

Simplified Mechanistic Model of the Multiple Hearth Furnace for Control Development

J. V. Gomez Fuentes*, S.-L. Jämsä-Jounela

Aalto University, School of Chemical Technology, Research Group on Process Control and Automation, P.O.Box 16100, FI-00076, Aalto, Finland; *jose.gomezfuentes@aalto.fi

SNE 28(3), 2018, 97 - 100, DOI: 10.11128/sne.28.sn.10426
Received: Sept. 15, 2016 (Selected EUROSIM Congress 2016
Postconf. Publ.), Revised July 30, Accepted: August 25, 2018
SNE - Simulation Notes Europe, ARGESIM Publisher Vienna,
ISSN Print 2305-9974, Online 2306-0271, www.sne-journal.org

Abstract. This paper presents the simplified mechanistic model of a Multiple Hearth Furnace (MHF), developed for process control implementation. The detailed mechanistic model of the MHF and its solving procedure are introduced. Based on the detailed model, the simplified model is developed in the nonlinear Hammerstein-Wiener form, which defines a specific type of nonlinear state space models suitable for example for Model Predictive Control (MPC) implementation.

The simplified model aims to preserve the key physical-chemical phenomena taking place in the furnace and to reproduce the nonlinear dependencies between the input and output variables. Finally, the paper presents the simulation results to compare the mechanistic and the simplified models. The comparison confirms that the dynamics of the simplified model accurately follows the mechanistic model outputs.

Introduction

Furnaces, such as the rotary kilns and multiple hearth furnaces, are widely used in industry for the calcination of clay minerals, such as kaolin. However, these processes continue to provide challenges in maintaining efficient process operations.

In particular, it is hard to control the final product quality, due to the difficulty in measuring the product characteristics, the solid temperature profile in the furnace, and the rates of the calcination reactions.

Instead, the existing control systems mostly rely on the gas temperature measurements and traditional control implementations, such as PID.

This strategy, however, does not allow achieving stable solid phase temperature profile and uniform product quality. In contrast, a Model Predictive Control (MPC), based on a model describing the physical-chemical phenomena in the furnace, would be able to stabilize the solid temperature and minimize the product quality variations.

1 Process Description

This paper considers a multiple hearth furnace used for kaolin calcination, having the counter-current solid and gas flows. The furnace has eight hearths, and eight burners, combusting natural gas to provide the heat necessary for the calcination reactions, are located in hearths 4 and 6. The amount of air flow, supplied to the burners for the gas combustion, is calculated based on the stoichiometric ratio. The burners are placed with a tangential alignment.

Kaolin is supplied to the first hearth located at the top of the furnace. In the calciner, the material is moved by the metal plates, called blades, which are attached to the rotating rabble arms, designed with the intention of transporting the material outwards on even-numbered hearths and inwards on odd-numbered hearths. The kaolin traversing the even numbered hearths moves outward to descend through the holes at the outside border of the hearth, while in the odd-numbered hearths kaolin falls to the next hearth through a single annulus located around the shaft carrying the rabble arms.

The temperature of the solid increases as it travels down through the furnace and reaches its maximum in Hearth 6. Kaolinite transforms to metakaolin in the hearths 3, 4 and 5 at the temperature between 400-700 °C. The metakaolin is released from hearth 5 at a temperature approximately 800 °C, which continues elevating in the hearth 6, where the transformation of metakaolin to the Al-Si spinel phase occurs [1].

Thus, the main objective of the hearth 6 is to increase the temperature in order to facilitate the absorption of aluminum into the silica phase. The control of temperature in the hearth 6 is essential to avoid overheating, which may result in the undesired formation of a more crystalline material that may generate some abrasion problems. The temperature of the solids begins to decrease in the hearths 7 and 8, and the product leaves from the hearth 8 through two discharge holes at a temperature of 750 °C.

2 Dynamic Model of the MHF

This section describes the mechanistic model of the MHF developed by Eskelinen *et al.*[2]. The modeling equations are developed for the six parts of the MHF: the gas phase, solid bed, central shaft, walls, rabble arms, and the cooling air. The model comprises the calcination reaction kinetics, the mass and energy balances, the transport phenomena in the parts of the MHF, as well as additional equations describing the temperature dependent parameters, more details can be found in [3].

The following assumptions have been made to simplify the model development. The solid bed in the hearths is split into four or five homogenous annular volumes, depending on the rabble arm configuration. The volumes are assumed to be equal in mass content and radial direction. The mixing model, describing the solids movement in the hearths, assumes that one shaft rotation disseminates a part of the volume contents to the neighbor volumes. Thus, the solid mass distribution between the volumes of hearth j can be calculated after one shaft rotation as follows:

$$m_{t+1}^j = D_j \cdot (m_t^j - R_{r,t}^j) + m_{feed,t}^j \quad (1)$$

Where $m_{feed,t}^j$ and $R_{r,t}^j$ connote the feed and the mass loss in the solid phase in Hearth j . The mixing matrix D_j is used to transform the distribution of solids m_t^j in Hearth j after one central shaft rotation.

Specifically, the column i of the matrix denotes the distribution of volume i contents between the volumes of the hearth.

3 Model Simplification

This section describes the simplified model developed based on the mechanistic model presented in Section 2. A simplification of the mechanistic model is designed, describing the dynamics and the nonlinear behavior of the system separately. In more details, the simplified model is expressed as a Hammerstein-Wiener model (HWM), decomposing the model in blocks containing the nonlinearities in static form and the linear dynamics. The linear block, enclosing the dynamics of the process, is preceded and followed by a static non-linear blocks.

The dynamics of the MHF includes the very fast component related to the gas phase, and the slower component representing the solid state. For MPC implementation, the temperature of the solid has to be described dynamically. Furthermore, as the temperature of the inner layer of the walls has a direct effect on the solid-walls heat exchange, it is also considered as a model state. The simplified model is implemented as following:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= \alpha x_t + (1 - \alpha)F(u_t) \\ y_t &= G(u_t, x_t) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where u_t is a vector containing the process inputs (kaolin feed rate, gas flows to the Hearths 4 and 6), x_t is the state vector contains the temperature of the solids in each volume of the furnace and the internal wall temperature in the hearths, y_t contains the gas phase temperature next to the walls in the hearths, α is the time constant parameter of the linear dynamic part of the modeling equations. The time constant α is obtained for each modeling equation by identification performed using the MATLAB® identification toolbox. $F(u_t)$ is a static nonlinear function calculating the steady state of the furnace using the process input values. In order to implement the first function $F(u_t)$, a look up table has been created by running the mechanistic model simulations with different process inputs. The obtained values are interpolated as follows:

$$F(u_t) = \sum_{i=1}^5 \sum_{j=1}^5 \sum_{k=1}^5 b_{i,j,k} h_i^x(F_K) h_j^y(F_{g4}) h_k^z(F_{g6}) \quad (3)$$

where $b_{i,j,k}$ are the values from the look-up table and the piecewise linear basis functions h_i^x , h_j^y and h_k^z have been used for the interpolation.

The second function $G(u_t, x_t)$, involved in the modeling equations (2), calculates the gas temperature profile next to the walls in the Hearths based on the current furnace state x_t and the process inputs u_t . The function $G(u_t, x_t)$ is implemented by solving the energy balance for the gas phase derived from the mechanistic model.

4 Simulation Results

The simulation study has been conducted to evaluate the performance of the simplified model by comparing its predictions with the results of the detailed mechanistic model. Input series have been designed for the open-loop tests to compare the dynamic response of the models. The shaft rotation period is used as the sampling time in the simulations, according to how it was made by the mechanistic model in [2]. The tests signals include a sequence of step and ramp changes in the input variables, including the kaolin feed rate, total gas flow ratio to the feed, and the ratio of hearth 4 gas flow to the total gas flow.

The results of the simplified model are shown as dashed lines, whereas the outputs of the mechanistic model are given as solid lines in the Figures 1 and 2, providing the simulation results [4]. The comparison of the gas phase temperature shows excellent simplified model accuracy for all hearths, specifically in hearths 1 to 4 and 7-8. For the solid phase temperature, presented in Figure 2, the comparison also confirms the accuracy of the simplified model, with the best results similarly achieved in hearths 1 to 4 and 7-8.

The quantification reference for the evaluation of the simulation results shown in Figure 1 and 2 is the coefficient of determination, denoted as R^2 . This coefficient provides a simple way to discern if the simplified model is accurately reproducing the results of the detailed mechanistic model.

In particular, the R^2 values for hearths 1 to 4 and 7-8 are above 0.8 in almost all cases, while the captured variance statistic calculated for the results in hearths 5 and 6 is below 0.7.

The reason for the elevated error of the simplified model obtained in Hearths 5 and 6 is the exothermic reaction actively ongoing in hearth 6 and complicating the temperature prediction in the hearth.




Figure 1. Comparison of models gas phase temperature.




Figure 2. Comparison of models solid phase temperature.

5 Conclusions

A simplified model of a MHF was developed in this paper, based on a mechanistic model developed previously. The simplified model is implemented in the form of Hammerstein-Wiener nonlinear dynamic model with a reduced number of dynamic equations and a state space structure, thus making model based control implementation possible. The results of the simplified model are compared against the mechanistic model and are found to be remarkable. For the gas and the solid phases, the results present higher accuracy, especially in the first four hearths and the last two hearths. The reason for the elevated simplified model error in hearths 5 and 6 can be the reaction occurring in hearth 6, which is unpredictable. This issue will be addressed in the future research to improve the simplified model performance. The simplified model obtained in the paper enables implementation of different MPCs, such as EMPC, in the developed simulation environment of the MHF.

References

- [1] Thomas RE. High Temperature Processing of Kaolinitic Materials. 2010.
- [2] Eskelinen A et al. "Dynamic modeling of a multiple hearth furnace for kaolin calcination," *AIChE J.*, vol. 61, (11), pp. 3683–3698, 2015.
- [3] Eskelinen A et al. "Dynamic modelling of a multiple hearth furnace for kaolin calcination with a sensitivity analysis with respect to reaction rates," in 17th IFAC Symposium on Control, Optimization and Automation in Mining, Mineral and Metal Processing, 2016, .
- [4] Gomez Fuentes JV. "Simulation Environment for Advanced Control Development of a Multiple Hearth Furnace." , 2016-05-17.