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ABSTRACT

The objective of this experiment was to determine an improved method by which evaporation of kraft black liquors to the 50 to 65% total solids level could be sufficiently performed in multiple effect evaporators. This would eliminate the need of the highly malodorous direct contact evaporators which are presently used. Heat transfer characteristics of the Kenics Static Mixer were examined to determine if its application in multiple effect evaporator tubes would possibly reduce viscous liquor film layers which now hinder heat transfer. A single pass heat exchange unit that allowed removal of the inner tube and its replacement by a Static Mixer unit was designed and built. Heat and mass balances were performed on the unit to determine possible gains in heat transfer achieved using the Static Mixer. Experimentation done in the laminar regions of flow showed that the inside film coefficient was enhanced a slight, but significant amount. It is recommended that further study be made at higher liquor concentrations and at turbulent flow conditions.
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LITERATURE REVIEW

The making of pulp and paper has come a long way since T'sai Lun first made his sheets of meshed mulberry fibers in 105 A.D.

As an example of the growth in this industry, the consumption of paper per capita during 1969 in the United States reached 576 pounds.

It was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that wood was used as a raw material in making paper by the major pulping processes. The first chemical wood-pulp mills for both the alkaline and acid pulping processes were started between 1852 and 1874.(1) In the past 100 years, great technical progress has been made in the manufacture of pulp and paper products. The range of wood species used as a raw material has required many technical modifications to the various pulping processes. In growing to the huge proportions that have now been obtained, the pulp and paper industry has come face to face with numerous dilemmas that must be dealt with.

In his report to International Paper Company's annual meeting, Paul A. Gorman, chairman, president, and chief executive of IPC,
made an assessment of today's major problems. Two areas of his report included the energy "crisis" and the economics of environmental control. Mr. Gorman states that recent and past increases in fuel costs have considerably outstripped increases in other elements of cost. On the environment, he notes that the nation's pulp and paper companies have spent over $1 billion for environmental controls and another $1 billion in outlays is planned. Mr. Gorman agrees that further degradation to our land must stop, but before we spend such vast resources, the industry should spend at least a small portion to determine once and for all what the real dangers are to our environment, and what the best ways are to stabilize our environment below those danger points.

Mr. Gorman states: "We are continually searching for methods to reduce the amount of energy required to produce a ton of finished product by recovering heat which is not now utilized and by installing equipment or using processes which require less energy per ton of product."
The possible revamping of present pulping processes to protect the environment is the main topic of this paper. More precisely, it deals with the evaporation of spent liquors in the kraft pulping process.

A necessary stage in the recovery of cooking liquors in the kraft process is the evaporation of black liquor from the digestion and washing stages. If the black liquor were discarded from the process after washing the pulp, it would be necessary to replace all the alkali charged to the digesters and the cost of alkaline pulp would be prohibitive. Hence, economy dictates the recovery of the alkali as completely as possible, and the first step in this procedure is to concentrate the weak black liquor to the density required by the recovery furnace. This necessitates the evaporation of all the black liquor from an original concentration of about 14 to 18% total solids to between 45 and 70% total solids, depending on the type of recovery unit used. For the higher concentrations, the liquor leaves the initial evaporation stage at approximately 50% and further evaporization is generally carried out in a direct
contact evaporator.

In the direct contact evaporator the liquor and flue gas from the recovery boiler are brought into intimate physical contact, and there is a mass transfer of water vapor from the liquor to the gas across the liquor-gas interface. The design of the direct contact evaporator requires that adequate liquor surface be provided for the desired heat and mass transfer. If liquor is splashed or sprayed on hot metal, the quantity must be sufficient for continuous washing. A further reason for continuous agitation or movement of the liquor is that sludge tends to precipitate because of acidification by absorption of $\text{CO}_2$ and $\text{SO}_2$ which decreases solubility of the dissolved solids.\(^{(1)}\)

One of the chief drawbacks concerning the use of contact evaporators is the fact that they have usually been malodorous. Elimination of the direct contact evaporator in the recovery boiler design removes a prime source of odor associated with the kraft process. Where a contact evaporator is used, odor can be reduced
by oxidation of sulfur compounds in the liquor before entering. The oxidation operation stabilizes sulfide compounds to preclude their reaction in the evaporator with flue gas and consequent release of volatile odor compounds. Oxidation can effectively reduce but does not eliminate discharge of malodorous gas compounds from the direct contact evaporator.

One mill practicing the process of black liquor oxidation is Union Camp's Savannah, Georgia mill. In their process, hydrogen sulfide generation in the direct contact evaporators will be eliminated by a heavy black liquor oxidation system using air spargers. Liquor will be fed at 225°F and 50% solids to a two-stage oxidation system designed for a maximum flowrate of 900 gpm. Each oxidizer will be 35 feet in diameter and 40 feet high and the air supply will be provided by a 12,000-scfm compressor. An intermediate soap separator will be located between the two stages. This system is capable of oxidizing up to 99% of the sodium sulfide. (3)

The cost of these added oxidation systems and the contact
evaporators themselves runs into many thousands of dollars. Power
cconsumption is great due to the needs of the added machinery.

As was noted earlier, the direct contact evaporator can be
eliminated and final liquor concentrating can be completed in the
multiple effect evaporator.

The initial evaporating system consists of a number of effects
comprised of numerous tubular channels heated by steam on the outside.
The complete tube bundle, which refers to the side-by-side position-
ing of the tubes, is enclosed in a shell in which the steam circulates.

In all heat transfer equipment, such as evaporators, heaters,
and condensers, it is usually necessary to transfer heat from one
fluid through a metal wall to another fluid. In most cases the heating
medium is steam, the heating surface is in the form of metal tubes,
and the material heated is a liquid. In this case, the heated
material is black liquor. The flow of heat under these conditions
is controlled by three factors: 1) the area of the heating surface,
2) the total working temperature drop, and 3) the overall coefficient
of heat transfer.\(^{(4)}\)

If \(q\) is the rate of heat transfer in BTU/hour, \(Q\) is the total heat transfer after \(\phi\) hours, \(A\) is the area of the heating surface in square feet, \(\Delta t\) is the total temperature drop across the heating surface in degrees Fahrenheit, and \(U\) is the overall coefficient of heat transfer in BTU/ft\(^2\) of heating surface/ degrees Fahrenheit temperature drop/hour, the fundamental equation of heat transfer is

\[
\frac{Q}{\phi} = q = UA \Delta t
\]

The flow of heat in clean tubes will meet a minimum of three separate resistances in series: 1) the condensate film resistance between the steam and the metal wall, 2) the resistance of the metal itself, and 3) the liquor film resistance between the metal wall and the flowing liquor.

In practically every evaporator, the most important, and by far the controlling factor in the rate of heat transfer, is the condition at the liquor side of the tubes, or the "liquor film coefficient."

For heat transfer operations required in the processing of highly viscous materials, the inside film resistance is so high that other
resistances are negligible. In these cases the overall heat transfer coefficient is approximately equal to the inside film coefficient.

The liquor film coefficient is controlled by the thickness of the stagnant film of liquor on the surface of the metal, which, in the final analysis, is determined by two factors: 1) the viscosity of the liquor at the prevailing concentration and temperature and 2) the turbulence or velocity of the liquor at the wall of the tube.

The higher the concentration and the lower the temperature of the liquor, the greater will be the viscosity and the lower will be the rate of heat transfer in the evaporator; similarly, the lower the rate of the circulation, the lower will be the rate of heat transfer.

Fouling on the inside of the tubes must be taken into consideration when calculations of overall coefficients of heat transfer are made. The metal tube surface may become coated with organic scale or some other deposit which may reduce the rate of heat transfer far below that normally obtained. Such a condition of scale, because of the low conductivity of the scale material, greatly increases resistance
to the flow of heat through the tube.

In some cases there is a tendency toward formation of a coating of organic matter on the surface of the evaporator tubes. This is usually a result of a slow polymerization and carbonization during the destructive-distillation reaction, which occurs on heating in the presence of caustic soda. This sort of deposit is a gummy, black, carbonaceous material which greatly reduces the rate of heat transfer. It can usually be removed by boiling out the evaporator with water, but it is sometimes necessary to boil with a weak alkali wash or a soda ash or white-liquor solution. In rare cases, it is difficult to remove the deposit by boiling out, and means of mechanical removal may be necessary. This cleaning is both difficult and expensive. This is seldom serious in low temperature operations at concentrations below 50% total solids.

Whenever possible, evaporator tubes are made of cast iron and steel. Many solutions however, attack ferrous metals, or are contaminated by them. Special materials such as copper, nickel,
stainless steel, aluminum, impervious graphite, and lead are then used. Since these materials are expensive, high heat transfer rates become especially desirable to minimize the first cost of the equipment.

E. H. Backteman and R. Y. Marr have written an article describing work done for Scandinavian mills in which they state that weak black liquor from the kraft pulping process can and should be concentrated to the 50 - 65% total solids level in the multiple effect evaporator. (6) There are two benefits from handling the black liquor this way. One is that it improves heat economy and the second is that no direct contact evaporator is needed, and thus, no H₂S is released to the flue gas.

The main objection to the modern system has been, and still is, the problems involved in operating a multiple effect evaporator at high concentrations of the heavy black liquor. One of the biggest problems encountered was that of fouling on the liquor side of the tubes due to the increased viscosity and concentration of the liquor.

The problems encountered due to fouling have been reduced by in-
corporating a unique piping arrangement among the effects. Even with this arrangement it is necessary to carry out a complete boil-out, with weak black liquor or water, of the final stages of the evaporator. This washing takes about two hours once or twice a week.

In light of the above discussion, it would seem reasonable that in order to increase heat transfer in a black liquor evaporator, a more efficient means of getting heat through the liquor film layer and spread throughout the liquor itself would be needed. This could reduce initial expenditures on evaporator construction, such as reducing elaborate piping systems as those in the Scandinavian mills. It could also reduce required steam quantities and cost, and give a more uniform product.

In an article by D. A. Pattison, assistant editor of Chemical Engineering magazine, the principles and applications of motionless inline mixers are described. The improvements in heat transfer rendered by these mixers are the main areas of interest to this project.
Three companies have come up with these units, but the mixer made by Kenics Corporation of Danvers, Mass. is extremely simple and inexpensive. When applied in certain evaporator areas, such as in line with the tubular channels, evaporator performance may be enhanced by increasing the overall heat transfer coefficient which is presently limited by the viscous liquor film at the higher concentration of total solids.

The Static Mixer is an in line, no-moving part, continuous mixing and processing unit which has no external power requirements. The unit is constructed of a number of short elements of right- and left-hand helices. These elements are alternated and oriented so that each leading edge is at \(90^\circ\) to the trailing edge of the one ahead. In general, the length of the individual element is approximately 1.5 diameters. The element assembly is then enclosed within a tubular housing.\(^{(8)}\)

Following are examples of the individual elements that are enclosed in the unit:
The unit can be constructed of various materials, including carbon steels, stainless steels, alloy metals, exotic alloys, glass, fiberglass, PVC, and other plastics. The unique plug flow mix progression within the Static Mixer unit is predictable and programmable. Careful control of in line processing is assured in numerous blending, dispersion, and thermal control applications. The radial mixing action thermally homogenizes processed materials regardless of viscosity.

The plug flow temperature and velocity profile narrows residence time distribution and enhances thermal history control.

Principles of operation of the Static Mixer are outlined in the following discussion.

When the materials to be mixed are passed through the mixer, two unique mixing actions, flow division and radial mixing, operate simultaneously in the unit, resulting in nearly plug flow characteristics.
(1) Flow Division: At the leading edge of each element the flow divides and follows the semi-circular channel created by the element's shape. At each succeeding element, the two flows are further divided, resulting in an exponential progression of flow division. The progression is described by the formula

\[ S = 2^n \]

where \( S \) is the number of striations produced and \( n \) is the number of elements in the unit.

(2) Radial Mixing: In either laminar or turbulent flow, rotational circulation of a processed material around the hydraulic center of each semi-circular channel causes radial mixing of the material, thus forcing the material from the diameter to the outer wall of the channel. At the same time, the flow reverses its rotation at each element junction due to the alternate right and left-hand alignment of the elements. Fluid rotation in a given element is opposite the rotational hand of that element. The overall effect of radial mixing is to cause the stream to be continuously and completely inverted radially so that particles entering at the center of the
stream are forced to the outer wall and back again on a continuous basis. Because of thorough radial mixing, the radial gradients in temperature, velocity, and composition are virtually eliminated.

Careful control over in line processing is assured in numerous blending, dispersion, and heat transfer applications.

![Diagram](clockwise_rotation_left_hand_element_interface_counter_clockwise_rotation_right_hand_element)

Figure 2: Radial Mixing Action of the Static Mixer

It has been shown that the use of direct contact evaporators in the final concentration of black liquors is not advantageous due to the odor emitted. The odor can be controlled to a certain extent, but requires vast sums of capital costs to build the necessary auxiliary equipment. It appears that final concentrating in the multiple effect evaporators themselves is currently the most promising technique.

It is the objective of this paper to show the feasability of replacing various evaporator tubes with Static Mixer units in order
to enhance evaporator performance. The flow division and radial mixing properties may reduce the liquor film resistance which hinders heat transfer. There should be a reduced stagnant film layer of liquor on the surface of the metal. Also, the forming of scale or other deposits that deter heat transfer may be reduced. Assuming this is true, problems now hindering thick liquor concentration in the multiple effect evaporators will be reduced, making this technique more desirable.

The Static Mixer concept is relatively new and there is skepticism concerning it. But in these days when energy is of such great concern, new ideas must be worked with and utilized. Less required mill area due to the elimination of the direct contact evaporators and fewer shutdowns due to fouling on the inside of the evaporator tubes would enhance the economy of the pulping process. Savings that would be gained in operating costs could be applied to increase the development of our pollution abatement programs.
EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Equipment and Liquor Considerations

In order to carry out this study of possible heat transfer improvements caused by the Static Mixer unit, a heat exchanger was needed that would allow removal of the inner tube through which the liquor was to flow and its replacement with the Static Mixer. After searching through the Paper Science and Engineering and the Mechanical Engineering Departments of Western Michigan University, no heat exchanger fulfilling the above requirements could be found. Thus, a heat exchanger unit had to be designed and built. The photograph of Figure 3 and the schematic diagram in Figure 4 outline details of design.

Spent liquor from the softwood kraft pulping process was obtained from Mosinee Paper Corporation, Mosinee, Wisconsin. Concentration determinations were performed and it was found that the total solids concentration of the liquor was approximately 56%.

Experimental Conditions

In order to perform mass and heat balances of the unit, input
Figure 3: Photograph of Heat Exchanger
Used in This Experiment
**Figure 4: Schematic Diagram of Heat Exchange Unit**
and output temperatures of the liquor, $T_{ca}$ and $T_{cb}$, were recorded.

Temperature of the condensing vapor, $T_{hb}$, was assumed to be equal to input steam temperature, $T_{ha}$. Liquor flow rate through the unit was controlled by a centrifugal pump equipped with a by-pass flow line for greater flow stability. Liquor flow was held low due to problems encountered in recording data at high flow rates. These problems included variances using a stop watch and graduated cylinder for flow rate determinations and time lags resulting from the thermometers stabilizing at changing temperatures.

Data were obtained by varying liquor flow rates and increasing initial liquor temperatures. The increasing initial liquor temperatures, however, were not considered in the analysis since relative data were taken for both the Static Mixer operation and the empty tube operation.

Liquor concentrations were determined by placing approximately 10 millimeters of liquor in a three inch evaporating dish, weighing, drying in a ventilated oven at 170°F for 24 hours, and reweighing.
The difference was the water content of the liquor. Data is presented in Table III.

Observations

It was desired to run these trials with the liquor as viscous as possible for greater enhancement of heat transfer. However, it was necessary to heat the liquor to approximately 90°F in order to maintain a constant pumping action. At this temperature the viscosity of the liquor was approximately 500 centipoises. The viscosity was noticeably decreased upon exit from the heat exchanger, so a mean temperature based upon T_{ca} and T_{cb} was used for calculation purposes.

Data Analysis

An evaluation of overall heat transfer between the two tubes could only be determined by calculations based on heat and mass balances. Following are the basic equations used, their meaning, and methods involved in their determination:

1) Heat Transfer Rate, q;

\[ q = \dot{m}C_p\Delta T \]
where \( \dot{m} \) = mass flow rate (lbs/hr)

\[ C_p = \text{specific heat (BTU/lb} - ^\circ F) \]

\[ \Delta T = T_{cb} - T_{ca} (^\circ F) \]

\[ q = \text{heat transfer rate (BTU/hr)} \]

This equation was used in determining the actual rate at which heat was obtained by the black liquor. Mass flow rate was obtained by first calculating the volumetric flow rate of the black liquor. Data in ml/sec was converted to ft\(^3\)/hr. This value was then multiplied by the density of the liquor at its mean temperature to get lbs/hr. Specific gravity, and thus, density, were obtained from graphs presented in Reference 4. Specific heat at the mean temperature was obtained from appropriate graphs found in Reference 10.

2) Overall Heat Transfer Coefficient, \( U_0 \):

\[ U_0 = \frac{q}{A_o \Delta T_L} \]

where \( U_0 \) = local overall heat transfer co-efficient based on the outside
area of the inner tube \(\text{BTU}/(\text{ft}^2)(\text{hr})(^\circ\text{F})\)

\(q\) = heat transfer rate \(\text{BTU/hr}\)

\(A_o\) = outside area of inner tube \(\text{ft}^2\)

\(\Delta T_L\) = logarithmic temperature difference (mean)

between input and output temperatures

of the liquor and steam.

\(\Delta T_L\) was calculated from the following equation:

\[
\frac{\Delta T_1 - \Delta T_2}{\ln \left(\frac{\Delta T_1}{\Delta T_2}\right)} \quad \text{where} \quad \Delta T_1 = T_{ha} - T_{ca} \quad \Delta T_2 = T_{hb} - T_{cb}
\]

3) Inside Film Coefficient, \(h_i\):

\[
\frac{1}{U_o} = \frac{D_o}{h_i} \cdot \frac{D_i}{h_i} + \frac{x_w \cdot u_o}{k_m \cdot \ell_i} + \frac{1}{k_o}
\]

where \(U_o\) = Overall heat transfer coefficient

\(\text{BTU}/(\text{ft}^2)(\text{hr})(^\circ\text{F})\)

\(D_o\) = outside diameter of inner tube \(\text{ft}\)

\(D_i\) = inside diameter of inner tube \(\text{ft}\)

\(x_w\) = thickness of metal wall \(\text{ft}\)

\(k_m\) = thermal conductivity of metal walls
\[ \frac{(\text{BTU} / (\text{ft})^2)(\text{hr})(\text{°F})}{D_L} = \text{logarithmic diameter of inner tube (ft) (mean)} \]

\[ h_i = \text{inside film coefficient (BTU}/(\text{ft})^2)(\text{hr})(\text{°F}) \]

\[ h_o = \text{surface heat transfer coefficient for outside of tube (A value of 2000 BTU}/(\text{ft})^2)(\text{hr})(\text{°F}) \text{ was assumed for these calculations.} \]

This equation suggests that the reciprocal of an overall coefficient can be considered to be an overall resistance composed of three resistances in series. The individual terms on the right-hand side of the equation represent the individual resistances of the two fluids and of the metal wall.

4) Reynolds Number, \( N_{RE} \):

\[ N_{RE} = \frac{D_1 \sqrt{\frac{C}{\mu}}}{V} \]

where \( D_1 \) = inside diameter of the tube (ft)

\( V \) = lineal liquor velocity (ft/sec)

\( C \) = density of liquor at mean temp (lb/ft^3)
\( \mu \) = viscosity of liquor at mean temp. (lb/ft-sec)

The Reynolds number coordinates the factors that determine the point at which a laminar boundary layer first shows turbulence. For these calculations, viscosity was taken from an appropriate nomograph coordinating values of liquor temperature, liquor concentration, and viscosity.

5) Nusselt Number, \( N_u \):

\[
N_u = \frac{h_i D_i}{k_m}
\]

where \( h_i \) = inside film coefficient

\( D_i \) = inside diameter of tube

\( k_m \) = thermal conductivity of metal used.

The Nusselt number is the ratio of the temperature gradient at the metal wall to the average temperature gradient across the entire pipe.
Raw data are presented on the following pages, as is calculated data. These can be found in Tables I and II respectively.

Graphing of results can be found in Figures 5, 6, and 7.

Discussion of Results

As can be seen from Figures 5 and 6, heat transfer rates do increase with increasing flow rates. This is so since an increasing amount of liquor is being heated. The leveling at higher flow rates is due to the decreasing temperature difference since less time is allowed for heat transfer. As noticed in the graphs, it appears that there is no significant difference developed when switching tubes. These plots are equivalent since the thermal conductivities of the tube walls were not taken into consideration.

In full scale heat transfer operations, the thermal conductivity of the metal walls has a negligible effect on the rate of heat transfer.

However, in my operation, the Static Mixer was encased in a stainless steel, type 316, casing and the empty tube was made of mild steel. The thermal conductivity of stainless steel is 9.4 BTU/(ft)(hr)(°F)
### Table I: Raw Heat and Mass Balance Data - STATIC MIXER UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Time (sec)</th>
<th>ml</th>
<th>Pressure (psig)</th>
<th>Steam-side Balance</th>
<th>Time (sec)</th>
<th>ml</th>
<th>T&lt;sub&gt;Ca&lt;/sub&gt; (8°F)</th>
<th>Liquor-side Balance</th>
<th>T&lt;sub&gt;Cb&lt;/sub&gt; (8°F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I: (Cont.) Raw Heat and Mass Balance Data  EMPTY PIPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Steam-side Balance</th>
<th>Liquor-side Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (sec)</td>
<td>ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II: Calculated Heat and Mass Balance Data  
**STATIC MIXER UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$V_{vol}$ (ft$^3$/hr)</th>
<th>$q_{steam}$ (BTU/hr)</th>
<th>$q_{liq uor}$ (BTU/hr)</th>
<th>$U$ (BTU/(ft$^2$)(hr)(°F))</th>
<th>$h_1$ (BTU/(ft$^2$)(hr)(°F))</th>
<th>$N_{HE}$</th>
<th>$N_u$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>14,434</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>15,670</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>14,434</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>15,716</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>14,434</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>15,670</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>15,682</td>
<td>6,780</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>14,434</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.725</td>
<td>15,682</td>
<td>9,020</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>15,716</td>
<td>6,460</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.980</td>
<td>18,043</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td>251.8</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.700</td>
<td>20,926</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>324.2</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.710</td>
<td>18,043</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td>263.3</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II: (Cont.) Calculated Heat and Mass Balance Data  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$V_{vol}$ (ft$^3$/hr)</th>
<th>$q_{steam}$ (BTU/hr)</th>
<th>$q_{liquor}$ (BTU/hr)</th>
<th>$h_o$ (BTU/(ft$^2$)(hr)(°F))</th>
<th>$h_t$ (BTU/(ft$^2$)(hr)(°F))</th>
<th>$N_{Re}$</th>
<th>$N_u$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>11,720</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>14,977</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>14,977</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>16,879</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.543</td>
<td>14,499</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>16,879</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>14,499</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>13,036</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>14,853</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.290</td>
<td>14,853</td>
<td>8,325</td>
<td>129.9</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.420</td>
<td>14,499</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.470</td>
<td>17,008</td>
<td>8,720</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.470</td>
<td>20,356</td>
<td>11,330</td>
<td>203.7</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III: % Total Solids Determination of Black Liquor

BEFORE DRYING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Static Mixer</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish &amp; liquor (g)</td>
<td>70.5068</td>
<td>76.4229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Dish (g)</td>
<td>60.0881</td>
<td>69.2295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Wt. (g)</td>
<td>10.4187</td>
<td>7.1934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFTER DRYING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dish &amp; liquor (g)</td>
<td>65.9324</td>
<td>73.1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Dish (g)</td>
<td>60.0881</td>
<td>69.2295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Wt. (g)</td>
<td>5.8443</td>
<td>3.9600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Solids</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III: (Cont.) % Total Solids Determination of Black Liquor

BEFORE DRYING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empty Pipe</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish &amp; liquor (g)</td>
<td>44.5038</td>
<td>77.8038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry dish (g)</td>
<td>37.1556</td>
<td>62.1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Wt. (g)</td>
<td>7.3482</td>
<td>15.6499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFTER DRYING

| Dish & liquor (g) | 41.2072 | 71.0469 | 67.5158 | 67.0338 |
| Dry dish (g)     | 37.1556 | 62.1539 | 60.5246 | 59.6045 |
| Liquor Wt. (g)   | 4.0516  | 8.8930  | 6.9912  | 7.4293  |

% Total Solids

| 55.2 | 56.7 | 55.8 | 55.7 |

Overall Average % Total Solids = 55.75%
Figure 5: Heat Transfer Rates vs Volumetric Flow Rates
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Figure 6: Overall Heat Transfer Coefficients vs Volumetric Flow Rates
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Figure 7: Nusselt Number vs Reynolds Number
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while that of mild steel is 26 BTU/(ft)(hr)(°F). This difference in conductivities has a considerable effect on the heat transfer in an operation, such as that used in this experiment, where flow rates are very low. Any graphical enhancement developed by the Static Mixer unit are offset by the increased transfer of heat in the empty pipe due to the lower resistance of the metal.

Further evidence that the Static Mixer does enhance heat transfer is illustrated in Figure 7 where the Nusselt number is plotted against the Reynolds number. The Nusselt number is dependent on the inside film coefficient and the thermal conductivity of the metal wall. The enhancement of the inside film coefficient using the Static Mixer is evident. For example, at a Reynolds number of 5, the Nusselt number using the Static Mixer is 1.15 while that using the empty pipe is 0.46. At a Reynolds number of 20, the Nusselt number is 5.8 using the Static Mixer while it is only 1.04 using the empty pipe. As stated earlier, the overall heat transfer coefficient is highly dependent on the inside film coefficient. It appears from these results that the Static Mixer is reducing the viscous film layer
which limits the transfer of heat.

Conclusions

The Static Mixer unit does decrease the resistance of the inside film layer a slight, but significant, amount. As seen in the plot of Nusselt number versus Reynolds number, the enhancement in the inside film coefficient is evident in the laminar areas of flow used. If higher viscosities would have been present, a greater increase in heat transfer caused by the Static Mixer, as compared to the empty pipe, may have occurred. Presently, when most initial and final evaporating systems are operated to get a total solids concentration of 50 to 60%, it does not appear that it would be economically feasible to employ these units. However, as newer recovery operations demand higher concentrations, I believe that the Static Mixer's application in the evaporating stages will become highly feasible and necessary. Conclusions presented here are limited to the laminar regions of flow. Large scale evaporators, however, operate in turbulent regions. Therefore, I recommend that further experimentation be carried out at
higher concentrations and flow rates to develop means by which
the Static Mixer unit can be economically used in the evaporation
process.
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