

Description

This invention relates to controlling sootblowing in one of a plurality of heat traps in a boiler, for instance a fossil or other organic fuel boiler.

The combustion of fossil fuels, for the production of steam or power, generates a residue broadly known as ash. All but a few fuels have solid residues and, in some instances, the quantity is considerable (see Table I hereinbelow).

For continuous operation, removal of ash is essential. In suspension firing the ash particles are carried out of the boiler furnace by the gas stream and form deposits on the tubes in the gas passes (fouling). Under some circumstances, the deposits may lead to corrosion of these surfaces.

Some means must be provided to remove the ash from the boiler surfaces, since ash in its various forms may seriously interfere with operation or even cause shutdown. Furnace wall and convection-pass surfaces can be cleaned of ash and slag while in operation by the use of sootblowers using steam or air as a blowing medium. The sootblowing equipment directs product air through retractable nozzles aimed at the areas where deposits accumulate.

The convective pass surfaces in the boiler, sometimes referred to as heat traps, are divided into distinct sections in the boiler. Each heat trap normally has its own dedicated set of sootblowing equipment. Usually, only one set of sootblowers is operated at any time, since the sootblowing operation consumes product steam and at the same time reduces the heat transfer rate of the heat trap being cleaned.

TABLE 1
Commercial Fuels for Steam Production

Fuels containing Ash	Fuels containing Little or No Ash
All coals	Natural gas
Fuel oil — "Bunker C"	Manufactured gas
Refinery Sludge	Code-oven gas (clean)
Tank residues	Refinery gas
Refinery coke	Distillates
Most tars	
Wood and wood products	
Other vegetable products	
Waste-heat-gases (most)	
Blast-Furnace gas	
Cement-kiln gas	
Black Liquor	

The sequencing and scheduling of the sootblowing operation can be automated by using controls. See, for example, US Patent No. US—A—4 085 438 (Butler) dated 18 April 1978.

A common practice for sootblowing scheduling is one utilizing fixed time sequences for the boiler cleaning equipment. The timing sequence is established based on plant measurements during startup. This approach does not allow for the on-line adaptation of the sootblowing sequences. Therefore, changes in boiler operation and unit characteristics are not accounted for in this method.

Sootblowing is also commonly done via "operator inspection", which is usually incomplete and leads to over-cleaning and waste of sootblowing steam.

One of the approaches to sootblowing optimization is the calculation of heat transfer coefficients utilizing a mathematical model of the unit and process measurements to determine sootblowing sequences.

A boiler diagnostic package which can be used for sootblowing optimization has been proposed by T. C. Heil *et al* in an article entitled "Boiler Heat Transfer Model for Operator Diagnostic Information" given at the ASME/IEEE Power Gen. Conference in October 1981 at St. Louis, Missouri. The method depends upon estimates of gas side temperatures from coupled energy balances, and the implementation requires extensive recursive computations to solve a series of heat trap equations. This method is used to estimate

heat transfer fouling factors. These intermediate results are then used as input to a boiler performance model based on steady state design conditions to estimate cost savings resulting from sootblower initiation. There is no economic optimization, however, and the method does not account for dynamic changes in incremental steam cost. Also the calculations required to accurately model the unit are quite complex and require complicated recursive techniques to solve the equations. Steady state design conditions (warranty data) are also required to estimate fouling factors of the individual heat traps.

This scheme quantifies the "operator inspection" method. Numerical values indicate the actual levels of fouling and potential savings from cleaning, but this data is not balanced against cost of cleaning and the rate of performance degradation to predict optimal cleaning times.

In considering the above-mentioned approaches to scheduling of boiler cleaning equipment, the following are desired points of a new optimization scheme:

- on-line adaptation of sootblowing scheduling;
- use of simple computational algorithm so that a computer is not required;
- no requirement for warranty test data;
- incorporation of economic consideration;
- accounting for interactions between various boiler sections;
- allowing for variable definition of heat traps;
- use of available process measurements;
- accounting for variations in cycle times with variations in system parameters such as load; and
- insensitivity to ambient conditions such as fuel analysis and atmospheric temperature.

The objective of on-line boiler tube cleaning (sootblowing) optimization is to predict the optimal times to start individual cleaning units for the various heat traps. Many factors affect the optimal sootblowing schedule and must be considered in any optimization scheme. A preferred method embodying the present invention and described hereinbelow utilizes a new approach in calculating sootblowing schedules, while still providing the necessary flexibility to incorporate specific safety and operating features relevant to individual boilers.

According to the invention there is provided a method, as set forth in claim 1, for controlling sootblowing in one of a plurality of heat traps in a boiler.

A preferred method embodying the invention and described in detail hereinbelow provides for an on-line adaptation of the sootblowing sequence. Computation of the optimum sootblowing schedule requires a standard boiler efficiency calculation. Therefore, the only process measurements necessary are generally available. Calculations are provided for an optimum schedule, based on economic considerations while accounting for the interactions between various heat transfer sections. The method involves a straightforward calculation which is easy to comprehend. The method does not require any design or warranty data for the calculation, and is sufficiently flexible to incorporate various operation considerations. The method can be used for optimizing a sootblowing period for a boiler, in particular a boiler having a plurality of heat traps each equipped with its own sootblowing equipment.

In the preferred method, the heat trap with the most advantageous optimum sootblowing period is selected for a sootblowing operation.

The invention will now be further described, by way of illustrative and non-limiting example, with reference to the accompanying drawings, in which:

Fig. 1 is a schematic side elevational view of a boiler having a plurality of heat traps;

Fig. 2 is a graph showing a cost penalty plotted against time between sootblowing operations;

Fig. 3 is a graph showing a rate of loss of efficiency against time, as a sootblowing operation becomes more necessary;

Fig. 4 is a graph showing the overall efficiency of the boiler against time, and including two sootblowing steps;

Fig. 5 is a graph plotting cost penalty against time for a short cycle sootblowing operation;

Fig. 6 is a graph similar to that of Fig. 5, showing a long cycle sootblowing operation;

Fig. 7 is a schematic diagram of a logic circuit for obtaining an optimum sootblowing period for each heat trap;

Fig. 8 is a schematic diagram of a logic circuit for obtaining a difference between an optimum and an actual time between sootblowing operations;

Fig. 9 is a schematic diagram of a logic circuit for selecting one of a plurality of heat traps for sootblowing; and

Fig. 10 is a schematic diagram of a logic circuit for one heat trap used to control the sootblowing operation.

Referring to the drawings, and Fig. 1 in particular, a method for optimizing a sootblowing schedule or cycle time in a boiler generally designated 10, is provided. The boiler 10 includes a plurality of zones which include, for example, platens 12, secondary superheater 13 with input and output portions, heater 14, primary superheater 16, and economizer 18.

EP 0 137 709 B1

The approach used in this equation scheme is to minimize the economic cost penalty associated with sootblowing. The major cost factors dealt with in this method are:

- Cost due to loss of efficiency of the boiler;
- Cost to operate sootblowers; and
- Long-term boiler degradation cost.

Using these factors, an objective function may be defined for individual heat traps as shown in Fig. 2. The definition of a heat trap is a set of sootblowing equipment which is designed to operate in a group fashion; for example, the sootblowers associated with the boiler economizer section 18 may be established as a heat trap. It should be noted that the definition of a heat trap group does not require specific spatial orientation for the sootblowers, but allows any desired pattern.

The present method models the rate of fouling and employs the model in schedule optimization. The model adapts to on-line process measurements, and thus provides accurate results for changing boiler characteristics. The implemented sootblowing sequence is a product of the optimal cycle times, safety constraints, operator set points, and interaction with other heat traps. The cycle time for an individual heat trap is computed independently but is considered as part of the overall boiler structure.

One form of this model is shown in Fig. 3. More complex models may be used, yet the basic concepts of this invention hold. The rate at which the buildup of soot affects the total boiler efficiency is shown to follow linear profile at slope = a . The cost of running the sootblowing equipment is taken as a fixed cost S during period θ_c . So the problem of adapting the model to the plant characteristics becomes one of estimating the rate of accumulation of soot or the value of slope a and cost to run the sootblowers during time period θ_c . In Fig. 3, θ_i is cycle time for the heat trap in question (the i th heat trap), and θ_c is its cleaning time.

It is assumed that cost of sootblowing can be determined from design specifications, or measured directly from on-line measurements. The rate of soot accumulation is inferred from the change in total boiler efficiency during the time the set of sootblowers are operational. Thus:

$$\Delta \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_{2i} - \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where:

- $\Delta \varepsilon_i$ is change in boiler efficiency due to cleaning heat trap;
- ε_{2i} is boiler efficiency after sootblowing the i th heat trap; and
- ε_{1i} is boiler efficiency before i th heat trap is cleaned.

Fig. 4 shows an example of the measurements taken to estimate the change in boiler efficiency due to sootblowing one heat trap. In order to account for the interactions between the various heat traps and reduce the effect of noise in the process measurements, the rate of efficiency loss is calculated using a discrete filtering technique as follows:

$$E_{Ni} = \frac{\Delta \varepsilon_i}{\theta_B} \quad (2)$$

$$E_{AVi} = (1 - X) E_{AVi} + X \cdot E_{Ni} \quad (3)$$

$$a_i = E_{AVi} \cdot \text{LOAD} \cdot (\text{Energy Cost}) \quad (4)$$

where:

- E_{Ni} is instantaneous efficiency loss (%) for the i th heat trap;
- E_{AVi} is average instantaneous efficiency loss (%);
- X is the filter constant;
- Load is boiler load ($\text{lb}_{\text{steam}}/\text{hr}$); and
- a_i is the average slope of the efficiency loss curve of the period $\Delta \theta$ ($\text{lb}_{\text{steam}}/\text{hr}^2$).

The same model is used for each heat trap. Parameter identification for each heat trap model is calculated independently and on-line. Only process measurements for the boiler efficiency estimate and the sootblowing start-stop signals of individual heat traps are required.

The optimization calculations which are performed using the model and the identified parameters for the curves will now be described. An objective function, comprising the cost of sootblowing and losses due to decrease in boiler efficiency, is minimized by selecting the optimum cycle time θ_c for each heat trap. In Figs. 5 and 6 the impact of cycle time on the sootblowing penalty costs is presented for a short or a long

EP 0 137 709 B1

cycle time. The problem is then to minimize the penalty costs (area under the curves). The optimization to minimize the losses is carried out as follows:

Cost Penalty per cycle:

$$\text{Cost} = \int_0^{\theta_b} (a \times t) dt + S \times \theta_c = \frac{a}{2} \theta_b^2 + S \times \theta_c \quad (5)$$

where

a is rate of efficiency loss per heat trap $\left(\frac{\$}{\text{hr}} \right)$;

and

S is the cost of a sootblowing operation $\left(\frac{\$}{\text{hr}^2} \right)$

To find the optimum cycle time, θ_b , one must minimize losses over an arbitrary time (Q hours),

$$\frac{\$ \text{Lost}}{Q \text{ hours}} = \left(\frac{a}{2} \theta_b^2 + S \cdot \theta_c \right) \left(\frac{Q}{\theta_b + \theta_c} \right) = (\$ \text{Lost/Cycle}) \left(\frac{\# \text{ of cycles}}{Q \text{ hours}} \right) \quad (6)$$

The minimization is achieved by taking the derivative of equation (6) with respect to θ_b , or:

$$\frac{d}{d\theta_b} \left(\frac{\$ \text{Lost}}{Q \text{ hours}} \right) = \phi = \frac{d}{d\theta_b} \left(\frac{a}{2} \theta_b^2 + S \cdot \theta_c \right) \times \left(\frac{Q}{\theta_b + \theta_c} \right) \quad (7)$$

$$\phi = \frac{[(\theta_b + \theta_c)a\theta_b - \frac{a}{2} \theta_b^2 - S \cdot \theta_c] \times Q}{(\theta_b + \theta_c)^2} \quad (8)$$

The sequencing logic is designed so as to allow for the addition of constraint criterion, (for example, high ΔP measurements), on top of the optimization. This allows the specific constraints of the plant to be treated without requiring a design change to the optimization algorithm:

$$\phi = \frac{a}{2} \theta_b^2 + a\theta_c\theta_b - S\theta_c \quad (9)$$

Solving for optimum cycle time $\theta_b = \theta_{opt}$ using the Quadratic formula:

$$\theta_{opt} = \frac{-a\theta_c \pm \sqrt{a^2\theta_c^2 + 4 \times \frac{a}{2} S\theta_c}}{a} = -\theta_c \pm \sqrt{\theta_c^2 + \frac{2S\theta_c}{a}} \quad (10)$$

Since θ_{opt} is a positive value, the value for θ_{opt} is:

$$\theta_{opt} = \sqrt{\theta_c^2 + \frac{2S\theta_c}{a}} - \theta_c \quad (11)$$

Fig. 7 represents the configuration of logic that can be used to implement the method.

The optimal economic sootblowing cycle time will be determined for each heat trap for Equation (11). These optimum cycle times (θ_{opt}) can be compared with the respective θ_b for each heat trap to determine sootblower sequencing priority if more than one heat trap has a cycle time greater than the optimum cycle time (see Table II). The generating bank would be the first section to be cleaned. The sootblowers for the

second generating bank would be the next set of sootblowers to be initiated. Figs. 8, 9 and 10 represent the configurational logic used to implement the sequencing strategy.

TABLE II

Heat Trap	Optimum Cycle Time	Time Since Start of Cycle	
	θ_{opt} , minutes	θ_b , minutes	$\theta_{opt} - \theta_b$, minutes
Secondary Superheater	83	84	-1
Reheat Superheater	104	95	9
Primary Superheater	155	110	45
Reheating Superheater	176	15	161
Economizer	240	174	66

A microprocessor-based NETWORK 90 distributed control instrumentation can be used to implement the method of the present invention and Figs. 7 to 10, without a process computer (NETWORK 90 is a trademark of the Bailey Controls Company of Babcock and Wilcox, A McDermott Company).

In the past, higher level supervisory controls have been implemented in process computers. Bailey's microprocessor-based NETWORK 90 control instrumentation provides an alternative to process computers for application of advance control algorithms and higher level control in energy management.

As noted above, Fig. 7 is a logic circuit which can be utilized to obtain optimum cycle times θ_{opt} . A signal for starting a sootblowing operation is initiated in DI element 20 and sent to a signal transmitter 22 and an SR unit 24.

While the circuit of Fig. 7 is for a single heat trap, there being such a circuit for each heat trap, a value corresponding to the overall boiler efficiency E is provided from element 26 over a signal processing unit 28 to another input of transmitter 22. The instantaneous efficiency for the boiler can be calculated in any known fashion, using for example a differential between the input and output temperatures, or other known methods.

The instantaneous efficiency is also supplied to a difference unit 30. Transmitter 22 is operable to periodically supply the instantaneous efficiency to another input of difference unit 30, so that a difference in efficiency over a known time period is established. This value is divided once more by the instantaneous efficiency in division unit 32 whose output is divided by an actual sootblowing cycle time θ_b supplied by PID unit 34 to a second dividing unit 36.

The actual sootblowing cycle time θ_b is provided to an output element 38 for other uses. The same value is provided to a HIGH/LOW unit 40 which provides high and low signals over lines 42 when the sootblowing period rises above or falls below set limits. Lines 42 can be utilized to activate an alarm or other suitable equipment.

PID 34 is controlled by an OR unit 44 by either a signal from a "1" value input 46 over an SR unit 48 or the output of SR unit 24 over a signal processing unit 50.

A filter constant for the heat trap is established by a second transmitter 52 and applied to a summing unit 54 and a multiplier 56. The filter constant is multiplied by the output of dividing unit 36 in the multiplier 56. The output of multiplier 56 is supplied to a summing unit 58, a third dividing unit 60 and a unit 62 for establishing maximum and minimum values, in sequence. The filter constant is subtracted from unity in the summing unit 54 and the result provided to the third dividing unit 60. The output of limiting unit 62 is provided back to summing unit 58.

A signal proportional to the plant load is supplied by load unit 64 over a signal processor 66 to a further multiplier 68 which multiplies a signal proportional to the load by the output of element 62 to produce the value a_1 corresponding to the average slope for the efficiency loss curve.

A cost factor S is provided by cost factor unit 70 to a signal processor 72 and a further multiplying unit 74, the output of which is subjected to a square root operation in square root unit 76 to produce the optimum sootblowing cycle time θ_{opt} at 78.

The signal processors 28, 50, 66 and 72 are provided for rendering the input signals compatible with the logic circuitry. The circuit of Fig. 7 is thus usable to make the calculation of equation (11).

Fig. 8 shows a logic circuit for obtaining the difference between optimum and actual sootblowing periods for each heat trap of the boiler. Four such circuits can be used where four heat traps are provided for obtaining the difference values $\Delta\theta_{b1}$, $\Delta\theta_{b2}$, $\Delta\theta_{b3}$ and $\Delta\theta_{b4}$.

These values can be utilized in the circuit of Fig. 9 to determine the priority of sootblowing among the four heat traps.

In Fig. 8, unit 78 and 38 for carrying the respective optimum and actual sootblowing periods for the *i*th heat trap are supplied to a difference unit 84 of signal processes 80 and 82. The difference signal is provided over signal transmitters 86 and 88, each operated by a manual/auto switch 100 over a signal generator 102, to supply the difference value $\Delta\theta_{bi}$ in units 90.

As shown in Fig. 9, the difference between actual and optimum sootblowing periods are supplied for each heat trap 1 through 4 at respective locations 90—1, 90—2, 90—3, 90—4. The signals are each processed in elements 106 for rendering the signals compatible with the remainder of the logic circuit.

The sootblowing equipment (not shown) is controlled by on-off controllers 104—1, 104—2, 104—3 and 104—4. As shown, several high/low controllers (labelled H/L) are used in conjunction with four difference units 108 and four AND gates 110 to selectively initiate sootblowing in one of the four heat traps.

A portion of the logic circuit generally designated 112 determines and displays which one of the sootblowers is operating, and which should be operating, at display 114. This circuit includes a low value unit 116, three transmitters (labeled T), two OR gates, three high/low units and an initial value unit for providing an initial value to the transmitters.

Fig. 10 shows an additional control circuit which is used for each of the heat traps so that four of the circuits are necessary for a boiler having four heat traps.

Controllers 120 and 122 are controlled by high ΔP and minimum timer 124 and 126 respectively.

Depending on the mode of operation, a manual or an auto signal is provided to OR gate 128, which outputs to an AND gate 130 having an inverting input connected to a low or minimum time unit 132 and a non-inverting input connected to an element 134 which provides a signal when a sootblowing operation is in progress. An OR gate 136 has three inputs, one connected to unit 124, one to 126 and one to the output of AND gate 130. The output of OR gate 136 is provided to an AND gate 138 having another input connected to an AUTO/MANUAL element 140 which provides a signal to the AND gate 138. The AND gate 138 is connected to one of three terminals of an ON/OFF unit 142, another terminal of which is connected to a unit 144 which provides a signal when a sootblowing operation is completed, and the final terminal of which is connected to an OR gate 146. OR gate 146 has one input connected to an output of AND 138 and the other input being inverted and connected to the output of unit 140.

The sootblowing unit with the most advantageous and economical sootblowing period is thus selected for a sootblowing operation by the circuits of Figs. 9 and 10.

Claims

1. A method of controlling sootblowing in one of a plurality of heat traps in a boiler, the method comprising:

calculating the average slope *a* for a loss of efficiency during a period between sootblowing operations for the heat trap;

calculating the optimum duration θ_{opt} between sootblowing operations according to the relationship:

$$\theta_{opt} = \sqrt{\theta_c^2 + \frac{2S\theta_c}{a}} - \theta_c$$

wherein *S* corresponds to the cost of running a sootblowing operation for the heat trap and θ_c corresponds to the duration of a sootblowing operation of the heat trap; and

initiating sootblowing of the heat trap at a time determined in accordance with the calculated optimum duration θ_{opt} between sootblowing operations.

2. A method according to claim 1, wherein the average slope *a* is calculated by calculating the instantaneous efficiency E_{Ni} for the heat trap, obtaining a filter constant *X* for the heat trap, obtaining an average instantaneous efficiency loss value E_{AVi} from the relationship

$$E_{AVi} = (1 - X) E_{AVi} + X \cdot E_{Ni}$$

and measuring the energy cost and load for the boiler, the slope *a* being equal to the product of the average instantaneous efficiency loss, the load and the energy cost.

3. A method according to claim 2, wherein the instantaneous efficiency loss E_{Ni} is calculated by measuring a change of boiler efficiency due to the sootblowing of the heat trap and dividing the change of efficiency by the actual duration θ_b between sootblowing operations for the heat trap.

4. A method according to claim 1, claim 2 or claim 3, including measuring the actual duration θ_b between sootblowing operations for each of a plurality of heat traps in the boiler, obtaining the optimum duration θ_{opt} between sootblowing operations for each of the heat traps, calculating the difference $\Delta\theta_b$ between the actual and optimum durations for each heat trap, and selecting the heat trap having the greatest difference $\Delta\theta_b$ for the next sootblowing operation.

In Fig. 8, unit 78 and 38 for carrying the respective optimum and actual sootblowing periods for the *i*th heat trap are supplied to a difference unit 84 of signal processes 80 and 82. The difference signal is provided over signal transmitters 86 and 88, each operated by a manual/auto switch 100 over a signal generator 102, to supply the difference value $\Delta\theta_{bi}$ in units 90.

As shown in Fig. 9, the difference between actual and optimum sootblowing periods are supplied for each heat trap 1 through 4 at respective locations 90-1, 90-2, 90-3, 90-4. The signals are each processed in elements 106 for rendering the signals compatible with the remainder of the logic circuit.

The sootblowing equipment (not shown) is controlled by on-off controllers 104-1, 104-2, 104-3 and 104-4. As shown, several high/low controllers (labelled H/L) are used in conjunction with four difference units 108 and four AND gates 110 to selectively initiate sootblowing in one of the four heat traps.

A portion of the logic circuit generally designated 112 determines and displays which one of the sootblowers is operating, and which should be operating, at display 114. This circuit includes a low value unit 116, three transmitters (labeled T), two OR gates, three high/low units and an initial value unit for providing an initial value to the transmitters.

Fig. 10 shows an additional control circuit which is used for each of the heat traps so that four of the circuits are necessary for a boiler having four heat traps.

Controllers 120 and 122 are controlled by high ΔP and minimum timer 124 and 126 respectively.

Depending on the mode of operation, a manual or an auto signal is provided to OR gate 128, which outputs to an AND gate 130 having an inverting input connected to a low or minimum time unit 132 and a non-inverting input connected to an element 134 which provides a signal when a sootblowing operation is in progress. An OR gate 136 has three inputs, one connected to unit 124, one to 126 and one to the output of AND gate 130. The output of OR gate 136 is provided to an AND gate 138 having another input connected to an AUTO/MANUAL element 140 which provides a signal to the AND gate 138. The AND gate 138 is connected to one of three terminals of an ON/OFF unit 142, another terminal of which is connected to a unit 144 which provides a signal when a sootblowing operation is completed, and the final terminal of which is connected to an OR gate 146. OR gate 146 has one input connected to an output of AND 138 and the other input being inverted and connected to the output of unit 140.

The sootblowing unit with the most advantageous and economical sootblowing period is thus selected for a sootblowing operation by the circuits of Figs. 9 and 10.

Claims

1. A method of controlling sootblowing in one of a plurality of heat traps in a boiler, the method comprising:

calculating the average slope a for a loss of efficiency during a period between sootblowing operations for the heat trap;

calculating the optimum duration θ_{opt} between sootblowing operations according to the relationship:

$$\theta_{opt} = \sqrt{\theta_c^2 + \frac{2S\theta_c}{a}} - \theta_c,$$

wherein S corresponds to the cost of running a sootblowing operation for the heat trap and θ_c corresponds to the duration of a sootblowing operation of the heat trap; and

initiating sootblowing of the heat trap at a time determined in accordance with the calculated optimum duration θ_{opt} between sootblowing operations.

2. A method according to claim 1, wherein the average slope a is calculated by calculating the instantaneous efficiency E_{Ni} for the heat trap, obtaining a filter constant X for the heat trap, obtaining an average instantaneous efficiency loss value E_{AVi} from the relationship

$$E_{AVi} = (1 - X) E_{AVi} + X \cdot E_{Ni},$$

and measuring the energy cost and load for the boiler, the slope a being equal to the product of the average instantaneous efficiency loss, the load and the energy cost.

3. A method according to claim 2, wherein the instantaneous efficiency loss E_{Ni} is calculated by measuring a change of boiler efficiency due to the sootblowing of the heat trap and dividing the change of efficiency by the actual duration θ_b between sootblowing operations for the heat trap.

4. A method according to claim 1, claim 2 or claim 3, including measuring the actual duration θ_b between sootblowing operations for each of a plurality of heat traps in the boiler, obtaining the optimum duration θ_{opt} between sootblowing operations for each of the heat traps, calculating the difference $\Delta\theta_b$ between the actual and optimum durations for each heat trap, and selecting the heat trap having the greatest difference $\Delta\theta_b$ for the next sootblowing operation.



Patentansprüche

1. Verfahren zum Steuern des Rußblasens in einer von einer Mehrzahl von Heizstufen bzw. -klappen in einem Kessel, wobei das Verfahren aufweist:

5 Berechnen des durchschnittlichen Anstiegs a für den Wirkungsgradverlust während eines Zeitraums zwischen Rauchblasvorgängen für die Heizstufe;

Berechnen der optimalen Zeitdauer θ_{opt} zwischen Rußblasvorgängen gemäß der Beziehung:

$$10 \quad \theta_{opt} = \sqrt{\theta_c^2 + \frac{2S\theta_c}{a}} - \theta_c,$$

wobei S den Kosten für das Durchführen eines Rußblasvorganges für die Heizstufe entspricht und θ_c der Zeitdauer eines Rußblasvorganges für die Heizstufe entspricht; und Auslösen der Rußblasens für die Heizstufe zu einem Zeitpunkt, der gemäß der berechneten optimalen Zeitdauer θ_{opt} zwischen den
15 Rußblasvorgängen bestimmt worden ist.

2. Verfahren nach Anspruch 1, wobei der durchschnittliche Anstieg a berechnet wird durch Ermitteln des anfänglichen Wirkungsgrades E_{Ni} für die Heizstufe, Erhalten einer Filterkonstanten X für die Heizstufe, Erhalten einer durchschnittlichen anfänglichen Wirkungsgradverlustwertes E_{AVI} aus der Beziehung

$$20 \quad E_{AVI} = (1 - X) E_{AVI} + X \cdot E_{Ni},$$

und Messen der Energiekosten und der Belastung des Kessels, wobei der Anstieg a gleich dem Produkt aus dem durchschnittlichen anfänglichen Wirkungsgradverlust, der Belastung und den Energiekosten ist.

3. Verfahren nach Anspruch 2, wobei der anfängliche Wirkungsgradverlust E_{Ni} berechnet wird durch
25 Messen der Änderung des Kesselwirkungsgrades aufgrund des Rußblasens der Heizstufe und Teilen der Wirkungsgradänderung durch die jeweilige Zeitdauer θ_b zwischen den Rußblasvorgängen für die Heizstufe.

4. Verfahren nach Anspruch 1, 2 oder 3, einschließlich des Messens der jeweiligen Zeitdauer θ_b zwischen den Rauchblasvorgängen für jeweils eine Mehrzahl von Heizstufen in dem Kessel, Erhalten der
30 optimalen Zeitdauer θ_{opt} zwischen den Rauchblasvorgängen für jede der Heizstufen, Berechnen des Unterschiedes $\Delta\theta_b$ zwischen der aktuellen und der optimalen Zeitdauer für jede Heizstufe und Auswählen der Heizstufe, welche den größten Unterschied $\Delta\theta_b$ hat für den nächsten Rußblasvorgang.

Revendications

35 1. Méthode de commande de soufflage de suie dans l'un d'une pluralité de passages de chauffage à l'intérieur d'une chaudière, la méthode comprenant:

le calcul de la pente moyenne a pour une perte de rendement durant une période située entre des opérations de soufflage de suie pour le passage de chauffage;

40 un calcul de la durée optimale θ_{opt} entre les opérations de soufflage de suie conforme à la relation:

$$\theta_{opt} = \sqrt{\theta_c^2 + \frac{2S\theta_c}{a}} - \theta_c,$$

45 où S correspond au coût d'exploitation d'une opération de soufflage de suie pour le passage de chauffage et où θ_c correspond à la durée d'une opération de soufflage de suie du passage de chauffage, et

l'initiation du soufflage de suie du passage de chauffage à un temps déterminé en conformité avec la durée optimale calculée θ_{opt} entre opérations de soufflage de suie.

50 2. Méthode selon la revendication 1, dans laquelle la pente moyenne a est calculée en calculant le rendement instantané E_{Ni} pour le passage de chauffage, permettant d'obtenir les constantes de filtre X pour le passage de chauffage, d'obtenir une valeur de perte de rendement instantanée moyenne E_{AVI} à partir de la relation:

$$55 \quad E_{AVI} = (1 - X) E_{AVI} + X \cdot E_{Ni},$$

et de mesurer le coût et la charge d'énergie pour la chaudière, la pente a étant égale au produit de la perte de rendement instantanée moyenne, de la charge et du coût d'énergie.

60 3. Méthode selon la revendication 2, dans laquelle la perte de rendement instantanée E_{Ni} est calculée en mesurant un changement de rendement de la chaudière dû au soufflage de suie du passage de chauffage et en divisant le changement de rendement par la durée effective θ_b entre les opérations de soufflage de suie pour le passage de chauffage.

4. Méthode selon la revendication 1, 2 ou 3, comprenant la mesure de la durée effective θ_b entre des
65 opérations de soufflage de suie pour chacun d'une pluralité de passages de chauffage de la chaudière,



EP 0 137 709 B1

permettant d'obtenir la durée optimale θ_{opt} entre les opérations de soufflage de suie pour chacun des passages de chauffage, de calculer les différences $\Delta\theta$, entre une durée effective et optimale pour chaque passage de chauffage, et de sélectionner le passage de chauffage présentant la différence $\Delta\theta$, la plus grande pour l'opération de soufflage de suie suivante.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

55

60

65

