



Development of Design Practices for Additively Manufactured Micro-Mix Hydrogen Fueled Turbine Combustors with High-Fidelity Simulation Analysis, Reduced Modeling and Testing

> Gustaaf Jacobs (Professor), Pavel Popov (Assistant Professor) San Diego State University

> > Michael Ramotowski, Solar Turbines

(DE-FOA-0002397)



- Motivation and Objectives
- Models and Codes
 - LES and FDF
 - DG and FD
 - Semi-Lagrangian vs. Particle Methods
- Simulations
 - LES of Injector in cross stream and dump combustor
 - Cold Flow and Reacting Flow
 - Wall roughness and additive manufacturing
- Reduced Modeling
 - Input-Output Design Maps
 - Reduced dynamic modeling for QoIs
- Testing
- Timeline





- High temperature of combustion of H₂
 - higher heat flux to the combustor's structure
 - increased NO_x emissions

- High laminar flame speeds of H₂
 - flashback
 - flameout for lean fuel mixtures
 - highly strained subgrid scales

• Metal embrittlement







- Mitigating of hydrogen issues using micro-mixers
 - optimal positioning of the ignition plugs
 - miniaturization decreases residence times of the reactants because reaction zones are small, which significantly reduces NO_x

- Considerations
 - ignition
 - a stable flameholding
 - a drag overhead
 - penetration of the fuel into the flow



Open Questions





- What is the effect of the geometric design and the location and configuration of injector arrays?
- What are the optimal flow conditions for a hydrogen fuel injector that produce a good quality of
- combustion?
- What is the effect of additive manufacturing on the mixing characteristics and combustion?
- What is good practice for combustion design in terms of air guides and flame holding?
- What is the best practice for simulation of these flows? Which models are suited to simulate hydrogen mixing and combustion?





1. Determination of <u>foundational design rules for hydrogen micromixer injectors</u> in industrial gas turbine combustors using high-fidelity analysis and testing

2. Assessment of <u>the impact of additive manufacturing on the roughness topography</u> including its anistropy in and around injectors on cold flow and combustion characteristics

3. <u>Development of design tools through reduced models</u> that predict flow mixing, pressure losses, heat transfer and flame stability as a function of geometric and flow design parameters in a computationally efficient manner





- High-Fidelity simulation of cold flow and reacting
 - Canonical injector arrays and combustor geometries with parametric dependencies
 - Development of stochastic models for AM geometries
 - Systematic study of the effect of geometric design
 - Systematical study of the effect of flow conditions
- Reduced dynamic modeling for combustion characteristics
- Testing in Solar Turbine's rigs







Solar Core Team

- **Dave Voss** Manager of University & Government Programs
- Mike Ramotowski H2 NPI Program Manager for TMP Engineering
- Luke Cowell Manager, Combustion NPI & Strategy
- Rajeshriben "Raj" Patel H2 Combustion Project Lead
- Gareth Oskam Combustion Senior SME
- Yonduck Sung Combustion Methods, CFD/LES analysis SME
- Daniel Ryan Materials and Additive Manufacturing SME



Caterpillar: NON- Confident













MODELS and CODES





Filtered Navier-Stokes equations $\frac{\partial \langle \rho \rangle_{l}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \langle \rho \rangle_{l} \langle u_{i} \rangle_{L}}{\partial x_{i}} = 0$ $\frac{\partial \langle \rho \rangle_{l} \langle u_{j} \rangle_{L}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \langle \rho \rangle_{l} \langle u_{i} \rangle_{L} \langle u_{j} \rangle_{L}}{\partial x_{i}} = -\frac{\partial \langle p \rangle_{L}}{\partial x_{j}} + \frac{\partial \langle \tau_{ij} \rangle_{l}}{\partial x_{i}} - \frac{\partial T_{ij}}{\partial x_{i}}$ $\frac{\partial \langle \rho \rangle_{l} \langle \phi_{\alpha} \rangle_{L}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \langle \rho \rangle_{l} \langle u_{i} \rangle_{L} \langle \phi_{\alpha} \rangle_{L}}{\partial x_{i}} = -\frac{\partial \langle J_{i}^{\alpha} \rangle_{l}}{\partial x_{i}} + \langle \rho \rangle_{l} \langle S_{\alpha} \rangle_{L} - \frac{\partial M_{i}^{\alpha}}{\partial x_{i}}$

We use a computationally efficient numerical filter => implicit LES

[Chaudhuri, Jacobs et al., JCP, 2017]



- Divide computational domain into elements
- Map each physical element onto a master element
- Approximate solution with higher-order (Jacobi) polynomial

 $f(x_i) \approx \sum_{j=0}^{N} \hat{f}_j L_j(x_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} f_j \ell_j(x_i) \qquad \qquad f'(x_i) \approx \sum_{j=0}^{N} f_j \ell'_j(x_i)$

- Based on Method of Weighted Residuals
- Elements are connected through Riemann solvers









- Complex geometries: unstructured grids
- Accurate wall modeling: boundary fitted elements to accurately model roughness element
 - no weird oscillation or reduced accuracy near the wall
- Accurate simulation of time-dependent flows: high-order accuracy with exponential convergence for
- Computational efficiency: highly parallelizable because of non-overlapping elements
- Numerically robust (entropy preserving methods)







- FDF approach
 - Solve for the filtered density function, $f(\boldsymbol{\psi}; \boldsymbol{x}, t)$
 - f is a PDF of the composition $oldsymbol{\psi}$ over a filter centered at x
- Motivation
 - Need full temperature PDF to account for changes in reaction rate is $k = Ae^{-\frac{E_a}{RT}}$ with exponential temperature dependence challenges models like $\widehat{k(T)} = k(\widetilde{T})$
 - NOx emissions in hydrogen combustors are strongly affected by the residence time in high-temperature regions => benefits from a knowledge of the complete PDF
- FDF evolution equation
 - $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} [\rho(\boldsymbol{\psi})f] + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} [\rho(\boldsymbol{\psi})\langle u_i | \boldsymbol{\psi} \rangle f] + \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_{\alpha}} [\rho(\boldsymbol{\psi})k(\boldsymbol{\psi})f] = \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_{\alpha}} \left[\left\langle \frac{\partial J_i^{\alpha}}{\partial x_i} | \boldsymbol{\psi} \right\rangle f \right]$
 - Conditional terms, $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$, require turbulence modeling









With turbulence models evolution equation is

$$\frac{\partial F_L}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \langle u_i \rangle_L F_L}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[(\gamma + \gamma_t) \frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial x_i} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\Omega_m (\psi_\alpha - \langle \phi_\alpha \rangle_L) F_L \right] - \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\Omega_m (\psi_\alpha - \langle \phi_\alpha \rangle_L) F_L \right] = \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L \right]}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \left[\frac{\partial F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_\alpha(\phi) F_L / \langle \rho \rangle_l}{\partial \psi_\alpha} \right] + \frac{\partial \left[S_$$

where, ϕ is the chemical species

 $\langle u_i \rangle_L$ Filtered velocity

 ψ_{lpha} is the species and energy domain;

 γ , γ_t are the molecular and thermal diffusivity;

 Ω_m SGS mixing frequency term due to hydrodynamic closure

 $\alpha = 1, \dots, N_s$; N_s : Number of species ~ 100

Chemical source terms in closed form => unique to FDF approach

- High dimensional Fokker-Plank type equation computationally expensive to solve.
- Solve an equivalent stochastic differential equation using a Monte Carlo particle approach





Equivalent stochastic differential equation to find the PDF of species concentration $dX_i(t) = u_i(X(t), t)dt + E(X(t), t)dW_i(t)$

$$\frac{d\phi_{\alpha}^{+}}{dt} = -\Omega_{m}(\phi_{\alpha}^{+} - \langle \phi_{\alpha} \rangle_{L}) + S_{\alpha}(\phi^{+})$$

 X_i MonteCarlo particle position, u_i drift coef, E diffusion coef and W_i Weiner-Levy process Not so parallel, sample convergence is slow in Monte-Carlo approach possible but still very expensive

Coupled system ussually solved with particle – mesh methods





Monte-Carlo particle method that <u>preserves accuracy and boundary fitted</u> properties of DGSEM is very, very challenging



[Jacobs and Hesthaven, JCP, 2006][Jacobs and Don, JCP, '09][Suarez and Jacobs, SISC, 2014]







- Particles tracked over the entire flow field
- FDF obtained by local sampling
 - > Conservative
 - Coupling with Eulerian solver, tracking particles, locality, especially HO coupling very difficult.

Semi-Lagrangian



- Local, parallel, semi-fixed grid
- High-Order Accurate
- Boundary Fitted
- Conservation

[Natarajan, Popov, Jacobs, CMAME, 2021]



Jacobs DSEM Code Capabilities







- Finite difference/filtered density function turbulent reactive flow solver
 - To be used for reactive flow simulations, and verification of the reacting version of the DSEM code
- Hybrid FD/Monte Carlo particle ensemble code
- FD handles hydrodynamics
 - Fourth order in space and time by itself
 - Provides velocity and turbulent diffusivity to particle ensemble
- Particle ensemble simulates chemical reactions, mixing and diffusion
 - Monte Carlo $N^{-1/2}$ convergence with respect to particle number, N
 - Weakly second-order accurate in time
 - Coupling with FD code via transported specific volume source term based on filtered particle compositions
- Demonstrated capability to predict turbulence/chemistry interactions







SIMULATIONS





- Arrays of injectors in cross-stream
 - determine grid resolution and computational domain size requirements for LES.
 - provide a reference dataset for primary quantities of interest, such as mixing levels as a function of the boundary layer character and momentum flux ratio.







- Injectors in cross-steam with dump combustor cavity and reacting flow
- To be simulated with DSEM LES/PDF solver
- Quantities of interest
 - Flame stability
 - Heat transfer to combustor structure
 - Max temperature at combustor structure
 - Pollutant (e.g., NO, NO₂) concentrations
- Chemical mechanisms to be used
 - Main mechanism for flame dynamics
 - Li et al., 2004
 - Shimazu et al., 2011
 - Both have 8 species and 21 reactions
 - Submechanism for NO_{χ} emissions
 - 39-reaction UCSD mechanism





Considerations

- Choosing the AM process and process parameters
- Specifying the beam path
- Orienting the particles in the powder bed
- Choosing which regions, if any, to postcondition





Using a generator network that uses roughness parameters and uses random factor to generate a synthetic wall roughness

$$R_{i,j,k}^1 = h_{act}^1 \left(\sum_l a_{i,j,k,l}^1 R_l^0 \right),$$

$$R_{i,j,k}^{n}=h_{act}^{n}\left(\tau_{i,j,k}\right),$$

$$\tau_{i,j,k} = \sum_{\substack{\{q_i, r_i | i = q_i + sr_i\} \\ \{q_j, r_j | j = q_j + sr_j\}}} \sum_{l} a_{q_i, q_j, k, l}^n R_{r_i, r_j, l}^{n-1},$$





• Convolutional neural network learns from data



• Generator network gets trained/corrected with CNN





REDUCED MODELING



Sparse Regression with Neural Network yield Surrogate Model for Input-Output Maps



[Sen et al. *JCP*, '15]



Sparse Regression





Initial Sample Points
Sample points for Iteration 3
Test Points for Computing Error

Sample points for Iteration 2
Sample Points for Iteration 4



Experience with Sparse Regression



- Initial tests performed on smooth functions
- Gaussian fitting methods are less effective on random grids, but are much in development
- Collocation methods converge faster.
- Dynamic Kriging is a particularly effective collocation method.





[Sen, Jacobs et al. JCP, '15]



Instead of an inflow-outflow map, learn dynamical systems for state variables from data

For each location, consider the minimum control energy problem:

minimize:	$J = \int_0^\infty u^T(\tau) u(\tau) d\tau$	Optimal cost:	$J_{opt} = x_f^T W_c^{-1} x_f$
subject to	$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t)$ $y(t) = Cx(t)$	Gramian:	$W_c \equiv \int_0^\infty e^{A\tau} B B^T e^{A\tau} d\tau$
	$x(0) = x_0$		
	$x(\infty) = x_f$		

Interpretation:

A system with a larger controllability Gramian can reach more of state-space for a given amount of input energy (all other things being equal).

[Bhattacharjee, Jacobs et al., TCFD, '21]





TESTING

AM Problem Statement & Testing

- Develop a better understanding of the influence of AM surface roughness of the as printed part on air and fuel flow splits (Ae or effective area) & mixing
- A better understanding of modeling surface roughness is needed as the scale of roughness becomes more pronounced in micro-scale jet combustors like micromix
- Being able to reduce or eliminate post process machining of the AM micromix parts can save significant cost
- Develop a better understanding and ability to accurately simulate AM surface roughness in complex reacting flows is needed to design future DLE micromix combustors
- First steps in providing test data for model validation includes:
 - Cold flow testing to determine Ae
 - Cold flow mixing studies
 - Combustion data*

Solar Turbines

A Caterpillar Company

*Combustion Data

- Solar would like to leverage the synergistic DOE program recently awarded to Solar Turbines to possibly provide AM micromix combustion data
- DE-FOA-0002400, "Development of a Retrofittable Dry Low Emissions Industrial Gas Turbine Combustion System for 100% Hydrogen and Natural Gas Blends"
- Combustion data could come from either:

 Solar single module high pressure test rig
 ERC (Energy Research Consultants) atmospheric pressure single module/array test rig





Solar HP Rig

Caterpillar: NON- Confidentia

ERC ATM Rig

Powering the Future





TIMELINE



- Simulations
 - Baseline Injector
 - Systematic Injector Study
 - Baselin Combustor
 - Systematic Combustor Study
- Modeling
 - Wall roughness modeling
 - Sparse regression
 - Data-driven dynamics modeling
- Testing
 - Build test setup
 - Cold flow test and extract mixing characteristics
 - Hydrogen combustion tests