LESSONS FROM THE FIELD - EJECTOR SYSTEMS

James R. Lines, Graham Corporation, USA, presents the problems associated with ejector system performance and subsequent solutions.



Figure 1. Ejector cross-sectional drawing

Hydrocarbon Engineering has previously reported on ejector system fundamentals, operating characteristics, and guides for troubleshooting[1]. Moving on from that stage, the current article provides real world ejector system performance limitations uncovered during routine performance surveys. Corrective action undertaken to improve performance is documented and discussed in detail. Principles from the initial article are used as the tools to define the cause of a particular limitation and the eventual solution. It should be noted that the corrective actions described were unique to the particular problems discussed. It will not always be possible to apply the same procedure to a comparable performance problem. A review of general corrective techniques is discussed where applicable. Ejector system manufacturers should be consulted as a first course of action, and guide fixes are often possible.

Survey 1 - nylon intermediate production facility

Nitrogen gas bleed for pressure control

A North American petrochemical company manufacturing nylon intermediates was operating a vacuum flasher supported by a precondenser and two stage ejector system. Overhead load from the vacuum flasher consisted of 160 000 pph (72 600 kg/hr) of mixed nitriles at a pressure of approximately 35 torr.

The precondenser produced adequate vacuum, but the two stage ejector system that extracted non-condensibles from the precondenser was performing in an unstable manner. Suction pressure of the first stage ejector was cycling between the design 35 torr and up to as high as 75 - 80 torr.

Vacuum flasher pressure was unaffected by the ejector instability, however, plant personnel had concerns that poor ejector performance may at some point have a negative impact on vacuum flasher operating pressure.



Figure 2. Precondenser to left of vacuum flasher

Both precondenser and vacuum system were supplied by the ejector system manufacturer. The manufacturer dispatched a service engineer to the site to survey the equipment and its performance. Figure 3 depicts the pressure profile of the equipment.

The service engineer initially inspected vapor piping and condensate drain legs to ensure equipment layout was satisfactory. Attention was then focused on the utilities. Motive steam pressure was measured at the inlet to each ejector, and actual motive steam supply pressure to the ejectors was 140 psig (9.7 barg). The ejector motive steam nozzles were designed to pass the required steam at 125 psig (8.6 barg). Although the motive steam pressure was above design and, consequently, more steam was being consumed by the ejectors, the excessive steam consumption was not enough to cause poor performance.

The cooling water inlet temperature to the condensers was below design, and temperature rise across each condenser was less than the design. Inlet cooling water was designed for 89.6 °F (32 °C) and the water flowed in series from the first intercondenser to the aftercondenser. The actual inlet water was at 85 °F (29.4 °C). The total temperature rise across both condensers at design was 29 °F (16.1 °C). The actual temperature rise was 13 °F (7.2 °C). The lower temperature rise would suggest greater cooling water usage or lower condensible vapor discharge from the precondenser, neither of which would cause poor ejector system performance.

An ejector system experiencing unstable suction pressure is typically operating in a broken mode. Broken ejector performance is often caused by low motive steam pressure, which has already been ruled out, a fouled intercondenser, high cooling water temperature or water flow, both of which have been ruled out, non-condensible loading.

While inspecting the ejector system, the service engineer noticed a periodic audible change in ejector operation. This audible change plus an unstable suction and discharge pressure first stage ejector confirmed that this particular ejector was the trouble

The service engineer noticed plant personnel had installed a pneumatically controlled control valve that bled nitrogen to the suction of the first stage ejector. Plant personnel installed a nitrogen bleed as a means of controlling suction pressure to allow the vacuum flasher to operate at a consistent pressure even at reduced charge rates. Pressure in the top of the vacuum flasher was sensed and a signal sent to the control valve to bleed nitrogen to the first stage ejector if the



Figure 5. Survey 3 pressure profile.



Survey 4 - Gulf Coast refinery

Fouled intercondenser

A Gulf Coast refiner was operating a damp crude vacuum distillation tower that was designed for 10 torr tower top pressure but was maintaining only 24 -25 torr. The first stage ejector was surging and back-streaming into the vacuum distillation unit. A factory service engineer was dispatched to the site to perform a system survey and evaluate causes of the poor performance.

Figure 6 documents as sold performance and what was measured in the field.



Figure 7. First stage ejectors for CVDU.

Broken first stage ejector performance may be caused by improper motive steam pressure, elevated inlet cooling water temperature, lower than design cooling water flowrate, a fouled first intercondenser, or poor operation of a downstream ejector. The performance survey indicated motive steam supply conditions were satisfactory. Cooling water temperature rise and pressure drop across the first intercondenser suggested the problem was here.

Design cooling water temperature rise across the first intercondenser was 14 °F (7.8 °C), however, the actual temperature rise was 19 °F (10.6 °C). Possible causes for an elevated temperature rise would be lower than designed cooling water flow or an increase in condensible load to the condenser. Pressure drop across the tubeside of the condenser gave an indication that something was wrong. The actual tubeside pressure drop was 25 psi (1.7 bar) while the design was only 5 psi (0.35 bar).

The tubeside of the condenser was fouled and the increased pressure drop across the condenser caused the recirculating pumps to circulate less water. Tubeside fouling to produce such an elevated pressure drop would be severe and actual tube blockage must have occurred.

Tubeside fouling deterred heat transfer and did not permit proper condensation of shell side vapors. This increased the pressure drop on the shell side of the condenser and elevated its operating pressure. By not permitting proper condensation of shellside vapors, the increased outlet flow of vapors caused an increase in pressure drop.

The first stage ejector could not overcome the elevated shell side pressure drop and, consequently, broke operation. The broken operation resulted in unstable suction pressure, surging and back-streaming of motive steam into the vacuum distillation unit. The first intercondenser was pulled from the platform and taken down to grade. At grade, the bundle was removed to inspect the shell side for fouling and to rod out the tubes. The shell side did not experience excessive fouling, but the tubeside had tubes blocked with solidified calcium carbonate and other inverse solubility salts.

Once the tubeside was cleaned and returned to acceptable condition, the bundle was reinstalled in the condenser, and the condenser taken up to the vacuum unit for re-hook up. When the system was brought in service, the tower top pressure was maintained at approximately 10 torr and system performance was stable.

Conclusion

Ejector systems provide extremely reliable performance, but they do require periodic maintenance. It is recommended that routine surveys be performed to document actual behavior and performance of the ejector system. An ejector system may be performing at less than optimal conditions for a variety of reasons, such as improper utilities, fouled condensers, mechanical damage, excessive process load, excessive non-condensible load or improper installation.

A skilled vacuum technician, most often from the ejector system manufacturer, should conduct the routine surveys and issue performance reports. The performance surveys may be conducted on line without affecting the process. The performance reports will document actual performance at a point in time, discuss corrective action where applicable and offer preventative maintenance suggestions.

If performance problems arise, the original supplier of the vacuum system should be consulted. If necessary, a request should be made for a service engineer to be dispatched to offer support on site. Actual corrective action to take is situation dependent and requires a thorough understanding of variables that influence ejector system performance.

References

1 LINES J R and SMITH R T, Ejector system troubleshooting, Hydrocarbon Engineering, Part 1 January/February 1997 pp. 69 - 78 , Part 2 March/April 1997 pp 35 - 40

Palladian Publications 1999

For More Information
Please Contact:

Graham Corporation

20 Florence Avenue
Batavia, New York 14020
USA

Telephone: 716 343 2216 Fax: 716 343 1097
Website: http/www.graham-mfg.com