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FLOW OF SUB-COOLED CRYOGENS THROUGH A JOULE-THOMSON DEVICE – INVESTIGATION OF METASTABILITY CONDITIONS

JOHN M. JURNS

ABSTRACT

Cryogenic fluid systems are fundamental to space flight architecture. Due to the unique properties of cryogenic fluids and the environments in which they operate for space flight, cryogenic fluid management systems must be developed to maintain these fluids at conditions in which they can be utilized. Liquid oxygen boils at 90 K, and liquid hydrogen boils at 20 K. Significant care must be taken to provide a thermal management system that prevents heat entering these fluids with consequential adverse effects on the performance of the cryogenic fluid systems. One critical component of a cryogenic thermal management system is a Joule-Thomson device. This one small component provides the driving force not only for the production of cryogenic fluids, but for the effective management of thermal loads in many cryogenic fluid systems including those used in space flight architectures.
As a fundamental understanding of the Joule-Thomson effect and J-T devices is critical to the effective design of cryogenic fluid management systems, the intent of this work is to examine J-T devices as they relate to space flight systems. This work will examine where these devices are used in space based cryogenic fluid management systems. It will consider research conducted to date that examines both the fundamental fluid physics behind how these devices operate and their application in real systems. Finally, it will report on the potential impact that fluid metastability has as it relates to J-T devices for certain cryogenic fluids.

An analytical assessment is made of the stability limits of single phase cryogenic fluids as a J-T device operates on them. This is compared to experimental results for tests conducted in liquid oxygen, and liquid methane. Results show that several factors influence the performance of J-T devices, and that the metastability of single phase cryogenic fluids below the saturation line must be considered in the design of cryogenic fluid management systems.
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**NOMENCLATURE**

$c_p$ – Specific heat

$h$ – Enthalpy

$k_B$ – Boltzmann Constant

$Lohm$ – Liquid ohm, measurement of Visco Jet flow resistance

$mdot$ – Mass flow rate

$p$ – Pressure

$Q$ – Heat

$R$ – Gas constant

$S$ – Specific Gravity

$T$ – Temperature

$\nu$ – Specific volume

$\nu_f$ – Liquid specific volume

$\nu_g$ – Vapor specific volume

$\nu_m$ – Specific volume at the root of a cubic $p$-$\nu$-$T$ equation between $\nu_f$ and $\nu_g$

$X$ – Fluid quality

$\mu_{JT}$ – Joule-Thomson coefficient

$\rho$ – Fluid density

$\sigma$ – Surface tension

$sp$ – spinodal

$sat$ – saturated
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A cryogenic fluid system is a fundamental component of virtually every space flight vehicle that leaves the confines of earth and travels to space. Whether it is a launch vehicle carrying a satellite to geosynchronous orbit, the satellite itself, a space station in low earth orbit, a science mission to the outer planets, or a lunar lander carrying astronauts back to the surface of the Moon, it would not be able to carry out its mission unless there were cryogenic fluids on board. When one speaks of a cryogenic fluid system, what essentially is meant is a container to hold a cryogenic fluid along with the ancillary components required to maintain that fluid at or below its vapor pressure. These components typically include insulation surrounding the tank to minimize heat leaking into the container, a system to pressurize the container as required, usually with an inert gas such as helium, a pump or other device to deliver the cryogenic fluid to an engine or other system, a vent system to relieve excess pressure from the container, and a heat exchanger system to either add heat to, or to extract heat from the cryogen. One small yet critical component of a heat exchanger system is a Joule-Thomson device. This seemingly insignificant item, which is essentially nothing more than an orifice in a pipe, is actually the critical component that allows the system to reject unwanted heat from the cryogenic fluid.
For a Joule-Thomson device to perform effectively in a cryogenic fluid thermal management system, pressure drop as a result of flow across the device must result in expansion of the liquid cryogen into the two phase region. Otherwise, there will be no accompanying temperature drop to provide the differential temperature required to drive the rejection of heat from the system. This observation is corroborated by liquid nitrogen (LN$_2$)$^1$ and liquid hydrogen (LH$_2$)$^2$ data from research conducted by the NASA Glenn Research Center in Cleveland, Ohio.

If cryogenic fluids are stored as saturated liquids, any heat entering the system converts liquid to vapor. It is therefore desirable to store a cryogenic fluid as a sub-cooled liquid. Subcooling the liquid is typically done by pressurizing the storage container with a non-condensable gas – typically gaseous helium (GHe). One operational issue that arises as a result of storing cryogenic fluids in the sub-cooled state is that the liquid then enters the Joule-Thomson device sub-cooled. As cryogen flows through the Joule-Thomson device, the pressure drop is isenthalpic until it crosses the two phase line. Further drop in pressure should result in phase change, and a resultant drop in temperature. However, a drop in pressure below the two phase line may, in some situations, still result in single phase flow of a metastable liquid, rather than two-phase liquid-vapor flow. That is, following a constant temperature line, the pressure can drop below the point at which transition to two-phase is expected, and even down to some minimum point beyond which the liquid cannot remain single phase. This theoretical limit can be predicted analytically, but actual minimum pressures where liquid no longer remains metastable are
typically higher than this value\textsuperscript{3,4,5,6}.

The significant question of practical importance is – how far below the two phase line might the liquid remain single phase? This is important to know for several reasons:

1. Designers may not assume that one needs only to drop pressure to the saturation line to get two phase flow and the accompanying temperature drop ($\Delta T$).
2. The amount of initial sub-cooling of the liquid may be very significant with respect to the performance of the Joule-Thomson device in achieving a temperature drop which will reject heat from a system.
3. There are a number of different devices that can be used for J-T expansion. The type of J-T device used in a given system may have an impact on the minimum pressure the sub-cooled metastable fluid reaches before transition to two phase flow occurs.

The object of the present study is to determine analytically the theoretical minimum temperature a fluid may drop below the two phase line, and determine experimentally how close to these limits several cryogenic fluids might approach in a typical system.

The fluids to be considered are liquid oxygen (LO$_2$) and liquid methane (LCH$_4$). A series of tests with varying degrees of sub-cooling on the inlet side and various downstream pressures were performed to determine how far below the saturation line the flow could go before becoming two phase with an accompanying temperature drop. These tests were carried out under several test programs at the NASA Glenn Research Center in Cleveland OH, at their cryogenic test research facilities\textsuperscript{7}. 

3
1.1 J-T Effect

The Joule-Thomson (J-T) effect is a process in which the temperature of a real gas is either decreased or increased by letting it expand freely at constant enthalpy, as described in thermodynamics or physics textbooks. When a real gas expands freely at constant enthalpy, the temperature may either decrease or increase, depending on the initial temperature and pressure (see Figure 1). For any given pressure, a real gas has a *Joule-Thomson inversion temperature*, above which expansion at constant enthalpy causes the temperature to rise, and below which expansion at constant enthalpy causes cooling.

\[ h_1 = h_2 \]
\[ T_1 > T_2 \]
\[ P_1 > P_2 \]

*Figure 1 – Flow across a J-T orifice resulting in temperature drop*

Applying the First Law of Thermodynamics for steady flow through an expansion device (a valve, orifice or other flow restriction), for zero heat transfer and zero work transfer, and negligible kinetic and potential energy changes, the enthalpy upstream equals the enthalpy downstream. That is:

\[ h_1 = h_2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Plotting lines of constant enthalpy on a graph of temperature versus pressure would reveal a region where the expansion through a J-T device produces an increase in temperature,
and a region where expansion would produce a decrease in temperature. The curve that separates these two regions is called the inversion curve. Figure 2 shows the inversion curve for gaseous methane passing through the maxima of lines of constant enthalpy.

**Figure 2 – Joule-Thomson Inversion Curve for Methane**

In many cryogenic systems, the Joule-Thomson effect is used to produce low temperatures by performing isenthalpic expansion (pressure drop) to the left of the inversion curve.

The effect of change in temperature from isenthalpic change in pressure is represented by the Joule-Thomson coefficient, $\mu_{JT}$. 
\[
\mu_{JT} = \left(\frac{\partial T}{\partial p}\right)_h
\]  

Note that the Joule-Thomson coefficient must be positive for a net temperature decrease during expansion, i.e. a temperature decrease resulting from a pressure decrease would result in a positive coefficient.

### 1.1.1 Devices

A Joule-Thomson device can be built in any number of physical configurations. The only requirement for the device is that it provides a restriction to flow of fluid through a pipe. This restriction could be provided by an orifice, porous plug, throttling valve, or any other similar device. Orifices and porous plugs have the advantage of having no moving parts. However, this may restrict their operating range. A throttling valve may provide pressure drop over a greater range of flows, but has the disadvantage of having moving parts. In cryogenic systems, careful attention must be paid to providing hardware that will perform reliably and without failure in the extreme cold temperature environment.

### 1.1.2 History

The J-T effect was discovered as one of the results of collaboration between James Prescott Joule and William Thomson (Lord Kelvin) in the 1850's, where they conducted research laying much of the groundwork in classical thermodynamic and kinetic theory\(^8\). Carl von Linde used the J-T effect in developing refrigeration cycles, and in 1895 liquefied air using J-T expansion and counter-flow heat exchangers\(^9\). This heralded the beginning of the air separation industry and modern cryogenics. Without this
fundamental work and the development of technology for liquefying and distilling air, modern rockets and the entire space industry would have never developed. (An interesting side note is that both Joule and von Linde were interested in developing technology to support the brewing industry – Joule investigated replacing steam engines with electric motors in breweries, and von Linde applied his refrigeration technology to German breweries and even Guinness!)

Modern rocketry was successfully developed based on the availability of cryogenic oxidizer and fuels. The higher density of liquid oxygen and hydrogen allows rockets to carry both fuel and oxidizer as relatively low pressure sub-critical fluids much more efficiently than if they were stored as high pressure gas. Early on in the United States space program, not much thought was given to conditioning cryogenic fluids, as their use was typically limited to very short durations. Propellant tanks would be loaded on the launch pad. Shortly thereafter, the rocket was launched, and the cryogenic oxidizer and propellant would be used up literally in a matter of minutes by the time the spacecraft reached orbit.

However, at the dawn of the Apollo era with the advent of longer duration space missions, managing cryogenic fluid conditions became a much more important issue. Whereas cryogenic storage in early rockets had only to be adequate for short term use, now cryogens for propulsion, on-board power and life support needed to be maintained for days or weeks duration. Systems and techniques needed to be developed to effectively manage fluid conditions and minimize heat entering these cryogenic systems.
As early as the 1960’s cryogenic thermal conditioning systems were being developed for the Apollo program\textsuperscript{10}. Since that time, there has been much work done in the aerospace industry developing cryogenic thermal management technology. Improved insulation systems to minimize heat leak into a cryogenic system\textsuperscript{11}, de-stratification and fluid mixing techniques\textsuperscript{12,13}, and active thermal control\textsuperscript{14} have all contributed to improving long-term cryogenic storage.

Joule-Thomson devices started showing up as system components in cryogenic thermal conditioning systems in the 1970’s\textsuperscript{15,16}. By the 1980’s, NASA had a robust cryogenic fluid management research program that included work on Thermodynamic Vent Systems incorporating Joule-Thomson devices\textsuperscript{1,2,17,18}.

### 1.2 J-T Devices in Space-Based Cryogenic TVS Systems

Long term storage of subcritical cryogenic fluids in space presents many challenges arising from a micro-gravity environment and ambient heat leak into the system. These factors result in thermal stratification of the fluid in storage tanks, formation of undesirable liquid/vapor mixtures and excessive tank pressure rise. Ambient heat leak into the system can be minimized, but not totally eliminated. Therefore, a means of minimizing thermal stratification and rejecting environmental heat is required. Heat rejection in space based cryogenic systems is provided by means of a Thermodynamic Vent System (TVS)\textsuperscript{19}. These systems are generally divided into active TVS and passive TVS categories, the difference between the two architectures being the active TVS system requires a pump to provide fluid mixing\textsuperscript{20}. Figure 3 shows a schematic representation of both (passive and active) architectures. However, a J-T device is common to both
systems, and understanding how J-T devices perform is critical to the design of the overall TVS system. In both active and passive TVS, a small amount of tank liquid is withdrawn (continuously or intermittently), and passed through a J-T device, resulting in a lower temperature and lower pressure two-phase fluid. This two-phase mixture then flows through a heat exchanger to cool the bulk tank fluid. The fluid mixture is completely evaporated in the heat exchanger, and then either vented overboard directly, or passed through vapor-cooled shields to intercept heat leak into the tank. It is apparent that the advantage of this system is to vent only vapor from the tank, thereby providing the maximum amount of heat rejection with the minimum loss of fluid from the tank.

Passive TVS

![Passive TVS Diagram](image)

Active TVS

![Active TVS Diagram](image)

Figure 3 – Passive and Active TVS cooling schematics
CHAPTER II
PREVIOUS RESEARCH

2.1 Cryogenic Propellants

Research on Joule-Thomson devices in both LN$_2$ and LH$_2$ was conducted at the NASA Lewis Research Center (now the NASA Glenn Research Center) by Papell et al.\textsuperscript{1-2} in the early 1990’s. They obtained flow rates, pressure drop and temperature drop data in LN$_2$ and LH$_2$ for a series of multiple orifice Joule-Thomson devices (Visco Jets\textsuperscript{TM}) over a range of conditions. For LN$_2$ tests, inlet pressures ranged from 207 to 414 kPa, inlet temperatures from 65 to 91 K, outlet pressures from 19.3 to 385 kPa, outlet temperatures from 65 to 91 K, and flow rates from 0.18 to 1.8 kg/hr of nitrogen. For LH$_2$ tests, inlet pressures ranged from 186 to 448 kPa, inlet temperatures from 19 to 25.5 K, outlet pressures from 17.2 to 418.5 kPa, outlet temperatures from 15.5 to 25.5 K, and flow rates from 0.007 to 0.44 kg/hr of LH$_2$.

Visco Jets were originally designed as a miniature hydraulic flow component using the multiple orifice concept to induce a pressure drop in a line. The flow path for this device includes many orifices in series containing spin chambers that induce significant pressure drops. Figure 4 shows a detail of one of the several plates stacked in a Visco Jet, and the flow path.
The advantage of this design results from having multiple larger holes instead of a single smaller orifice. The design provides the same pressure drop as a smaller single orifice with a much larger flow. The larger holes in the Visco Jet reduce the possibility of clogging due to solid contaminants in the line. The onset of cavitation is also minimized by the reduced velocity in the jet due to the larger size holes. The resistance to flow in Visco Jets is measured in liquid ohms – or “Lohm”, a term coined by the manufacturer. This term is included in an equation that predicts single phase liquid flow rates for many fluids\textsuperscript{21}. The form of the equation is:

\[
m = \frac{10000}{\text{Lohm}} (\Delta P * S)^{0.5}
\]  

The Visco Jet multiple orifice design inherently reduces the onset of cavitation with hydraulic fluids. However, with cryogens stored at or near saturated conditions, it is inevitable that some flashing will occur, leading to a reduction in flow. Papell’s work resulted in an empirical factor to correct flow for cryogens based on the quality of the flow exiting the Visco Jet. The modified correlation was determined to be:
\[ m = k \frac{10000}{Lohm} \cdot (\Delta P \cdot S)^{0.5} \cdot (1 - X) \]  

(4)

where X is the fluid quality and k is an empirical constant. Exit flow quality was determined using isenthalpic expansion calculations:

\[ h_i = X h_g + (1 - X) h_l \]  

(5)

where \( h_i \) is inlet enthalpy, and \( h_g \) and \( h_l \) are saturated and liquid enthalpies at the outlet pressure, respectively. Reviewing data from Papell’s report hinted at the potential issue of metastable liquid flow at the Visco Jet orifice. His tests were conducted by establishing a fixed inlet pressure and temperature for the fluid, and varying the downstream pressure. As the downstream pressure varied, typically the liquid cryogen flow through the Visco Jet would remain isothermal until the downstream pressure dropped below saturation conditions. At this point, the fluid temperature would drop, indicating the existence of two-phase flow, with the downstream temperature essentially following the temperature curve for saturated fluid. However, in a few cases, data were shown below the saturation line in which no temperature drop occurred, indicating the absence of phase change. Figures 5 and 6 show the data with these points noted.
Figure 5 – LN₂ Visco Jet Data showing possible metastable liquid points

Figure 6 – LN₂ Visco Jet Data showing possible metastable liquid points
Further work with Visco Jets was performed by LeBar\textsuperscript{22} and presented results of Visco Jet tests in liquid hydrogen. Tests were conducted on Visco Jets with Lohm ratings from 1,600 to 243,000 Lohm. LeBar concluded that flow rates from Visco Jets may vary considerably from predictions, and appears to be configuration dependent. No data was presented on fluid conditions downstream of the Visco Jets.

Jurns and Lekki\textsuperscript{23} reported in 2006 on clogging of Joule-Thomson Devices in Liquid Hydrogen. This investigation focused on a phenomenon that was originally observed in some of Papell’s 1992 Visco Jet tests. It was discovered that Joule-Thomson devices became clogged when transferring liquid hydrogen, operating within a temperature range from 20.5 to 24.5 K. Blockage did not exist under all test conditions, but was found to be sensitive to the inlet temperature of the LH\textsubscript{2}. It was proposed that the clogging was due to trace amounts of neon in the LH\textsubscript{2} supply\textsuperscript{24}. Neon freezes at 24.5 K at one atmosphere pressure, and it was postulated that between 20.5 and 24.5K, the neon existed in a metastable supercooled liquid state. When impacting the face of an orifice, liquid neon solidified and accumulated, blocking flow over time. The test program attempted to obtain visual evidence of accretion of neon in the orifice. Tests were performed with LH\textsubscript{2}, and obtained similar results to the 1992 tests.

Baidakov and Skripov\textsuperscript{6} conducted experimental work in 1992 with a number of cryogens, including hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, neon, argon, and methane. They investigated metastability by evaluating superheated liquids. Cryogenic liquids are readily superheated because they contain little dissolved gas or suspended solids (possible
nucleation sites). The focus of this work was to try and address the concern of eliminating the super heat in superheated liquids that might cause large hydraulic shock (explosive boiling). Their studies were predicated on the fact that in the absence of other factors initiating phase transition, homogenous nucleation defines the upper limit of the metastable state. Experimental investigations were carried out to compare with theory. Their results showed good agreement with theory, and showed significant excursion into the metastable region for cryogens. Table I shows results from some of their tests.

Table I – Maximum superheat temperature achieved for metastable cryogens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluid</th>
<th>Saturation Temperature (K)</th>
<th>Maximum Superheat Temperature Achieved (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implication of this work for metastable superheated fluids in space flight applications was further investigated and reported by Hasan et al\textsuperscript{26} in 1993.

Hasan\textsuperscript{26} reported in 1993 on a space flight experiment using Freon 113 as a surrogate fluid to study explosive boiling in a microgravity environment. They determined that for very low heat fluxes (0.2 to 1.2 kW/m\textsuperscript{2}), a high degree of liquid superheat can be sustained for a long duration in microgravity. The unique issues relating to pressure control in microgravity have to do with the liquid-vapor interface. In a microgravity environment, surface tension forces tend to dominate in a fluid, resulting in (for a wetting
fluid) liquid wetting the surface of a container, with the liquid-vapor interface located in the middle of the fluid. This presents a unique thermal problem, as for a partially full tank, there may not be direct contact between the tank wall and the vapor region. Heat transfer from the tank wall is transferred directly to the liquid and then to the vapor. As a consequence, the liquid may end up superheated. A great enough degree of super heat could result in explosive boiling, and significant pressure rise in the container. Like Baidakov and Skripov’s work, this investigation deals not with subcooled liquid, but with superheated liquid. As such, the relation to the present work is not directly applicable.

However, Hasan does make several relevant points. First of all, the presence of a superheated cryogen is more likely in a microgravity environment (with possibly significant negative impact on container pressure in the case of explosive boiling).

Secondly, even relatively small heat fluxes can result in superheated liquid due to the location of the vapor ullage. These observations point to the importance of understanding the nuances of cryogenic fluid thermal control in space. Hopefully, our work will provide additional insight into how to best design thermal control systems to deal with these issues.

Simoneau\textsuperscript{27} conducted studies on the maximum two phase flow rates of sub-cooled nitrogen through a sharp edged orifice. This work evaluated flow through an orifice with sub-cooled inlet and two phase exit conditions. Fluid conditions were well below critical values (95 < T < 130K, 800 < P < 6750 kPa). Tests varied downstream pressure and evaluated the asymptotic behaviors of flow rates as minimum back pressures were approached. They showed that as back pressures were lowered below saturated pressure;
orifice exit temperatures decreased and corresponded to saturation temperatures for that pressure. Of course, this is what one would typically expect, and agrees by in large with Visco Jet data from Papell. Simoneau states that some others\textsuperscript{28,29} postulated that no vaporization occurs right at the orifice, but flow passes through as metastable liquid, and flashes downstream. Simoneau’s work left it at this, and did not examine extensively downstream conditions. However, one interesting conclusion is that if the difference between saturation pressure and orifice downstream pressure is large enough, the metastable jet vaporizes sufficiently close to the orifice to interfere with the flow and reduce the flow coefficient. This conclusion is consistent with Baidakov & Skripov’s\textsuperscript{6} assertion that “the depth of penetration ... depends on the intensity of process”. It is also consistent with Papell’s\textsuperscript{2} observation of decreased flow through a Visco Jet when downstream conditions were two phase.

2.2 Work done near critical state
Simoneau, Hendricks and Ehlers\textsuperscript{30} also conducted additional research with liquid nitrogen choked flow, with the emphasis on critical region (pressures up to 9650 kPa and temperatures from 88 – 279 K). This work is not directly applicable to the present work, as the present work deals with fluids much closer to saturation conditions. However, their conclusions do mention sub-cooled and saturated liquids and refer to Henry, Grolmes and Fauske\textsuperscript{31} for treatment of LN\textsubscript{2} in this region.

Henry, Grolmes and Fauske\textsuperscript{31} discuss flow of saturated and subcooled liquids through nozzles and orifices, and report some results for LN\textsubscript{2} flow for fluid close to the critical
state. Their discussion provides some relationships for calculating flow, and asserts that saturated or subcooled liquids discharging through a sharp-edged orifice behave in a completely metastable manner. Again, they do not provide any detail of the fluid downstream conditions, but limit their discussion to flow rates.

Although flows through orifices near the critical state is not directly applicable to this work, it should be mentioned that recently proposed architectures for future space flight systems are considering storing cryogenic propellants at pressures as high as 2,400 kPa, and investigating the possibility of metastable liquid flows through J-T devices at these conditions could provide useful data for designers.

It is evident from the literature and research conducted in cryogens that there is a solid foundation of both analytical and experimental treatment of sub-cooled flow of cryogens through an orifice. However, much of the theory and work to date focuses not so much on downstream conditions as on matters of flow rate, choked flow for two phase fluids, and has only a passing nod to metastability downstream. Also, much of the work is based on idealized conditions and test sections, as opposed to real world systems. The present work, although not as theoretically rigorous, attempts to examine more complicated Joule-Thomson geometries (i.e. – multiple orifice Visco Jets), with the hope of providing some realistic valuable data for designers.
CHAPTER III

POTENTIAL PROBLEMS – 2 phase transition, choking, clogging

The amount of heat that can be removed from a system using a J-T device depends not only on the pressure drop and resultant temperature drop across the device, but also on the mass flow through the device. For example, considering either of the two TVS systems shown in Figure 3, the total amount of heat being removed from the system is:

\[ Q = \dot{m} c_p \Delta T \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

Where

\( \dot{m} \) = mass flow rate of cooled fluid venting

\( c_p \) = Heat capacity of venting fluid

\( \Delta T \) = Temperature difference between bulk liquid and J-T cooled fluid in vent line

Obviously, if the mass flow of venting fluid is decreased, the total amount of heat that can be rejected from the system also decreases. Mass flow through the J-T device can be limited by choking through the orifice. Flow downstream of the device may be limited by critical two-phase flow conditions. Simoneau examined the maximum flow rate of liquid nitrogen through a sharp edged orifice. They referenced earlier work by Benjamin
and Miller\textsuperscript{28} and Bailey\textsuperscript{29} that postulated that no vaporization occurs at the orifice, but that flow passes through as a liquid in a metastable state and flashes downstream. Simoneau’s work suggested that the flow of single phase liquid passing through a sharp edged orifice reaches a limit as downstream pressure decreases due to a metastable jet of liquid vaporizing sufficiently close to the orifice to interfere with flow. Also, for liquid hydrogen, it has been shown that a J-T orifice can become clogged under certain conditions, presumably due to metastable impurities in the liquid which solidify out in the orifice\textsuperscript{23}. 
CHAPTER IV
PROPOSED WORK FOR THIS EFFORT

It has been established that there is a solid foundation of both analytical and experimental treatment of sub-cooled flow of cryogens through an orifice. However, much of the theory and work to date focuses not so much on downstream conditions as on matters of flow rate, choked flow for two phase fluids, with limited emphasis on metastability downstream of the orifice. Also, much of the work is based on idealized conditions and test sections, as opposed to real world systems. The present work attempts to examine more complicated Joule-Thomson geometries (i.e. – multiple orifice Visco Jets) with particular emphasis on characterizing performance for these J-T devices, examining behavior around the two phase transition line, and determining the practical stability limits for metastable cryogenic liquids with comparison to their spinodal conditions.

4.1 J-T Effect
For a Joule-Thomson device to perform effectively in a cryogenic fluid thermal management system, pressure drop across the device must result in expansion into the two phase region. Otherwise, there will be no accompanying temperature drop. This expansion of the cryogenic fluid into the two phase region and its accompanying
temperature drop provides the differential temperature between the expanded fluid and the surrounding environment to drive heat rejection from the system. In most sub-critical cryogenic fluid systems, it is desirable to store the cryogen in a subcooled state for a number of reasons. Maintaining the liquid sub-cooled allows it to absorb heat from the environment without boiling and a resulting in undesirable pressure rise. Sub-cooled liquid is also necessary to provide adequate net positive suction pressure (NPSP) to turbo-pumps feeding rocket engines. Insufficient NPSP would result in pump cavitation, resulting not only in a decrease in engine performance, but also possibly catastrophic damage to turbo-machinery. Sub-cooling may be accomplished by several means, but for space based cryogenic systems is typically done by pressurizing the ullage volume of a container with GHe. This results in the tank vapor volume consisting of a mixture of helium and vapor phase fluid from the stored cryogen. The partial pressure of the cryogen is less than the total pressure in the tank, allowing the cryogen to absorb heat with a resulting temperature rise before it would boil. Take for example LCH$_4$. A volume of LCH$_4$ is stored under its own vapor pressure at 103.4 kPa has a saturation temperature of 111.9 K. If the volume were then pressurized to 137.9 kPa with GHe, the liquid would initially remain at its saturation temperature of 111.9 K. However, as the saturation temperature of LCH$_4$ at 137.9 kPa is 115.5 K, the LCH$_4$ could absorb additional heat without boiling until its temperature increased by 3.7 K to 115.5 K. As is demonstrated, pressurizing a tank with GHe provides a good short term solution for subcooling stored cryogens. However, heat leaking into the system will eventually result in pressure rise. This pressure rise could be eliminated by venting off some of the vapor. The downside of this is that venting vapor would also vent off some of the GHe, resulting
in a lower partial pressure of helium in the vapor space to suppress boiling. A solution to this problem of venting vapor is to utilize a TVS system as described in section 1.2.

One operational issue that arises in the function of the TVS system is that the cryogenic liquid typically enters the Joule-Thomson device sub-cooled, due to GHe pressurant. As sub-cooled cryogen flows through the Joule-Thomson device, the pressure drop is isenthalpic until it crosses the two phase line. Further drop in pressure should result in phase change, and a resultant drop in temperature. Based on the downstream pressure, the temperature is predicted based on standard thermodynamic tables. Note for example the pressure versus enthalpy chart shown in Figure 7. LCH$_4$ with a temperature of 111.1 K follows a line of constant enthalpy as the pressure is reduced from 275 kPa, crossing the liquid to vapor transition line at approximately 97 kPa. With further reduction in pressure, the fluid would follow the saturation line. For example in Figure 7, dropping the pressure down to 34.6 kPa would result in a fluid temperature of 100.0 K.
4.2 Metastable Cryogenic Liquids

It is widely known and described in the literature\textsuperscript{6} that liquids can be both cooled below their freezing temperatures without solidifying (supercooled liquid), and heated above their boiling point without vaporizing (superheated liquid). In both of these cases, the fluid remains homogenous beyond the phase equilibrium line. Fluids that remain homogenous in this region are referred to as metastable. The limit beyond which fluids can no longer remain homogenous is called the spinodal limit. For subcritical fluids, the spinodal curve represents the stability boundary of the single phase state in the two phase region. This limit can be described in terms of an isotherm as it passes through local maxima and minima defined by
\[
\left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial v} \right)_{\text{cons} \tan \text{IT}} = 0
\]  

(7)

This theoretical boundary cannot be approached absolutely by real fluids due to molecular level fluctuations in the fluid\(^3\). Nevertheless, there have been a large number of experiments conducted\(^6\) that point to the existence of this spinodal line.

The location of the spinodal curve is of particular importance to us in relation to the function of a TVS. In a TVS, liquid is passed through a J-T device where is it expanded to a lower pressure. Thermodynamically, the liquid follows an isothermal path until it reaches the J-T device. As it expands, the fluid follows the phase equilibrium line until it reaches the saturation temperature at the downstream pressure, resulting in a temperature drop and subsequent phase change as previously described (refer to Figure 7).

Phase change is critical to the function of the J-T device, as without it there would be no temperature drop and consequently no cooling provided to the cryogenic system. If indeed the fluid passing through a J-T device does not follow the saturation curve to a lower temperature as pressure drops, but remains as a single phase metastable fluid, the TVS will not function as required. The spinodal line as shown in Figure 8 therefore represents the potential “worst case” pressure that a metastable fluid could drop to without phase change and temperature drop.
Figure 8 – Typical real fluid isotherm showing saturated liquid and spinodal lines

Empirical relationships\(^3,6\) have been developed to estimate the spinodal line. These relationships, although approximate, provide a reasonably accurate estimate of the spinodal.

\[
p_{sp} = p_{sat} - \frac{C \sigma^{1.5}}{(k_B T)^{0.5} \left(1 - \frac{P_{v, sat}}{P_{sat}}\right)}
\]  

(8)

The constant “C” has several reported values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baonza et al(^{25})</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lienhard et al(^4)</td>
<td>1.2064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saturation pressure and spinodal pressure versus specific volume are plotted for methane and oxygen in Figures 9 and 10. Both plots show the spinodal pressure dropping
precipitously below zero as the specific volume decreases. The negative spinodal pressures indicate that the fluid is actually under tension.

![Saturation Pressure, Spinodal Pressure vs. Specific Volume, CH4](image)

**Figure 9 – Saturation and Spinodal Pressure vs. Specific Volume for Methane**
Figure 10 – Saturation and Spinodal Pressure vs. Specific Volume for Oxygen

Practically speaking, the spinodal limit is only approached experimentally by use of extremely sensitive experimental hardware, and not typical flight hardware. However, for real systems, it is still important to determine if fluid traverses into the metastable region, and if so, to what extent. Also, it is of interest to determine if the phenomena might depend on either the type of J-T device, or possibly the rate of the process.
CHAPTER V
EXPERIMENTAL FACILITIES

5.1 Low pressure LCH$_4$ facility

Low pressure LCH$_4$ Visco Jet testing was performed at the CCL-7 cryogenic test facility at the NASA Glenn Research Center Creek Road Complex in Cleveland, Ohio$^7$. This test facility specializes as a low-cost small scale screening facility for concept and component testing. In addition to component screening, the facility can perform propellant transfer as well as vent flow tests. CCL-7 safely handles 1135 L of LH$_2$ and LN$_2$, 455 L of LCH$_4$, and 909 L of LO$_2$. GH$_2$, GO$_2$, GHe and GN$_2$ are available on-site. Figure 11 shows a simplified schematic diagram of the CCL-7 test facility.
5.1.1 Capabilities/capacities

CCL-7 testing can be performed in either a Supply or Receiver dewar at the facility; although the supply dewar is generally used for propellant conditioning. The Supply dewar is a vertical cylinder with a 55.9 cm diameter and 135.9 cm height. It has a 320 L internal volume and an operating pressure of 276 kPa. An instrument rake equipped with silicon diodes provides temperature measurements and liquid level indication.

Three interchangeable Receiver dewars are available at CCL-7. They all have a smaller liquid volume than the Supply dewar. The receiver dewars all have a common stationary lid. Fluid supply and vent as well as instrumentation pass through this stationary lid. The
diameter of the Receiver dewars is 55.9 cm. The bodies of these test dewars are raised and lowered on a lift and secured with an o-ring seal to a flanged lid by 12 bolts. The removable Receiver dewar allows for ready access to the test hardware with a minimum of down time between hardware re-configuration. All Receiver dewars are vacuum jacketed. An instrument rake equipped with silicon diodes provides temperature measurements and liquid level indication for the dewars. The first dewar has the highest working pressure, 372 kPa. Its overall length is 81.3 cm, with a resulting internal volume of 158.5 L. The second tank is 106.7 cm long and has an internal volume of 226.5 L. A window in the sidewall is located 54.6 cm from the bottom of the dewar. It has a working pressure of 172.4 kPa and 3 pressure taps in the bottom of the dewar. The third Receiver dewar is identical to the second dewar except the window in the sidewall is 76.2 cm from the bottom. The dewars with sidewall windows have been used to view tank internal hardware. Light from a fiber optic light source is supplied through the window on the dewar lid and a camera is available to record images inside the receiver dewar through the window.

Cryogen is transferred to the test facility through a 19 mm diameter vacuum jacketed hose and piping from a roadable dewar parked at the test cell. Cryogens are transferred into the Supply dewar, and from there to the Receiver dewar. The Supply and Receiver dewars can vent either directly to atmosphere or through a series of air ejectors. The air ejectors are venturi devices that use compressed air as a motive fluid to create suction in the dewar vent piping. The ejectors allow the dewars to operate at a minimum pressure of approximately 17.2 kPa. The Supply dewar vent valve is an open loop proportional valve
that can be set at 0 – 100% open. The Receiver dewar vent valve is operated either open loop, or with a PID loop in the PLC control system, and can control backpressure in the Receiver dewar to within ±0.34 kPa. A separate vent line with an open loop proportional valve is available for test articles installed inside the Receiver dewar. Gasses evolved during testing from the dewars and test articles can vent directly to atmosphere, or to a series of four mass flow meters. The mass flow meters have a combined range of 0 – 24000 SLPH. Test articles installed inside the receiver tank also have an independently controlled pressurization system for added flexibility.

5.1.2 Control

A PLC with a Wonderware© HMI (Human Machine Interface) controls the facility. Interlocks, alarms and shutdowns are used to protect the research hardware and the facility and operator controlled open-loop processes are used to provide flexibility. The control system is independent from the data system but data can be shared between the two systems through standard communication protocols.

Test operations are conducted from a remote control room. Checkout can either be performed locally at the facility or in an interconnect room located at a remote building. The test area has been designed to NEC Class 1, Division 2, Group B and is suitable for propellant testing. Components including the data acquisition hardware, the PLC and flow meters that are not rated for the environment are installed inside purged/pressurized cabinets per NEC code.
5.1.3 Instrumentation

CCL-7 has a state of the art LabVIEW\textsuperscript{©} based data collection system. Up to 320 channels of data at can be collected at a nominal rate of 1 Hz. Many of the facility channels are pre-configured for standard instruments including thermocouples, pressure transducers, and silicon diodes. Modular jack-type field connections at instrument cabinet facilitate installation and checkout of research hardware.

5.2 Higher pressure LO\textsubscript{2} facility

NASA Glenn Research Center also has a cryogenic test facility named SMiRF (Small Multipurpose Research Facility)\textsuperscript{7}. This facility provides the ability to simulate space, high altitudes and launch pressure environments, to conduct calorimetric tests on prototype insulation systems and to safely handle gaseous and cryogenic propellants. Operations at this facility have an established track record of safely handling 5,678 L LH\textsubscript{2} and 7,571 L of LN\textsubscript{2} simultaneously. Recent augmentations to this facility have resulted in the capability to test with LO\textsubscript{2} and LN\textsubscript{2} at pressures up to 1724 kPa. Gaseous hydrogen (GH\textsubscript{2}), gaseous oxygen (GO\textsubscript{2}), gaseous helium (GHe) and gaseous nitrogen (GN\textsubscript{2}) are also available on-site. Visco Jet tests as part of a larger cryogenic research program\textsuperscript{33} were conducted in this facility.

5.2.1 Capabilities/capacities

The test facility consists of an interconnect room (used for instrument and control terminations and check out), a shop area (for build up and bench work), and the test cell. The test cell has been designed to National Electric Code (NEC) Class 1, Division 2,
Group B and is suitable for propellant testing. The interconnect room and shop area are pressurized during tests to meet NEC requirements.

The center of the SMiRF test cell is a cylindrical space simulation vacuum chamber. The 7.45 m$^3$ vacuum chamber shown in Figures 12 and 13 accommodates test articles as large as 183 cm in diameter and 229 cm high. The SMiRF vacuum system includes mechanical and diffusion vacuum pumps, and can maintain a vacuum environment of 6.7 x 10$^{-4}$ Pa in the chamber. The vacuum system also allows the chamber to be evacuated to simulate a launch vehicle (i.e. - the Space Shuttle) ascent pressure profile (from atmospheric pressure to 1.33 Pa in 2 minutes). Chamber pressure can be maintained at intermediate values as required by research programs. A programmable thermal shroud is available for use at the facility. The shroud limits the dimensions of the test article to a maximum diameter of 112 cm. The shroud can simulate lunar or Martian diurnal temperature profiles and operate over a temperature range of 110 to 360 K with ramping capabilities of 0.1 K per minute over the entire range. Gas composition in the vacuum chamber is continuously monitored with a mass spectrometer based residual gas analyzer that detects species in the 0-200 amu range.
Figure 12 – Bottom view of SMIRF vacuum chamber

Figure 13 – Top view of vacuum chamber
Test articles are suspended from the vacuum chamber lid, and then placed inside the vacuum chamber when the lid is attached to the chamber. Figure 14 shows the test tank used for these tests suspended from the vacuum chamber lid during build up. This tank was 122 cm diameter, 160 cm overall height 304 stainless steel pressure vessel with a maximum working pressure of 1724 kPa. All electrical and fluid connections pass through the lid of the vacuum chamber as shown in Figure 13. The facility supply/vent systems limit the maximum working pressure of test articles in the vacuum chamber to 1965 kPa. Mechanical vacuum pumps can also provide sub-atmospheric pressure conditions to the research hardware located inside the vacuum chamber if required, as well as providing backing for the SMiRF chamber diffusion pumps.
The facility boasts four independently controllable cryogenic liquid fill/drain lines and three independent vent systems. The fill systems consist of 19 mm main supply line that branches into four independent fill paths. In the past, the independent fill lines have been used to fill multiple tanks within the vacuum chamber with different liquid cryogens. The 51 mm diameter main vent is the most commonly used vent system. It can either vent directly to the atmosphere or the backpressure of the control research hardware to
within ±0.13 kPa by modulating a series of five parallel control valves. One of five mass flow meters with a range of 0.57 to 90,600 Standard Liters per Hour (SLPH) can measure gas vent rate. The flow meters are typically used to establish baseline heat flow into the test articles installed in the vacuum chamber by measuring boil-off in the test article. A secondary 25 mm diameter vent system can be controlled to within 1.4 kPa of the set point or directly vented. A differential pressure controller maintains pressure levels in the main and secondary vents. The controller is referenced to a gas volume in an isothermal bath. A tertiary vent system, also 25 mm diameter, can be controlled to within 6.9 kPa or vented directly to atmosphere. Figure 15 shows a simplified cryogenic supply and vent schematic.

Figure 15 – Simplified schematic of SMIRF facility supply and vent systems
5.2.2 Control

A programmable logic controller (PLC) with a Wonderware© HMI (Human Machine Interface) controls the facility. Interlocks, alarms and shutdowns protect the research hardware and the facility, and operator controlled open-loop processes provide testing flexibility. The control system is independent from the data system, but data can be shared between the two systems through standard communication protocols.

5.2.3 Instrumentation

SMiRF has a state-of-the-art LabVIEW© based data collection system. Up to 425 channels of data can be recorded at a nominal rate of 1 Hz. An additional 24 channels can be recorded at rates of 0.1 Hz. Many of the facility channels are pre-configured for standard instruments including thermocouples, pressure transducers, and silicon diode thermometers. Modular jack-type field connections at instrument cabinets located throughout the facility enable installation and checkout of research hardware.
CHAPTER VI
DESCRIPTION OF EXPERIMENT

6.1 LCH₄ tests

A series of tests with varying degrees of sub-cooling on the inlet side and various
downstream pressures was performed to determine how far below the saturation line the
flow through a Visco jet Joule-Thomson device might reach as a metastable superheated
liquid before transitioning to two phase with an accompanying temperature drop. These
tests were performed at the NASA Glenn Research Center CCL-7 cryogenic test facility
described in detail in section 7.1. The test facility was configured for LCH₄ testing. A
Visco Jet was installed in the CCL-7 Receiver dewar. The dewar was partially filled with
LCH₄ and conditioned to a certain temperature as determined by the test matrix shown in
Table II. LCH₄ flowed out of the dewar through the Visco Jet. Silicon diode temperature
sensors were located in the outflow line, upstream and downstream of the Visco Jet. A
schematic diagram of the test configuration is shown in Figure 16. Note that the Visco
Jet and temperature sensors were wrapped with insulation to prevent false temperature
readings from the bulk LCH₄. Liquid methane was transferred to the dewar through a 19
mm diameter vacuum jacketed hose and piping from a portable 450 L liquid methane
vacuum jacketed dewar.
6.2 Test conditions

Test conditions were established to assure that the LCH$_4$ would enter the Visco Jet as single phase liquid, and that the downstream pressure could be varied so as to allow the exiting fluid to cross the two phase transition line. The Visco Jet outlet pressure was controlled to be initially above the transition line, after which the downstream pressure was gradually reduced to a level below the transition pressure. Figure 17 is a plot of Visco Jet outlet pressure versus liquid enthalpy for LCH$_4$ between approximately 34.5 and 206.8 kPa. Lines of constant temperature are shown for a number of isotherms between 97 and 122 K. Table II shows the specific conditions for the tests performed.
Figure 17 – Plot of pressure vs. liquid enthalpy for LCH₄

Table II - Test Matrix for determining minimum pressure of metastable subcooled liquid methane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visco Jet</th>
<th>Lohm Rating</th>
<th>Tank Pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>2 Phase transition Press (kPa)</th>
<th>Minimum Downstream Press (kPa)</th>
<th>Bulk Fluid Temp. (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VXL A 2500 820D</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VXL A 2500 820D</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>112.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Test procedure

For the LCH₄ Visco Jet testing, the Visco Jet Joule-Thomson device was installed in an outflow line in the Receiver dewar as shown in Figure 16. The dewar was filled with LCH₄ approximately 31.75 cm deep. Liquid level was measured by means of a 0-7.5 kPa differential pressure transducer. This amount of liquid was sufficient to submerge the Visco Jet. The bottom of the inlet line was located approximately 10 cm above the
bottom of the dewar. After fill was complete, the temperature of the bulk LCH₄ was noted. Two series of tests were performed; the first series of test with the LCH₄ saturated close to the normal boiling point (NBP). The second series of test was performed with LCH₄ subcooled below the NBP. For the first series of tests, the LCH₄ was allowed to saturate at NBP conditions by simply venting the dewar to atmospheric pressure. This resulted in bulk LCH₄ temperature of approximately 112.2 K. For the second series of tests, the LCH₄ was subcooled by reducing the pressure in the dewar to approximately 53.8 kPa and allowing the liquid to boil. The pressure was reduced in the dewar by means of the test facility ejector system described in detail in section 5.1.1. For the subcooled tests, the bulk LCH₄ temperature was reduced to approximately 105 K. For both tests, once the desired LCH₄ temperature was attained, the dewar was then pressurized to between 137.9 and 151.7 kPa with GHe. A small constant bleed of GHe was fed to the dewar, and the pressure maintained by means of a proportional vent valve operated with a PID loop controller. The desired dewar pressure was input to the controller, and the vent valve modulated automatically to maintain dewar pressure to within ± 0.34 kPa of the set point.

Once the desired fluid conditions were attained and the dewar pressurized, flow was initiated through the Visco Jet. Liquid flowed through the Visco Jet from the bulk LCH₄ and then out of the dewar, through a heat exchanger which vaporized and warmed the LCH₄, through a proportional valve, a mass flow meter, and finally out the ejector to atmosphere. Figure 18 shows a simplified schematic of the flow path of methane. The pressure on the downstream side of the Visco Jet was varied by modulating the control
valve between 0 – 100% open while maintaining the flow to the ejector. Using this operating scenario, the Visco Jet downstream pressure could be varied between 56.5 and 120.6 kPa.

![Diagram of Visco Jet system]

**Figure 18 – Visco Jet outflow line simplified schematic diagram**

Table III shows the actual test conditions attained for the two test series.

**Table III – LCH₄ Visco Jet test conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sub-cooled LCH₄</th>
<th>NBP LCH₄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8,200 Lohm Visco Jet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewar ullage pressure (kPa)</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>151.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk LCH₄ temperature (K)</td>
<td>105.7 – 106.0</td>
<td>112.9 – 113.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visco Jet inlet temperature (K)</td>
<td>105.7 – 106.0</td>
<td>112.9 – 113.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visco Jet outlet Temperature (K)</td>
<td>105.7 – 106.0</td>
<td>106.5 – 112.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visco Jet outlet pressure (kPa)</td>
<td>57.9 – 97.2</td>
<td>60.0 – 126.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Rate (slpm)</td>
<td>0-33</td>
<td>11 - 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 LO$_2$ tests

A second series of tests with varying degrees of sub-cooling on the inlet side and constant downstream pressures was performed to determine how far below the saturation line the flow through a Visco Jet Joule-Thomson device would persist as a metastable superheated liquid before transitioning to two phase with an accompanying temperature drop. These tests were performed at the NASA Glenn Research Center SMiRF cryogenic test facility described in detail in section 5.2. The test facility was configured for LO$_2$ testing. Six Visco Jets with a range of Lohm ratings were installed in the 1.4 m$^3$ SMiRF test tank. The dewar was partially filled with LO$_2$ and conditioned to a certain temperature per the test matrix shown in Table IV. LO$_2$ flowed out of the test tank through the Visco Jets. Silicon diode temperature sensors were located in the outflow lines, upstream and downstream of the Visco Jets. A schematic diagram of the test configuration is shown in Figure 19. Note that unlike previous LCH$_4$ tests at CCL-7, Visco Jet and temperature sensors were not wrapped with insulation to prevent false temperature readings from the bulk LO$_2$. Liquid oxygen was transferred to the test tank through 25 mm diameter vacuum jacketed piping from a portable 13,600 L LO$_2$ vacuum jacketed trailer.
Test conditions were established to assure that the LO$_2$ would enter the Visco Jet as single phase liquid. As the SMIRF test tank had a higher working pressure, tests could be performed with a wider range of conditions. To establish liquid conditions, the test tank was filled approximately 30% to cover the Visco Jets while venting the tank to atmosphere. This resulted in LO$_2$ saturated at close to NBP conditions. Unlike CCL-7, the facility was not configured to allow us to subcool the liquid below atmospheric pressure. The tank was pressurized with gaseous helium to the pressures shown in Table IV. The liquid would either remain close to its NBP temperature, or could be warmed up by maintaining tank pressure and bubbling warm gaseous oxygen into the liquid. The
piping downstream of the Visco Jets vented to atmosphere through open/close isolation valves. With this configuration, the downstream pressure could not be varied as was done with the proportional valve in the CCL-7 LCH4 test series. That is, the downstream pressure would drop below the two phase transition line, but could not be brought through the transition line in a controlled manner. Figure 20 is a plot of pressure versus liquid enthalpy for LO2 between approximately 103.4 and 1379 kPa. Lines of constant temperature are shown for a number of isotherms between 86.1 and 122.2 K. Table IV shows the specific conditions for the tests performed.

![Pressure vs. Enthalpy, Oxygen](image)

**Figure 20 – Plot of pressure vs. liquid enthalpy for LO2**
Table IV - Test Matrix for determining minimum pressure of metastable subcooled liquid oxygen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visco Jet</th>
<th>Lohm Rating</th>
<th>Tank Pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>2-phase transition pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>Minimum Downstream Pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>Bulk Fluid Temp. (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VDLA 4316 135T</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEVB 1815 313K</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEVB 1825 102K</td>
<td>102000</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>144.1</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDCB 1845 112H</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VXLA 2500 330D</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEVB 1825 102K</td>
<td>102000</td>
<td>835.6</td>
<td>786.7</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>115.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VXLA 2500 330D</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>835.0</td>
<td>763.9</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>115.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDLA 4316 135T</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>835.0</td>
<td>793.6</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>115.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEVB 1815 313K</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>834.3</td>
<td>804.6</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>116.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDCB 1845 112H</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>832.9</td>
<td>788.1</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>115.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VXLA 2500 680L</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>832.9</td>
<td>790.8</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>115.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDLA 4316 135T</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>836.3</td>
<td>804.6</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>116.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDCB 1845 112H</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>835.6</td>
<td>790.1</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>115.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDCB 1845 112H</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEVB 1815 313K</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6 Test procedure

For the LO₂ Visco Jet testing, the Visco Jet Joule-Thomson devices were installed in an outflow line in the SMIRF test tank as shown in Figure 21. The test tank was filled with LO₂ approximately 91 cm deep. Liquid level was measured by means of a load cell system that weighed the amount of LO₂ in the tank. This amount of liquid was sufficient to submerge the Visco Jets. The Visco Jets themselves were located approximately 61 cm above the bottom of the test tank. The bottom of the inlet lines for each Visco Jet was located approximately 20 cm above the bottom of the test tank. After fill was complete, the temperature of the bulk LO₂ was noted. Two series of tests were performed; the first series of test with the LO₂ temperature approximately 93.3 K (saturated temperature for 137.9 kPa liquid). The second series of test was performed with LO₂ temperature
approximately 115.5 K (saturated temperature for 827.4 kPa liquid). For the first series of tests, the LO₂ temperature was attained by maintaining test tank pressure at 137.9 kPa while filling. For the second series of tests, the LO₂ was filled into the test tank at approximately atmospheric pressure. The tank vent system was set at 827.4 kPa which was maintained with a proportional valve operating with a PID loop that sensed test tank pressure. Warm gaseous oxygen was bubbled into the LO₂ to warm it up to approximately 115.5 K. For both tests, once the desired LO₂ temperature was attained, the dewar pressure was maintained by the proportional vent valve operating on a PID loop with the test tank pressure as the input to the PID control. If tank pressure dropped below the set point, GHe was used to re-pressurize the test tank.

Once the desired fluid conditions were attained and the dewar pressurized, flow was initiated through the Visco Jet. As with the LCH₄ tests, liquid flowed through the Visco Jet from the bulk LO₂ and then out of the test tank, through a heat exchanger which vaporized and warmed the LO₂, through an isolation valve, a mass flow meter, and finally out to atmosphere. As mentioned previously, the SMIRF facility did not include an ejector, so the Visco Jet outlet pressure could not be lower than atmospheric pressure. Figure 21 shows a simplified schematic of the flow path of oxygen. The downstream side of the Visco Jet was vented through an on/off valve. As the valve could not be modulated as in the LCH₄ tests, the outlet pressure immediately dropped to approximately 103.4 kPa when it was opened.
Figure 21 – Simplified Schematic of Visco Jets in SMIRF Test Tank
CHAPTER VII

ANALYTICAL DISCUSSION

It has been established\textsuperscript{3-6} that cryogenic fluids can exist as metastable fluids to some extent below the saturation line. That is, following an isothermal line for decreasing pressure, the fluid may cross the two phase transition line and continue along an isothermal line as a single phase liquid until it reaches its theoretical limit at the liquid spinodal line. This liquid spinodal curve has been described previously in section 4.3, equation (8).

Consider fluid passing through the saturation curve along an isothermal path as shown in Figure 22. If point (A) is the beginning state, the path followed by the liquid crosses the saturation line at point (B). It continues to follow the curve to its theoretical minimum metastable liquid state at point (C), and follows on through points (D) and (E). It crosses the saturated vapor curve at (F), and exists as a stable vapor from points (F) to (G). The area of interest is the shape of the curve from (A) to (G). It is desired to follow the line from the saturated liquid point (B) to some practical lower limit (C). Point (C) is presumably some value significantly closer to the saturated liquid line than the metastable liquid limit (D). This curve takes the form of a cubic equation. There have been a number of methods proposed for determining its shape and where the minimum crosses
the spinodal line. These methods rely on a combination of existing data in the stable regime, some limited data available in the metastable regime, and the following additional constraints:

- Match known isotherms of fluid in the stable regime
- Must satisfy Maxwell-Gibbs requirement that integral \( \int_{\text{sat. liquid}}^{\text{sat. vapor}} v dp = 0 \)
- Must define spinodal line correctly (i.e. – the minimum stability point fits equation (8))

Figure 22 – P-V curve for a typical fluid showing saturation curve, spinodal curve and proposed practical lower metastable limit.

There are several references that discuss how this line can be defined. The Himpan cubic equation of state represents the essential features of a correct equation of state and provides a good fit to real fluid data in the stable regimes. The Himpan equation is
shown in equation (9).

\[ p = \frac{RT}{(v - \beta)} - \frac{\gamma}{(v - \alpha)(v - \delta)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

The constants \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \) and \( \delta \) are empirical constants and \( v \) is the molar specific volume.

These constants could be determined based on the criteria listed above and specific data from the metastable subcooled regime. Unfortunately, to date, literature searches have not uncovered values for these constants for the fluids and conditions (LO\(_2\) & LCH\(_4\)). Annamali\(^{35}\) also addresses this problem and has proposed the following equation to estimate the curve in the metastable region:

\[ p = \frac{RT}{(v - \beta)} - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{T} v^* (v - \beta)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (10)

where \( \alpha \), and \( \beta \) are empirical constants, and \( v \) is specific volume.

Several others\(^{36,37}\) have had good success fitting cubic equations to predict surface tension and spinodal limits for individual isotherms in the metastable region. These equations may be useful in analyzing data from the experiments conducted as part of the present study.

The curves described by these equations predict the behavior of single phase fluids in the metastable region. In practical applications such as those found in typical cryogenic TVS systems, one would not expect to find a deep penetration of single phase fluids into the two phase region. However, data from the experiments conducted as part of the present study indicate that at least in some cases, there is penetration of single phase fluids into
the two phase region to some small extent. One might expect that an intermediate curve could be drawn between the saturation curve and the spinodal curve that would give the practical limits for metastable single phase fluids below the saturation line. It is likely that this curve would be influenced by the complexity of the J-T device. For example, a Visco Jet has multiple convoluted passages that the fluid would have to pass through during expansion. In comparison, a single orifice would provide a “cleaner” passage, and might more likely result in a deeper excursion below the saturation line.

For the tests conducted for the present study, Visco Jet J-T devices were utilized. Therefore, the data presented only represents conclusions that can be drawn from the specific configuration used in these tests.
CHAPTER VIII
EXPERIMENTAL TEST RESULTS

8.1 LCH₄ Tests

The general procedure for performing these tests has been outlined in section 6.3. The intent of these tests was to start with the Visco Jet outlet pressure greater than the saturation pressure of the bulk liquid methane. The outlet pressure would gradually be decreased to bring the outlet pressure through the saturation point for the bulk liquid. Data paid particular attention to was the outlet pressure and temperature. Presumably, as the pressure on the outlet of the Visco Jet decreased and passed through the pressure corresponding to the temperature of saturated liquid, further decreases in pressure would result in a corresponding decrease in temperature as explained in section 4.1. If the outlet temperature did not track with the outlet pressure but remained at or near the bulk liquid temperature, it could indicate that the liquid did not change state, but had remained as a metastable liquid. Therefore, to determine whether or not the outlet conditions indicated metastable liquid methane, the outlet temperature was compared to the temperature of saturated liquid based on outlet pressure.

Two different tests were performed in December 2006. The first test was performed with
warm LCH₄, with liquid temperature close to NBP conditions. The second test was performed with LCH₄ that was subcooled to approximately 105.3 K. A summary of the tests conducted is shown in Table V. Figure 23 plots inlet and outlet pressure of the methane as it flowed through the Visco Jet for the 112.9 K LCH₄ test. Figure 24 plots inlet and outlet temperature and outlet temperature corresponding to the outlet saturation pressure for methane as it flowed through the Visco Jet. Figures 25 and 26 show the same data for the 105.3 K subcooled liquid condition test.

### Table V – Test Results for LCH₄ Visco Jet Clogging Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data File</th>
<th>Visco Jet Lohm</th>
<th>LCH₄ condition</th>
<th>Bulk Liquid Temp (K)</th>
<th>Inlet Pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>Outlet Pressure (kPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCL7_12.20.06</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>saturated</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>60.6 – 124.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCL7_12.21.06</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>subcooled</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>52.4 – 97.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 23 – Dewar inlet and outlet pressures for NBP LCH₄ test

Figure 24 – Dewar inlet and outlet temperatures for NBP LCH₄ test
Figure 25 – Dewar inlet and outlet pressures for subcooled LCH<sub>4</sub> test

Figure 26 – Dewar inlet and outlet temperatures for subcooled LCH<sub>4</sub> test
For the NBP test, Figure 23 shows inlet pressure to the Visco Jet constant at approximately 151.7 kPa. The outlet pressure is initially sub-atmospheric, approximately 60.0 kPa. A valve in the outlet piping of the Visco Jet was throttled back, decreasing the flow, and increasing the outlet pressure to approximately 124.1 kPa. The outlet valve was then gradually opened, increasing the flow and decreasing the outlet pressure from 124.1 to 60.0 kPa (T=5500 to T=7900 seconds). It is noted that inlet temperature remains constant at approximately 112.8 K. The outlet temperature was initially about 106.1 K, which was consistent with the saturation temperature based on outlet pressure from T=4000 to T=5500. The outlet temperature was slightly warmer than the saturation temperature in this range (about 1 K), and one might conclude that this was metastable fluid. However, as the outlet fluid temperature was significantly less than the bulk fluid temperature upstream of the Visco Jet, it is unlikely that the fluid would have remained at some intermediate temperature between the bulk liquid and the downstream saturation temperature. It is much more likely that the outlet temperature fluid was tracking the saturation temperature and that the offset was due to either a temperature measurement or pressure measurement offset. At T=4500, the valve was throttled back. As flow decreased and outlet pressure increased, the temperature of the methane tracked closely with the saturation temperature, approaching the inlet fluid temperature at approximately T=6000. At T=5500, the valve was gradually opened up, decreasing outlet pressure and saturation temperature. At T=6500, the saturation temperature at the outlet dropped to the bulk liquid temperature. Between T=6500 and T=8000, the outlet temperature tracked the saturation temperature closely as before. That is – a fluid temperature at the
outlet of the Visco Jet that would indicate metastable conditions was not observed.

For the subcooled liquid test, Figure 25 shows inlet pressure to the Visco Jet constant at approximately 151.7 kPa from T=3000 to T=6500 and 137.9 kPa from T=6500 to T=13500 sec. The outlet pressure is initially sub-atmospheric, approximately 59 kPa. A valve in the outlet piping of the Visco Jet was throttled back, decreasing the flow, and increasing the outlet pressure to approximately 97 kPa from T=6000 to T=8000 sec. At T=8000, the outlet valve was then gradually opened, increasing the flow and decreasing the outlet pressure from 97 to 55 kPa at T=13500. It is noted in Figure 25 that the inlet temperature remains constant at approximately 105.5 K (subcooled liquid). The outlet temperature was initially about 106.1 K from T=3000 to T=6000, which was consistent with the bulk liquid temperature and the saturation temperature based on outlet pressure. The outlet temperature tracked well with the saturation temperature in this range. From T=6000 to T=8000, the valve gradually was throttled back. As flow decreased and outlet pressure increased, the saturation temperature based on outlet pressure increased accordingly, while the outlet temperature remained close to the bulk liquid temperature (approximately 106.1 K). At T=8000, the valve was gradually opened up, decreasing outlet pressure and saturation temperature. From T=8000 to T=12500, the saturation temperature dropped from 111.1 to 106.1 K, while the outlet temperature of the fluid remained approximately 106.1 K. In this range, the outlet pressure was still higher than the saturation pressure of the 106.1 K liquid, so one would expect no temperature drop. However, from T=12500 to T=13500, the outlet pressure continued to drop to a minimum of about 55 kPa, and the saturation temperature dropped correspondingly to 104 K.
However, it is noted that between $T=12500$ and $T=13500$, the Visco Jet outlet temperature remained above the corresponding saturation temperature. The expectation would be that the outlet temperature should track outlet saturation conditions, and drop to about 103.9 K. This observation is consistent with the existence of metastable warm liquid.

8.2 LO$_2$ Tests

The general procedure for performing these tests has been outlined in section 6.4. The intent of these tests was to start with the Visco Jet outlet pressure greater than the saturation pressure of the bulk liquid methane. The outlet pressure was then decreased to bring the outlet pressure through the saturation point for the bulk liquid. Data paid particular attention to was the outlet pressure and temperature. As with the LCH$_4$ tests, as the pressure on the outlet of the Visco Jet decreased and passed through the pressure corresponding to the temperature of saturated liquid, further decreases in pressure would result in a corresponding decrease in temperature as explained in section 4.1. If the outlet temperature did not track with the outlet pressure but remained at or near the bulk liquid temperature, it could indicate that the liquid did not change state, but had remained as a metastable liquid. As with the LCH$_4$ tests, the outlet temperature was compared to the temperature of saturated liquid based on outlet pressure to determine whether or not the outlet conditions indicated metastable liquid methane.
Two test series were performed in July and August 2007. The first test was performed with warm LO₂, with liquid temperature approximately 116 K. The second test was performed with colder LO₂ that has with liquid temperature approximately 93.5 K. A summary of tests is shown in Table VI. Figure 27 plots inlet and outlet pressure of the oxygen as it flowed through the Visco Jet for a typical LO₂ test for an 11,200 Lohm Visco Jet. Figure 28 plots inlet and outlet temperature and outlet temperature corresponding to the outlet saturation pressure for oxygen as it flowed through the Visco Jet.

Table VI – Test Results for LO₂ Visco Jet Clogging Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data File</th>
<th>Visco Jet Lohm</th>
<th>LO₂ condition</th>
<th>Bulk Fluid Temp. (K)</th>
<th>Inlet Pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>Outlet Pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>2-phase transition pressure (kPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT001 7-31-07</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>142.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT002 7-31-07</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>143.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT003 7-31-07</td>
<td>102000</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>143.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT004 7-31-07</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>142.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT005 7-31-07</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>142.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT003 8-01-07</td>
<td>102000</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>835.9</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>786.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT005 8-01-07</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>834.8</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>764.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT001 8-01-07</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>835.0</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>793.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT002 8-01-07</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>834.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>804.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT004 8-01-07</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>833.1</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>788.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT006 8-01-07</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>832.9</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>790.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT001 8-02-07</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>836.3</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>804.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT004 8-02-07</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>835.8</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>790.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX JT002 8-02-07</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>138.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 27 – Dewar inlet and outlet pressures for subcooled LO₂ test

Figure 28 – Dewar inlet and outlet temperatures for subcooled LO₂ test
For the test run shown in Figures 27 and 28, Visco Jet inlet pressure remains constant at approximately 833 kPa. The outlet pressure is initially atmospheric, approximately 103 kPa. At time T=50, the outlet valve downstream of the Visco Jet was opened, initiating flow through the device. Note in Figure 27 the small rise in outlet pressure at T=50 as flow starts. The outlet pressure recovers almost immediately to atmospheric pressure and remains there for the duration of the test run. Note also in Figure 28 that the outlet fluid temperature drops immediately to slightly below the corresponding saturation temperature based on outlet pressure, and then recovers to track saturation temperature for the duration of the test run. It is noted that the response was immediate (within the limits of our data collection system), and it is noted that there was no temperature in the outlet stream that would indicate the presence of metastable warm liquid. This test result is typical of all test runs performed with LO₂. With some of the test runs where the flow rate was much smaller, it was noted that the outlet temperature was masked by the bulk fluid temperature. This was noted previously, and is due to the lack of any insulation on the piping downstream of the Visco Jet that would have insulated the outlet line from the influence of the bulk liquid temperature. Appendix 12.2 provides more detail for each of the other LO₂ test runs.
CHAPTER IX

DISCUSSION

9.1 General Observed Behavior

9.1.1 LCH₄ Tests

For both NBP and subcooled LCH₄ tests, initial test conditions started with outlet conditions close to one atmosphere. Increasing outlet pressure resulted in raising outlet temperatures close to inlet temperatures. For both tests, the outlet pressure was slowly decreased to bring outlet conditions below the saturation pressure based on bulk liquid condition. For NBP liquid, the outlet temperatures measured tracked saturation temperatures for measured outlet pressure. It is noted for the NBP test that the outlet pressure did not start very high above saturation pressure of bulk liquid. For the subcooled liquid test, once the outlet pressure was decreased below the saturation pressure for the bulk liquid, the outlet temperature did not track outlet saturation temperature based on outlet pressure. This persisted for about 1000 seconds (from T=12500 to T=13500 seconds). The outlet temperature did start to drop at T=13500, but still remained above the saturation temperature based on outlet pressure. In this timeframe, the flow was at a maximum for the entire test run. As the flow was higher, it is unlikely that outlet temperature was a false reading influenced by bulk fluid. If this
was the case, it would have been also observed in the NBP test. NBP temperatures tracked saturated temperatures based on outlet pressure, and did not appear to be influenced by bulk liquid temperatures. In hindsight, it would have been nice if an additional case with liquid subcooled to a lesser degree could have been run.

9.1.2 LO₂ Tests

Tests were performed at two conditions – 137.9 kPa inlet pressure with bulk liquid temperature 93.3 K and 827.4 kPa inlet pressure with bulk liquid approximately 115.5 K. For the 137.9 kPa test, the liquid was very close to the saturation temperature with respect to the tank pressure. Since the facility was not set up to allow for discharge to sub-atmospheric pressures, Bulk liquid was not subcooled very much with respect to the test tank pressure. However, for the 827.4 kPa tests, the liquid was subcooled approximately 0.8 K with respect to the test tank pressure. For both tests, outlet pressure was close to atmospheric. Refer to Table 4 for bulk liquid temperatures and two-phase transition pressures for the tests conducted. Figure 28 shows test results for a typical subcooled LO₂ test. From T=0 to T=50, both inlet and outlet temperatures were approximately 115.5 K. Outlet saturation temperature is based on the outlet pressure of approximately 103.4 kPa. At T=50, the outlet valve was opened, and flow was initiated through the Visco Jet. As can be seen from the plot, the outlet temperature immediately dropped to approximately 90 K, and recovered to about 90.3 K, very close to the saturation temperature of 90.6 K. This result was typical for all tests performed with LO₂. That is - the observed the outlet temperature was not elevated above the saturation temperature, but in each case, the outlet temperature tracked the saturation temperature based on the
outlet pressure, which indicated no apparent metastability of the outlet flow.

9.1.3 Summary of Test Observations

In summary, the following observations are made about tests with LO$_2$ and LCH$_4$:

1. For NBP LCH$_4$ tests, there were no observed apparent metastable conditions downstream of the Visco Jet.

2. For subcooled LCH$_4$ tests, some apparent metastable conditions were observed based on the downstream temperature remaining above the corresponding saturation temperature by approximately 2K for an extended period of time (approximately 1000 seconds). During this time, the outlet temperature started to decrease somewhat, but remained above the saturation temperature based on outlet pressure.

3. For both 93.5 K and 116 K liquid LO$_2$ tests, no apparent metastability downstream of the Visco Jet was observed.

9.2 Comparison with Theory

For LCH$_4$, a significant degree of liquid subcooling was achieved in one test, and not much subcooling in the other test. As noted previously, the warmer liquid test did not show any evidence of metastability downstream of the Visco Jet. However, apparent metastability was noted in the subcooled tests, where the outlet temperature remained above the outlet saturation temperature. It is noted that in these tests, the outlet conditions could be controlled due to the presence of a proportional valve. This valve allowed the transition through the phase transition point in a controlled manner.
For the subcooled LCH₄ test where observations indicated metastability, pressure versus specific volume was plotted as shown in Figure 29. Specific volume for test data is calculated based on the downstream liquid temperature. The pressure versus specific volume curve for saturation conditions is also shown. Note the excursion of data below the saturation line. This curve is compared to the general curve for saturated and spinodal pressure versus specific volume shown in Figure 22. For this particular test, one would desire to generate the curve described by points BDEF in the metastable region. This would allow comparison of how far into the metastable region the isotherm would extend with respect to the minimum spinodal point. Section 7.0 discusses fitting cubic equations to predict spinodal limits for individual isotherms in the metastable region. Per Biney.
consider fitting a cubic equation of the form:

$$\frac{p}{p_{\text{sat}}} = 1 - \frac{(v - v_f)(v - v_m)(v - v_g)}{(v + b)(v + c)^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

Where \(v_f\), \(v_g\) and \(p_{\text{sat}}\) are evaluated for the inlet fluid conditions (temperature = 105.3K).

This equation is fit by assuming some reasonable value for \(v_m\) between \(v\), and \(v_g\), and iterating on constants \(b\) and \(c\) to match the slope of the \(P\) vs. \(V\) curve in the liquid stable region. The resultant curve is shown in Figure 30. An expanded region of this curve in the stable liquid region is shown in Figure 31, showing that the cubic equation curve matches the slope of the stable liquid isotherm reasonably well. Figure 30 shows that for the methane 105.3K isotherm, the minimum spinodal pressure is in the vicinity of -60,000 kPa. Obviously, the data shown in Figure 29 only represents an excursion of a few degrees into the metastable region.

![Calculated pressure vs. specific volume for methane in the metastable region per Biney cubic equation for 105.3K isotherm](image)

**Figure 30 – Calculated press. vs. specific vol. in metastable regime, LCH\(_4\) 105.3K isotherm**
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Figure 31 – P vs. V actual and per calculated cubic equation, LCH$_4$ 105.3K isotherm

For LO$_2$, our bulk liquid conditions were almost at saturated conditions – not much subcooling. These conditions were a result of other test program requirements. In retrospect, it would have been nice if the tank pressure could have been bumped up some to further subcool the liquid with respect to the test tank pressure. Also, the test apparatus did not allow us to traverse through the two phase transition point smoothly as with the LCH$_4$ tests, but when initiating flow through the Visco Jet, outlet pressure immediately dropped to the minimum outlet pressure of 103.4 kPa. This may have an influence on whether or not metastability occurs downstream of the Visco Jet.
CHAPTER X

CONCLUDING REMARKS

10.1 General Comments

The original premise for this study was to obtain a better understanding of Joule-Thomson devices used in space based cryogenic fluid management systems and determine if the metastability of single phase cryogenic fluids below the saturation line needed to be considered in the design of these systems. If this behavior was indeed observed, it was desired to see if some intermediate curve might be defined as shown in Figure 22 that could define a minimum practical limit of metastability. So, the questions that need to be answered are (1) did metastability observed in the present tests, and (2) could the phenomenon be consistently predicted and reproduced? Based on LO$_2$ and LCH$_4$ test data from this program, some apparent metastability was indeed observed (in subcooled LCH$_4$ tests), but was not observed in other tests (NBP LCH$_4$ tests and all LO$_2$ tests). Therefore, it does not appear that the present work can define any minimum practical metastability limit for LO$_2$ and LCH$_4$ with any certainty. That being said, one needs to consider what other factors may be at play that may have had an influence on results. Reviewing the test procedures and results, the following factors are noted:

1. For all LO$_2$ tests and the NBP LCH$_4$ test, the bulk liquid was not deeply subcooled
with respect to the test tank pressure. That is, the transition through the saturation point was very close to the saturation temperature based on Visco Jet inlet pressure.

2. The differential pressure across the Visco Jets was substantially higher for the LO₂ tests than it was for the LCH₄ tests.

3. In the LCH₄ tests, the downstream pressure could be modulated to bring it through the saturation point in a controlled manner, whereas with the LO₂ tests, this was not possible. This may indicate an influence of rate on the process.

4. Metastability was not observed with LO₂, but was in some cases with LCH₄. This may indicate some dependence on fluid. Although there was limited reference in the literature found that would indicate this, the possibility cannot be unilaterally dismissed. However, that study is beyond the scope of this work.

Considering the first two factors listed above, refer to Hendricks. He refers to Benjamin and Miller who postulated that “no vaporization occurred right at the orifice, but that the flow passes through as a liquid in a metastable state and flashes slightly downstream”. Hendricks work with LN₂ indicated that a metastable jet downstream of an orifice existed, but that the distance downstream that the metastable jet breaks down is a function of the pressure difference across the orifice. That is, a very large pressure drop across the orifice would result in vaporization very near the orifice, causing a decrease in flow. In our tests, the pressure difference across the Visco Jets for LO₂ tests were as high as 700 kPa, whereas the maximum pressure drop across Visco Jets for LCH₄ tests was only approximately 90 kPa. If there was any metastability in the LO₂ flow, it could have
broken up before reaching the downstream temperature sensor. It is possible that with the lower pressure drop across the Visco Jet with LCH₄, that metastability may have persisted far enough downstream to be sensed by the temperature sensor. For both LO₂ and LCH₄ test configurations, the downstream temperature sensor was located approximately 5 cm downstream of the Visco Jet orifice.

Considering the third factor (the difference in rate of depressurization between LCH₄ and LO₂ tests), it would appear that depressurizing more slowly would be more likely to result in a metastable state downstream of the Visco Jet. However, Shamsundar³⁹ addresses the rate of depressurization across an orifice, and states that the faster the rate of depressurization and the fewer the sources of heterogeneous nucleation, the closer the liquid can come to the metastable spinodal limit. That is, if the depressurization happens quickly enough, the fluid won’t have time to react to the change in pressure by changing state. This runs counter to the present test work’s results with LCH₄, as apparent metastability was observed with a slower rate of depressurization. As Shamsundar also noted that the number of sources of heterogeneous nucleation influences metastability, and that a Visco Jet with its multiple passages provides many potential nucleation sites that would promote phase change, it seems reasonable to look elsewhere for reasons for our observations of metastability. To date, no good explanation in the literature has been found that would explain observations from the tests conducted in the present work.

Considering the influence of the fluids themselves, Shamsundar also makes reference to the fact that a slow process \textit{with industrial quality liquid} will vaporize very close to the
saturation point. The LO\(_2\) and LCH\(_4\) used for these tests was relatively high purity (99.9%+ pure). However, each fluid did have in its specification impurities of other atmospheric gas species in the 1 – 100 ppm range, which could have possibly had an effect. That is, if these other species were cold enough to actually freeze, they could have provided nucleation sites that would have enhanced phase transition. Although this possibility is worth considering, it is outside the scope of this work, and may be addressed in future work in this area.

Finally, one needs to consider the possibility of bad data due to an inadequate experimental set up. As previously noted in the LO\(_2\) test results section, the outlet temperature was masked by the bulk fluid temperature, as the outlet of the Visco Jet was not insulated. This can be seen in more detail in data runs in Appendix 13.2. However, the LCH\(_4\) test set up did insulate the outlet. Also, it is noted that the NBP test results showed downstream fluid temperatures tracking saturation temperatures very closely, which validates the downstream temperature reading. The LCH\(_4\) flow rate for both tests was consistent and varied from approximately 20 – 30 slpm, negating the possibility of the different flow rates influencing downstream temperatures. Based on this information, it can be asserted that the temperatures observed in the subcooled LCH\(_4\) test indeed did indicate metastability.

In summary, the data from this test program does not provide enough consistent data to formulate a predictive tool that would quantify a minimum metastable temperature for the fluids tested. However, one still might make some observations and provide some
recommendations for designers to consider when constructing cryogenic TVS systems.

1. In some instances, it appears that a metastable, warm fluid flow can persist for an extended period of time. Presuming that eventually the temperature downstream of the orifice would drop, any time constant for metastability should be considered in design.

2. A greater pressure drop across a J-T device appears to be less prone to any metastability. This observation was based on the lack of any indication of metastability with the LO$_2$ tests where pressure drop across the orifice ranged from 40 to 730 kPa, as opposed to LCH$_4$ tests where metastability was indicated with pressure drops in the range of 40 to 90 kPa.

3. The rate at which depressurization occurs may have an influence on the presence of metastability. This is based on the fact that metastable conditions were observed with LCH$_4$ where the pressure was decreased across the J-T device in a controlled manner. This may influence how the J-T device or other components might be specified.

10.2 Implications for Space Flight TVS Systems

As previously mentioned, J-T devices are key to cryogenic thermal control systems in space flight architecture. Findings from this study indicate that metastable superheated liquid may indeed be present under certain conditions, and system designers should be aware of the implications. Based on the results of this study, a designer should consider the following factors in system design:

1. Higher pressure cryogenic storage systems would appear to be less likely to see any
metastability due to the higher pressure drop across a J-T device.

2. Consideration should be made on where to locate any temperature measurement devices, as any metastable warm liquid may give a false indication of downstream fluid conditions (i.e. – fluid changes state and drops in temperature downstream of the temperature sensor).

3. The physical location of heat exchangers should be such that if there is any metastable flow, it has a chance to change state with a corresponding temperature drop before the heat exchanger.

**10.3 Possible Future Work**

Inconsistent test results are never as good as a large amount of good data that can be used to develop useful tools for the designer. However, although there were some inconsistent results, one must consider what has been learned from this work, and use that information to help map out what future work would be most useful in providing a better understanding of these J-T devices and the issue of metastability.

These tests were “piggybacked” onto other tests that were being performed at the NASA Glenn Research Center as part of their cryogenic fluid management development program. That is, the Visco Jet test hardware was not optimized for these tests. Nor was the entire system devised solely for the purpose of studying metastable phenomena. Obviously, a test configuration that would consistently produce metastable flow would be ideal. A test configuration that could isolate and study the various factors that influence the onset of metastability would be useful in determining how these factors should best be incorporated into cryogenic fluid system designs. Based on test results observed from
this program, that test configuration might have the following characteristics:

1. Ability to vary the rate of pressure drop across the J-T orifice. Although this was accomplished with the LCH₄ test configuration, it was not so with the LO₂ test.

2. Considering that there may be metastable flow downstream of the orifice, temperature sensors could be located at a number of stations to determine how far this flow might persist downstream.

3. Consider a broader set of test conditions with varying degrees of subcooling. Current tests only looked at test conditions where the liquid was either highly subcooled, or very close to saturation conditions. In addition, higher pressure tests may be of specific interest to NASA, as current cryogenic propellant systems are considering higher pressure storage tanks. As propellant conditions come closer to the critical point, it should be noted that the minimum spinodal temperature comes much closer to the nominal saturation temperature. This is illustrated in Figure 32 which shows the saturation curve and spinodal curves for water.

4. Increase the duration of the tests. In the case where apparent metastable flow was observed, the test should have been extended until the downstream temperature started to track the saturation temperature.

5. Future tests should be configured to allow change out of different type J-T devices. The Visco Jets consisted of multiple orifices. Presumably, a single clean orifice may be more prone to metastable phenomenon than a J-T device with multiple passages like the Visco Jet.
In summary, it is noted that there is abundant literature on metastability from a theoretical and experimental perspective. This body of work to date has largely focused on theoretical limits using precise experimental hardware. The present work has provisionally demonstrated that this effect may also be present in systems that represent real space flight hardware. Further work is recommended to better quantify the factors that may induce metastable flow. These factors being items such as degree of subcooling, rate of process and type of J-T device. This present work has contributed to the general
body of knowledge by observing metastable phenomena in typical cryogenic fluid management systems, and by providing a path for research that will assure that the potential metastable nature of flow through J-T devices is properly incorporated into these system designs.
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APPENDIX A - LCH₄ Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure vs. Time</th>
<th>Temp. vs. Time</th>
<th>Visco Jet Lohm</th>
<th>LCH₄ Condition</th>
<th>Bulk Liquid Temp. (K)</th>
<th>Inlet Pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>Outlet Pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>2-phase transition pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>Saturation Temperature based on tank pressure (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 33</td>
<td>Figure 34</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>saturated</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>60.6 – 124.1</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>116.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 35</td>
<td>Figure 36</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>subcooled</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>52.4 – 97.2</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>115.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visco Jet inlet and outlet pressures, LCH₄

Figure 33
Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperature, LCH4

Inlet Temperature

Saturation temperature based on outlet pressure

Outlet Temperature

Figure 34

8,200 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet pressures, LCH4

Inlet

Outlet pressure

Figure 35
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Figure 36

Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperature, LCH4

Inlet Temperature

Outlet Temperature

Saturation temperature based on outlet pressure

sec

K
## APPENDIX B - LO₂ Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press. vs. Time</th>
<th>Temp. vs. Time</th>
<th>Visco Jet Lohm Rating</th>
<th>LO₂ condition</th>
<th>Bulk Fluid Temp. (K)</th>
<th>Inlet Press. (kPa)</th>
<th>Outlet Press. (kPa)</th>
<th>2-phase transition pressure (kPa)</th>
<th>Saturation Temperature based on tank pressure (K)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 37</td>
<td>Figure 38</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 39</td>
<td>Figure 40</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>143.7</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 41</td>
<td>Figure 42</td>
<td>102000</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>143.9</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 43</td>
<td>Figure 44</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>142.6</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 45</td>
<td>Figure 46</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 47</td>
<td>Figure 48</td>
<td>102000</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>835.9</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>786.6</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 49</td>
<td>Figure 50</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>834.8</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>764.0</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 51</td>
<td>Figure 52</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>835.0</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>793.5</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 53</td>
<td>Figure 54</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>834.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>804.5</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 55</td>
<td>Figure 56</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>833.1</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>788.0</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 57</td>
<td>Figure 58</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>832.9</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>790.7</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 59</td>
<td>Figure 60</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>836.3</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>804.5</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 61</td>
<td>Figure 62</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>835.8</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>790.2</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 63</td>
<td>Figure 64</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>Subcooled</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Figure 38 – outlet temperature drops immediately at T=270 sec to outlet saturation temperature. Subsequent rise to inlet temperature at T=500 is not due to metastability, but due to outlet line being submerged in bulk liquid with no insulation on outlet line. Heat transfer from bulk liquid masks outlet flow temperature. This phenomena is noted for many of the low flow (high Lohm rating) Visco Jets.

2. Figure 40 – see note 1
3. Figure 42 see note 1. At T=260, outlet temperature tracks outlet saturation temperature.

4. Figure 48 – similar to Figure 41, except at T=100, outlet temperature is masked by bulk liquid temperature.

5. Figure 52 – see note 1.

6. Figure 54 – see note 1.

7. Figure 57 – outlet pressure increase due to high flow through Visco Jet.

8. Figure 60 – see note 1.
Figure 37

1,350,000 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 38

135,000,000 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
313,000 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX
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313,000 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
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Figure 41

102,000 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 42

102,000 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 43

11,200 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 44

11,200 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 45

3,300 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 46

3,300 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 47

102,000 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 48

102,000 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 49

3,300 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 50

3,300 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 51

1,350,000 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 52

1,350,000 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 53

313,000 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 54

313,000 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 55

11,200 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet pressure, LOX

Figure 56

11,200 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 57

680 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 58

680 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 59

1,350,000 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 60

1,350,000 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
Figure 61

11,200 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Figure 62

11,200 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX
313,000 Lohm Visco Jet Inlet & Outlet Pressures, LOX

Visco Jet Inlet Pressure
Visco Jet Outlet Pressure

Figure 63

313,000 Lohm Visco Jet inlet and outlet temperatures, outlet saturation temperatures, LOX

Visco Jet Inlet Temperature
Visco Jet Outlet Temperature
Outlet Saturation Temperature

Figure 64
APPENDIX C - CRYOGENIC FLUID THERMO-PHYSICAL PROPERTIES

Cryogenic fluid thermo-physical properties are available from a number of sources. Fluid properties used for analysis in this test program were obtained from the NIST Standard Reference Database 12, “NIST Thermophysical Properties of Pure Fluids” Version 3.0, 1992, published by the Fluid Mixtures Data Center, Thermophysics Division, NIST, Boulder, CO. This interactive DOS based database program computes thermophysical properties of 17 pure fluids according to the extremely accurate and wide ranging NIST standards reference correlations.

This database has since been commercialized, and is marketed under the name “GASPAK” by Cryodata.com. Cryodata’s website is: http://www.cryodata.com/

This data is also available directly from NIST via their interactive website titled “Thermophysical Properties of Fluid Systems”, available at: http://webbook.nist.gov/chemistry/fluid/