



25<sup>th</sup> ABCM International Congress of Mechanical Engineering  
October 20-25, 2019, Uberlândia, MG, Brazil

**COB-2019-0201**

## **COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SIMULATED SOLAR TOWER POWER PLANT BETWEEN TWO CITIES OF BRAZIL AND THE USA.**

**Breno Gusmão Barbosa**

**Frederico Romagnoli Silveira Lima**

**José Henrique Martins Neto**

Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais, Dept. of Mechanical Eng., Av. Amazonas, 7675 Belo Horizonte, Brasil  
brenogusm@gmail.com  
fredericolima@cefetmg.br  
neto.henrique@cefetmg.br

**Abstract.** A solar tower CSP power plant with a thermal storage system was simulated in the cities of Dagget (California/USA) and Petrolina (Pernambuco/Brazil) using solar data files in the Typical Metrological Year 2 format. The computational programs used for the solar power plant simulation were the EES, SAM and TRNSYS. The EES software was used to write the code of the power block subsystem that outputted its needed parameters, for 41.2 % of thermal efficiency. The SAM software was used to determine the parameters of the solar field and the thermal storage subsystems, in their most profitable setups, for each city. Finally, the designed solar tower CSP power plant was simulated in the TRNSYS software, outputting the interrelationships between the three subsystems during a typical year. The energy output of the plant in the solstices and equinox were plotted. The simulated power plant in the city of Petrolina outputted less (11.2 %) annual energy than Dagget power plant. In addition, even with a solar field with 55.4 % more heliostats, the Petrolina solar power plant capacity factor was 8.5 % lower. Through the study carried out, Dagget showed to be a more suitable location for the designed solar tower.

**Keywords:** Concentrated Solar Power, Solar Tower Plant, Thermal Storage, Computational Simulations.

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The generation of electricity through renewable sources helps to reduce the burning of fossil fuels and thus contributes to a lower emission of greenhouse gases. Resolutions and treaties for the reduction of global warming are due to the consequences of the greenhouse effect, which causes the melting of the ice caps, raises the level of the oceans, changes the thermal profile of the planet, generates natural disasters and creates diverse socioeconomic problems (Whitaker et al., 2013).

Thermal energy storage makes energy production more stable. The dispatchability measures how much is produced in relation to the power demanded by the network. In CSP plants with thermal storage, the generation takes place in two stages, from solar radiation it is generated heat that is used to power a thermal system of electric energy production, as used in conventional thermoelectric plants. With the CSP, 72 kg of equivalent carbon per MWh could be achieved, much lower than a plant using combined cycle natural gas, 400 kg of equivalent carbon per MWh (Koberle et al., 2015).

State-of-the-art CSP Solar Tower technology, with a molten salt storage above 10h, had a Leveled Cost of Electricity (LCOE) of approximately 13 ¢/kWh in 2015 in the United States and its development is estimated to cost 6 ¢/kWh in 2020 (Luo et al., 2016).

The simulation done in this paper tried to reach low costs of energy production. It were used simulation programs to calculate the power block, the field of heliostats, the tower and its receiver and the thermal storage system parameters. The behaviors of the Solar Tower CSP plants, and its subsystems and components, in the cities of Dagget and Petrolina were simulated through the Transient System Simulation Tool (TRNSYS), Fig. 1, version 17.0 with the aid of the following programs: Engineering Equation Solver (EES), version 10.115 and Systems Model Advisor (SAM), version 2017.1.17.



For the simulation in TRNSYS it was used the solar thermal electric components (STEC), version 3.0, created and developed through an initiative of Solar Power and Chemical Energy Systems (SolarPACES). The library was last updated in November 2007. After that date, due to the large development of commercial solar thermoelectric projects, mainly in the United States and Europe, the progress of the library went from the public research sector to private research of business institutions.

## 2. CSP POWER PLANTS SIMULATIONS

Fichter et al. 2017, evaluated the CSP technology for hybridization with biomass in the northeastern region of Brazil with a simulation program developed called REMix-CEM-B, which evaluated the technical-economic possibility of the insertion of the technology in Brazil. For competitiveness, it was concluded that it would be necessary to use energy back-up systems with biomass of at least 49 % of the nominal power of the CSP plants.

Janjai et al. 2011, simulated three types of CSP plants over a period of eight years for the city of Ubon Ratchathani in Thailand. Solarimetric data derived from satellite images were used. The simulated technologies were the parabolic trough, the solar tower and the parabolic dish, all used in a plant with nominal power of 10 MW. The program used was TRNSYS and its STEC 2.0 library. Among the simulated technologies, the parabolic trough was the one with the lowest LCOE, corresponding to 30 ¢/kWh in dollars. The capacity factor found was 20.5 % for this system and the solar-electric efficiency was 18 %.

Hussain et al. 2017, simulated solar tower, parabolic trough and linear Fresnel technologies for comparison using hybridization with biomass in regions of Europe, Madrid being the region with the best radiation, between 1600 and 1800kWh/m<sup>2</sup> per year. According to the TRNSYS simulation the parabolic trough was the most viable technology for a 3.2 MW power plant. The solar field fluid worked at 395 °C.

Srilakshmi et al. 2017, simulated the field of heliostats for CSP solar tower type plants with storage and hybridization systems. The receiver used was open and the simulated plants were Spain's Gemasolar, which has a nominal capacity of 20 MW, a thermal storage system of 15 hours and an average annual efficiency of 16 %, and Crescent Dunes of the United States, which has a nominal capacity of 110 MW, 10 hours thermal storage system and average annual efficiency of 18.3 %. The city of Jodhpur in India was also used for plant simulation after validation of the models. The simulation developed was based on the creation of dimensionless contour conditions related to the size of the tower. The results were validated by comparison with the data collected from the Gemasolar and Crescent Dunes plants.

Abdelhady et al. 2014, simulated a solar thermal plant for an isolated region of Egypt. The region called New Valley of Egypt has one of the highest radiation rates, reaching 3000 kWh/m<sup>2</sup> per year. The simulated technology was the parabolic trough with thermal storage in concrete blocks and the software used was the TRNSYS. The simulation, programmed confidentially by the authors, generated 180 GWh of thermal energy in the year during 3385 hours of operation, converting 33,38 % of the normal radiation available. It was evidenced that the TES had a fundamental role in the thermal energy supply for the receiver to work at its operating temperature of 427 °C.

Yamani et al. 2017, evaluate solar-powered CSP technology for the generation of electrical power in the Algerian climate in the cities of Tamanrasset, Hassi R'mel and Algiers. A central tubular open receiver tower with a power block with the Rankine cycle was simulated, and a central volumetric receiver tower with a power block with the Brayton cycle. The STEC 3.0 library was used in the TRNSYS program to simulate the thermal performance of 3 MWel production. In the results it was found that the Brayton cycle presented better performance for high radiation rates, but as this cycle works at high temperatures, in the order of 1000 °C, it consumed more fossil fuel during a typical year by using a combustion chamber to regulate the temperature of input to the turbine after the gaseous HTF passes through the solar receiver. The difference in the cost of producing electricity between the two technologies, Rankine and Brayton, was only 3.4 % more for Brayton, for the city of Hassi R ' honey. But it was much larger for the other two cities, about 11 % in Algiers and 16.4 % in Tamanrasset. This was due to the higher DNI and longer duration in Hassi R'mel.

## 3. SIMULATION MODEL

The simulation consists in the thermodynamic cycle of the power block subsystem, written in the EES for a 104 MWel plant. The SAM software to simulate the solar field and thermal storage subsystems. Moreover, the integration of the whole plant was made in TRNSYS software.

### 3.1 Power Block

The EES was used to calculate, through a set of equations, the parameters: specific heats and densities of molten salt and water at certain temperatures; the condenser, evaporator, economizer, regenerator and superheater thermal capacitances; the mass flow of the system and its ramifications for the extractions in the stages of the turbine; the output

pressures of the steam in the turbine stages and the pressure variations in the pumps and the mass flow rate and the cooling water temperature. The vapor generator system was simulated according Equation (1). (Bergman et al., 2011).

$$\dot{Q}_{SIST} = \dot{m}_{H2O} \cdot (i_{H2O,out} - i_{H2O,in}) = \dot{m}_{HTF} \cdot cp_{HTF} \cdot (T_{HTF,in} - T_{HTF,out}) \quad (1)$$

Where  $\dot{Q}_{SIST}$  (kW) is the thermal transfer rate that occurs in the steam generator system,  $\dot{m}_{H2O}$  (kg/s) mass vapor flow,  $i_{H2O,out}$  (kJ/kg) the enthalpy of the vapor at the output of the steam generator,  $i_{H2O,in}$  (kJ/kg) the enthalpy of the vapor in  $cp_{HTF}$  the specific heat of the HTF,  $T_{HTF,in}$  (°C) the temperature of the HTF at the entrance of the solar field and  $T_{HTF,out}$  (°C) the temperature of the HTF the system output.

### 3.2 Solar Field

The SAM program was used to determine the amount of heliostats and the dimensional data of the solar field for the solarimetric data of the Dagget and Petrolina locations, through a parametric study with the use of the Equation (2). (Duffie and Beckman, 2013).

$$V_{HTF} = \frac{\dot{W}_{TURB,NOM} \cdot t_{STR}}{\rho_{HTF} \cdot cp_{HTF} \cdot (T_{H,HTF} - T_{C,HTF}) \cdot \epsilon_{RANKINE}} \quad (2)$$

Where  $\dot{W}_{TURB,NOM}$  (kW) is the nominal power of the turbine,  $t_{STR}$  the storage time,  $\rho_{HTF}$  (kg/m<sup>3</sup>) the density of the HTF,  $cp_{HTF}$  (kJ/kgK) the specific heat of the HTF,  $T_{H,HTF}$  (°C) the temperature of the HTF in the state "hot",  $T_{C,HTF}$  (°C) the temperature of the HTF in the "cold" state and  $\epsilon_{RANKINE}$  the efficiency of the Rankine cycle.

The TRNSYS program was used to obtain the dynamic behavior of the plants through solarimetric data and the interconnections of the power block (PB), solar field (SF) and thermal storage (TES) subsystems. For the Modeling of the cycle, Tab. 2, boundary conditions (Parameters) were adopted.


Table 2 – Solar Tower boundary conditions

HTF hot	574°C
HTF cold	290°C
Receiver Design Thermal Flow	1000kW/m <sup>2</sup>
Gross Turbine Power	115MW
Gross Power to Net Conversion	0.9

For the simulation of the storage system and solar field, the SAM program was used, which relates the dimensional parameters, such as the number of heliostats, dimensions of the tanks and receiver, among others, with financial parameters.

By analyzing the accumulated percentage of the solarimetric data, Fig. 2, it is possible to know for how long, in the typical year, the flow will be above the designed thermal flow. In Dagget, 30 % to 40 % of the data are less than 500 W/m<sup>2</sup> in Petrolina the amount of solarimetric data with the DNI below 500 W/m<sup>2</sup> is approximately 60 %.

#### DNI Dagget



#### DNI Petrolina





Figure 2. Direct Normal Irradiation

The axis of the left ordinates in figure 2 represents the solar data, which contains information such as DNI, ambient temperature, wind speed, etc. for each hour of a typical year. The DNI is represented on the abscissa axis, the vertical bars are related to the left-hand axis and it is possible to see that 14 % of the data has values between 900 and 960 W/m<sup>2</sup> for Dagget. For Petrolina only 2 % of the data has a DNI between 900 and 942 W/m<sup>2</sup>, which is the maximum registered DNI for this city, and for Dagget the DNI of 1025 W/m<sup>2</sup>. The amount of DNI data between 0 and 75 W/m<sup>2</sup> is 10 % for Dagget and 16 % for Petrolina.


#### 4. RESULTS

The days analyzed were the spring and autumn equinoxes and the summer and winter solstices, due to the position of the sun on these dates, Fig. 3. In relation to the Equator, the spring and autumn equinoxes provide an equal declination angle of the earth of 0°. The summer and winter solstices correspond to the possible dates of higher and lower incidence of radiation in the tropics, which occur between June 20 and 21 and December 20 and 21, respectively, for the northern hemisphere. For the southern hemisphere the winter solstice is between 20 and 21 June and the summer between 20 and 21 December.


Spring Dagget



Summer Dagget



Autumn Dagget



Winter Dagget




Figure 3. Dagget Power Plant Behavior

At spring equinox in Dagget, only at three moments the PB lost power, ending up for a longer period between March 21 and 22. The day 20 radiation was excellent, which allowed the plant to run uninterrupted at maximum power for two days in a row.

The summer behavior of Dagget represents the ideal behavior of a CSP power plant, as it produces the energy demanded during the day and during the night. The solar source is harnessed to the maximum during the day and the

amount of heat stored in the hot tank supplies the PB overnight and until the sun is providing the radiation necessary for the operation of the plant without the use of the storage system.


In the period of high solar radiation, the TES, which was being discharged overnight, returns to store heat. This process can be visualized following the displacement of the pink and orange lines throughout the days. The upward movement of these lines represent the filling of the respective tank and the downward movement its discharge. Approximated in the half of the daylight period the tanks volumes even, in a process of hot tank loading and cold tank discharge.

During the autumn, in the city of Dagget, the days presented great variations in the tendencies of the curves of DNI, in which momentary falls were shown, before, during and after the point of zenith. From dawn to the point of zenith, DNI presented slight variations. At dusk, records of rainfall, clouds, can explain abrupt variations or other events that hampered the incidence of DNI in the solar field during the typical year analyzed.


Between September 22 and 23, the heliothermic plant loses power due to the depletion of the storage system and lack of solar radiation, but does not stop to function, as it happens between the other represented days. The solar radiation before the zenith point was good enough for the production to increase the power before the plant shutdown.

The worst time represented for Dagget was the winter solstice, in which the plant had to be shut down completely during intervals in every day analyzed. On the days of 19 and 21 December, the MWel production after the DNI incidence was still good, due to the filling of the hot salt tank at volumes close to its halves, as represented in the pink and yellow lines. By December 20 the hot salt tank stored heat only for the operation of the plant for a few hours after the end of the day's DNI period.


### Spring Petrolina



### Summer Petrolina



### Autumn Petrolina



### Winter Petrolina




Figure 4. Petrolina Power Plant Behavior

The solar field of the plant located in Petrolina has a larger solar multiple, with a value of 3.8 for a thermal storage of 16 hours. In the case of Dagget, a solar field with a solar multiple of 2.9 was enough to allow a thermal storage of 14

hours in the best cost-benefit of the plant. The explanation of the high increase in the solar multiple for the little gain in storage hours is due to the lower and more intermittent DNI in Petrolina.

The spring represented the best performance of the Petrolina CSP plant. Because it has a large solar field, the plant can produce its nominal power for 24 hours without incident radiation reaching high values. The plant was designed for a design DNI of 850 W/m<sup>2</sup>, because as the radiation is lower than in Dagget, so it was necessary a plant that worked satisfactorily in these worst conditions.

The days of September 22, 23 and 24 made possible the operation of the storage system from 50 to 70 % of its capacity.

On December 19, 20 and 21, the plant's thermal storage system was practically unused. Only on the 20th that the plant produced a few hours beyond the period of incidence of radiation and on days 19 and 21, in addition, to not working at its nominal power the plant did not use the storage system. The most dispatched day was December 22.

The sizing of the solar field and the storage system considered the DNI at all times of the year. One way to reduce the size of the solar field and its storage system would be the use of fossil fuels or biomass to heat the HTF after the receiver tower. The more robust the auxiliary heating system, the smaller the heliostat field. If solar radiation were not used to provide the heat needed for PB, the plant would work as a conventional thermoelectric plant.

In the analyzed days of autumn and winter, where the autumn equinox and the winter solstice respectively are shown, the Petrolina heliothermic plant does not produce electricity at its rated power for a long time. Of the days, only June 22 has a good incidence of solar radiation.

The results obtained for Petrolina help to understand the largest number of heliostats in its solar field. Each day of the year, when the plant is not producing, its capacity factor decreases, this makes it necessary to increase the reflecting area, so that the radiation is better used in lower values, to compensate the lost days.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The city of Petrolina had a solar field with 55.4 % more heliostats, with an annual energy production and a capacity factor 11.2 % and 8.5 % lower than Dagget respectively. The factors with the greatest influence on the economic aspect of the plants were the solar field dimension data, in which the Petrolina plant presented 5954 heliostats more than the simulated plant in Dagget. The increase in the number of heliostats was due to the need to maintain a nominal power output of 104 MW for both plants during an annual period in which plant capacity factors were not reduced. Petrolina, which had a lower incidence of normal direct radiation DNI, worked with a design flow of 850 W/m<sup>2</sup>, 100 W/m<sup>2</sup> less than in Dagget. That lead to Dagget be a more suitable place for the construction of the developed solar tower power plant.

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais (CEFET-MG) for the use of the Software TRNSYS 17.0 and for all the technical material and resources necessary to conduct the simulations carried out in this work.

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.

## 7. REFERENCES

Abdelhady, S., Borello D., Tortora, E., 2014. "Design of a small scale stand-alone solar thermal cogeneration plant for an isolated region in Egypt". *Energy Conversion and Management*, Vol. 88, pp. 872–882.

Bergman, T. L., Lavine, A. S., Incropera, F. P., 2011. *Fundamentals of Heat and Mass Transfer*. John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey, 7<sup>th</sup> edition.

Duffie, J. A., Beckman, W., A. 2013. *Solar Engineering of Thermal Processes*. John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey, 4th edition.

Fichter, T., Soria, R., Szklo, A., Schaeffer, R., Lucena, A. F. P., 2017. "Assessing the potential role of concentrated solar power (CSP) for the northeast power system of Brazil using a detailed power system model". *Energy*, Vol. 121, pp. 695–715.

Hussain, C. M. I., Norton, B., Duffy A., 2017. "Technological assessment of different solar-biomass systems for hybrid power generation in Europe". *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, Vol. 68, pp. 1115–1129.

Janjai, S., Laksanaboonsong, J., Seesaard, T., 2011. "Potential application of concentrating solar power systems for the generation of electricity in Thailand". *Applied Energy*, Vol. 88, pp. 4960–4967.

Koberle, A. C., Gernaat, D. E. H. J., Vuuren, D. P. V., 2015. “Assessing current and future techno-economic potential of concentrated solar power and photovoltaic electricity generation”. *Energy*, Vol. 89, pp. 739–756.

Liqreina, A., Qoaidar, L., 2014. “Dry cooling of concentrating solar power (CSP) plants, an economic competitive option for the desert regions of the MENA region”. *Solar Energy*, Vol. 103, p. 417–424.

Lovegrove, K., Stein, W., 2012. *Concentrating solar power technology Principles, developments and applications*. Woodhead Publishing, Cambridge, 1<sup>st</sup> edition.

Luo, Q., Ariyur, K. B., Mathur, A. K., 2016. “Control-Oriented Concentrated Solar Power Plant Model”. *IEEE Transactions On Control Systems Technology*, Vol. 24, pp. 623–635.

Srilakshmi, G., Suresh, N. S., Thirumalai, N. C., Ramaswamy, M. A., 2017. “Preliminary design of heliostat field and performance analysis of solar tower plants with thermal storage and hybridization”. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, Vol. 19, pp. 102–113.

Whitaker, M. B., Heath, G. A., Burkhardt, J. J., Turchi, C. S., 2013. “Life Cycle Assessment of a Power Tower Concentrating Solar Plant and the Impacts of Key Design Alternatives”. *Environmental Science & Technology*, Vol. 47, pp. 5896–5903.

Yamani, N., Khellaf, A., Mohammedi, K., Behar, O., 2017. “Assessment of solar thermal tower technology under Algerian climate”. *Energy*, Vol. 126, pp. 444–460.

Zaversky, F., Barberena, J. G., Sánchez, M., Astrain, D., 2013. “Transient molten salt two-tank thermal storage modeling for CSP performance simulations”. *Solar Energy*, Vol. 93, pp. 294–311.

## 8. RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

The authors are the only responsible for the printed material included in this paper.