hand calculations. Equipment costs were calculated using equations presented in Chapter 16 of *Seider et al.* The total cost of equipment is \$21.35MM.

<b>EQUIPMENT</b> <b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>TYPE</b>	<b>PURCHASE</b> <b>COST</b>	<b>BARE MODULE</b> <b>FACTOR</b>	<b>BARE</b> <b>MODULE</b> <b>COST</b>
<b>RP-301</b>	Process Machinery	\$4,555	3.30	\$15,032
<b>RP-302</b>	Process Machinery	\$5,370	3.30	\$17,721
<b>RP-303</b>	Process Machinery	\$4,546	3.30	\$15,002
<b>RP-304</b>	Process Machinery	\$5,038	3.30	\$16,625
P-302	Process Machinery	\$5,667	3.30	\$18,701
$P-201$	Process Machinery	\$4,770	3.30	\$15,741
$P-202$	Process Machinery	\$4,581	3.30	\$15,117
$P-203$	Process Machinery	\$11,393	3.30	\$37,597
$B-101$	Process Machinery	\$8,820	2.15	\$18,963
$B-102$	Process Machinery	\$8,820	2.15	\$18,963
$B-201$	Process Machinery	\$14,604	2.15	\$31,399
$C-401$	Process Machinery	\$2,226,011	2.15	\$4,785,924
$C-201$	Process Machinery	\$392,000	2.15	\$842,800
$C-202$	Process Machinery	\$61,447	2.15	\$132,111
$C-203$	Process Machinery	\$35,079	2.15	\$75,420
$C-204$	Process Machinery	\$34,706	2.15	\$74,618
H-401	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$512,053	3.17	\$1,623,208
$C-301$	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$22,835	3.17	\$72,387
$C-302$	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$13,243	3.17	\$41,980
$C-303$	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$172,944	3.17	\$548,232
$C-304$	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$15,630	3.17	\$49,547
E-301	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$14,990	3.17	\$47,518
E-302	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$17,589	3.17	\$55,757
E-303	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$13,175	3.17	\$41,765
E-304	Fabricated Equipment	\$16,489	3.17	\$52,270
<b>HX-202</b>	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$16,302	3.17	\$51,677
<b>HX-203</b>	<b>Fabricated Equipment</b>	\$12,001	3.17	\$38,043

**Table 12.1:** Summary table for process equipment and machinery



A breakdown of costs is shown in the figure below:



**Figure 12.1:** A breakdown of equipment capital costs of the plant

58 units were accounted for in Table 20.1, nine from Section 000-100, 15 from Section 200, 25 from Section 300, four from Section 400, and five units in other. Section 400, the refrigeration cycle, has the least number of units but accounts for 33% of total equipment costs. The compressor (C-401) in the refrigeration cycle is the most expensive unit in the plant and its bare module cost is \$4.79MM. The compressor is that expensive because it compresses 66,000 lb/hr of ethylene gas from 30 psia to 2000 psia. Even though temperature only increases from 85°F to 100°F, ethylene will still be a gas. Section 300, separation processes, accounts for almost half of the total equipment costs. The most expensive units in Section 300 are distillation columns and the storage tanks. All the columns are made of carbon steel, the cheapest material, and they can withstand pressures of up to 15,000 psia. We considered having more storage tanks in a previous design, but we opted to store all recovered fuel in a storage tank.

# **Section 13. Fixed Capital Investment Summary**

The total capital investment for the project was determined to be \$27.5 MM. This value was calculated using the method from Chapter 16 of Seider et al. The calculation sequence can be seen in the table below.

**Table 13.1**: Relationship bare-module investment, direct permanent investment, depreciable

capital, permanent investment, and capital investment



The costs of certain factors such as site preparations and service facilities were not as clear as others. The table below shows the assumptions that were made in calculating the total capital investment.

<b>Table 19.4.</b> Tissuiliphons made to calculate require fees in the total capital investment.				
Cost of site preparations	5% of Total bare-module costs			
Cost of service facilities	5% of Total bare-module costs			
Cost of contingencies and contractor fees	18% of Direct permanent investment			
Cost of land	2% of Total depreciable capital			
Cost of plant start-up	10% of Total depreciable capital			

**Table 13.2:** Assumptions made to calculate require fees in the total capital investment.

# **Table 13.3**: Further analysis on total capital investment and working capital.





# **Section 14. Operating Cost-Cost of Manufacture**

*i. Variable Costs* 

Annual variable operating costs were calculated to be \$5MM and this includes the costs of raw material, general expenses, utilities, and revenue generated from byproducts. The following table summarizes the variable costs for this process.





The raw materials in this process are LDPE, HDPE, PP, and PS plastic shards. The total feed rate is 70 MT/day or 6,430 lb/hr. Unlike the other monomers that are produced in the rotary kiln, styrene does not proceed through the process as it is the primary component of the pyrolytic oil. Ethylene was also purchased as a raw material for the start-up of the refrigeration cycle.

The byproducts from the process are 450 psig steam, chilled water, and pyrolytic oil. High pressure steam is generated when boiler water undergoes a phase change while quenching cracked gases in the transfer line exchanger. Chilled water is generated in the reboiler of the C2 splitter column (D-303) as cooling water is used to heat the boil-up stream Some of the chilled water is sent to HX-202, while the rest is sold as a byproduct. Pyrolytic oil that was not burned in the rotary kiln was sold as a byproduct as well.

Utilities used in the process are boiler feed water, cooling water, low pressure steam, refrigerant, and electricity. Boiler feed water was used for quenching the cracked gases in the transfer line exchanger, cooling water was used as a coolant in heat exchangers and in the quench tower, refrigerant was bought for start-up purposes in the plate-fin exchanger in the refrigeration cycle, and low pressure steam was used to heat reboilers in the demethanizer (D-301), deethanizer (D-302), and depropanizer (D-304) columns. Electricity is the most expensive utility in the process and it is used in pumps, compressors, and to power units in Section 100.

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Ratio Required (per</b> lb of Ethylene and Propylene)	Unit Cost	<b>Annual</b> Demand	Annual Cost/Sale
Raw	Plastic shards	0.0011 MT	\$261.54	24,500 MT	\$6.41MM
<b>Material</b>	Ethylene	$0.00295$ lb	\$0.70	66,000 lb	\$46,200
<b>Byproducts</b>	450 psig steam	$1.56$ lb	\$.008	34.97MM lb	\$279.788
	Chilled Water	.00752 ton-day	\$1.50	168,021 ton-day	\$252,031
	Pyrolytic Oil	$0.254$ lb	\$0.70	5.67MM lb	\$3.97MM
<b>Utilities</b>	Cooling water	57.85 gal	\$0.0001	155.96MM gal	\$15,496
	50 psig steam	2.046 lb	\$.06	45.71MM lb	\$274,250
	$-30F$ ,	$0.0001$ ton-day	\$4.00	$2,165$ ton-day	\$8,660
	Refrigerant				
	Electricity	2.232 kWh	\$0.07	49.89MM kWh	\$3.80 MM
	<b>Boiler Feed</b>	$0.188$ gal	\$.02	$4.19$ MM gal	\$8,385
	Water				

**Table 15.2:** Summary of Raw Materials, Byproducts, and Utilities in the process

# *ii. Fixed Costs*

Fixed costs were calculated to be \$8.03MM per year. This includes the costs for operations, maintenance, and operating overhead as well as property taxes and insurance. We assumed that we would need four working shifts with five operators per shift. There will be four teams, one working a 12-hr day shift and another working a 12-hr night shift, while two teams are off over a four day period. The rotating work schedule will be 4 days on and 4 days off. At the plant there will be two consoles, each with one operator, and there will be three process technicians in the field. The technical assistance to manufacturing costs account for two process engineers and two process control engineers that work regular 40-hr weeks. This work schedule was recommended by an industrial consultant. The following table presents a summary of our fixed costs.



**Table 15.3:** Summary of fixed costs estimated for the project on an annual basis.

#### **Section 15. Other Important Considerations**

#### *i. Environmental Factors*

The main motivation of this project is to reduce the amount of plastic waste that gets disposed of in harmful ways, such as being dumped into the ocean or being incinerated dangerously close to habitation. One obvious way in which our project meets this goal is that it takes plastic waste in as its feed and prevents that plastic waste from reaching the ocean or incineration facilities. Given a feed of 68.9 tons of plastic each day, this corresponds to an annual 25,150 tons of plastic waste that are saved from dangerous disposal. This is only 0.3% of the 8 *million* tons of plastic waste that get dumped into the ocean each year— one plant will not be enough to eliminate the world's plastic waste problem. However, if similar plants were built around the world, it is conceivable that a significant portion of the world's plastic waste could be dealt with in a more sustainable manner.

Another important metric of success for our project is how well it can reduce the need for additional plastic to be created. Of the 68.9 tons of plastic waste entering the system each day, 40.14% is converted into ethylene and propylene by mass. These monomers can be used to create plastic resin through polymerization—ethylene can be polymerized to polyethylene, and propylene can be polymerized to polypropylene. These resins can then be used to make plastic products. How much of our plastic waste feed gets converted into these products relies in part on the efficiency of these processes, in addition to our own. Given that an estimated 300MM tons of plastic are produced each year, our annual ethylene and propylene output of 7,980 tons seems woefully small, but, again, if several such plants were built around the world, it is possible that we could significantly reduce the need to create new plastic material.

The process itself could also be modified to increase the ethylene and propylene yield but as of now, that is an expensive proposition. The catalysts that we considered for our process each had their own problems, but some of them had higher yields of light hydrocarbons, meaning that a greater amount of pyrolytic product could be cracked in the steam cracker to produce the desired products.

Plastic waste is not the only problem that currently threatens the environment. Greenhouse gas emission is a huge contributor to global climate change, which poses a huge threat to humanity and all organisms. Industrial processes are one of the most significant sources of greenhouse gas emission. It is important for our project not to offset the good done for the environment by emitting a large amount of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  into the atmosphere. A chemical plant is considered to be a very significant greenhouse gas emitter if it produces a high-digit six-figure number of tons of greenhouse gas annually, a significant greenhouse gas emitter if it produces a low-digit six-figure number of tons of greenhouse gas annually, and a moderate greenhouse gas emitter if it produces 100,000 tons or less of greenhouse gas annually. Our process produces  $3,706$  tons of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  annually, meaning that we produce far less than even a moderate greenhouse gas emitter. So, our goal to create an environmentally beneficial process without offsetting these benefits with greenhouse gas emissions was successful.

# *ii. Safety Factors*

The rotary kiln operates at high temperatures and poses a risk to plant operators if they get too close. To prevent any dangerous accidents, it is important to monitor the temperature of the kiln to ensure that it does not reach extreme temperatures. Devices such as UV detectors can be used to monitor the kiln temperature.

The storage tanks all contain flammable hydrocarbon gas. To prevent explosions, the pressure of the storage tanks is maintained at 30 psia, so that in the case of a puncture, gas would flow out to the atmosphere rather than air flowing in. It is dangerous for oxygen to enter the tanks because it makes ignition and explosions possible.

# *iii. Global factors*

Plastic waste is a threat across the globe. As discussed in the introduction, big plastic buyers like China have stopped purchasing plastic waste, and now other countries, mainly in Southeast Asia, have stepped in to become the primary purchasers. However, much of this plastic waste is disposed of in ways that are harmful to the environment and the people who live near the disposal plants. Incineration plants emit harmful compounds into the atmosphere that nearby habitants may breathe in, resulting in health problems. The fumes are also unpleasant and affect the quality of life for habitants living near the plant. Implementing recycling processes like the one proposed in this project could benefit communities throughout the world that suffer as a result of dangerous plastic waste disposal. For this reason, countries that are being overwhelmed with plastic waste stand to benefit the most from chemical recycling facilities.

This was one reason that Indonesia was selected for the plant location. Indonesia is believed to be the second-largest contributor to plastic waste ocean pollution, behind China [1]. While Indonesia is not a major plastic purchaser like many of its neighbors in Southeast Asia, its waterways are among the most polluted in the world, because the Indonesian population generates tons of plastic waste annually. Building a chemical recycling plant here would allow for convenient sourcing of plastic waste; because there is already so much plastic waste in Indonesia, transportation of plastic waste from faraway countries would not be necessary.

139

# *iv. Robustness of feedstock*

It is interesting to consider the feedstock as proposed by the project author. The feed to the process is PE, PP, and PS, which are selected as they are entirely composed of carbon and hydrogen. Introducing other types of plastic, notably PVC and PET, presents hazards due to oxygen and chlorine content, and thus other methods of recycling need be considered for those plastics. Due to the stability of the aromatic rings of polystyrene, polystyrene is converted to other aromatic compounds, namely styrene, toluene, and ethylbenzene. In this sense, polystyrene is primarily useful in the production of fuel oils from plastic waste, or in the production of styrene itself. Additionally, polystyrene has a significantly higher melting point than polypropylene and polyethylene, which increases electricity demands on the plastic extruder. It follows that in a pilot scale plant, excluding polystyrene from a feedstock should be considered, as its utility for making ethylene and propylene is minimal.

#### **Section 16. Profitability Analysis**

### *i. Profitability Metrics*

The proposed process for chemical recycling of mixed plastic waste is not a profitable venture. The Net Present Value of the recycling plant in 2022 is -\$18.8MM, and the Internal Rate of Return (IRR) is -4.72%. In the third year of production, a -2.12% Return on Investment (ROI) is obtained. The table below summarizes key profitability insights at a nominal interest rate of 15%:

*Table 16.1: Profitability Measures for the proposed process of chemical recycling.*

<b>Profitability Measures</b>	
The Internal Rate of Return (IRR) for this project is	$-4.47\%$
The Net Present Value (NPV) of this project in 2022 is	\$(18,605,100)

# **ROI Analysis (Third Production Year)**



This financial assessment is based on the following timeline: the plant is designed in one year (2022), constructed in the next year (2023), and operated for the following fifteen years (2024- 2038). The following table summarizes this trajectory:

<b>Chronology</b>						
		Distribution of		<b>Production Depreciation</b>	<b>Product Price</b>	
<u>Year</u>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Permanent Investment</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	5 year MACRS		
	2022 Design		$0.0\%$			
	2023 Construction	$100\%$	$0.0\%$			
	2024 Production	$0\%$	$45.0\%$	20.00%	\$0.69	
	2025 Production	$0\%$	67.5%	32.00%	\$0.69	
	2026 Production	$0\%$	$90.0\%$	19.20%	\$0.69	
	2027 Production		$90.0\%$	11.52%	\$0.69	
	2028 Production		$90.0\%$	11.52%	\$0.69	
	2029 Production		$90.0\%$	5.76%	\$0.69	
	2030 Production		$90.0\%$		\$0.69	
	2031 Production		$90.0\%$		\$0.69	
	2032 Production		$90.0\%$		\$0.69	
	2033 Production		90.0%		\$0.69	
	2034 Production		90.0%		\$0.69	
	2035 Production		90.0%		\$0.69	
	2036 Production		$90.0\%$		\$0.69	
	2037 Production		90.0%		\$0.69	
	2038 Production		90.0%		\$0.69	

*Table 16.2: Chronology of the proposed plant. One year will be used for design, one year for construction, and fifteen for production of ethylene and propylene product.*

This process has a negative IRR and a negative NPV, meaning that it does not produce value. A large contributor to these negative values is the large annual cost associated with running this plant. At 90% capacity, variable costs for the process are \$4.5MM, and fixed costs are \$8MM, equaling \$12.5MM in total annual cost. Annual sales are \$13.9MM, just \$1.4MM more than annual cost. With depreciation and taxes, this leads to net earnings of -\$560,000 in the third year of production. The plant earns negative dollars until 2030, when it finally begins to generate positive net earnings.

If this plant were built, it would require one year for design (2022) and one year for construction (2023), followed by a lifespan of fifteen years (2024-2038) of ethylene and propylene production. During the first year of production, 45% of plant capacity is reached. During the second year of operation, 68% of plant capacity is reached. For the remaining thirteen years of operation, 90% of plant capacity is reached, where 100% capacity is 70 MT per day feed of plastic waste. The following table summarizes the cashflow of the plant for the entire fifteen-year lifespan:



Cash Flow Summary

Table 16.2: Cashflow Spreadsheet for fifteen years of operation of chemical plant *Table 16.2: Cashflow Spreadsheet for fifteen years of operation of chemical plant*
The following figure summarizes the cumulative NPV at 15% for the two years prior to operation and the fifteen-year operation period:



*Figure 16.1: Cumulative discounted cash flow for the proposed chemical recycling process. The plant has an NPV of -\$18.8MM. The process does not break even after 15 years of operation.*

The following figure summarizes net earnings for the two years prior to operation and for



the fifteen-year operation period:

*Figure 16.2: Annual net earnings (\$) for the proposed process of chemical recycling. The plant has an NPV of -\$18.8MM. The process does not break even after 15 years of operation.*

In 2030, the plant begins to generate positive annual earnings. To breakeven, the plant would need to operate for an additional seventeen years, after which point it could begin turning a profit. This means that a total of thirty-two years of operation are required to even reach the breakeven point, which is an unrealistic amount of time to wait to breakeven.

## *ii. Sensitivity Analyses*

The profitability analysis was performed using a product price of \$0.69 and an annual variable cost of \$4.5MM. It would be beneficial to examine how product price point and annual variable costs affect the profitability of the plant. Given our current annual variable costs, a product price of \$0.76 per pound would result in a positive IRR. It would be worth investigating the possibility of pricing our product slightly above market value. Typically, ethylene and propylene sell for roughly \$0.70 per pound. However, some companies might be willing to pay a slightly higher price for our product since it is generated using a green process; it is possible that companies that source their plastic feedstock from a green facility rather than the typical petrol plant could receive tax credit or a government subsidy for being more sustainable. Depending on the size of the credit, this could serve as incentive to choose our product over other, cheaper feedstock options.

The table on the following page shows a sensitivity analysis for the Internal Rate of Return in several different scenarios of product price and variable costs, with the current IRR scenario highlighted in red, and acceptable-IRR scenarios (those above an IRR of 12%) highlighted in green:



Product Price

*Table 16.3: Sensitivity analysis for different product price points and annual variable*  Table 16.3: Sensitivity analysis for different product price points and annual variable

According to this sensitivity analysis table, when annual variable costs are \$5MM at 100% (and \$4.5MM at 90% capacity, which is our case), a product price of \$0.76 per pound is necessary to obtain a positive, albeit small, IRR of 2.11%. However, to reach a more acceptable IRR of at least 12%, a product price of \$0.97 is necessary. At our current product price, annual variable costs would need to be reduced to \$3.99MM to have a (barely) positive IRR. At the current product price, not even a 50% reduction in annual variable cost would yield a suitable IRR. This project has very high annual costs. Refer to Section 13 for the tables summarizing fixed and variable cost.

A simple balance on the ethylene and propylene sales, byproduct sales, cost of raw materials, and cost of utilities can be performed on a per-pound of ethylene and propylene basis to understand how variable costs affect profitability:



The cost of raw material and utilities equal 66.7% of the value of the ethylene and propylene product, and the byproducts generated in the process equal 44.9% of the value of the ethylene and propylene product. One way to increase the value of the process overall would be to reduce the amount of raw materials and utilities required in the process, as shown in the sensitivity analysis table above.

## *iii. Potential Adjustments for Increased Profitability*

Despite the current process's failure to breakeven and generate profit, chemical recycling of plastic waste may still be a worthy process for investors to consider. There are several parts of our process that could be modified to reduce costs and make the process more economically viable.

In this process, there are several streams that have some valuable property that are not currently being exploited. These alternatives were not considered for the purposes of this project due to time constraints, but it would be worthwhile to investigate further if this plant were to be designed. The distillate from the C2-Splitter and depropanizer columns exit the condenser at roughly -30°F. These streams could be used to cool water so that it could be sold as a chilled water byproduct. Further, all of the streams that exit the separations process are sent to be stored in storage tanks at 30 psia. They each exit the column at fairly high pressure (ranging from 150 psia to 300 psia). As these gases move from high pressure to low pressure, they will expand. When a gas expands, it can be used to perform work. Gas expansion in a turbine can generate electricity. That would be an idea worth investigating for future development of this process.

There are also opportunities to reduce the amount of utilities used in the process. For example, in the depropanizer column, the two feed streams are fed at the same tray location. As discussed in Section 10, these feeds could be fed into the column at different locations to reduce the amount of cooling and heating duty needed in the condenser and reboiler of the column (see Section 10 for a detailed explanation of this reasoning). This would lower the amount of utilities required for the depropanizer column. However, this is only a small contribution to the utilities cost; the compressor in the refrigeration cycle requires \$2MM worth of electricity annually, which is by far the greatest utility requirement in the process.

One drastic modification that could potentially turn this endeavor into a profitable one would be to do away with the separations and refrigeration processes and sell the steam-cracked product to a plant that is equipped to handle these costly separations. Petroleum and ethylene plants use similar separations processes to produce ethylene and propylene from naphtha and other hydrocarbon oils, but because they sell a greater amount of product, they are able to turn a profit.

The steam-cracked product from our process, which is comprised of the same light hydrocarbons found in natural gas, could be used as supplemental feedstock in plants that already produce ethylene and propylene. The utilities associated with the separations process in our project are extremely costly; the electricity for the compressor in the refrigeration cycle costs over \$2MM per year, and accounts for almost half of the total variable cost. Eliminating these costs would save a large amount of money annually.

With this modification, ethylene and propylene would no longer be the products; rather, a light hydrocarbon oil would be the product. Price information for this light hydrocarbon oil would need to be determined to analyze the profitability of the process with this modification. Another consequence of this modification would be that some of the byproducts would no longer be produced, and we would lose on revenue opportunity there.

Removing the separations and refrigeration sections would also significantly reduce the total capital investment. The equipment cost for the separations and refrigeration process units is \$10MM. This represents 78% of the total equipment cost. Getting rid of this equipment, would significantly reduce the total capital investment from \$27.5MM to \$17.5MM (and that's only considering the equipment itself—removing this section would also reduce the amount of land required for the plant, the cost of plant start-up, and other components of capital investment that depend on the bare module cost). With a lower total capital investment, it would be easier to breakeven in a shorter amount of time and to start generating profit.

## *iv. Summary*

While the proposed process for chemical recycling of mixed plastic waste is not a profitable endeavor, the concept is still a worthy pursuit, as there are several possible modifications and alternatives to the existing process that could make the process a profitable one.

## **Section 17. Conclusions and Recommendation**

The process described offers insight into a circular monomers' economy. 70 MT/day of high-density polyethylene, low-density polyethylene, polypropylene, and polystyrene are converted to 33,840 lb/day of 99% purity ethylene and 30,000 lb/day of 95.7% purity propylene. Pyrolytic oil, chilled water, and high-pressure steam are additionally produced for sale. The overall recovery is 41.4% by mass of the monomers originally in the plastic feedstock.

The innovative design combines plastic waste processing technology with established unsaturated hydrocarbon production techniques in a two-part cracking process. Notably, the byproducts of the cracking reactions provide a sufficient fuel source to meet the high energy demands of cracking chemistry, which has both economic and environmental benefits.

Economically, the process is not profitable, and we do not recommend investing in the process as it is currently modeled. The Internal Rate of Return (IRR) is -4.74%, the Net Present Value (NPV) is -\$18.8MM, and the Return on Investment (ROI) in the third year of operation is - 2.12%; it would not be worth investing in this project unless the IRR and ROI were much higher, around 12-15% at least. However, chemical recycling deserves to be considered as a viable recycling option; there are ways to make the process more profitable, and the environmental benefits of the process are important enough to warrant further development and consideration. Additionally, exploration into government subsidy for the environmental merits of the process may hold potential in achieving profit.

It is recommended that a pilot-scale facility is constructed to better understand and optimize the process, especially the rotary kiln. The true product distribution and function of the kiln, as well as the proposed method for purifying the fuel oil product, are It is recommended that a pilotscale facility is constructed to better understand and optimize the process, especially the rotary kiln. The true product distribution and function of the kiln, as well as the proposed method for

151

purifying the fuel oil product, are at this time theoretical. In scale-up, challenges will arise surrounding heat transfer in all stages of the process, given the high temperatures of the cracking reactions and low temperatures of the separations train.

#### **Section 18. Acknowledgments**

Our team would like to thank Professor Our team would like to thank Professor Bruce Vrana and Dr. Sean Holleran for their support throughout the completion of this project. Their guidance—in our weekly meetings, in office hours, and in numerous email exchanges—was invaluable, and we could not have accomplished this feat without them. We would also like to thank Mr. Stephen Tieri for writing a problem statement that was at once challenging and interesting; each moment of frustration was matched with many moments of excitement, and we appreciate the chance to work on a project that reminded us why we chose our major in the first place. We would like to thank each of the other industry consultants who offered their Tuesday afternoons to us, even in the midst of a global pandemic. We would especially like to thank Professor Leonard Fabiano for sharing his seemingly-boundless knowledge of chemical engineering practices, teaching us about refractory materials and rotary kilns, and for his willingness to spend multiple hours on Skype walking us through ASPEN simulations. The stories he shared about his years in process engineering were an added bonus. Finally, we would like to thank the entire CBE faculty and administration for making our education possible, and for preparing us to complete what once felt like a Herculean task with confidence.

## **Section 19. Works Cited**

### **Section 2: Introduction and Time-Objective Chart**

- [1] Stegman, Robyn, et. al. "Plastics in the Ocean." *Ocean Conservancy,* 2 Mar. 2020, https://oceanconservancy.org/trash-free-seas/plastics-in-the-ocean/.
- [2] Badoud, Mathilde, et. al. "Do You Know Where Your Plastic Goes?" *Ocean Concervany,* 18 Dec. 2018, https://oceanconservancy.org/blog/2018/06/06/know-plasticgoes/?ea.tracking.id=20HPXGJAXX&gclid=Cj0KCQjwj7v0BRDOARIsAGh37iryqU 2ndXJLoHiKcxYPuuAVNHBX6unhbPUeA6YJOBikFKhSLUpxuCUaAsy5EALw\_w cB.
- [3] Dufour, Fred. "A Whopping 91% of Plastic Isn't Recycled." *National Geographic,* 20 Dec. 2018, https://www.nationalgeographic.com/news/2017/07/plastic-producedrecycling-waste-ocean-trash-debris-environment/.
- [4] Pardes, Arielle. "The Future of Fashion in One Word: Plastics." *Wired*, Conde Nast, https://www.wired.com/story/plastics-in-fashion-everlane-renew/.
- [5] Chen, Wan-Ting, et. al. "Use of Supercritical Water for the Liquefaction of Polypropylene into Oil." *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, vol. 7, no. 4, Oct. 2019, pp. 3749-3758, doi: 10.1021/acssuschemeng.8b03841.
- [6] Budsaereechai, Supattra, et al. "Catalytic Pyrolysis of Plastic Waste for the Production of Liquid Fuels for Engines." *RSC Advances*, vol. 9, no. 10, 2019, pp. 5844–5857., doi:10.1039/c8ra10058f.
- [7] US10131847B2; Conversion of Waste Plastics Material to Fuel; McNamara, David et al.; Nov. 20, 2018; https://patents.google.com/patent/US10131847B2/en

## **Section 3: Market & Competitive Analysis**

- [1] ESI Africa. "Global Ethylene Capacity to See Considerable Growth of 27%." *ESI*, Clarion Energy, 21 June 2019, www.esi-africa.com/industry-sectors/business-andmarkets/global-ethylene-capacity-to-see-considerable-growth-of-27/.
- [2] Garside, M. "Propylenel Production Capacity Globally 2030." *Statista*, 7 Nov. 2019, www.statista.com/statistics/1065879/global-propylene-production-capacity/.
- [3] Patel, Martin Kumar, et al. "Olefins from Conventional and Heavy Feedstocks: Energy Use in Steam Cracking and Alternative Processes." *Fuel and Energy Abstracts*, vol. 47, no. 4, Mar. 2006, pp. 425–451., doi:10.1016/s0140-6701(06)81544-4.
- [4] "Coca-Cola's 100% Plant-Based Bottle." *Packaging Gateway*, www.packaginggateway.com/projects/coca-cola-plant-based-bottle/.
- [5] Peltekis, Kon, et al. *Plant and Process for Pyrolysis of Mixed Plastic Waste*. 4 Jan. 2018.

## **Section 5: Preliminary Process Synthesis**

- [1] Sharuddin, S. D. A., Abnisa, F., Daud, W. M. A. W., & Aroua, M. K. (2016). A review on pyrolysis of plastic wastes. *Energy conversion and management*, *115*, 308-326.
- [2] ICIS. "Ethylene Production and Manufacturing Process." *Independent Chemical Information Service*, Reed Business Information Limited, www.icis.com/explore/resources/news/2007/11/05/9075778/ethyleneproduction-and-manufacturing-process/.
- [3] Akah, Aaron & Al-Ghrami, Musaed. (2015). Maximizing Propylene Production via FCC Technology. Applied Petrochemical Research. 5. 1-16. 10.1007/s13203-015-0104-
- [4] McNamara, David & Michael Murray Patent Conversion of waste plastics material to fuel. US 20120261247 A1, United States Patent and Trademark Office, 18 October 2018.
- [5] Qureshi, Muhammad, et al. "Thermolysis of Plastic Waste: Reactor Comparison." VTT beyond the obvious. Pyroliq 2019, 2020, Cork, Ireland.
- [6] Fakhrhoseini SM, Dastanian M. Predicting pyrolysis products of PE, PP, and PET using NRTL activity coefficient model. Hindawi Publishing Corporation;2013. p. 1–5.
- [7] Abnisa, F., & Daud, W. M. A. W. (2014). A review on co-pyrolysis of biomass: an optional technique to obtain a high-grade pyrolysis oil. *Energy Conversion and Management*, *87*, 71-85.
- [8] Koo, J. K., & Kim, S. W. (1993). Reaction kinetic model for optimal pyrolysis of plastic waste mixtures. *Waste management & research*, *11*(6), 515-529.
- [9] Fogler, H. S., & Gürmen, M. N. (1999). Elements of Chemical Reaction Engineering. 2005. *There is no corresponding record for this reference.[Google Scholar]*, 741-760.
- [10] Bagri, R., & Williams, P. T. (2002). Catalytic pyrolysis of polyethylene. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, *63*(1), 29-41.
- [11] Oasmaa, A., Qureshi, M. S., Pihkola, H., Deviatkin, I., Mannila, J., Tenhunen, A., ... & Laine-Ylijoki, J. (2020). Pyrolysis of Plastic Waste: Opportunities and Challenges. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, 104804.
- [12] Williams, P. T., & Slaney, E. (2007). Analysis of products from the pyrolysis and liquefaction of single plastics and waste plastic mixtures. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, *51*(4), 754-769.
- [13] Chen, W. T., Jin, K., & Linda Wang, N. H. (2019). Use of supercritical water for the liquefaction of polypropylene into oil. *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, *7*(4), 3749-3758.
- [14] Wang, B., Huang, Y., & Zhang, J. (2014). Hydrothermal liquefaction of lignite, wheat straw and plastic waste in sub-critical water for oil: product distribution. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, *110*, 382-389.
- [15] Scheirs, J., & Kaminsky, W. (Eds.). (2006). *Feedstock recycling and pyrolysis of waste plastics*(pp. 383-434). Chichester, UK:: John Wiley & Sons.
- [16] Kaminsky, W., & Kim, J. S. (1999). Pyrolysis of mixed plastics into aromatics. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, *51*(1-2), 127-134.
- [17] Lopez, G., Artetxe, M., Amutio, M., Alvarez, J., Bilbao, J., & Olazar, M. (2018). Recent advances in the gasification of waste plastics. A critical overview. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *82*, 576-596.
- [18] Oasmaa, A., Qureshi, M. S., Pihkola, H., Deviatkin, I., Mannila, J., Tenhunen, A., ... & Laine-Ylijoki, J. (2020). Pyrolysis of Plastic Waste: Opportunities and Challenges. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, 104804.
- [19] Wilk, V., & Hofbauer, H. (2013). Conversion of mixed plastic wastes in a dual fluidized bed steam gasifier. *Fuel*, *107*, 787-799.
- [20] Fogler, H. S., & Gürmen, M. N. (1999). Elements of Chemical Reaction Engineering. 2005. *There is no corresponding record for this reference.[Google Scholar]*, 741-760.
- [21] Olazar, M., Lopez, G., Amutio, M., Elordi, G., Aguado, R., & Bilbao, J. (2009). Influence of FCC catalyst steaming on HDPE pyrolysis product distribution. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, *85*(1-2), 359-365.
- [22] Sharuddin, S. D. A., Abnisa, F., Daud, W. M. A. W., & Aroua, M. K. (2016). A review on pyrolysis of plastic wastes. *Energy conversion and management*, *115*, 308-326.
- [23] Elordi, G., Olazar, M., Aguado, R., Lopez, G., Arabiourrutia, M., & Bilbao, J. (2007). Catalytic pyrolysis of high density polyethylene in a conical spouted bed reactor. *Journal of analytical and applied pyrolysis*, *79*(1-2), 450-455.
- [24] Elordi, G., Olazar, M., Castaño, P., Artetxe, M., & Bilbao, J. (2012). Polyethylene cracking on a spent FCC catalyst in a conical spouted bed. I*ndustrial & engineering chemistry research,* 5*1(*43), 14008-14017.
- [25] Miandad, R., Barakat, M. A., Aburiazaiza, A. S., Rehan, M., & Nizami, A. S. (2016). Catalytic pyrolysis of plastic waste: A review. *Process Safety and Environmental Protection*, *102*, 822-838.
- [26] Seider, Warren D. "Chapter Thirteen: Separation Train Design." *Product and Process Design Principles: Synthesis, Analysis, and Design*. New York: Wiley, 1998.
- [27] Sharuddin, S. D. A., Abnisa, F., Daud, W. M. A. W., & Aroua, M. K. (2016). A review on pyrolysis of plastic wastes. *Energy conversion and management*, *115*, 308-326.
- [28] Onwudili, J. A., Insura, N., & Williams, P. T. (2009). Composition of products from the pyrolysis of polyethylene and polystyrene in a closed batch reactor: Effects of temperature and residence time. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, *86*(2), 293-303.
- [29] Wilk, V., & Hofbauer, H. (2013). Conversion of mixed plastic wastes in a dual fluidized bed steam gasifier. *Fuel*, *107*, 787-799.
- [30] Lopez, A., De Marco, I., Caballero, B. M., Laresgoiti, M. F., & Adrados, A. (2011). Influence of time and temperature on pyrolysis of plastic wastes in a semi-batch reactor. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, *173*(1), 62-71.
- [31] Rahimi, A., & García, J. M. (2017). Chemical recycling of waste plastics for new materials production. Nature Reviews Chemistry, 1(6), 1-11.
- [32] Geyer, R., Jambeck, J. R., & Law, K. L. (2017). Production, use, and fate of all plastics ever made. Science advances, 3(7), e1700782.
- [33] Maisel, F., Chancerel, P., Dimitrova, G., Emmerich, J., Nissen, N. F., & Schneider-Ramelow, M. (2020). Preparing WEEE plastics for recycling–How optimal particle sizes in pre-processing can improve the separation efficiency of high quality plastics. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 154, 104619.
- [34] "Pp Black Recycled Pellet Polypropylene Scrap Buy Pp Black Pellet,Pp Recycle,Pp Pellets Product on Alibaba.com." *Www.alibaba.com*, www.alibaba.com/product-detail/PP-Black-Recycled-Pellet-polypropylenescrap\_62016385112.html?spm=a2700.galleryofferlist.0.0.22958ec6efmCbL&bypass=true.
- [35] Waste360 Staff | Oct. "Recycled HDPE Prices Climb, While PET, PP Prices Fall." *Waste360*, 17 Oct. 2019, www.waste360.com/business/recycled-hdpe-prices-climb-whilepet-pp-prices-fall.
- [36] *Manufacturers, Suppliers, Exporters & Importers from the World's Largest Online B2B Marketplace-Alibaba.com*, www.alibaba.com/product-detail/lowest-price-Recycled-Regrinded-HDPE-Blue\_62006530428.html?spm=a2700.7724857.normalList.21.36001805R40wAf&bypass= true.
- [37] "Modest Changes in Scrap Plastics Pricing." *Plastics Recycling Update*, Plastics Recycling Update, 17 July 2019, resource-recycling.com/plastics/2019/07/17/modest-changes-inscrap-plastics-pricing/.
- [38] "Wholesale Clean And Dry Recycled Plastic PU Foam Scraps Plastic Foam Scraps ." *Alibaba*, www.alibaba.com/product-detail/Wholesale-Clean-And-Dry-Recycled-Plastic\_62506006073.html?spm=a2700.7724857.normalList.7.6efb2d2c9taM3u&s=p&byp ass=true.
- [39] "War on Plastic Waste Faces Setback as Cost of Recycled Material Soars." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 13 Oct. 2019, www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/oct/13/war-on-plastic-waste-faces-setback-ascost-of-recycled-material-soars.
- [40] "Plastic Scrap Price Today, United States Country Averages Paid by Scrap Yards." *Recycling Centers Finder, How To Recycle, Scrap Metal Prices*, www.recyclingmonster.com/price/plastic-scrap/337.
- [41] Akah, A., & Al-Ghrami, M. (2015). Maximizing propylene production via FCC technology. *Applied Petrochemical Research*, *5*(4), 377-392.

#### **Section 8: Process Description**

- [1] Vandermeersch, Steven. "Steam Cracking of Complex Hydrocarbon Mixtures." *Ghent University*, 2012.
- [2] G. Schmidt, D.S.U., Dr. C. Geipel, Olefin Academy 2010 Cracking Furnace Technology, L. Engineering, Editor. 2010.
- [3] Alstom, P.E.R.G., Transfer Line Exchangers for Ethylene Plants. 2009.

### **Section 15: Other Important Factors**

[1] "Indonesia & Plastic Pollution." *Ocean Waste Plastic*, www.oceanwasteplastics.com/indonesia-plastic-pollution.

### **Section 20. Appendix**

*Appendix A: Calculations*

## *Rotary Kiln Pyrolysis Unit*

Average density of waste =  $58.9$  lb/ft<sup>3</sup>

Assume 80% empty volume to favor gas formation

19.7% of input not converted: average of 59.9% by weight non-gas in kiln

Feed rate =  $6430$  lb/hr, with 47.5-minute residence time =  $5090$  lb/47.5 minutes

 $(.599)(50901b) = 30491b$  liquid = 51.8 ft<sup>3</sup>

80% void fraction:  $V = 259$  ft<sup>3</sup>

 $L/D = 15$ : **L=2.8 ft; D = 42ft** 

Find Angle Using the Manning Formula:

#### $v = 0.0147$  ft/s

Area for flow =  $0.738$  ft<sup>2</sup> Wetted perimeter  $= 2.04$  ft  $R_h = 0.738/2.04 = 0.362$  ft  $K = 1.49$  (English Units)

 $n = 0.019$  (Gauckler-Manning Coefficient for rough steel due to presence of char)

 $S = 0.0192$  ft/ft (rotary kiln standard is 0.02-0.04 ft/ft)

#### $\Theta = 1.1^0$

Gas generated =  $5161$  lb/hr =  $4086$  lb/47.5 min

 $V_{gas}$  = 259-51.8 = 207.2 ft<sup>3</sup>

 $T = 1112 \text{ }^{\circ}F$ 

Approximate molar mass of gas as 38.6 g/mol

 $N_{\text{gen}} = 48015 \text{ mol}/47.5 \text{ min}$ 

 $P = nRT/V$ 

 $P_{closed} = 8610 \text{ psia}$  (!)

Thus, will use a pressure cap to operate at **73.5 psia**

 $C_p = f(t)$ . Values of  $C_p$  for PE, PP, PS established as functions of temperature on a per-mol basis. Not per kg. Conversion is complex, thus approximate with:

> $C_p$  (polystyrene) = 1400 J / kg K  $C_p$ (polyethylene) = 1900 J / kg K  $C_p(polypropylene) = 1920 \text{ J} / \text{ kg K}$ Average =  $0.442$  BTU/lb <sup>o</sup>F

Heating need in first section:

 $Q = H_{in} - H_{out}$ 

H<sub>in</sub> (approximate) = m C<sub>p</sub>  $\Delta T$  (of molten polymer) = 2.94 x 10<sup>6</sup> BTU/hr

 $H_{out}$  (from ASPEN) = 4.33 x 10<sup>6</sup> BTU/hr

Assuming 40% thermal efficiency **Q = 3.44 x 106 BTU/hr**

Pyrolysis Oil considered as:

Styrene:  $C_8H_8 + 10 O_2 \rightarrow 8 CO_2 + 4 H_2O$  (- $\Delta H_R = 4232.6$  kJ/mol)

Toluene:  $C_7H_8 + 9 O_2 \rightarrow 7 CO_2 + 4 H_2O$  (- $\Delta H_R = 3909.7 \text{ kJ/mol}$ )

Ethylbenzene:  $C_8H_{10}$  + 10.5 O<sub>2</sub> -> 8 CO<sub>2</sub> + 5 H<sub>2</sub>O (- $\Delta H_R$  = 4564.5 kJ/mol)

 $\Delta H_C$  pyrolysis oil = 3963 BTU/mol

Adiabatic flame temperature:

4181000 J =  $(8.213$  J/mol K)  $*( + 5)$ 

 $T_2 = 8852$ <sup>o</sup>F

Too high, thus will need to dilute with air. Assume that the pyrolysis temperature chamber is 2732  $\rm{^0F}$  (1500 $\rm{^0C}$ ). This temperature is non-trivially selected due to the nature of insulating refractories.

4181000 J =  $(8.314$  J/mol K)  $*( + 5)$ 

 $n_{\text{air}} = 28 \text{ mol}$ 

Thus 1 mol of pyrolysis oil combusts to 8 mol  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ , 5 mol H<sub>2</sub>O, and 28 mol air at 2732 <sup>o</sup>F.

Assume the air will cool to  $1292^{\circ}F(700^{\circ}C)$ .

 $\Delta H$  (using above with n<sub>air</sub> = 28 and T<sub>1</sub> = 700<sup>o</sup>C) = 2501 BTU gas available/mol combusted

Fuel requirement is therefore (using 100.8 g/mol mass of fuel oil): 306 lb/hr

-this is for the first 15.5 ft of the kiln, during which the heating is said to occur-

-consider the second 26.5 ft, during which the temperature need be maintained at  $1112^{\circ}$ F-

Assume heat loss of 500 BTU/ hr ft2

Area =  $(\pi)(2.8 \text{ ft})$  $(26.5 \text{ ft})$  = 233 ft<sup>2</sup>

With again  $40\%$  efficiency,  $Q = 2.24 \times 10^5$  BTU/hr

With the same combustion temperature, oil demand is therefore: 19.9 lb/hr

#### **Total Oil Requirement = 325.9 lb/hr**

Castable thickness:

In a rough approximation, one dimensional heat transfer,  $q_x'' = k(\Delta T)/L$ 

The heat flux in the heating region is:  $(1.39 \times 10^6 \text{ BTU/hr})/(\pi^*2.8 \text{ ft*15.5ft})$ 

 $= 1.31 \times 10^4$  BTU/hr ft<sup>2</sup>

 $k = 10.4$  BTU/h ft <sup>o</sup>F

 $\Delta T$  (chamber to chamber) = 1620 <sup>o</sup>F

Suppose  $\Delta T_{refractory}$  should be 1000<sup>o</sup>F to prevent overheating in the reaction chamber and to protect the inner carbon steel

 $L = 0.7$  ft = 8.4 inches.

## **Thus, the inner wall has a thickness of 0.25 in of Carbon Steel and 8.4 in of alumina oxide refractory.**

Outerwall (assume same heat flux)

Now,  $\Delta T$  (combustion chamber to outside) = 2532 (if kiln exterior is no more than 200<sup>0</sup>F)

 $\Delta T_{refractory} = 1500 \text{ °F}$  $L = 1.2$  ft = 14.4 in

The outer wall of the kiln will be 14.4 inches of alumina oxide refractory with 0.25 in of carbon steel exterior for support.

## *Solid/Liquid Splitter*

The vessel needs to handle 1181 lb/hr of oil and 84 lb/hr of char. The density of the oil is an estimated 46.2 lb/ft<sup>3</sup>. The vessel is assumed to be 60% full, and it is desired that it can contain up to 1 residence time cycle of kiln product (1000 lb). The volume required is thus  $36.1 \text{ ft}^3$ . Using an assumed aspect ratio of 5, the dimensions of the unit are found. 36.1  $ft^3 = (\pi/4)^*(D^2)^*(5D)$ , which gives dimensions of **2.09 ft diameter and 10.5 ft length.**

There are two outlets of this vessel, one with liquid product and one with a slurry. The slurry is assumed to be the char and to have 15% of liquid in it. Thus, the liquid outlet flow rate is 1003 lb/hr, and the slurry is 262 lb/hr.

Costing:

$$
C_{P} = F_{M}C_{V} + C_{PL}
$$
  
\n
$$
F_{M} = 1(Carbon \text{ Steel})
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{V} = \exp(5.6336 + 0.4599 \ln(W) + 0.00582 (\ln(W))^{2}
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{PL} = 2275D^{0.2094}
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{PL} = $2655
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{V} = $7973
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = $10,628
$$

## *Plastic Extrusion Screw*

The extrusion screw is simply a unit purchased from manufacturers. The desired capacity used for search is 3000 kg/hr. The full details on what is found are included in Appendix II. The cost, estimated from online, is \$500,000.

The power requirement is estimated: It should be noted that in an extrusion screw, much of the heat generated is as a result from the friction between the plastic and the wall and viscous heating effects. A detailed analysis on the temperature profile and heating zones of the screw are not included.

PE: heat of melting = 287.6 kJ/kg.  $C_p$  = 1900 J / kg K. Melting point = 142<sup>o</sup>C. Heat Required: Assume PE flow is  $2916$  kg/hr  $*(.511) = 1490$  kg/hr

Heat requirement =  $(1490 \text{ kg/hr})*(287.6 \text{ kJ/kg})+(1.9 \text{ kJ/kg K})(225 \text{ K})) = 1065499 \text{ kJ/hr} = 295$ kW PP: heat of melting = 103.8 kJ/kg,  $C_p$  = 1920 J / kg K, melting point = 158<sup>o</sup>C. Assume PP flow is 2916 kg/hr  $*(.372) = 1084$  kg/hr Heat Requirement =  $(1084 \text{ kg/hr}) * ((103.8 \text{ kJ/kg}) + (1.92 \text{ kJ/kg K})(225 \text{ K})) = 161 \text{ kW}$ 

Polystyrene: heat of fusion = 96.2 kJ/kg,  $C_p$  = 1400 J / kg K, melting point = 240<sup>o</sup>C

Assume PS flow is  $(2916 \text{ kg/hr})$  \*  $(.116) = 338 \text{ kg/hr}$ 

Heat Requirement =  $(338 \text{ kg/hr}) * ((96.2 \text{ kJ/kg}) + (1.2 \text{ kJ/kg K})(225 \text{ K})) = 34 \text{ kW}$ 

Heat required for melting  $= 490 \text{ kW}$ . This is primarily supplied by the drive force to the motor. 80% efficiency is assumed, and the demand is thus  $612.5$  kW =  $821$  hp.

The two models below are used to inform power requirement and economics:



# **SAT-X Series**



## **SK series**



SK series divide the functions for conventional single-screw and developed each capability. In addition, it controlled them separately. Thus, it enjoys more freedom and fully performs the capability that an single-axis extruder has.

#### Features

- · Pellet extrusion of PVC and PE
- It demonstrates excellent performance for film and sheet extrusion (PVC, PS, ABS), especially PVC's transparent sheet and two-axis drawing film.



#### SK extruder standard specifications

#### *Bucket Elevators*

The height of the bucket elevators estimated as 5 feet above the required height. For the elevator to the silos, this means that the height is 55 feet. For the elevator to section 001 and the extrusion screw, the height is estimated from summing the rotary kiln diameter and slant height and adding 10 feet for machinery and equipment beneath the kiln. This height is 16 feet.

For both elevators, the width of the buckets is estimated as 1 foot.

Costing:

$$
C_P = 692 \, W^{0.5} \, L^{0.57}
$$

 $C_P$  (elevator 1) = \$23,534;  $C_P$  (elevator 2) = \$11,642

Power Requirement:

 $P = 0.02$  m ( $L^{0.63}$ ) + 0.00182 mL

P (elevator 1) =  $0.626$  hp; P (elevator 2) =  $0.206$  hp

*Screw Feeder*

Volumetric Feed Rate:

Assuming a 75% empty space due to packing, density is approximate as 78.5 lb/ $ft^3$ .

 $S = 6430$  lb/hr = 81.9 ft ft<sup>3</sup>/ hr

Costing:

 $C_P = 1094 S^{0.22} = $2883$  (cost includes motor and belt drive)

Power Requirement:

 $P = 0.0146$  L (m)<sup>0.85</sup>

 $m = 1.79$  lb/s; L (approximated) = 40 ft; P = 0.958 hp

*Feed Silo*

Average shard density =  $58.9$  lb/ft<sup>3</sup>

Daily processing capacity = 70 MT = 154324 lb; space demand is 2620 ft<sup>3</sup> for one day of plastic

Assume, due to packing,  $75\%$  empty space thus space demand is 3490 ft<sup>3</sup> per day.

Allow each silo to store three days' worth of material.

 $V_{\rm silo} = 10500 \text{ ft}^3$ 

Assume an aspect ratio of 3: 10500 ft<sup>3</sup> =  $(\pi/4)^*(D^2)^*(3D)$ 

**Diameter = 16.5 ft; Length = 49.5 ft**

Costing: C<sub>P</sub>:  $646 S^{0.46} = $45,707$ 

## *Blower*

Sample given for B-101 Sizing:

$$
k = 1.4; nB = 0.75; PB = 23 hp
$$
  
\n
$$
\eta_m = 0.8 + 0.0319 ln(PB) - 0.00182(ln(PB))2
$$
  
\n
$$
\eta_m = 0.882
$$
  
\n
$$
PC = PB / \etam = 26.1 hp
$$

Costing:

$$
C_{P} = C_{B}F_{M}
$$
  
\n
$$
F_{M} = 0.6 \text{ (aluminum)}
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{B} = \exp(7.0187 + 0.79 \text{ ln}(P_{C}))
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{B} = $14,700
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = $8,820
$$

*Steam Cracker Calculating heat required*

The heat required for the radiative section of the furnace is found by adding the heat required of the cracking reaction and the sensible heat required to heat the feed stream to the coil outlet temperature (COT).

The heat of cracking can be found from:

where *i* represents all the product components, *j* represents the reactant components, and is the mass flow rate. Using this equation, the heat of cracking was calculated to be 10.4 MM BTU/hr. The temperature dependent specific enthalpies of formation of components was acquired from NIST.

The sensible heat required to increase the temperature of the cracked gas (diluent steam and light gas) from the crossover temperature (XOT) to the COT is:

where is the mass flow rate of steam, , is the specific enthalpy of steam at the COT, is the specific enthalpy of steam at the XOT, is the mass flow rate of light gas, and is the average specific heat. The sensible heat was calculated to be 2.65 MM BTU/hr.

The process duty was calculated from:

The heat needed to preheat the process steam to XOT is found from:

where is the latent heat of vaporization of water and is the temperature of the water leaving the purge stream, and is the saturation temperature of water at atmospheric pressure. The heat needed to preheat the process steam is 3.04 MM BTU/hr.

The heat needed to preheat the boiler feed water is 13.09 MM BTU/hr and is found from:

The total heat requirement from the radiation section of the steam cracker is found from:

where a 21.5% heat loss is assumed.

## *Flue gas requirements*

The following equations show the general method of calculating the flue gas and fuel requirements to satisfy .

Where is a fraction of radiation section duty that a specific fuel, *k*, will satisfy, is the specific enthalpy of flue gas leaving the firebox into the convection section, and is the specific enthalpy of the flue gas in the firebox. was determined from the following combustion reaction:

where  $k$  is methane,  $10\%$  excess air was assumed, and the lower heating value (LHV) is  $21,433$ BTU/lb. Through this combustion reaction, can be calculated:

A mass balance can be done to calculate the amount of fuel needed to supply amount of heat:

where  $\beta$  is 0.477.

## *Quench Tower*

A tower diameter and height of 3.5 and 8 feet respectively is assumed. The tower would be made from carbon steel, which has a density of 490 lb/ft<sup>3</sup>.

## *Transfer Line Exchanger*

The heat duty of the TLE, or any heat exchanger, is determined from the desired sensible heat changer of the stream of interest. The heat duty can be calculated from the following equation:

where is the mass low rate of the stream, is the average specific heat capacity of the stream, and is the inlet and outlet temperature difference.

The calculated heat duty is then equated to an identical equation of the alternate stream passing through the heat exchanger. In the second case, either or is unknown and it must be solved for.

Once specified, the area of the heat exchanger can be calculated from its overall heat transfer coefficient U  $[BTU/ft^2-lb-hr]$ , heat duty Q  $[BTU/hr]$ , and log-mean temperature difference.

The velocity of the stream can calculated, or one can assume a value from 1-10ft/s, the crosssectional area of the heat exchanger can be calculated from:

where is the density of the stream and is the velocity. A pipe inner diameter can be assumed and the number of tubes per pass in the HX can be found from:

Assume a tube length of 8ft, 12ft, 16ft, or 20ft and calculate the surface area of one tube and then the number of tube passes can be calculated.

# *Distillation Columns*

*Costing*

*Example: Demethanizer Column*

$$
C_{p} = F_{M}C_{V} + C_{PL}
$$
  
\n
$$
F_{M} = 1
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = 190,083 + 25,236
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = $215,318 \text{ at } CE = 567
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = $227,850 \text{ at } CE = 600
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{V} = exp\{10.5449 - 0.4672 [\ln(W)] + 0.0.05482[\ln(W)]^{2}\}
$$
  
\n
$$
W = 69,955 \text{ lbs}
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{V} = $190,083
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{PL} = 341*(D)^{0.63316}(L)^{0.80161}
$$
  
\n
$$
D = 5.4 \text{ ft}
$$
  
\n
$$
L = 57.5 \text{ ft}
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{PL} = $25,236
$$
  
\n
$$
W = \pi (D_{i} + ts)(L + 0.8D_{i})t_{sp} \rho
$$
  
\n
$$
D_{i} = 5.3 \text{ ft}
$$
  
\n
$$
t_{s} = 1.567 \text{ in}
$$
  
\n
$$
\rho = 490 \text{ lb/cuff}
$$
  
\n
$$
W = 69,955 \text{ lbs}
$$
  
\n
$$
P_{d} = exp\{0.60608 + 0.91615[\ln(P_{o})] + 0.0015655[\ln(P_{O})]^{2}\}
$$
  
\n
$$
P_{o} = 535.3 \text{ psig}
$$
  
\n
$$
P_{d} = 616 \text{ psig}
$$

 $C_T=N_TF_{NT}F_{TT}F_{TM}C_{BT}$  $N_T = 15$  $F_{TT} = 1$  $F<sub>TM</sub> = 1$  $C_T = $18,853$  at  $CE = 567$  $C_T = $19,950$  at  $CE = 600$  $F_{NT} = 2.251/0414N_T$  $F_{NT} = 1.22$  $C_{\text{BT}} = 468 \exp(0.1482 \text{Di})$  $C_{\text{BT}} = 1,027$  $C_{TOT} = C_T + C_P$  $C_{\text{TOT}} = 19,950 + 227,850 = $247,800$  $C_{BM} = C_{TOT} * F_{BM}$  $F_{BM} = 4.16$  $C_{BM} = $1,030,848$ 

## *Pumps*

*Sizing*

*Example: C2 Feed Pump*

 $S = O(H)^{0.5}$  $S = (7.06 \text{ gal/min})*(477 \text{ft})^{0.5}$  $S = 916$  (gpm)(ft)<sup>0.5</sup>

H taken from ASPEN report

*Costing*

$$
C_{P} = F_{T}F_{M}C_{B}
$$
  
\n
$$
F_{M} = 1 \text{ for cast iron}
$$
  
\n
$$
F_{T} = 1
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = (1)(1)(4305) = $4296 \text{ for CE} = 567
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = $4,546 \text{ FOR CE} = 600
$$

$$
C_B = \exp[12.1656 - 1.144lb(S) + 0.0862(ln(S))^2]
$$
  
 
$$
C_B = 4,305 \text{ for CE} = 567
$$

*Heat Exchangers*

Condensers and reboilers were both modeled as U-tube heat exchangers.

*Sizing*

ASPEN provided heat transfer area required for each piece of equipment.

*Costing*

*Example: Demethanizer Condenser*

 $C_P = F_P F_M F_L C_B$  $C_P = 1.13*1*1*19,085$  $C_P = $21,579$  for  $CE = 567$  $C_P = $22,835$  for  $CE = 600$ 

 $C_B$  = exp[11.4185 – 0.9228ln(*A*) + 0.09861(ln(*A*))<sup>2</sup>]  $C_B = $72,388$ 

 $F_M = a + (A/100)^b$ 

 $a = 0$  $b = 0$  $F_M = 1$  for carbon steel/carbon steel

 $F_L = 1$  for 20 ft tube

#### *Storage Tanks*

*Sizing*

Storage tanks were designed to allow for one hour's worth of storage of gas product. To determine the volume needed for one hour's worth of storage, the volumetric flowrate was determined and multiplied by the amount of time for storage (one hour). The storage tanks are kept at 70°F and 14.7 psia, and properties of the components were calculated at these conditions.

*Example: Ethylene Product Storage Tank*

Volume:

 $\rho_{\text{ethylene}} = 0.073 \text{ lbs/cuft}$  at  $70^{\circ}$ F, 14.7 psia  $m_{\text{ethylene}}$  = 1410 lbs/hr  $v_{\text{ethylene}} = m_{\text{ethylene}} / \rho_{\text{ethylene}} = 19,316 \text{ cuft/hr}$ 

Length and Diameter:

 $L = 59.0$  ft  $L/D = 3$  $D = L/3$  $D = 19.7$  ft *Costing*

Storage tanks were modeled as floating roof storage tanks because the contents of the tanks are all in gas form.

*Example: Ethylene Storage Tank*

 $C_p = 475*V^{0.507}$ V = 144,494 gallons  $C_p = $188,996$  at CE = 567  $C_p = $199,996$  at  $CE = 600$ 

## *Compressors*

*Sizing*

ASPEN provided sizing information for the compressor. See section 11 specification sheet for sizing information.

*Costing*

*Example: Refrigeration Compressor*

$$
C_{p} = F_{D}F_{M}C_{B}
$$
  
\n
$$
F_{D} = 1
$$
  
\n
$$
F_{M} = 1
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{B} = $2,226,011
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = $2,226,011 \text{ at } CE = 567
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = $2,355,567 \text{ at } CE = 600
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{B} = exp\{9.1553 + 0.63[\ln(P_{C})]\}
$$
  
\n
$$
P_{C} = 5810 \text{ hp}
$$

$$
C_B = $2,226,011
$$

## *Flash Vessels*

## *Sizing*

Flash Vessels were modeled as vertical pressure vessels and sized assuming a 5-minute residence time. The volume needed for 5 minutes' worth of accumulation was calculated and an L/D aspect ratio of 3 was assumed to determine the dimensions of the vessels.

*Example: Flash Vessel 1*

Volumetric flow rate = 2,631 cuft/hr 5 minutes of accumulation = 219.25 cuft

$$
L = 13.6 \text{ ft}
$$
  
 $D = 4.53 \text{ ft}$ 

*Costing*

*Example: Flash Vessel 1*

$$
C_{P} = F_{M}C_{V} + C_{PL}
$$
  
\n
$$
F_{M} = 1 \text{ for carbon steel}
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{V} = 120,685
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{PL} = 410(D_{i})^{0.73960}(L)^{0.70864}
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = $128,614 \text{ for CE} = 567
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{P} = 136,099 \text{ for CE} = 600
$$

$$
C_V = \exp\{7.1390 + 0.18255[\ln(W)] + 0.2297[\ln(W)]^2\}
$$
  
 $C_V = $120,685$ 

*Appendix B: MSDS Sheets*

# **SAFETY DATA SHEET**



Ethylene





Any concentration shown as a range is to protect confidentiality or is due to batch variation. There are no additional ingredients present which, within the current knowledge of the supplier and in the

concentrations applicable, are classified as hazardous to health or the environment and hence require reporting in this section.

Occupational exposure limits, if available, are listed in Section 8.

# **Section 4. First aid measures**

**Description of necessary first aid measures** 







# Safety Data Sheet<br>Version 1.16

Revision Date 08/01/2016

SDS Number 300000000074 Print Date 08/04/2018

#### 1. PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION



## 2. HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

#### **GHS** classification

Flammable gases - Category 1<br>Gases under pressure - Compressed gas.

#### GHS label elements

Hazard pictograms/symbols



Signal Word: Danger

**Hazard Statements:** 

H220: Extremely flammable gas.

Versum Materials US, LLC

 $1/10$ 

Hydrogen
## Safety Data Sheet<br>Version 1.16

Revision Date 08/01/2016

SDS Number 300000000074 Print Date 08/04/2018

H280: Contains gas under pressure; may explode if heated.<br>May displace oxygen and cause rapid suffocation.<br>May form explosive mixtures in air.<br>Burns with invisible flame.

**Precautionary Statements:** 



#### Hazards not otherwise classified



## 3. COMPOSITION/INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS



Concentration is nominal. For the exact product composition, please refer to technical specifications.

### **4. FIRST AID MEASURES**



Versum Materials US, LLC

 $2/10$ 

Hydrogen

## **SAFETY DATA SHEET**



Methane



**Classification of the<br>substance or mixture** 

ŧ

## **GHS label elements**

**Hazard pictograms** 





Date of issue/Date of revision

Date of previous issue : 6/15/2018 Version : 1.05  $1/11$ 





Any concentration shown as a range is to protect confidentiality or is due to batch variation.

There are no additional ingredients present which, within the current knowledge of the supplier and in the<br>concentrations applicable, are classified as hazardous to health or the environment and hence require reporting in this section.

Occupational exposure limits, if available, are listed in Section 8.

## **Section 4. First aid measures**

### **Description of necessary first aid measures**



#### Most important symptoms/effects, acute and delayed



**AIR f'...**<br>PRODUCTS **f'...** 

# Safety Data Sheet<br>Version 1.10

Revision Date 08/01/2016

SDS Number 300000000118 Print Date 08/04/2018

#### 1. PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION



## 2. HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

GHS classification

Flammable gases - Category 1<br>Gases under pressure - Liquefied gas. Simple Asphyxiant **GHS** label elements

Hazard pictograms/symbols



Signal Word: Danger

**Hazard Statements:** 

Air Products and Chemicals, Inc

 $\frac{1}{10}$ 

Propylene

## Safety Data Sheet<br>Version 1.10

Revision Date 08/01/2016

SDS Number 300000000118 Print Date 08/04/2018

H220: Extremely flammable gas. H280:Contains gas under pressure; may explode if heated.<br>May displace oxygen and cause rapid suffocation. May form explosive mixtures in air. May cause frostbite.

**Precautionary Statements:** 



#### Hazards not otherwise classified

Can cause rapid suffocation. Extremely flammable liquefied gas. May form explosive mixtures in air. Vapors may spread long distances and ignite. Immediate fire and explosion hazard exists when mixed with air at concentrations exceeding the lower flammability limit (LFL). High concentrations that can cause rapid suffocation are within the flammable range and should not be entered. Avoid breathing gas.<br>Direct contact with liquid can cause frostbite. Self contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) may be required.

### 3. COMPOSITION/INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS



#### 4. FIRST AID MEASURES



Air Products and Chemicals, Inc

Propylene

## **SAFETY DATA SHEET**



N-Butane











## **SAFETY DATA SHEET**

Creation Date 11-Jun-2009

Revision Date 17-Jan-2018

**Revision Number 4** 

#### 1. Identification

**Product Name** 

## **Toluene**

Cat No.:

T326F-1GAL; T326P-4; T326S-20; T326S-20LC

**CAS-No Synonyms**  108-88-3 Tol; Methylbenzene

**Recommended Use Uses advised against**  Laboratory chemicals. Not for food, drug, pesticide or biocidal product use

#### Details of the supplier of the safety data sheet

**Company**<br>Fisher Scientific<br>One Reagent Lane Fair Lawn, NJ 07410<br>Tel: (201) 796-7100

#### **Emergency Telephone Number**

CHEMTREC®, Inside the USA: 800-424-9300 CHEMTREC®, Outside the USA: 001-703-527-3887

#### 2. Hazard(s) identification

Classification<br>This chemical is considered hazardous by the 2012 OSHA Hazard Communication Standard (29 CFR 1910.1200)



**Label Elements** 

**Signal Word** Danger

**Hazard Statements** Highly flammable liquid and vapor May be fatal if swallowed and enters airways Causes skin irritation Causes serious eye irritation May cause respiratory irritation May cause drowsiness or dizziness

Page 1/8

#### **Toluene**

#### Suspected of damaging the unborn child Causes damage to organs through prolonged or repeated exposure



Response IF exposed or concerned: Get medical attention/advice **Inhalation** IF INHALED: Remove victim to fresh air and keep at rest in a position comfortable for breathing **Skin** If skin irritation occurs: Get medical advice/attention IF ON SKIN (or hair): Take off immediately all contaminated clothing. Rinse skin with water/shower Wash contaminated clothing before reuse **Eyes** IF IN EYES: Rinse cautiously with water for several minutes. Remove contact lenses, if present and easy to do. Continue rinsing If eye irritation persists: Get medical advice/attention Ingestion IF SWALLOWED: Immediately call a POISON CENTER or doctor/physician Do NOT induce vomiting Fire In case of fire: Use CO2, dry chemical, or foam for extinction **Storage** Store locked up Store in a well-ventilated place. Keep container tightly closed **Disposal** Dispose of contents/container to an approved waste disposal plant Hazards not otherwise classified (HNOC)

WARNING. Reproductive Harm - https://www.p65warnings.ca.gov/.

#### 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients



Page 2/8



## **SAFETY DATA SHEET**

Creation Date 06-Aug-2010

Revision Date 17-Jan-2018

**Revision Number 6** 

#### 1. Identification

**Product Name** 

**Ethylbenzene** 

O2751-1

#### Cat No.:

**CAS-No** Synonyms

 $100 - 41 - 4$ Ethylbenzol; Phenylethane

**Recommended Use Uses advised against**  Laboratory chemicals.

Not for food, drug, pesticide or biocidal product use

#### Details of the supplier of the safety data sheet

Company<br>Fisher Scientific<br>One Reagent Lane<br>Fair Lawn, NJ 07410<br>Tel: (201) 796-7100

Emergency Telephone Number<br>CHEMTREC®, Inside the USA: 800-424-9300 CHEMTREC®, Outside the USA: 001-703-527-3887

#### 2. Hazard(s) identification

Classification<br>This chemical is considered hazardous by the 2012 OSHA Hazard Communication Standard (29 CFR 1910.1200)



Label Elements

**Signal Word** Danger

#### **Hazard Statements**

Highly flammable liquid and vapor<br>May be fatal if swallowed and enters airways<br>Harmful if inhaled May cause respiratory irritation<br>May cause drowsiness or dizziness<br>Suspected of causing cancer May cause damage to organs through prolonged or repeated exposure

#### **Ethylbenzene**



**Precautionary Statements** Prevention Obtain special instructions before use Do not handle until all safety precautions have been read and understood Use personal protective equipment as required Use only outdoors or in a well-ventilated area Do not breathe dust/fume/gas/mist/vapors/spray Keep away from heat/sparks/open flames/hot surfaces. - No smoking Keep container tightly closed Ground/bond container and receiving equipment Use explosion-proof electrical/ventilating/lighting/equipment Use only non-sparking tools Take precautionary measures against static discharge Keep cool Response IF exposed or concerned: Get medical attention/advice **Inhalation** IF INHALED: Remove victim to fresh air and keep at rest in a position comfortable for breathing **Skin** IF ON SKIN (or hair): Take off immediately all contaminated clothing. Rinse skin with water/shower Ingestion IF SWALLOWED: Immediately call a POISON CENTER or doctor/physician Do NOT induce vomiting Fire In case of fire: Use CO2, dry chemical, or foam for extinction Storage<br>Store locked up Store in a well-ventilated place. Keep container tightly closed **Disposal** Dispose of contents/container to an approved waste disposal plant<br>
Dispose of contents/container to an approved waste disposal plant<br>
Harards not otherwise classified (HNOC)<br>
Harmful to aquatic life with long lasting effec



Page 2/8

*Appendix C: ASPEN Report*

*Section 200: Compressor Blocks and Streams* LOCK: C-201 MODEL: COMPR

-----------------------------

INLET STREAM: CG-1

OUTLET STREAM: CG-2

 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF **STATE** 

### \*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\*

#### IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF.

TOTAL BALANCE



## \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\*

FEED STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR

### \*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*



## \*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*



BLOCK: C-202 MODEL: COMPR

 INLET STREAM: CG-3 OUTLET STREAM: CG-4

-----------------------------

 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF **STATE** 

\*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\*

IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF.

TOTAL BALANCE

 MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 455.679 455.679 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR) 5163.00 5163.00 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) 533809. 978008. -0.454188

\*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\*

FEED STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR

\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*



\*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*





BLOCK: C-203 MODEL: COMPR

INLET STREAM: CG-5

-----------------------------

OUTLET STREAM: CG-6

 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE



## ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) 539151. 820758. -0.343106

 \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR

\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*

## ISENTROPIC CENTRIFUGAL COMPRESSOR PRESSURE CHANGE PSI 115.000 ISENTROPIC EFFICIENCY 0.81000 MECHANICAL EFFICIENCY 1.00000

\*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*



INLET HEAT CAPACITY RATIO 1.28483 INLET VOLUMETRIC FLOW RATE , CUFT/HR 12,339.8 OUTLET VOLUMETRIC FLOW RATE, CUFT/HR 9,556.64 INLET COMPRESSIBILITY FACTOR 1.00552 OUTLET COMPRESSIBILITY FACTOR 1.00987 AV. ISENT. VOL. EXPONENT 1.29011 AV. ISENT. TEMP EXPONENT 1.27116 AV. ACTUAL VOL. EXPONENT 1.37322 AV. ACTUAL TEMP EXPONENT 1.35039

BLOCK: C-204 MODEL: COMPR

-----------------------------

INLET STREAM: CG-7

OUTLET STREAM: CG-8

 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF **STATE** 

## \*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\*

 IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF. TOTAL BALANCE MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 455.679 455.679 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR) 5163.00 5163.00 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) 386804. 665985. -0.419200

## \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\*

FEED STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR

## \*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*

 ISENTROPIC CENTRIFUGAL COMPRESSOR PRESSURE CHANGE PSI 171.000 ISENTROPIC EFFICIENCY 0.81000 MECHANICAL EFFICIENCY 1.00000

\*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*



## AV. ACTUAL TEMP EXPONENT 1.36058















*Section 200: Intercooler blocks and streams BLOCK: HX-203 MODEL: HEATX* 

*-----------------------------*

 *HOT SIDE:*

 *---------*

 *INLET STREAM: CG-2 OUTLET STREAM: CG-3 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE COLD SIDE:*

 *----------*

 *INLET STREAM: CW-IN3 OUTLET STREAM: CW-OUT3 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

 *\*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\**

 *IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF.*

 *TOTAL BALANCE*

 *MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 983.009 983.009 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR ) 14663.0 14663.0 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) -0.645271E+08 -0.645271E+08 0.230929E-15*

 *\*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\**

 *FEED STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR* 

 *\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\**

 *FLASH SPECS FOR HOT SIDE: TWO PHASE FLASH MAXIMUM NO. ITERATIONS 30 CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000*

 *FLASH SPECS FOR COLD SIDE: TWO PHASE FLASH MAXIMUM NO. ITERATIONS 30 CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000*

 *FLOW DIRECTION AND SPECIFICATION: COUNTERCURRENT HEAT EXCHANGER SPECIFIED HOT TEMP CHANGE SPECIFIED VALUE F 100.0000 LMTD CORRECTION FACTOR 1.00000*

 *PRESSURE SPECIFICATION:*



 *HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT SPECIFICATION:*

 *OVERALL COEFFICIENT BTU/HR-SQFT-R 80.0000*

 *\*\*\* OVERALL RESULTS \*\*\**

 *STREAMS:*

 *-------------------------------------- | | CG-2 ----->| HOT |-----> CG-3 T= 3.2432D+02 | | T= 2.2432D+02*



 *--------------------------------------*

 *DUTY AND AREA:*



 *HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT:*



 *LOG-MEAN TEMPERATURE DIFFERENCE:*



 *PRESSURE DROP:*

*-------------------------------------*



*HEATX COLD-TQCU HX-203 TQCURV INLET* 

211

 *PRESSURE PROFILE: CONSTANT2* 

 *PRESSURE DROP: 0.0 PSI* 

*---*

 *PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

*! DUTY ! PRES ! TEMP ! VFRAC ! ! ! ! ! ! !*  $I = |I| = |I| = |I| = |I|$ *! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! BTU/HR ! PSIA ! F ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !============!============!============!============! ! 0.0 ! 14.6959 ! 119.8091 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.0772+04 ! 14.6959 ! 117.9127 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.1544+04 ! 14.6959 ! 116.0163 ! 0.0 ! ! 6.2317+04 ! 14.6959 ! 114.1199 ! 0.0 ! ! 8.3089+04 ! 14.6959 ! 112.2234 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 1.0386+05 ! 14.6959 ! 110.3270 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.2463+05 ! 14.6959 ! 108.4307 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.4541+05 ! 14.6959 ! 106.5343 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.6618+05 ! 14.6959 ! 104.6381 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.8695+05 ! 14.6959 ! 102.7419 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 2.0772+05 ! 14.6959 ! 100.8458 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.2849+05 ! 14.6959 ! 98.9499 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.4927+05 ! 14.6959 ! 97.0540 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.7004+05 ! 14.6959 ! 95.1583 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.9081+05 ! 14.6959 ! 93.2628 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------!*

*! 3.1158+05 ! 14.6959 ! 91.3675 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.3236+05 ! 14.6959 ! 89.4723 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.5313+05 ! 14.6959 ! 87.5774 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.7390+05 ! 14.6959 ! 85.6826 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.9467+05 ! 14.6959 ! 83.7882 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 4.1544+05 ! 14.6959 ! 81.8939 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.3622+05 ! 14.6959 ! 80.0000 ! 0.0 ! ---*

*HEATX HOT-TQCUR HX-203 TQCURV INLET* 

*---*

*-------------------------------------*

 *PRESSURE PROFILE: CONSTANT2 PRESSURE DROP: 0.0 PSI PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

*! DUTY ! PRES ! TEMP ! VFRAC ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! BTU/HR ! PSIA ! F ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !============!============!============!============! ! 0.0 ! 158.5000 ! 324.3175 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.0772+04 ! 158.5000 ! 319.6650 ! 1.0000 ! ! 4.1544+04 ! 158.5000 ! 315.0022 ! 1.0000 ! ! 6.2317+04 ! 158.5000 ! 310.3290 ! 1.0000 ! ! 8.3089+04 ! 158.5000 ! 305.6452 ! 1.0000 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------!*



*BLOCK: HX-204 MODEL: HEATX* 

*-----------------------------*

 *HOT SIDE:*

 *---------*

 *INLET STREAM: CG-4 OUTLET STREAM: CG-5 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE COLD SIDE:*

 *INLET STREAM: CW-IN4 OUTLET STREAM: CW-OUT4 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

 *\*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\**

 *----------*

 *IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF. TOTAL BALANCE MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 985.896 985.896 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR ) 14715.0 14715.0 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) -0.648777E+08 -0.648777E+08 0.114840E-15*

 *\*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR* 

 *\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\**

 *FLASH SPECS FOR HOT SIDE: TWO PHASE FLASH MAXIMUM NO. ITERATIONS 30 CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000*

 *FLASH SPECS FOR COLD SIDE: TWO PHASE FLASH MAXIMUM NO. ITERATIONS 30 CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000*

 *FLOW DIRECTION AND SPECIFICATION:*



 *PRESSURE SPECIFICATION:*



 *HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT SPECIFICATION:*



 *\*\*\* OVERALL RESULTS \*\*\**

 *--------------------------------------*

 *STREAMS:*

 *| | CG-4 ----->| HOT |-----> CG-5 T= 3.2671D+02 | | T= 2.2671D+02 P= 2.7350D+02 | | P= 2.7350D+02 V= 1.0000D+00 | | V= 1.0000D+00 | | CW-OUT4 <-----| COLD |<----- CW-IN4 T= 1.1983D+02 | | T= 8.0000D+01 P= 1.4696D+01 | | P= 1.4696D+01*  $V = 0.0000D + 00$  |  $V = 0.0000D + 00$  *--------------------------------------*
*DUTY AND AREA:*



 *HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT: AVERAGE COEFFICIENT (DIRTY) BTU/HR-SQFT-R 80.0000 UA (DIRTY) BTU/HR-R 2506.7434*

 *LOG-MEAN TEMPERATURE DIFFERENCE:*



 *PRESSURE DROP:*

*-------------------------------------*



*HEATX COLD-TQCU HX-204 TQCURV INLET* 

 *PRESSURE PROFILE: CONSTANT2 PRESSURE DROP: 0.0 PSI PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

*! DUTY ! PRES ! TEMP ! VFRAC !*

*---*

*! BTU/HR ! PSIA ! F ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !============!============!============!============! ! 0.0 ! 14.6959 ! 119.8321 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.0898+04 ! 14.6959 ! 117.9346 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.1796+04 ! 14.6959 ! 116.0371 ! 0.0 ! ! 6.2694+04 ! 14.6959 ! 114.1396 ! 0.0 ! ! 8.3592+04 ! 14.6959 ! 112.2421 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 1.0449+05 ! 14.6959 ! 110.3446 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.2539+05 ! 14.6959 ! 108.4471 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.4629+05 ! 14.6959 ! 106.5497 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.6718+05 ! 14.6959 ! 104.6523 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.8808+05 ! 14.6959 ! 102.7550 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 2.0898+05 ! 14.6959 ! 100.8579 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.2988+05 ! 14.6959 ! 98.9608 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.5078+05 ! 14.6959 ! 97.0639 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.7167+05 ! 14.6959 ! 95.1671 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.9257+05 ! 14.6959 ! 93.2705 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 3.1347+05 ! 14.6959 ! 91.3740 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.3437+05 ! 14.6959 ! 89.4778 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.5527+05 ! 14.6959 ! 87.5817 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.7616+05 ! 14.6959 ! 85.6859 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.9706+05 ! 14.6959 ! 83.7904 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 4.1796+05 ! 14.6959 ! 81.8950 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.3886+05 ! 14.6959 ! 80.0000 ! 0.0 !*

*---*

*HEATX HOT-TQCUR HX-204 TQCURV INLET* 

*-------------------------------------*

# *PRESSURE PROFILE: CONSTANT2*

 *PRESSURE DROP: 0.0 PSI* 

 *PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

*--- ! DUTY ! PRES ! TEMP ! VFRAC ! BTU/HR ! PSIA ! F ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !============!============!============!============! ! 0.0 ! 273.5000 ! 326.7066 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.0898+04 ! 273.5000 ! 322.0500 ! 1.0000 ! ! 4.1796+04 ! 273.5000 ! 317.3835 ! 1.0000 ! ! 6.2694+04 ! 273.5000 ! 312.7068 ! 1.0000 ! ! 8.3592+04 ! 273.5000 ! 308.0201 ! 1.0000 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 1.0449+05 ! 273.5000 ! 303.3230 ! 1.0000 ! ! 1.2539+05 ! 273.5000 ! 298.6157 ! 1.0000 ! ! 1.4629+05 ! 273.5000 ! 293.8979 ! 1.0000 ! ! 1.6718+05 ! 273.5000 ! 289.1697 ! 1.0000 ! ! 1.8808+05 ! 273.5000 ! 284.4308 ! 1.0000 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 2.0898+05 ! 273.5000 ! 279.6813 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.2988+05 ! 273.5000 ! 274.9210 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.5078+05 ! 273.5000 ! 270.1499 ! 1.0000 !*

*! 2.7167+05 ! 273.5000 ! 265.3678 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.9257+05 ! 273.5000 ! 260.5747 ! 1.0000 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 3.1347+05 ! 273.5000 ! 255.7705 ! 1.0000 ! ! 3.3437+05 ! 273.5000 ! 250.9551 ! 1.0000 ! ! 3.5527+05 ! 273.5000 ! 246.1283 ! 1.0000 ! ! 3.7616+05 ! 273.5000 ! 241.2902 ! 1.0000 ! ! 3.9706+05 ! 273.5000 ! 236.4406 ! 1.0000 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 4.1796+05 ! 273.5000 ! 231.5794 ! 1.0000 ! ! 4.3886+05 ! 273.5000 ! 226.7066 ! 1.0000 ! ---*

*BLOCK: HX-205 MODEL: HEATX* 

*-----------------------------*

 *HOT SIDE:*

 *---------*

 *INLET STREAM: CG-6* 

 *OUTLET STREAM: CG-7* 

 *PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE COLD SIDE:*

 *----------*

 *INLET STREAM: CW-IN5 OUTLET STREAM: CW-OUT5 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

 *\*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\**

 *IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF.*

 *TOTAL BALANCE*

 *MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 967.744 967.744 0.00000* 

 *MASS(LB/HR ) 14388.0 14388.0 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) -0.627804E+08 -0.627804E+08 0.00000* 

 *\*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR* 

 *\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\**

 *FLASH SPECS FOR HOT SIDE: TWO PHASE FLASH MAXIMUM NO. ITERATIONS 30 CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000*

 *FLASH SPECS FOR COLD SIDE: TWO PHASE FLASH MAXIMUM NO. ITERATIONS 30 CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000*

 *FLOW DIRECTION AND SPECIFICATION: COUNTERCURRENT HEAT EXCHANGER SPECIFIED HOT TEMP CHANGE SPECIFIED VALUE F 100.0000 LMTD CORRECTION FACTOR 1.00000*

 *PRESSURE SPECIFICATION: HOT SIDE PRESSURE DROP PSI 0.0000*

# *COLD SIDE PRESSURE DROP PSI 0.0000*

 *HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT SPECIFICATION: OVERALL COEFFICIENT BTU/HR-SQFT-R 80.0000*

 *\*\*\* OVERALL RESULTS \*\*\**

 *STREAMS:*



 *DUTY AND AREA:*



 *HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT:*



 *LOG-MEAN TEMPERATURE DIFFERENCE:*



 *PRESSURE DROP:*



*HEATX COLD-TQCU HX-205 TQCURV INLET* 

*---*

*-------------------------------------*

 *PRESSURE PROFILE: CONSTANT2 PRESSURE DROP: 0.0 PSI PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

*! DUTY ! PRES ! TEMP ! VFRAC ! ! ! ! ! ! !*  $\hat{I} = \hat{I} = \hat{I} = \hat{I} = \hat{I} = \hat{I}$ *! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! BTU/HR ! PSIA ! F ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !============!============!============!============! ! 0.0 ! 14.6959 ! 120.7836 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.0664+04 ! 14.6959 ! 118.8408 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.1329+04 ! 14.6959 ! 116.8980 ! 0.0 ! ! 6.1993+04 ! 14.6959 ! 114.9552 ! 0.0 ! ! 8.2658+04 ! 14.6959 ! 113.0123 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------!*



*HEATX HOT-TQCUR HX-205 TQCURV INLET* 

*-------------------------------------*

 *PRESSURE PROFILE: CONSTANT2 PRESSURE DROP: 0.0 PSI PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

*! DUTY ! PRES ! TEMP ! VFRAC !*

*---*

*! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! BTU/HR ! PSIA ! F ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !============!============!============!============! ! 0.0 ! 388.5000 ! 292.1519 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.0664+04 ! 388.5000 ! 287.4937 ! 1.0000 ! ! 4.1329+04 ! 388.5000 ! 282.8255 ! 1.0000 ! ! 6.1993+04 ! 388.5000 ! 278.1473 ! 1.0000 ! ! 8.2658+04 ! 388.5000 ! 273.4590 ! 1.0000 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 1.0332+05 ! 388.5000 ! 268.7606 ! 1.0000 ! ! 1.2399+05 ! 388.5000 ! 264.0521 ! 1.0000 ! ! 1.4465+05 ! 388.5000 ! 259.3332 ! 1.0000 ! ! 1.6532+05 ! 388.5000 ! 254.6040 ! 1.0000 ! ! 1.8598+05 ! 388.5000 ! 249.8644 ! 1.0000 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 2.0664+05 ! 388.5000 ! 245.1143 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.2731+05 ! 388.5000 ! 240.3536 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.4797+05 ! 388.5000 ! 235.5823 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.6864+05 ! 388.5000 ! 230.8003 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.8930+05 ! 388.5000 ! 226.0076 ! 1.0000 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 3.0997+05 ! 388.5000 ! 221.2040 ! 1.0000 ! ! 3.3063+05 ! 388.5000 ! 216.3896 ! 1.0000 ! ! 3.5130+05 ! 388.5000 ! 211.5642 ! 1.0000 ! ! 3.7196+05 ! 388.5000 ! 206.7278 ! 1.0000 ! ! 3.9263+05 ! 388.5000 ! 201.8803 ! 1.0000 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------!*

*! 4.1329+05 ! 388.5000 ! 197.0217 ! 1.0000 ! ! 4.3395+05 ! 388.5000 ! 192.1519 ! 1.0000 !*

*---*

*BLOCK: HX-206 MODEL: HEATX* 

*-----------------------------*

 *HOT SIDE:*

 *---------*

 *INLET STREAM: CG-8 OUTLET STREAM: CG-9 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE COLD SIDE:*

 *----------*

 *INLET STREAM: CW-IN6 OUTLET STREAM: CW-OUT6 PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

 *\*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\**

 *IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF.*

 *TOTAL BALANCE*

 *MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 1044.07 1044.07 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR ) 15763.0 15763.0 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) -0.724150E+08 -0.724150E+08 0.205774E-15*

 *\*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 15175.0 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR* 

 *\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\**

 *FLASH SPECS FOR HOT SIDE: TWO PHASE FLASH MAXIMUM NO. ITERATIONS 30 CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000*





 *PRESSURE SPECIFICATION:*



 *HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT SPECIFICATION: OVERALL COEFFICIENT BTU/HR-SQFT-R 80.0000*

 *\*\*\* OVERALL RESULTS \*\*\**

 *STREAMS:*

 *--------------------------------------*



 *--------------------------------------*

 *DUTY AND AREA:*



 *HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT:*



 *LOG-MEAN TEMPERATURE DIFFERENCE:*



 *PRESSURE DROP:*



*HEATX COLD-TQCU HX-206 TQCURV INLET* 

*-------------------------------------*

### *PRESSURE PROFILE: CONSTANT2*

 *PRESSURE DROP: 0.0 PSI* 

 *PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

*--- ! DUTY ! PRES ! TEMP ! VFRAC ! BTU/HR ! PSIA ! F ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !============!============!============!============! ! 0.0 ! 14.6959 ! 120.7539 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.3727+04 ! 14.6959 ! 118.8126 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.7455+04 ! 14.6959 ! 116.8712 ! 0.0 ! ! 7.1182+04 ! 14.6959 ! 114.9297 ! 0.0 ! ! 9.4909+04 ! 14.6959 ! 112.9883 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 1.1864+05 ! 14.6959 ! 111.0469 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.4236+05 ! 14.6959 ! 109.1055 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.6609+05 ! 14.6959 ! 107.1642 ! 0.0 ! ! 1.8982+05 ! 14.6959 ! 105.2229 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.1355+05 ! 14.6959 ! 103.2817 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 2.3727+05 ! 14.6959 ! 101.3406 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.6100+05 ! 14.6959 ! 99.3997 ! 0.0 ! ! 2.8473+05 ! 14.6959 ! 97.4588 ! 0.0 !*

*! 3.0845+05 ! 14.6959 ! 95.5181 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.3218+05 ! 14.6959 ! 93.5776 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 3.5591+05 ! 14.6959 ! 91.6372 ! 0.0 ! ! 3.7964+05 ! 14.6959 ! 89.6971 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.0336+05 ! 14.6959 ! 87.7572 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.2709+05 ! 14.6959 ! 85.8175 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.5082+05 ! 14.6959 ! 83.8781 ! 0.0 ! !------------+------------+------------+------------! ! 4.7455+05 ! 14.6959 ! 81.9389 ! 0.0 ! ! 4.9827+05 ! 14.6959 ! 80.0000 ! 0.0 ! ---*

*HEATX HOT-TQCUR HX-206 TQCURV INLET* 

*---*

*------------------------------------- PRESSURE PROFILE: CONSTANT2 PRESSURE DROP: 0.0 PSI PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE* 

*! DUTY ! PRES ! TEMP ! VFRAC ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! BTU/HR ! PSIA ! F ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !============!============!============!============! ! 0.0 ! 559.5000 ! 258.3075 ! 1.0000 ! ! 2.3727+04 ! 559.5000 ! 252.9138 ! 1.0000 ! ! 4.7455+04 ! 559.5000 ! 247.5075 ! 1.0000 !*















*Section 200: Pump blocks and streams* BLOCK: P-201 MODEL: PUMP

----------------------------

 INLET STREAM: BW-1 OUTLET STREAM: BW-2 PROPERTY OPTION SET: STEAM-TA ASME STEAM TABLE EQUATION OF STATE

 \*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\* IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF. TOTAL BALANCE MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 13443.0 13443.0 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR) 242180. 242180. 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) -0.161924E+10 -0.161885E+10 -0.239884E-03

 \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E  $0.00000$  LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 0.00000 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR

\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*



 FLASH SPECIFICATIONS: LIQUID PHASE CALCULATION NO FLASH PERFORMED MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ITERATIONS 30 TOLERANCE 0.000100000



BLOCK: P-202 MODEL: PUMP

----------------------------

INLET STREAM: SW-2

OUTLET STREAM: SW-3

PROPERTY OPTION SET: STEAM-TA ASME STEAM TABLE EQUATION OF STATE

\*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\*

IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF.

TOTAL BALANCE

 MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 10295.7 10295.7 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR) 185480. 185480. 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) -0.126276E+10 -0.126274E+10 -0.135040E-04

 \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 0.00000 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 0.00000 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR

239

 UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR

\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*



 FLASH SPECIFICATIONS: LIQUID PHASE CALCULATION NO FLASH PERFORMED MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ITERATIONS 30 TOLERANCE 0.000100000

\*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*



BLOCK: P-203 MODEL: PUMP

----------------------------

 INLET STREAM: REC-1 OUTLET STREAM: PS-1

# PROPERTY OPTION SET: STEAM-TA ASME STEAM TABLE EQUATION OF STATE

 \*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\* IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF. TOTAL BALANCE MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 114.680 114.680 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR) 2066.00 2066.00 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) -0.140037E+08 -0.140033E+08 -0.283979E-04

 \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 0.00000 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 0.00000 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR

\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*



 FLASH SPECIFICATIONS: LIQUID PHASE CALCULATION NO FLASH PERFORMED MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ITERATIONS 30 TOLERANCE 0.000100000

\*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*





BW-1 BW-2 PS-1 REC-1 SW-2

-------------------------



SUBSTREAM: MIXED

PHASE: LIQUID LIQUID LIQUID LIQUID LIQUID COMPONENTS: LBMOL/HR

WATER 1.3443+04 1.3443+04 114.6804 114.6804 1.0296+04 TOTAL FLOW:

 LBMOL/HR 1.3443+04 1.3443+04 114.6804 114.6804 1.0296+04 LB/HR 2.4218+05 2.4218+05 2066.0000 2066.0000 1.8548+05 CUFT/HR 4048.1762 4043.4331 33.4703 33.4752 2985.6609 STATE VARIABLES:



242

ENTHALPY:





*Section 200: Blower block and streams*

BLOCK: B-201 MODEL: COMPR

-----------------------------

INLET STREAM: FU-1

OUTLET STREAM: FU-2

PROPERTY OPTION SET: RK-SOAVE STANDARD RKS EQUATION OF STATE

\*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\*

 IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF. TOTAL BALANCE MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 358.697 358.697 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR) 1787.00 1787.00 0.00000 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR) -746094. -150451. -0.798349

\*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\*

FEED STREAMS CO2E 14975.0 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 14975.0 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR

\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*

 ISENTROPIC CENTRIFUGAL COMPRESSOR PRESSURE CHANGE PSI 40.0000 ISENTROPIC EFFICIENCY 1.00000 MECHANICAL EFFICIENCY 1.00000 \*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*







BLOCK: C2-SPLIT MODEL: RADFRAC

------------------------------- CONFIGURATION JUSTIFICATION INLETS - C2-FEED STAGE 12 OUTLETS - ETHYLENE STAGE 1 ETHANE STAGE 25 PROPERTY OPTION SET: PENG-ROB STANDARD PR EQUATION OF STATE

 \*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\* IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF. TOTAL BALANCE MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 53.4498 53.4498 0.132937E-15 MASS(LB/HR) 1500.00 1500.00 0.114201E-08 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) 682408. 904484. -0.245528

 \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 180.747 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 180.747 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.306777E-05 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.306777E-05 LB/HR

> \* \*\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*\* \*

\*\*\*\* INPUT PARAMETERS \*\*\*\*

NUMBER OF STAGES 25 ALGORITHM OPTION STANDARD ABSORBER OPTION NO INITIALIZATION OPTION STANDARD HYDRAULIC PARAMETER CALCULATIONS NO INSIDE LOOP CONVERGENCE METHOD BROYDEN DESIGN SPECIFICATION METHOD NESTED MAXIMUM NO. OF OUTSIDE LOOP ITERATIONS  $70$ MAXIMUM NO. OF INSIDE LOOP ITERATIONS 10 MAXIMUM NUMBER OF FLASH ITERATIONS 30 FLASH TOLERANCE 0.000100000 OUTSIDE LOOP CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000

#### \*\*\*\* COL-SPECS \*\*\*\*



1.00000  $10.0000$ 1,410.00

\*\*\*\* PROFILES \*\*\*\*

P-SPEC STAGE 1 PRES, PSIA 290.000

 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### \*\*\* COMPONENT SPLIT FRACTIONS \*\*\*

--------------

# OUTLET STREAMS



\*\*\* SUMMARY OF KEY RESULTS \*\*\*

TOP STAGE TEMPERATURE F -20.5717 BOTTOM STAGE TEMPERATURE F 17.2805 TOP STAGE LIQUID FLOW LBMOL/HR 502.847 BOTTOM STAGE LIQUID FLOW LBMOL/HR 3.00479 TOP STAGE VAPOR FLOW LBMOL/HR 50.4450 BOILUP VAPOR FLOW LBMOL/HR 524.493 MOLAR REFLUX RATIO 9.96823 MOLAR BOILUP RATIO 174.552 CONDENSER DUTY (W/O SUBCOOL) BTU/HR -1,968,990. REBOILER DUTY BTU/HR 2,191,070.

### \*\*\*\* MAXIMUM FINAL RELATIVE ERRORS \*\*\*\*



COMPONENT MASS BALANCE 0.18410E-04 STAGE= 12 COMP=HYDROGEN ENERGY BALANCE 0.10868E-04 STAGE= 18

\*\*\*\* PROFILES \*\*\*\*

 \*\*NOTE\*\* REPORTED VALUES FOR STAGE LIQUID AND VAPOR RATES ARE THE FLOWS

FROM THE STAGE INCLUDING ANY SIDE PRODUCT.



12 0.1583E+05 0.1557E+05 1499.9994

13 0.1581E+05 0.1574E+05

14 0.1578E+05 0.1572E+05

 24 0.1577E+05 0.1565E+05 25 90.00 0.1568E+05 89.9994



\*\*\*\* MOLE-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

STAGE PROPANE

- 1 0.38339E-20
- 2 0.19454E-19
- 11 0.31625E-13
- 12 0.14962E-12
- 13 0.15119E-12
- 14 0.15331E-12
- 24 0.70499E-11
- 25 0.22385E-10

# \*\*\*\* MOLE-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*<br>STAGE HVDROGEN METHANE ETH



#### \*\*\*\* MOLE-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

#### STAGE PROPANE

- 1 0.68522E-21
- 2 0.35468E-20
- 11 0.60079E-14
- 12 0.28733E-13
- 13 0.29561E-13
- 14 0.30666E-13
- 24 0.21515E-11
- 25 0.69621E-11



\*\*\*\* K-VALUES \*\*\*\*

STAGE PROPANE

- 1 0.17873
- 2 0.18232
- 11 0.18996
- 12 0.19202
- 13 0.19548
- 14 0.19996
- 24 0.30515
- 25 0.31099

\*\*\*\* MASS-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*



\*\*\*\* MASS-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

# STAGE PROPANE

- 1 0.60292E-20
- 2 0.30569E-19
- 11 0.49375E-13
- 12 0.23318E-12
- 13 0.23498E-12
- 14 0.23744E-12
- 24 0.10397E-10
- 25 0.32955E-10

\*\*\*\* MASS-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*


\*\*\*\* MASS-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

STAGE PROPANE

- 1 0.10810E-20
- 2 0.55794E-20
- 11 0.94014E-14
- 12 0.44904E-13
- 13 0.46086E-13
- 
- 14 0.47675E-13
- 24 0.31806E-11
- 25 0.10267E-10

#### \* \*\*\*\*\* HYDRAULIC PARAMETERS \*\*\*\*\* \*

\*\*\* DEFINITIONS \*\*\*

```
 MARANGONI INDEX = SIGMA - SIGMATO
 FLOW PARAM = (ML/MV)*SQRT(RHOV/RHOL)
 QR = QV*SQRT(RHOV/(RHOL-RHOV))
F FACTOR = QV*SQRT(RHOV)
  WHERE:
 SIGMA IS THE SURFACE TENSION OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE
  SIGMATO IS THE SURFACE TENSION OF LIQUID TO THE STAGE
  ML IS THE MASS FLOW OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE
  MV IS THE MASS FLOW OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE
  RHOL IS THE MASS DENSITY OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE
  RHOV IS THE MASS DENSITY OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE
  QV IS THE VOLUMETRIC FLOW RATE OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE
```
**TEMPERATURE** 





 MASS FLOW VOLUME FLOW MOLECULAR WEIGHT LB/HR CUFT/HR STAGE LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO 1 14100. 15510. 515.12 6453.2 28.040 28.032 2 14180. 15590. 519.40 6479.5 28.063 28.053 11 14158. 15568. 520.00 6453.0 28.244 28.217 12 15830. 15740. 581.78 6523.4 28.294 28.285 13 15812. 15722. 581.74 6518.4 28.373 28.364 14 15784. 15694. 581.57 6511.3 28.473 28.465 24 15773. 15683. 604.19 6483.1 29.901 29.901 25 89.999 0.0000 3.4553 0.0000 29.952 DENSITY VISCOSITY SURFACE TENSION LB/CUFT CP DYNE/CM STAGE LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM 1 27.372 2.4035 0.64998E-01 0.93924E-02 7.6060 2 27.302 2.4061 0.64853E-01 0.93953E-02 7.5444 11 27.228 2.4126 0.65274E-01 0.94164E-02 7.4496 12 27.210 2.4129 0.65393E-01 0.94217E-02 7.4039 13 27.180 2.4119 0.65582E-01 0.94273E-02 7.3713 14 27.140 2.4102 0.65798E-01 0.94336E-02 7.2227 24 26.105 2.4190 0.64439E-01 0.94710E-02 6.0712 25 26.047 0.64137E-01 6.0187 MARANGONI INDEX FLOW PARAM QR REDUCED F-FACTOR





 \* \*\*\*\*\* TRAY SIZING CALCULATIONS \*\*\*\*\* \*

 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\* SECTION 1 \*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

STARTING STAGE NUMBER 2 ENDING STAGE NUMBER 24 FLOODING CALCULATION METHOD GLITSCH6

DESIGN PARAMETERS

-----------------

PEAK CAPACITY FACTOR 1.00000 SYSTEM FOAMING FACTOR 1.00000 FLOODING FACTOR 0.80000 MINIMUM COLUMN DIAMETER FT 1.00000 MINIMUM DC AREA/COLUMN AREA  $0.100000$ HOLE AREA/ACTIVE AREA 0.100000 DOWNCOMER DESIGN BASIS EQUAL FLOW PATH LENGTH

TRAY SPECIFICATIONS

-------------------



#### \*\*\*\*\* SIZING RESULTS @ STAGE WITH MAXIMUM DIAMETER \*\*\*\*\*





# \*\*\*\* SIZING PROFILES \*\*\*\*



# \*\*\*\* ADDITIONAL SIZING PROFILES \*\*\*\*





 HEIGHT DC REL TR LIQ REL FRA APPR TO STAGE OVER WEIR FROTH DENS FROTH DENS SYS LIMIT FT



BLOCK: DEETH MODEL: RADFRAC

-------------------------------

CONFIGURATION NOTES INLETS - C2H4-REC STAGE 20 OUTLETS - H2-CH4-2 STAGE 1 DE-BOT STAGE 32 C2-OUT STAGE 6 PROPERTY OPTION SET: PENG-ROB STANDARD PR EQUATION OF STATE

 \*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\* IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF. TOTAL BALANCE MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 73.3744 73.3744 0.387352E-15 MASS(LB/HR ) 2097.60 2097.60 0.386560E-07 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) 258065. 403615. -0.360615

 \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 2281.18 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 2281.14 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION -0.421563E-01 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION -0.421563E-01 LB/HR

> \* \*\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*\* \*

\*\*\*\* INPUT PARAMETERS \*\*\*\*

NUMBER OF STAGES 32 ALGORITHM OPTION STANDARD ABSORBER OPTION NO INITIALIZATION OPTION STANDARD HYDRAULIC PARAMETER CALCULATIONS NO INSIDE LOOP CONVERGENCE METHOD BROYDEN DESIGN SPECIFICATION METHOD NESTED MAXIMUM NO. OF OUTSIDE LOOP ITERATIONS  $70$ MAXIMUM NO. OF INSIDE LOOP ITERATIONS 10 MAXIMUM NUMBER OF FLASH ITERATIONS 30 FLASH TOLERANCE 0.000100000 OUTSIDE LOOP CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000

\*\*\*\* COL-SPECS \*\*\*\*

MOLAR VAPOR DIST / TOTAL DIST 1.00000 MASS REFLUX RATIO 25.0000 MASS DISTILLATE RATE LB/HR 120.000

\*\*\*\* PROFILES \*\*\*\*

P-SPEC STAGE 1 PRES, PSIA 200.000

 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### \*\*\* COMPONENT SPLIT FRACTIONS \*\*\*

--------------

#### OUTLET STREAMS



#### \*\*\* SUMMARY OF KEY RESULTS \*\*\*

TOP STAGE TEMPERATURE F -129.792 BOTTOM STAGE TEMPERATURE F 57.4754 TOP STAGE LIQUID FLOW LBMOL/HR 120.520 BOTTOM STAGE LIQUID FLOW LBMOL/HR 12.2031 TOP STAGE VAPOR FLOW LBMOL/HR 7.72145 BOILUP VAPOR FLOW LBMOL/HR 129.144 MOLAR REFLUX RATIO 15.6084 MOLAR BOILUP RATIO 10.5829 CONDENSER DUTY (W/O SUBCOOL) BTU/HR -603,649. REBOILER DUTY BTU/HR 749,187.

#### \*\*\*\* MAXIMUM FINAL RELATIVE ERRORS \*\*\*\*



 COMPONENT MASS BALANCE 0.33906E-04 STAGE= 1 COMP=HYDROGEN ENERGY BALANCE 0.17310E-03 STAGE= 1

\*\*\*\* PROFILES \*\*\*\*

 \*\*NOTE\*\* REPORTED VALUES FOR STAGE LIQUID AND VAPOR RATES ARE THE FLOWS

FROM THE STAGE INCLUDING ANY SIDE PRODUCT.



\*\*\*\* MASS FLOW PROFILES \*\*\*\*





\*\*\*\* MOLE-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*<br>STAGE PROPANE BUTANE





31 0.11718E-01 0.89081E-03

32 0.18167E-01 0.34148E-02











# \*\*\*\* MASS-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*







\*\*\*\* MASS-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*



 \* \*\*\*\*\* HYDRAULIC PARAMETERS \*\*\*\*\* \*

#### \*\*\* DEFINITIONS \*\*\*

 MARANGONI INDEX = SIGMA - SIGMATO FLOW PARAM = (ML/MV)\*SQRT(RHOV/RHOL) QR = QV\*SQRT(RHOV/(RHOL-RHOV))  $F$  FACTOR = QV\*SQRT(RHOV) WHERE: SIGMA IS THE SURFACE TENSION OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE SIGMATO IS THE SURFACE TENSION OF LIQUID TO THE STAGE ML IS THE MASS FLOW OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE MV IS THE MASS FLOW OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE RHOL IS THE MASS DENSITY OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE RHOV IS THE MASS DENSITY OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE QV IS THE VOLUMETRIC FLOW RATE OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE

TEMPERATURE



MASS FLOW VOLUME FLOW MOLECULAR WEIGHT

 LB/HR CUFT/HR STAGE LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO 1 3000.0 3120.0 97.286 2208.6 24.893 24.330 2 3597.1 3717.1 121.42 2425.8 27.360 26.704 5 3801.1 3921.1 130.48 2504.2 28.023 27.350







#### \* \*\*\*\*\* TRAY SIZING CALCULATIONS \*\*\*\*\* \*



STARTING STAGE NUMBER 2 ENDING STAGE NUMBER 31 FLOODING CALCULATION METHOD GLITSCH6

#### DESIGN PARAMETERS

 ----------------- PEAK CAPACITY FACTOR SYSTEM FOAMING FACTOR FLOODING FACTOR MINIMUM COLUMN DIAMETER FT MINIMUM DC AREA/COLUMN AREA HOLE AREA/ACTIVE AREA DOWNCOMER DESIGN BASIS



#### TRAY SPECIFICATIONS

-------------------



# \*\*\*\*\* SIZING RESULTS @ STAGE WITH MAXIMUM DIAMETER \*\*\*\*\*



# \*\*\*\* SIZING PROFILES \*\*\*\*



# \*\*\*\* ADDITIONAL SIZING PROFILES \*\*\*\*





 HEIGHT DC REL TR LIQ REL FRA APPR TO STAGE OVER WEIR FROTH DENS FROTH DENS SYS LIMIT **FT** 





BLOCK: DEMETH MODEL: RADFRAC

 $-$ 

 INLETS - SEP-FEED STAGE 4 OUTLETS - H2-CH4-1 STAGE 1 C2H4-REC STAGE 1 DM-BOT STAGE 12 PROPERTY OPTION SET: PENG-ROB STANDARD PR EQUATION OF STATE

 \*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\* IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF. TOTAL BALANCE MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 455.421 455.421 0.00000 MASS(LB/HR ) 5164.04 5164.04 0.399150E-06 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR ) 162107. -0.123700E+07 1.13105

 \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 15164.8 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 15164.8 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.199291E-02 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.199291E-02 LB/HR

> \* \*\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*\* \*

\*\*\*\* INPUT PARAMETERS \*\*\*\*

NUMBER OF STAGES 12

 ALGORITHM OPTION STANDARD ABSORBER OPTION NO INITIALIZATION OPTION STANDARD HYDRAULIC PARAMETER CALCULATIONS NO INSIDE LOOP CONVERGENCE METHOD BROYDEN DESIGN SPECIFICATION METHOD NESTED MAXIMUM NO. OF OUTSIDE LOOP ITERATIONS  $70$ MAXIMUM NO. OF INSIDE LOOP ITERATIONS 10 MAXIMUM NUMBER OF FLASH ITERATIONS 30 FLASH TOLERANCE 0.000100000 OUTSIDE LOOP CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000

\*\*\*\* COL-SPECS \*\*\*\*



\*\*\*\* PROFILES \*\*\*\*

P-SPEC STAGE 1 PRES, PSIA 550.000

 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### \*\*\* COMPONENT SPLIT FRACTIONS \*\*\*

--------------

#### OUTLET STREAMS

 H2-CH4-1 C2H4-REC DM-BOT COMPONENT: HYDROGEN .99567 .43312E-02 .39198E-09 METHANE .84957 .15043 .16161E-05 ETHENE .27236 .72617 .14681E-02 ETHANE .16177 .82800 .10235E-01 PROPENE .66451E-02 .29018 .70318 PROPANE .31042E-02 .18771 .80918 BUTANE .37777E-04 .58465E-02 .99412

#### \*\*\* SUMMARY OF KEY RESULTS \*\*\*



TOP STAGE LIQUID FLOW LBMOL/HR 664.623 BOTTOM STAGE LIQUID FLOW LBMOL/HR 29.7236 TOP STAGE VAPOR FLOW LBMOL/HR 352.323 BOILUP VAPOR FLOW LBMOL/HR 1,185.29 MOLAR REFLUX RATIO 1.56126 MOLAR BOILUP RATIO 39.8771 CONDENSER DUTY (W/O SUBCOOL) BTU/HR -5,002,050. REBOILER DUTY BTU/HR 3,602,910.

\*\*\*\* MAXIMUM FINAL RELATIVE ERRORS \*\*\*\*

 DEW POINT 0.13723E-03 STAGE= 11 BUBBLE POINT 0.13838E-03 STAGE= 11 COMPONENT MASS BALANCE 0.77778E-06 STAGE= 3 COMP=BUTANE ENERGY BALANCE 0.67885E-04 STAGE= 7

\*\*\*\* PROFILES \*\*\*\*

 \*\*NOTE\*\* REPORTED VALUES FOR STAGE LIQUID AND VAPOR RATES ARE THE FLOWS

FROM THE STAGE INCLUDING ANY SIDE PRODUCT.







4 1015. 708.5

8 1247. 1196.

9 1249. 1217.

10 1235. 1219.

11 1215. 1205.

12 29.72 1185. 29.7236

#### \*\*\*\* MASS FLOW PROFILES \*\*\*\*



# \*\*\*\* MOLE-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*



\*\*\*\* MOLE-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*



#### \*\*\*\* MOLE-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

### STAGE HYDROGEN METHANE ETHENE ETHANE PROPENE 1 0.85037 0.91175E-01 0.54531E-01 0.33389E-02 0.57679E-03





# \*\*\*\* K-VALUES \*\*\*\*



\*\*\*\* K-VALUES \*\*\*\*





\*\*\*\* MASS-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*



\*\*\*\* MASS-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

- STAGE PROPANE BUTANE
	- 1 0.46606E-02 0.11547E-02 2 0.13111E-01 0.71116E-02
	- 3 0.21688E-01 0.26952E-01
	- 4 0.26298E-01 0.26935E-01
	- 8 0.34480E-01 0.77885E-01
	- 9 0.34833E-01 0.11079
	- 10 0.34430E-01 0.15780
	-
	- 11 0.33138E-01 0.22150
	- 12 0.30895E-01 0.30193

#### \*\*\*\* MASS-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*



#### \*\*\*\* MASS-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

#### STAGE PROPANE BUTANE

- 1 0.94964E-04 0.91931E-05 2 0.43197E-02 0.10692E-02 3 0.11827E-01 0.63197E-02 4 0.21195E-01 0.12249E-01 8 0.33553E-01 0.49021E-01 9 0.34575E-01 0.71966E-01
- 10 0.34936E-01 0.10582
- 11 0.34521E-01 0.15407
- 12 0.33196E-01 0.21943

#### \* \*\*\*\*\* HYDRAULIC PARAMETERS \*\*\*\*\* \*

\*\*\* DEFINITIONS \*\*\*

 MARANGONI INDEX = SIGMA - SIGMATO FLOW PARAM = (ML/MV)\*SQRT(RHOV/RHOL) QR = QV\*SQRT(RHOV/(RHOL-RHOV))  $F$  FACTOR = QV\*SQRT(RHOV) WHERE: SIGMA IS THE SURFACE TENSION OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE SIGMATO IS THE SURFACE TENSION OF LIQUID TO THE STAGE ML IS THE MASS FLOW OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE MV IS THE MASS FLOW OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE RHOL IS THE MASS DENSITY OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE RHOV IS THE MASS DENSITY OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE QV IS THE VOLUMETRIC FLOW RATE OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE

TEMPERATURE



STAGE LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO



12 205.24 205.24

 MASS FLOW VOLUME FLOW MOLECULAR WEIGHT LB/HR CUFT/HR STAGE LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO 1 21098. 22800. 619.95 8282.9 28.588 20.911 2 27246. 31046. 953.46 10248. 32.561 24.591 3 26875. 30675. 942.52 10612. 36.405 26.355







 \* \*\*\*\*\* TRAY SIZING CALCULATIONS \*\*\*\*\* \*

 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\* SECTION 1 \*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*



DESIGN PARAMETERS

 ----------------- PEAK CAPACITY FACTOR 1.00000 SYSTEM FOAMING FACTOR 1.00000 FLOODING FACTOR 0.80000 MINIMUM COLUMN DIAMETER FT 1.00000 MINIMUM DC AREA/COLUMN AREA  $0.100000$ HOLE AREA/ACTIVE AREA 0.100000 DOWNCOMER DESIGN BASIS EQUAL FLOW PATH LENGTH

# GLITSCH6

TRAY SPECIFICATIONS

-------------------



### \*\*\*\*\* SIZING RESULTS @ STAGE WITH MAXIMUM DIAMETER \*\*\*\*\*



#### \*\*\*\* SIZING PROFILES \*\*\*\*





#### \*\*\*\* ADDITIONAL SIZING PROFILES \*\*\*\*



# HEIGHT DC REL TR LIQ REL FRA APPR TO STAGE OVER WEIR FROTH DENS FROTH DENS SYS LIMIT





BLOCK: DEPROP MODEL: RADFRAC

-------------------------------

 INLETS - DP-FEED STAGE 16 OUTLETS - C2-WASTE STAGE 1 BUTANE STAGE 30 PROPENE STAGE 10 PROPERTY OPTION SET: PENG-ROB STANDARD PR EQUATION OF STATE

 \*\*\* MASS AND ENERGY BALANCE \*\*\* IN OUT RELATIVE DIFF.

TOTAL BALANCE

 MOLE(LBMOL/HR) 41.9268 41.9268 0.169472E-15 MASS(LB/HR ) 1841.64 1841.64 0.628359E-06 ENTHALPY(BTU/HR) -438973. -544581. 0.193925

 \*\*\* CO2 EQUIVALENT SUMMARY \*\*\* FEED STREAMS CO2E 0.245077E-01 LB/HR PRODUCT STREAMS CO2E 0.245084E-01 LB/HR NET STREAMS CO2E PRODUCTION 0.791071E-06 LB/HR UTILITIES CO2E PRODUCTION 0.00000 LB/HR TOTAL CO2E PRODUCTION 0.791071E-06 LB/HR

> \* \*\*\*\* INPUT DATA \*\*\*\* \*

#### \*\*\*\* INPUT PARAMETERS \*\*\*\*

NUMBER OF STAGES 30 ALGORITHM OPTION STANDARD ABSORBER OPTION NO INITIALIZATION OPTION STANDARD HYDRAULIC PARAMETER CALCULATIONS NO INSIDE LOOP CONVERGENCE METHOD BROYDEN DESIGN SPECIFICATION METHOD NESTED MAXIMUM NO. OF OUTSIDE LOOP ITERATIONS  $70$ MAXIMUM NO. OF INSIDE LOOP ITERATIONS 10 MAXIMUM NUMBER OF FLASH ITERATIONS 30 FLASH TOLERANCE 0.000100000 OUTSIDE LOOP CONVERGENCE TOLERANCE 0.000100000

\*\*\*\* COL-SPECS \*\*\*\*

MOLAR VAPOR DIST / TOTAL DIST 1.00000 MASS REFLUX RATIO 42.0000 MASS DISTILLATE RATE LB/HR 96.0000

\*\*\*\* PROFILES \*\*\*\*

P-SPEC STAGE 1 PRES, PSIA 150.000

 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* RESULTS \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### \*\*\* COMPONENT SPLIT FRACTIONS \*\*\*

--------------

#### OUTLET STREAMS



#### \*\*\* SUMMARY OF KEY RESULTS \*\*\*

TOP STAGE TEMPERATURE F -11.3169 BOTTOM STAGE TEMPERATURE F 149.115 TOP STAGE LIQUID FLOW LBMOL/HR 122.190 BOTTOM STAGE LIQUID FLOW LBMOL/HR 9.05243 TOP STAGE VAPOR FLOW LBMOL/HR 3.10094 BOILUP VAPOR FLOW LBMOL/HR 78.0805 MOLAR REFLUX RATIO 39.4042 MOLAR BOILUP RATIO 8.62537 CONDENSER DUTY (W/O SUBCOOL) BTU/HR -702,345. REBOILER DUTY BTU/HR 596,741.

\*\*\*\* MAXIMUM FINAL RELATIVE ERRORS \*\*\*\*

 DEW POINT 0.48729E-04 STAGE= 28 BUBBLE POINT 0.21325E-03 STAGE= 2 COMPONENT MASS BALANCE 0.72413E-05 STAGE= 15 COMP=ETHENE ENERGY BALANCE 0.12987E-03 STAGE= 1

\*\*\*\* PROFILES \*\*\*\*

 \*\*NOTE\*\* REPORTED VALUES FOR STAGE LIQUID AND VAPOR RATES ARE THE FLOWS

FROM THE STAGE INCLUDING ANY SIDE PRODUCT.





# \*\*\*\* MASS FLOW PROFILES \*\*\*\*





\*\*\*\* MOLE-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

- STAGE PROPANE BUTANE
	- 1 0.28888E-02 0.40331E-09
	- 2 0.72111E-02 0.39609E-08
	- 3 0.12019E-01 0.24252E-07
	- 9 0.28219E-01 0.79075E-04
	- 10 0.31117E-01 0.28693E-03
	- 11 0.34284E-01 0.10392E-02
	- 14 0.39792E-01 0.21834E-01
	- 15 0.39681E-01 0.55092E-01
- 16 0.39715E-01 0.97277E-01
- 17 0.42228E-01 0.97320E-01
- 29 0.47826E-01 0.59607
- 30 0.27451E-01 0.78640

#### \*\*\*\* MOLE-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*



\*\*\*\* MOLE-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

- STAGE PROPANE BUTANE 1 0.78067E-03 0.26655E-10 2 0.28366E-02 0.39399E-09 3 0.70400E-02 0.38563E-08 9 0.24903E-01 0.21169E-04 10 0.27483E-01 0.76956E-04 11 0.30304E-01 0.27924E-03 14 0.35703E-01 0.59971E-02 15 0.36478E-01 0.15637E-01 16 0.38151E-01 0.29286E-01 17 0.40918E-01 0.29655E-01
- 29 0.72061E-01 0.33262
- 30 0.50188E-01 0.57400

\*\*\*\* K-VALUES \*\*\*\*



\*\*\*\* K-VALUES \*\*\*\*





\*\*\*\* MASS-X-PROFILE \*\*\*\*

# STAGE PROPANE BUTANE

- 1 0.38604E-02 0.71040E-09
- 2 0.87466E-02 0.63326E-08
- 3 0.13480E-01 0.35851E-07
- 9 0.29648E-01 0.10951E-03
- 10 0.32683E-01 0.39723E-03
- 11 0.35992E-01 0.14380E-02
- 14 0.41432E-01 0.29966E-01
- 15 0.40801E-01 0.74666E-01
- 16 0.40130E-01 0.12956
- 17 0.42614E-01 0.12945
- 29 0.40761E-01 0.66961
- 30 0.22109E-01 0.83483

#### \*\*\*\* MASS-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*



\*\*\*\* MASS-Y-PROFILE \*\*\*\*



30 0.43065E-01 0.64921

 \* \*\*\*\*\* HYDRAULIC PARAMETERS \*\*\*\*\* \*

\*\*\* DEFINITIONS \*\*\*

 MARANGONI INDEX = SIGMA - SIGMATO FLOW PARAM = (ML/MV)\*SQRT(RHOV/RHOL) QR = QV\*SQRT(RHOV/(RHOL-RHOV))  $F$  FACTOR = QV\*SQRT(RHOV) WHERE: SIGMA IS THE SURFACE TENSION OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE SIGMATO IS THE SURFACE TENSION OF LIQUID TO THE STAGE ML IS THE MASS FLOW OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE MV IS THE MASS FLOW OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE RHOL IS THE MASS DENSITY OF LIQUID FROM THE STAGE RHOV IS THE MASS DENSITY OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE QV IS THE VOLUMETRIC FLOW RATE OF VAPOR TO THE STAGE

#### TEMPERATURE

F





 MASS FLOW VOLUME FLOW MOLECULAR WEIGHT LB/HR CUFT/HR STAGE LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO 1 4032.0 4128.0 132.27 3470.0 32.998 32.947 2 4125.8 4221.8 130.54 3393.8 36.355 36.212 3 4340.4 4436.4 135.20 3388.5 39.319 39.090 9 4725.2 4821.2 147.99 3486.8 41.970 41.675 10 4727.2 4823.2 148.10 3484.5 41.984 41.688 11 3477.6 4823.6 108.97 3481.5 42.004 41.702 14 3454.9 4800.9 108.15 3464.4 42.350 41.946 15 3421.4 4767.4 106.86 3451.0 42.886 42.320 16 4421.1 3925.4 137.82 2811.1 43.640 42.550 17 4433.2 3937.6 138.28 2813.6 43.697 42.614 29 4508.2 4012.6 140.47 2638.3 51.740 51.390 30 495.64 0.0000 15.636 0.0000 54.752 DENSITY VISCOSITY SURFACE TENSION LB/CUFT CP DYNE/CM STAGE LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM VAPOR TO LIQUID FROM 1 30.484 1.1896 0.91044E-01 0.85703E-02 8.8278 2 31.605 1.2440 0.92216E-01 0.88116E-02 8.8963 3 32.103 1.3093 0.89882E-01 0.89503E-02 8.6357 9 31.928 1.3827 0.84280E-01 0.90493E-02 7.7666 10 31.920 1.3842 0.84268E-01 0.90513E-02 7.7598 11 31.913 1.3855 0.84276E-01 0.90541E-02 7.7532 14 31.945 1.3858 0.84630E-01 0.90953E-02 7.7035 15 32.017 1.3815 0.85230E-01 0.91474E-02 7.6385 16 32.080 1.3964 0.85769E-01 0.91384E-02 7.6670 17 32.059 1.3995 0.85616E-01 0.91412E-02 7.6377 29 32.094 1.5209 0.92279E-01 0.95780E-02 7.0751 30 31.698 0.93530E-01 6.4649





#### \* \*\*\*\*\* TRAY SIZING CALCULATIONS \*\*\*\*\* \*

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

 \*\*\* SECTION 1 \*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

### STARTING STAGE NUMBER 2 ENDING STAGE NUMBER 29 FLOODING CALCULATION METHOD GLITSCH6

#### DESIGN PARAMETERS

-----------------

PEAK CAPACITY FACTOR 1.00000 SYSTEM FOAMING FACTOR 1.00000 FLOODING FACTOR 0.80000 MINIMUM COLUMN DIAMETER FT 1.00000 MINIMUM DC AREA/COLUMN AREA  $0.100000$ HOLE AREA/ACTIVE AREA 0.100000 DOWNCOMER DESIGN BASIS EQUAL FLOW PATH LENGTH

#### TRAY SPECIFICATIONS

 ------------------- TRAY TYPE SIEVE NUMBER OF PASSES 1 TRAY SPACING FT 1.50000
# \*\*\*\*\* SIZING RESULTS @ STAGE WITH MAXIMUM DIAMETER \*\*\*\*\*



## \*\*\*\* SIZING PROFILES \*\*\*\*





## \*\*\*\* ADDITIONAL SIZING PROFILES \*\*\*\*



 HEIGHT DC REL TR LIQ REL FRA APPR TO STAGE OVER WEIR FROTH DENS FROTH DENS SYS LIMIT FT 2 0.2227 0.5637 0.2214 50.13 3 0.2304 0.5671 0.2179 51.71 4 0.2405 0.5667 0.2137 53.90 5 0.2465 0.5660 0.2114



#### BUTANE C2-FEED C2-OUT C2-WASTE C2H4-REC

---------------------------------------

STREAM ID BUTANE C2-FEED C2-OUT C2-WASTE C2H4-REC FROM : DEPROP B1 DEETH DEPROP DEMETH TO : ---- C2-SPLIT B1 ---- DEETH SUBSTREAM: MIXED PHASE: LIQUID LIQUID LIQUID VAPOR LIQUID COMPONENTS: LBMOL/HR HYDROGEN 0.0 8.1869-03 8.1869-03 1.1758-07 1.3033 METHANE 1.6354-23 0.4507 0.4507 5.9895-05 5.6878 ETHENE 2.5443-12 49.9360 49.9360 0.1902 51.2248 ETHANE 1.9986-08 3.0549 3.0549 2.6497 6.0211 PROPENE 1.6851 7.0919-08 7.0919-08 0.2586 8.8741 PROPANE 0.2485 6.7261-11 6.7261-11 2.4208-03 0.2217 BUTANE 7.1189 1.9388-15 1.9388-15 8.2655-11 4.1672-02 TOTAL FLOW: LBMOL/HR 9.0524 53.4498 53.4498 3.1009 73.3744 LB/HR 495.6388 1499.9994 1499.9994 96.0001 2097.5991 CUFT/HR 15.6363 51.9239 51.5214 83.1029 61.6375 STATE VARIABLES: TEMP F 149.1145 -40.9305 -44.1624 -11.3169 -131.2174 PRES PSIA 156.9200 300.0000 203.5600 150.0000 550.0000 VFRAC 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.0000 0.0 LFRAC 1.0000 1.0000 1.0000 0.0 1.0000 SFRAC 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 ENTHALPY: BTU/LBMOL -4.8418+04 1.2767+04 1.2709+04 -3.0181+04 3517.1063 BTU/LB -884.3223 454.9390 452.8657 -974.8802 123.0289 BTU/HR -4.3830+05 6.8241+05 6.7930+05 -9.3589+04 2.5807+05 ENTROPY: BTU/LBMOL-R -89.8621 -32.7966 -32.8967 -45.5229 -39.5110 BTU/LB-R -1.6413 -1.1686 -1.1722 -1.4705 -1.3821 DENSITY: LBMOL/CUFT 0.5789 1.0294 1.0374 3.7314-02 1.1904 LB/CUFT 31.6980 28.8884 29.1141 1.1552 34.0312 AVG MW 54.7520 28.0637 28.0637 30.9584 28.5876

DE-BOT DM-BOT DP-FEED ETHANE ETHYLENE

-------------------------------------



SUBSTREAM: MIXED PHASE: LIQUID LIQUID MIXED LIQUID VAPOR COMPONENTS: LBMOL/HR HYDROGEN 1.3272-24 1.1795-07 1.1795-07 1.7883-25 8.1869-03 METHANE 3.8434-11 6.1106-05 6.1106-05 5.4964-12 0.4507 ETHENE 0.1041 0.1036 0.2076 0.1754 49.7607 ETHANE 2.9617 7.4427-02 3.0362 2.8294 0.2255 PROPENE 8.8739 21.5042 30.3781 7.0919-08 3.6801-16 PROPANE 0.2217 0.9557 1.1774 6.7261-11 3.4566-20 BUTANE 4.1671-02 7.0857 7.1274 0.0 0.0 TOTAL FLOW: LBMOL/HR 12.2031 29.7236 41.9268 3.0048 50.4450 LB/HR 477.5974 1364.0427 1841.6401 89.9994 1410.0000 CUFT/HR 15.4960 58.9891 443.0044 3.4553 595.3505 STATE VARIABLES: TEMP F 57.4754 205.2431 103.2282 17.2805 -20.5717 PRES PSIA 207.2000 554.4000 207.2000 296.2200 290.0000 VFRAC 0.0 0.0 0.4240 0.0 1.0000 LFRAC 1.0000 1.0000 0.5760 1.0000 0.0 SFRAC 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 ENTHALPY: BTU/LBMOL -9828.5061 -1.0733+04 -1.0470+04 -3.8271+04 2.0210+04 BTU/LB -251.1288 -233.8889 -238.3598 -1277.7355 723.0350 BTU/HR -1.1994+05 -3.1903+05 -4.3897+05 -1.1500+05 1.0195+06 ENTROPY: BTU/LBMOL-R -52.2978 -56.1697 -54.1629 -56.6729 -21.6822 BTU/LB-R -1.3363 -1.2240 -1.2331 -1.8921 -0.7757 DENSITY: LBMOL/CUFT 0.7875 0.5039 9.4642-02 0.8696 8.4732-02 LB/CUFT 30.8207 23.1236 4.1572 26.0470 2.3684 AVG MW 39.1373 45.8908 43.9252 29.9520 27.9512

H2-CH4-1 H2-CH4-2 PROPENE SEP-FEED



#### SUBSTREAM: MIXED

----------------------------------



 PROPENE 0.2032 1.0595-14 28.4343 30.5815 PROPANE 3.6662-03 2.1741-18 0.9265 1.1810 BUTANE 2.6926-04 2.5603-24 8.5428-03 7.1277 TOTAL FLOW: LBMOL/HR 352.3234 7.7215 29.7734 455.4214 LB/HR 1702.3991 120.0022 1250.0000 5164.0430 CUFT/HR 2242.3848 120.6316 39.1603 5275.4676 STATE VARIABLES: TEMP F -131.2174 -129.7919 69.1628 142.5000 PRES PSIA 550.0000 200.0000 154.1200 555.0000 VFRAC 1.0000 1.0000 0.0 1.0000 LFRAC 0.0 0.0 1.0000 0.0 SFRAC 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 ENTHALPY: BTU/LBMOL -3337.9202 -2.0170+04 -426.1427 355.9486 BTU/LB -690.8059 -1297.8502 -10.1502 31.3914 BTU/HR -1.1760+06 -1.5574+05 -1.2688+04 1.6211+05 ENTROPY: BTU/LBMOL-R -12.3661 -22.8672 -51.8721 -12.2323 BTU/LB-R -2.5593 -1.4714 -1.2355 -1.0788 DENSITY: LBMOL/CUFT 0.1571 6.4009-02 0.7603 8.6328-02 LB/CUFT 0.7592 0.9948 31.9201 0.9789 AVG MW 4.8319 15.5414 41.9838 11.3390