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The performance of standard industrial evaporative cooling tower drift eliminators is analyzed using experiments and numerical simulations. The experiments measure the droplet size spectra at the inlet and outlet of the eliminator with a laser light scattering technique. From these measured spectra, the collection efficiency is deduced as a function of droplet size. The numerical simulations use the computer code SOLASUR as a subroutine of the computer code DRIFT to calculate the two-dimensional laminar flow velocity field and pressure drop in a drift eliminator. The SOLASUR subroutine sets up either no-slip or free-slip boundary conditions at the rigid eliminator boundaries. This flow field is used by the main program to calculate the eliminator collection efficiency by performing trajectory calculations for droplets of a given size with a fourth-order Runge-Kutta Numerical method.

The experimental results are in good agreement with the collection efficiencies calculated with no-slip boundary conditions. The pressure drop data for the eliminators is measured with an electronic manometer. There is good agreement between the measured and calculated pressure losses. The results show that both particle collection efficiency and pressure loss increase as the eliminator geometry becomes more complex, and as the flowrate through the eliminator increases.
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1.1 Background

Current practice in the design and operation of new electric power stations selects a single method of waste heat disposal and then designs the cooling apparatus to meet the worst station heat load throughout the year (Di). This is an outgrowth of past trends, in which once-through cooling was virtually the universal method of power station waste heat disposal in the United States. In the late 1960's waste heat disposal suddenly became a controversial topic with the introduction of unprecedentedly large (>800MWe) and thermally inefficient nuclear power stations. In 1973 the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) added impetus to the use of cooling towers when it took under advisement a Burns & Roe study indicating that evaporative cooling towers may well be the only closed circuit cooling option available in the near future. Based on this study, the EPA recommended the evaporative cooling tower as the best practical technology under the Water Pollution Control Amendments. Subsequent concern for protection of the aquatic environment, and a desire to avoid costly licensing delays has motivated many utilities to design their new, large power stations using cooling towers rather than once-through cooling. As recently as October, 1973, a complete listing of all operating or committed nuclear generating units revealed that 48% of the generating capacity was to be served by cooling towers. The participation by fossil-fueled plants is not as great as this, and projections
indicates that about 50% of the newly added power generating installations at early 1980's will be using cooling towers.

The major cooling tower vendors in the United States are Ecodyne, Inc., Santa Rosa, Calif.; The Marley Co., Mission, Kansas; Research Cottrell, Inc., Bond Brook, N.J.; Ceramic Co., Fort Worth, Texas, and Zurn Industries, Erie, Pa. Other large corporations which are either entering the field or considering doing so are Westinghouse Electric Corp., General Electric Corp., and the Babcock and Wilcox Co.

To meet the increasing demand for electricity in the United States, the utilities are planning to build a large quantity of new, large power stations with more emphasis on nuclear power plants. With the prospect of rapidly increasing cooling requirements due to these plants, special attention has been paid to the environmental effects of cooling methods. The major areas of concern related to the environmental effects of cooling towers are fog, icing, and drift deposition.

Drift consists of the water droplets that are mechanically entrained in the cooling tower's exhaust air stream from the station's cooling water. Drift particles contribute very little to the visibility of cooling tower plumes because the quantity of drift is very small compared to the other forms of water present. The following order of magnitude numbers for the mass concentration of typical cooling tower effluents illustrates this point (S3):

\[
X(\text{vapor}) \sim 20 \, \text{g/m}^3 \\
X(\text{fog}) \sim 1 \, \text{g/m}^3 \\
X(\text{drift}) \sim 0.01 \, \text{g/m}^3
\]
Drift has several important deleterious effects on the local environment. When the mixture of water vapor and drift particles in the cooling tower plume, mixed with the ambient cold air, is carried away, the drift particles may form nucleation sites for condensation. Also, the mixing of the cooling tower plume with the stack plume may form acids through chemical reactions.

In order to meet future electric power requirements and because of the scarcity of cooling water, it will be necessary for many of the new power generating plants to utilize cooling water that contains various concentrations of salt, e.g., brackish inland waters, estuarine water, or sea water. Therefore the drift will contain salt as well as chemicals from the coolant water chemistry. The main concern about drift is its potential for damage to nearby facilities, transmission lines and biota. In some instances, drift has caused serious problems in electric distribution systems; the drift deposits being responsible for equipment failures. Cases involving corrosion and fouling of nearby structures have been reported from both fresh and sea water cooling towers (L3). Drift can also be a considerable nuisance when it spots cars, windows, and buildings.

Estimates of drift from cooling towers range from 0.001% of the circulating water to more than 3%. The industry practice, until early 1970, was for cooling tower vendors to guarantee drift release to be less than 0.2%. At the American Power Conference in Chicago (April, 1970) a new performance standard
of 0.03% was introduced, and in November, 1970, a further reduction was proposed, leading to the estimate that future cooling towers may be certified for drift release less than 0.002%.

Drift from cooling towers is traditionally reduced by passing the exhaust flow through drift eliminators installed in the cooling towers. These eliminators operate by passing the two-phase flow stream through a curved duct, with the heavy water droplets becoming trapped on the duct walls due to centrifugal acceleration. The accumulated water on the walls flows back into the cooling tower.

There are many different ways to install the drift eliminators in a cooling tower, depending upon the type and geometry of the cooling tower. All cooling towers are either crossflow or counterflow types, which is determined by the flow direction of the cooling air relative to the downward travel of the water to be cooled. In general, eliminators are installed either horizontally or vertically. The horizontal scheme is commonly used in crossflow type cooling towers and the vertical scheme in counterflow type cooling towers, as shown in Fig. 1.1.1. The horizontal installation scheme is easier and more sturdy in construction. It can also be used to adjust the air flow pattern within the tower. The main problem with the horizontal installation scheme is the inefficient drainage of water from the eliminator walls: a thick water film forms on the eliminator walls and reduces the drift collection effectiveness. The vertical installation scheme has little water drainage.
Fig. 1.1.1 Installation Schemes of Drift Eliminators in Cooling Towers
problem due to the enhanced film flow by gravity.

There are many different types of drift eliminators sold by cooling tower vendors. The common ones are shown in Fig. 1.1.2. The single and double-layer louvre eliminators are generally made with wood. The sinus-shaped eliminator is made from asbestos cement. The Hi-V eliminator is made of polyvinyl chloride (PVC) plastic. The zig-zag eliminator is made from fiber. Some other industrial eliminators are also shown in Fig. 1.1.3.

The performance of drift eliminators can be quantified by two factors: the droplet collection efficiency and the pressure drop across the eliminator. The collection efficiency is generally defined as the ratio of drift mass collected by the eliminator to the total drift mass entering the eliminator. For environmental protection, this factor should be high. The pressure drop across the eliminator represents the resistance of the eliminator to the exhaust air flow. The presence of an eliminator will reduce the air flow within the cooling tower, thus decreasing the tower's cooling capacity. This particular effect can be very detrimental in natural draft cooling towers, since they pass only the small draft caused by the air density difference at the entrance and exit. For mechanical draft cooling towers, a high pressure drop will cause a high horsepower requirement in the fans. Therefore, for inexpensive cooling tower performance, the pressure drop across the eliminators should be as low as possible.

Eliminators operate on the principle of centrifugal separation caused by turning of the flow in the duct. In
Fig. 1.1.2 Some Common Drift Eliminator Geometries
Herringbone Eliminator

Duplex Eliminator

PVC Chevron Type Eliminator

Fig. 1.1.3 Some Modern Industrial Drift Eliminators
general, more turning results in a higher collection efficiency, but a higher pressure drop. In order to achieve a high collection efficiency and a low pressure drop, the design of drift eliminators calls for an optimization between these two factors. In current industrial practice, there is no standard design procedure for doing this. That is, all existing drift eliminators are generated through random innovation, experience, and experiments. This thesis develops a numerical technique to study the cooling tower drift eliminator performance, which can eventually be used to evaluate and design drift eliminators.

1.2 Previous Theoretical Studies of Drift Eliminator Performance

Studies of eliminator performance have been carried out mainly with experiments. However, the experiments suffer from the difficulties encountered in measuring the drift quantity and distribution. None of the drift measurement techniques has yet been proven to be generally satisfactory to the point of their being adapted for general use (A1). Theoretical studies are rarely performed because it is feared that such studies would be unreliable due to a number of uncertainties. These include the possibility of flow turbulence within the eliminator, the droplets rebounding from or being generated in the water film on the eliminator walls, and the water film drainage system design. Despite this, a theoretical model is still a very useful tool in evaluating the relative performances of different drift eliminators, and in designing improved drift eliminators. Recently a few attempts have been made in this
direction; the approaches are briefly described next.

1.2.1 Roffman's analytical formulation

An analytical formulation for the estimation of drift eliminator collection efficiency has been developed by Roffman et al. (R4). In this model it is assumed that the drift droplets flow longitudinally at the assumed-constant vertical air velocity within the eliminator, and that it experiences transverse viscous drag due to the transverse air velocity component. This component is obtained by assuming that the air velocity at any point in the eliminator is locally parallel to the eliminator wall. For complex geometries the model uses a Fourier series expansion of the transverse velocity component in terms of the duct contour. By using these assumptions an explicit form of the equation describing the droplet transverse displacement can be obtained as a function of longitudinal location of the droplet. From the displacement information it can be determined which of the entering droplets will hit the eliminator walls. The collection efficiency of the eliminator can be determined as a function of droplet size. The results are claimed to be satisfactory when overall collection efficiencies are compared with the experimental data obtained by Chilton (C4).

1.2.2 Foster's Model

Foster, et al. (F3) have developed a potential flow numerical simulation model for theoretical investigations of drift eliminators. The model defines the effective eliminator boundaries with experimental flow visualization photography,
and it is assumed that all droplets entering this region are eliminated. The main stream flow fields are obtained by solving the Laplace equation for the velocity potential within an experimentally defined laminar flow region. Using this information the collection efficiency for any droplet size is estimated from numerically computed droplet trajectories by solving the droplet equation of motion using a Runge-Kutta-Gill procedure. However, the estimated efficiencies are much greater than those observed experimentally. This is thought to be due to the improper treatment of the turbulent wake region. It has been found that results obtained from direct calculation of the flow field without definition of the turbulent wake region provide better agreement with experiments (F2).

1.2.3 Yao and Schrock's model

Yao and Schrock (Y2) also developed a numerical model for evaluating the eliminator collection efficiency. The flow field is calculated by a relaxation method for iterative solution of the Laplace equation for the stream function. The droplet trajectories are calculated step by step in space, with the droplet drag-induced acceleration assumed constant within a given mesh interval. In this model the pressure drop across the eliminator is also calculated by using a boundary layer analysis.

1.3 Survey of Experimental Evaluation of Drift Eliminator Performance

Experimental evaluations of drift eliminator performance are performed by measuring the drift at the exhaust side of the
eliminator in a particular cooling tower or a simulated cooling tower facility. In most cases only the drift rate (defined as the drift mass flowrate escaping the tower divided by the recirculating water flowrate in the tower) is measured. The droplet size-dependent collection efficiency of the eliminator is generally never measured. Many methods exist for measuring drift in these two ways. Most of them stem from droplet measurement techniques in cloud physics. Those that are widely used are summarized below.

1.3.1 Droplet Size Distribution Measurement Techniques

The following methods measure the drift droplet size distribution. The total drift rate can be determined by integrating the distribution over the droplet size.

1.3.1.1 Sensitive Paper

This method has been used extensively to measure the liquid water content and size distribution in clouds and fog. Recently this method was adapted for cooling tower drift measurements (F1,R3,S3,S4,W2). In this method filter paper is sensitized by soaking it with a 1% solution of potassium ferricyanide. The paper is dried thoroughly and dusted with finely ground ferrous ammonium sulfate. The treated paper is pale yellow in color. When a water droplet falls on the paper, it dissolves both chemicals and forms an insoluble blue precipitate known as Turnbull's blue which is easily identifiable against the pale yellow background. The area of the stain is related to the droplet diameter. Adjustments must be made for the speed of
impingement and porosity of the paper. The best method of obtaining calibration factors for these variables and various droplet sizes is to use a monodisperse droplet generator to form stains from a known droplet size, speed of impingement, and porosity of the paper. The calibration is independent of sensitizing agent (C4).

There are two types of sensitive paper sampling methods. The most common method exposes the paper briefly in the air stream with the paper normal to the air flow. However, in this method, the impingement speeds are different for different droplet sizes. A second method (S3) moves the sensitive paper through the air by a rotating head machine with the axis of rotation parallel to the air flow. The head velocity is perpendicular to the average air flow and droplet trajectory, therefore the droplet impingement speed is always equal to the rotational speed of the heads.

The collection efficiency of sensitive paper depends on the droplet sizes and velocities. Calibration of this method should include consideration of the dynamics of particle motion and impingement: particles can impinge at an angle, producing elongated stains, and at higher velocities droplets will produce larger stains. The collection efficiency decreases for smaller droplets. For these reasons calibration and data reduction are time-consuming in the sensitive paper technique.

1.3.1.2 Coated Slide or Film

The measurement technology for this method was also established by cloud physics investigators. This technique is
easily adaptable to field measurements of cooling tower drift droplet size distribution (R3,S4,W2). In this method a glass slide or photographic film is coated with a material that preserves the shape of impinging droplets against coalescence and evaporation. Of all the slide coatings evaluated, a liquid plastic coating called FORMVAR gives the clearest and most distinct representation of the drift droplets. When a water droplet impacts the coating, it is encapsulated as the plastic solvent evaporates. The water in the droplet eventually evaporates through the thin FORMVAR skin, but the exact shape of the impacting droplet is preserved by the plastic film for future size analysis with a microscope. Calibration involves corrections for the flattening of droplets on the slide, and for evaporation, which is a function of time and droplet mineral concentration.

This technique has an upper droplet size limitation in the range of 200 to 300 microns. When droplets larger than this impinge on the slides, the droplets tend to shatter, making a size determination impossible. As with the sensitive paper method, data reduction is lengthy and tedious.

1.3.1.3 Laser Light Scattering

In the laser light scattering technique for drift measurement (S2,S4,S5,S7), droplets are illuminated by coherent, monochromatic laser light. Light scattered by a particle within the sampling volume (defined by the intersection of the laser beam and the detector acceptance cone) is detected by a photodetector, producing a current pulse which is related uniquely
to the droplet size. The current pulses are analyzed and stored in a pulse height analyzer and the data can be processed by a minicomputer. The size of the sampling volume should be small, so that lengthy sampling times can be avoided, and so that the probability of having more than one particle present in the volume is small.

The system is calibrated by noting the response of the instrument to droplets of known size that are generated by a monodisperse droplet generator. However, this method is complicated by the variation of the laser light intensity across the laser beam and by an edge effect.

The main advantage of the laser light scattering system is that it can operate on-line, providing fast results.

1.3.1.4 Laser Light Imaging

This method has not been used in cooling tower drift measurement but appears in principle to have some advantages over the laser light scattering system (K1). In this method a linear array of photodetectors spaced equally measures the droplet shadow diameter. The droplet passes between a He-Ne laser and the detector array of fiberoptics. An optical system focusses the laser beam to cast the droplet's shadow at the desired magnification on the detector array. A voltage drop across a given detector in the array due to shadowing is compared to the quiescent voltage of the unshadowed detectors. Since the ambient light level is always used as a reference, this method has an increased sensitivity to soiling of its optics. The size of particle is determined by the number of
occulted fibers. Only shadows lying fully within the array are used, which eliminates the unavoidable edge effects of scattering or extinction methods.

The device operates on-line and samples particles in situ. However, it is expected that considerable experimentation and possibly modification would be required before an imaging instrument was developed to the point of practical applications for drift measurement.

1.3.1.5 Holography

The principle of this method is that light from coherent laser light source scattered by the droplet interferes at the film plane with light which proceeds unscattered and forms the hologram interference pattern. The photographic film is then processed and replaced in the electromagnetic wave. The diffraction by the interference pattern density variations in the film is such as to produce a focusing of light to produce a real image of the hologram of the droplet. This can be viewed with a closed circuit television system. If the recording and reconstruction light waves have the same properties the reconstructed image will be at the same distance as the recording distance and the cross-section of the droplet under reconstruction will be the same as the cross-section of the original scattering droplet. In this way, one may therefore map out a dynamic droplet field with respect to both position and size distribution.

The method has been used in measuring fog droplets in the size range of 5 to 35 microns (T3). The system has the
disadvantage that the reconstruction necessitates a two-step process and is therefore lengthy. This method is expensive and is shown to be inferior to the light scattering method (S4).

1.3.1.6 Photography

Droplets can be filmed using a high-speed cine camera, with the droplets being diffusely illuminated from the opposite direction. Droplets down to a diameter of 50 microns have been measured. The films are studied frame by frame using an analyzing projector, and the diameter, velocity, and trajectory of the droplets that are clearly in focus can be analyzed. This method has been used in studying drift eliminator collection efficiency (F3). However, the data reduction is lengthy.

1.3.2 Total Drift Mass Measurement Techniques

In most experimental work drift eliminators are evaluated by measuring the total drift mass flux escaping cooling towers. Some of these methods are described below.

1.3.2.1 Isokinetic Systems

In isokinetic systems air is drawn into the collector with a kinetic energy identical to that of a fluid element at that position, had the collector not been there. If the density and temperature of the air do not change as the air is drawn into the collector, isokinetic sampling requires only that the velocity of the air flow into the collector being equal to that in the absence of the collector at the point of measurement. In an isokinetic system, the mean air flow within the collector is adjusted by a blower to be
equal to the mean air flow outside the collector. There are many different isokinetic systems which use various collectors. One of them is cyclone collector (R1,W2), where droplets entering the cyclone collector are separated from the air stream by centrifugal force and are collected in a container. The collection efficiency of the collector is determined in a fog chamber. Drift droplets collected are analyzed by atomic absorption spectroscopy for dissolved mineral concentration. Since the collected water contains not only drift water, but also condensed water, the drift mass flux cannot be determined simply from the quantity of the collected water. Rather, the drift mass flux is determined from the dissolved mineral concentration by assuming that the mineral concentration in the drift is the same as in the makeup water source. This constitutes the greatest uncertainty in this method.

Another kind of collector is the isokinetic sampler tube (H4,M1,S3,S4) in which a heated glass tube filled with glass beads is used to collect drift mineral residue. The heating element evaporates all of the liquid water sampled. Only the mineral residues are retained for subsequent chemical analysis. This method also suffers from the uncertainty in assuming an equality of mineral concentration in the drift and the makeup water source.

The mineral background in a real cooling tower is generally high, and this introduces even more error into either of these methods.
1.3.2.2 High Volume Sampler

The high volume sampler method measures the drift mineral concentration per unit volume of air \( (L_1, R_2) \). Air is pumped through a filter and particles in the air are trapped. The air flow rate through the filter is recorded continuously to give the total volume of air sampled. The filter is heated to keep it dry. Data reduction of the drift mineral concentration is performed with atomic absorption spectroscopy and by comparing the results to a clean filter background count. This method is affected by ambient humidity, wind, and background airborne particulate concentration.

1.3.2.3 Airborne Particulate Sampler

The airborne particulate sampler (APS) was originally developed for monitoring atmospheric salt loading at coastal locations. It operates on the principle of collection by impaction. Two woven polyester meshes mounted on rotating arms sweep out a known volume of air per revolution. By counting the number of revolutions, the total volume of air sampled can be determined. A fan maintains the air flow past the meshes and keeps it parallel to their plane. A wind vane rotates the entire system about the vertical axis so that it always faces into the wind. Calibration can be done with a monodisperse droplet generator. Data reduction is performed by a spectroscopic analysis of the meshes for salt content. The main advantage of the APS over the high volume sampler is that the APS system does not require as much power, and can be
run on a car battery at remote locations.

1.3.2.4 Deposition Pans

In this method petri dishes or polyethylene jars are put at various locations in the horizontal plane surrounding the cooling tower to measure the quantity of drift residue that settles on the ground. Residue is collected for a known length of time and is analyzed by atomic absorption spectrophotometry.

1.3.2.5 Chemical Balance

This method measures the rate of decrease in concentration of a chemical such as sulfate or other tracer chemicals added to the circulating water (C2). The drift rate is calculated from the amount of change in the concentration of the tracer with time. The disadvantages of this method are that a long test period is required and that circulating water systems invariably have other leaks that deplete the chemical tracer.

1.3.2.6 The Calorimetric Technique

The calorimetric technique incorporates special thermodynamic and hydrodynamic principles by utilizing a calorimeter with a throttling nozzle (R3). The droplets passing through the throttle point evaporate because of a pressure drop, and in doing so, they remove heat from the surrounding air. This in turn causes a detectable air temperature drop which is used to determine the drift rate.

1.4 Industrial Efforts in Drift Eliminator Evaluation

The first extensive investigation of drift eliminator
performance was done by Chilton (C4) in the late 1940's and early 1950's. The test apparatus included a closed loop experimental tower which simulated a natural draught cooling tower. The drift droplets were collected by a Calder Fox Scrubber at the tower exit. By measuring the water collected for a certain period of operating time at different velocities, the collection efficiencies of various eliminators for several ranges of droplet size were determined. The pressure drop was measured by pitot static tubes leading to a Chattock Fry tilting micro-manometer. Many different eliminator geometries were tested, and a double-layer louvre eliminator was recommended, which was subsequently adopted on many cooling towers in England. Measurements of precipitation from the cooling towers after installation of the recommended eliminator were then performed using the sensitive paper technique. The sensitive paper used was Whatman No. 1 filter paper.

The experiment was considered to be a great success. Since then, not much work on eliminator performance evaluation has been reported until recently. In 1969, drizzle from two modern 2000 MW stations was detected by the Central Electricity Generating Board Regional Scientific Service Staff. Research work on drift eliminators was subsequently rekindled by the Central Electricity Research Board. Tests similar to those by Chilton were performed on some eliminator geometries (G1), with a recommendation for a closer pitched (1.75 in.) asbestos-cement eliminator. Droplet size measurements were made on water sensitive papers exposed inside cooling towers at various levels
including both under and over the eliminators (M3). Droplet removal efficiencies were found for conventional louvre eliminators. The sensitive paper technique described in this work is the same as the one reported in Chilton's paper except that the calibration was extended to smaller droplet sizes (25-400μm). Theoretical evaluation was also carried out to calculate the collection efficiency as a function of droplet size (F3). The theoretical efficiencies were found to be much greater than the observed efficiencies from their experiments which was done with a photographic method.

In 1971, Fish and Duncan at Oak Ridge National Laboratory developed an isokinetic sampling sensitive paper technique using Whatman No. 41 filter paper (F1). The technique was used to measure the drift size distribution above drift eliminators of a counterflow hyperbolic cooling tower. The drift rate was found to be 0.002-0.006%.

The Marley Company has established a strong program in drift measurement and drift eliminator development since late 1960's. In 1968, a chemical balance method was used in the Marley Laboratory to check drift levels with and without drift eliminators in the testing tower. The technique was also used in drift determinations on an operating mechanical draft industrial crossflow tower at a Municipal Power Plant. In 1970, the Marley Co. was interested in operating a cooling tower on salt water makeup, which required an accurate knowledge of drift rate. Since that time they have sponsored and cooperated with the Environmental Systems Corporation (ESC) to develop
reliable drift measurement instruments that include the Particulate Instrumentation by Laser Light Scattering (PILLS) system, the Isokinetic Sampling (IK) system, and sensitive paper techniques. Later the Marley Co. added a special drift test cell to the Marley Laboratory exclusively for drift eliminator development. Drift measurements were mostly done with the isokinetic sampling system developed by ESC. Many different eliminators have been tested. Some of the important conclusions are listed here (H4):

(1) Numerous observations have shown that the circulating water rate has little effect on the drift level. Specific tests on the Duplex eliminator revealed, within the limits of test accuracy, that there was no change in drift rate with circulating water rates ranging from 12 GPM/ft² to 22 GPM/ft².

(2) Theoretically, drift eliminator collection efficiency increases with air velocity. However, the water load on the eliminator also increases with the air velocity, but at a greater rate than the increase in efficiency. Altogether it was found that drift increases with air velocity. The rate of this increase can be drastic with an inefficient eliminator, with the failure to control the pattern of the water on the fill side of the eliminator, or with inadequate provision for draining the eliminator.
(3) The effect of efficient air handling in the tower by the eliminators seriously changes the tower performance and drift release rate.

The Environmental Systems Corporation was first sponsored by the Marley Co., but later established itself as an independent organization providing services to parties of every interest. In 1971 ESC received grants from Environmental Protection Agency to further develop drift measurement techniques, particularly on the PILLS system. Other techniques to be evaluated were isokinetic sampling using filter papers, cyclone collector and glass wool fill material, sensitive paper using milli-pore membrane filter paper, and on-line holography. APS was developed later for airborne particulate measurement. Numerous drift measurements at operating cooling towers by ESC using these techniques have been performed. Some of them are listed in Table 1.4.1.

In the early 1970's, Ecodyne developed several drift measurement techniques for field testing. These include the isokinetic sampling system using a cyclone separator, assembled and calibrated by Meteorology Research, Inc., the impaction method using FORMVAR coated slides, and sensitive paper techniques. As of 1973, more than twenty types of drift tests had been conducted on industrial towers. The tests included towers equipped with both the standard two pass drift eliminator configurations typical of the industry for the past twenty years, and a new drift eliminator developed by Ecodyne, the Hi-V eliminator. Test results showed that drift rates for the standard two pass
Table 1.4.1  
Field Work of the Environmental Systems Corporation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Trip Description</th>
<th>Measuring Instrumentation</th>
<th>Drift Rate Measured (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical draft tower at Oak Ridge (J1,S4)</td>
<td>IK</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatower, a small commercial cooling tower (S4)</td>
<td>IK</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A commercial double flow mechanical draft tower (S4)</td>
<td>PILLSS</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural draft hyperbolic tower (S4)</td>
<td>IK</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PILLSS (d&gt;145\mu m)</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer City, Pa., a 500 MWe counter flow natural draft tower (M1,S3)</td>
<td>IK</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornaing, France, a 250 MWe cross flow natural draft tower (S3)</td>
<td>IK</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk Point Unit #3 (H3,S6)</td>
<td>PILLSS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster Creek, Forked River, N.J. (S1)</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Havre, France, a cross flow natural draft testing tower (M1)</td>
<td>IK</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
designs varied from 0.02% to 0.12% with a typical value of 0.05%. The Hi-V drift eliminator drift rates varied from 0.001% to 0.008% with a typical value of 0.004%.

Other companies that are involved in cooling tower drift measurements are Research Cottrell, Inc., who uses the High Volume Air Sampling Method (L1), and the Balcke Co., who uses the cyclone separator (R3), etc.

Although much progress has been made recently in drift measurement techniques, disagreements and unreconciled differences frequently show up, which often involve factors of two or three in the value of certain results. Reliable methods should be developed soon in order to accurately access the environmental effects of cooling towers.

1.5 Present Approach

In the present study, an analysis of the performance of standard industrial drift eliminator devices using both theoretical and experimental techniques is carried out. The theoretical approach makes use of the code SOLASUR (H2) to calculate the air velocity distribution within a drift eliminator and the pressure loss through the eliminator, using both free-slip and no-slip boundary conditions at the eliminator walls.

This information is used to perform trajectory calculations with a fourth order Runge-Kutta numerical technique for droplets of a given size injected into the eliminator in a uniform transverse distribution.

In the experimental approach, the laser light scattering technique is used to measure the droplet size spectra both at
the inlet section and outlet section of the eliminator. This drift measurement technique is selected because of its on-line data acquisition and reduction capacity, and because of its successful application in the PILLS system by the Environmental Systems Corporation. The main differences between the present technique and the PILLS system are that the laser presently used is a steady-state laser instead of a pulsed laser as in the PILLS system (S4), and that there is no fog problem in this laboratory scale work. The pressure drop across the eliminator is measured with a differential electronic manometer.

Comparison of the calculated results and the experimental data for several drift eliminators is presented.

1.6 Organization of this Report

Chapter 2 describes the numerical model for theoretical evaluation of drift eliminator performance. The assumptions made in the theoretical model are also listed in Chapter 2. The results of this calculation for some common cooling tower drift eliminators are presented in Chapter 3.

In Chapter 4, the details of the experimental measurement techniques in this work are described. The experimental data is displayed in Chapter 5, where it is compared with the calculated results. The sources of experimental error, and efforts to quantify this error are included in both Chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter 6 discusses the discrepancies between the measured and calculated results, the validations of the assumptions
made in the theoretical calculations, and the usefulness of the theoretical model. The overall performances of many drift eliminators are compared, and future improvements are recommended for drift eliminator design.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL EVALUATION OF
DRIFT ELIMINATOR PERFORMANCE

2.1 Introduction

Despite the fact that many of the important parameters which affect the performance of drift eliminators cannot be easily accounted for, a theoretical model remains very useful in evaluating the relative performances of different drift eliminators, and in designing improved devices.

In order to do this, a computer program, DRIFT, has been written to numerically simulate the performance of drift eliminators. This chapter describes the theory of the calculations performed by the code and the assumptions that are made in the analysis. A detailed discussion of the use of the code can be found in Ref. C5.

2.2 Assumptions

There are many parameters that affect eliminator performance that cannot be easily included in a theoretical model. Therefore, the following assumptions have to be made in the numerical analysis:

(1) The air flow within the eliminator is laminar. It was demonstrated (F3) experimentally that the flow in a typical drift eliminator is laminar throughout most of the eliminator volume, with
Reynolds numbers lying in the range 2000 to 4000.

(2) The exhaust flow field is not affected by the presence of the drift since the drift density is low.

(3) The flow is two dimensional.

(4) The flow is incompressible since the flow Mach number is low.

(5) Any water film effects on the air flow are neglected.

(6) The initial velocity of the droplet at the inlet of the eliminator is the vector sum of the exhaust flow velocity at the inlet and the vertical droplet terminal velocity.

(7) The probability of a droplet of a given size entering the eliminator inlet at any location is uniform.

(8) There is no droplet mass loss due to either evaporation or friction.

(9) Interactions among the droplets can be neglected since the drift density is low.

(10) The drift is eliminated if it impinges on the eliminator walls, i.e., the "bounce" effect and any water film effects are neglected. Re-entrainment of water droplets from the water film on wall into the exhaust flow can be neglected if the drainage is properly designed and if the film
thickness is sufficiently small so that film surface instabilities do not develop over the anticipated range of exhaust speeds.

Further discussion of the validity of some of these assumptions is presented in Chapter 6.

2.3 Calculation of Air Flow Distributions

In order to calculate the droplet trajectory within an eliminator, it is necessary to know the air velocity distribution within the eliminator. In all previous studies either a uniform flow distribution (R3), or potential flow (F3,Y2) is assumed. In this study, the flow distribution is calculated by the SOLASUR code (H2) which is included in the DRIFT code as a subroutine. In the original SOLASUR code a free-slip boundary condition is used at the rigid boundaries of the eliminators. In this work the option of a no-slip boundary condition at the rigid boundaries has been added to the code so that the mass-averaged total pressure drop between the inlet phase and the outlet phase of the eliminator can be evaluated. It is found that the flow distributions calculated with no-slip boundary conditions look more realistic than those with free-slip boundary conditions. Also, the collection efficiencies calculated with these more realistic flow distributions agree better with measured values. All of these results are shown in later chapters.
The SOLASUR code is a modified version of the SOLA code for calculating confined fluid flows having curved rigid or free surfaces as boundaries. It solves the two-dimensional, transient Navier-Stokes equations for an incompressible fluid using an implicit finite difference technique. This technique is based on the Marker-and-Cell (MAC) method (H1, W1). The description of a flow transient proceeds step by step from an assumed initial velocity field to an asymptotically steady final exhaust flow distribution. The time step size is determined from numerical stability considerations (H2). The fluid region is made up of uniform rectangular cells, and is surrounded by a single layer of fictitious cells as shown in Fig. 2.3.1. Fluid velocities and pressures are located at cell positions as shown in Fig. 2.3.2; horizontal velocities at the middle of the vertical sides of a cell, vertical velocities at the middle of the horizontal sides, and pressure at the cell center.

The procedures involved in one calculational cycle (one time step) consist of:

1. Computing guesses for the new velocities for the entire mesh from the difference form of the Navier-Stokes equations, which involve only the previous values of contributing pressures and velocities in the various flux contributions. The velocities at boundary cells are adjusted so that the boundary conditions are satisfied.
Fig. 2.3.1 General Mesh Arrangement in SOLASUR. Fictitious Boundary Cells are Shaded
Fig. 2.3.2 Arrangement of Finite Difference Variables in a Typical Cell
(2) Adjusting these velocities iteratively to satisfy the continuity equation by making appropriate changes in the cell pressures. In the iteration, each cell is considered successively and is given a pressure change that drives its instantaneous velocity divergence to zero, thus satisfying the continuity equation.

(3) When convergence has been achieved, the velocity and pressure fields are at the advanced time level and are used as starting values in the next calculational cycle.

The above procedures are repeated in each time step until an asymptotic distribution is reached. The results are then used for droplet trajectory calculations in the main program. The flow chart of the SOLASUR subroutine is shown in Fig. 2.3.3.

In the original code, free-slip boundary conditions are used at the rigid boundaries (the top and bottom boundaries), where in each top surface cell the u-velocity in the top fictitious cell (the cell above the surface cell) is set equal to the u-velocity in the top surface cell, and for each bottom surface cell the u-velocity in the bottom fictitious cell (the cell below the bottom cell) is set equal to the u-velocity in the bottom surface cell. In the DRIFT code, no-slip boundary conditions were added as an
SET INITIAL CONDITIONS FOR PROBLEM.

COMPUTE INITIAL GUESS VELOCITIES.

SET BOUNDARY CONDITIONS.

HAVE PRESSURES CONVERGED?

UPDATE CELL PRESSURE AND VELOCITIES.

UPDATE FREE SURFACE POSITION.

ADVANCE TIME AND CYCLE.

PRINT & PLOT.

PRESSURE DROP CALCULATION.

NO

TIME TO STOP?

NO

START

READ INPUT PARAMETERS.

COMPUTE PROBLEM CONSTANTS.

SET INITIAL CONDITIONS FOR PROBLEM.

COMPUTE INITIAL GUESS VELOCITIES.

SET BOUNDARY CONDITIONS.

HAVE PRESSURES CONVERGED?

YES

SET SPECIAL BOUNDARY CONDITIONS.

STOP

Fig. 2.3.3 Flow Chart of the SOLASUR Code
option, where the u-velocity in the fictitious cells at the top and bottom boundaries are set equal to the negative u-velocity in the top and bottom surface cells.

A detailed discussion of the SOLASUR code is given in Ref. H2. Results of air velocity distribution calculations are presented in Chapter 3.

2.4 Pressure Loss Calculations

The pressure loss of the air stream flowing through an eliminator is an important factor in designing a drift eliminator. A large pressure drop will reduce the tower cooling capacity and will thus either increase the capital cost or the operating cost of the tower. An estimate (Gl) reveals that a flow resistance of three velocity heads ($=\Delta P/\frac{1}{2} \rho V^2$) will increase the final temperature of the condensate by approximately $0.2^\circ$C. This seems to be a very small increase, yet it is significant in terms of overall station economics, bearing in mind that $1^\circ$C is valued at about $3M over the life of a 2000MW station. The flow resistances of current industrial drift eliminators range from two to ten velocity heads.

Prediction of the pressure drop across an eliminator is complicated by the fact that flow separation occurs in most eliminator geometries, and this induces a large pressure drop. Yao and Schrock (Y1, Y2) calculated the pressure drop across drift eliminators using the method of Lieblein and Roudebush (L2), in which the total pressure loss is expressed as a
function of boundary layer thickness, provided that no flow separation occurs in the eliminator. The hydrodynamic boundary layer thickness is determined by an approximation method proposed by Thwaites (T5).

In the SOLASUR code values of pressure are calculated at all cells. Using no-slip boundary conditions at the rigid walls, the pressure drop can be calculated. Assuming equal air density at the inlet and outlet regions of the eliminators, the mass averaged pressure loss is defined as

$$\Delta P = \sum_{j=JB}^{JT} \frac{u_{2,j}}{2} \cdot P_{2,j} - \sum_{j=JB}^{JT} \frac{u_{IBAR,j}}{2} \cdot P_{IBAR,j},$$  (2.4.1.)

where the summation is from the bottom boundary cell (JB) to the top boundary cell (JT). \(i=IBAR\) is the outlet region, and \(i=2\) is the inlet region. \(u_{i,j}\) and \(P_{i,j}\) are horizontal velocity component and pressure at cell \((i,j)\), respectively. This pressure loss calculation is performed at each time step until a steady state value is reached. Results of this calculation are presented in Chapter 3.

2.5 Droplet Trajectory and Collection Efficiency Calculations

The droplet collection efficiency of an eliminator is generally defined as the ratio of drift mass collected by the eliminator to the drift mass entering the eliminator. It is customary to study eliminator efficiency only in terms of its effect on the total mass of droplets leaving the cooling
tower. However, it is currently known that the droplet size distribution also plays an important part in determining the nature of drift deposition. Therefore it is necessary in evaluating an eliminator to investigate the variation of eliminator efficiency as a function of droplet size. The collection efficiency is defined as

\[ n(d) = \frac{N_c(d)}{N_1(d)}, \quad (2.5.1) \]

where \( N_c(d) \) represents the number of droplets of diameter \( d \) being captured by the eliminator, and \( N_1(d) \) represents the number of droplets of diameter \( d \) entering the eliminator.

In the numerical simulation process, a certain number of droplets of a given size are injected into the eliminator with a uniform transverse distribution. By calculating their trajectories within the eliminator, the number of droplets that encounter the eliminator boundaries and are then assumed to be captured can be found. The collection efficiency of the eliminator for this droplet size is then determined from Eq. 2.5.1.

The drift trajectory is calculated by solving the droplet equation of motion. For a sphere moving in a flow field, the general solution is governed by the momentum equation (M4)

\[ m_d \frac{dV_d}{dt} = 6 \pi \nu_a R(V_a - V_d) \frac{C_d Re}{24} + m_d g, \quad (2.5.2) \]

where
\[
\frac{C_d \text{Re}}{24} = 1 + 0.197 \text{Re}^{0.63} + 2.6 \times 10^{-4} \text{Re}^{1.38} \quad (2.5.3)
\]

and
\[
\text{Re} = \frac{2 \left| V_a - V_d \right| \rho_a}{\mu_a} \quad (2.5.4)
\]

For a spherical water droplet, Eq. 2.5.2 can be simplified:
\[
\frac{dV_d}{dt} = \frac{9 \mu_a}{2 \rho_a \rho_w R^2} \frac{C_d \text{Re}}{24} (V_a - V_d) + g \quad (2.5.5)
\]

The symbols appearing in the above equations are:
- \( m_d \): droplet mass
- \( \bar{V}_d \): droplet velocity
- \( t \): time
- \( \mu_a \): air viscosity
- \( R \): droplet radius
- \( \bar{V}_a \): air velocity
- \( C_d \): drag coefficient
- \( \text{Re} \): Reynolds number
- \( g \): gravitational acceleration
- \( \rho_a \): air density
- \( \rho_w \): water density

Equation 2.5.5 is a nonlinear differential equation. A fourth-order Runge-Kutta numerical analysis is applied to
determine the droplet trajectory. At any time step, the position of the droplet and its velocity are found. At each location the air velocity is interpolated from the cell values calculated by the SOLASUR code. The air velocity at the beginning of each time step is used throughout that time step, and the local drag coefficient and droplet acceleration are calculated from these velocities and from the local values of the remaining parameters.

A variable time step size is used in the calculation. The step size is determined from a consideration of the propagation of errors in the following manner: For a differential equation of the form

$$\frac{dV_d}{dt} = f(t, V_d),$$

the error at time step \( i + 1 \) in the fourth order Runge-Kutta method is (Cl)

$$\varepsilon_{i+1} = \varepsilon_i (1 + h \frac{df}{V_d} \bigg|_{t_i, a} ) - \frac{h^2}{2} f'(\xi, V_d(\xi)),$$

where \( \alpha \) is a velocity value somewhere in the interval between \( t_i \) and \( t_{i+1} \), \( \xi \) is a time value somewhere in the interval between \( t_i \) and \( t_{i+1} \), and \( h \) is the time step size.

The first term on the right hand side of Eq. 2.5.7 represents the propagation error, and the second term is the local truncation error, which is generally small for small values of \( h \). Then, if \( \frac{df}{V_d} \bigg|_{t_i, a} \) is negative, a value of \( h \)
can be found which will make \( (1 + h \frac{\partial f}{\partial V_d} \bigg|_{t_i, a}) < 1 \), and the error will tend to diminish or die away, so the solution will be stable. For the cases considered, \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial V_d} \) is always found to be negative, so by specifying a proper value for the step factor, \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial V_d} \), a stable solution can be obtained. A large value for this step factor will yield a smaller propagation error but a larger truncation error. A small step factor will result in too small a step-size, thus prolonging the computation. A step factor of 0.1 has been found to be satisfactory for the cases under study. In the present model, \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial V_d} \) is determined at the beginning of each time step using the local values of droplet velocity and air velocity. The step size of this time step is then the constant step factor divided by \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial V_d} \).

If the eliminator is installed in a vertical scheme, the droplets are assumed to enter the eliminator at a velocity which is the difference between the air velocity and their terminal velocities. The terminal velocity of a droplet of radius \( R \) is determined from Eq. 2.5.5 by requiring \( \frac{dV_d}{dt} \) to be zero. Thus

\[
\overline{V}_t = V_a - V_d = - \frac{2}{9} \frac{\rho_w g R^2}{\mu_a C_d Re} \frac{1}{24}
\]  
(2.5.8)
This nonlinear algebraic equation is solved by Newton's method of tangents with a calculational accuracy of 0.1%.

If a droplet enters the eliminator other than vertically (as in a horizontal scheme), then the initial velocity of the droplet will have a vertical component which equals the difference between the vertical component of the air velocity and the droplet terminal velocity, and a horizontal component which equals the horizontal component of the air velocity.

Droplets of a certain size are introduced uniformly across the inlet of the eliminator. The trajectory of each droplet is calculated until it either hits the eliminator walls or passes through the eliminator. The collection efficiency for this droplet size is then the ratio of the number of captured droplets to the number introduced at the entrance. The number of droplets introduced at the entrance determines the accuracy of the collection efficiency calculation. If \( N_d \) droplets are introduced uniformly at the entrance, then the error in the collection efficiency calculation will be proportional to \( 1/N_d \). In the DRIFT code, a provision is made for testing a finer distribution of droplets at the locations where the condition of trap and escape changes between two adjacent droplets. This method greatly improves the accuracy but does not demand too much computation time.

A flow chart of the DRIFT code is presented in Fig. 2.5.1.

Trajectory plots and calculated collection efficiencies are presented in Chapter 3.
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Fig. 2.5.1 Flow Chart of the DRIFT Code
3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the calculations performed with the DRIFT code. The air velocity distributions in some common cooling tower drift eliminators are calculated by the SOLASUR subroutine. The calculations employ both free-slip and no-slip boundary conditions at the eliminator walls, and results are compared and discussed in Section 3.2. The calculated droplet trajectories within these eliminators are presented in Section 3.3. The collection efficiencies calculated from these trajectories are compared with those obtained from other sources in Section 3.4. The last section of this chapter presents the calculated pressure loss across some common industrial drift eliminators.

Table 3.1.1 tabulates the physical dimensions of the eliminators under study. The case numbers in the table will be referred to throughout this thesis.

3.2 Air Velocity Distributions

In this section, air velocity distribution plots for some drift eliminators are presented and discussed. In the plots, the length of the line segments are proportional to the magnitudes of the velocities at the mesh points, and the directions of the lines represent the directions of the flow at the mesh points. In all of the cases presented here
Table 3.1.1
Physical Dimensions of the Eliminators Under Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Eliminator Type</th>
<th>Pitch (cm)</th>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Inclination Angle, °</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Single-Layer Louver</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Double-Layer Louver</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Double-Layer Louver (Lath type)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Sinus-Shaped</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Sinus-Shaped (Belgian-wave)</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Asbestos-Cement</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>HI-V</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1</td>
<td>Zig-Zag</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>E-E</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the air flow direction at the inlet of the eliminator is normal to the flow channel cross section. The gravity effect on the air flow is negligible; therefore the air velocity fields will be assumed to be the same whether the eliminators are installed horizontally or vertically.

Figures 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 display the air velocity distributions for a single-layer louver eliminator as calculated by the SOLASUR subroutine using free-slip and no-slip boundary conditions at the eliminator walls, respectively. With the free-slip condition, the calculated velocity is quite uniform (see Fig. 3.2.1). With the no-slip boundary condition, the calculated velocity field, shown in Fig. 3.2.2, is more realistic. Near the lower boundary a wake region can clearly be seen. Such a wake region is expected in the real flow. Note that the velocity in both cases is mainly parallel to the duct boundary, thus, the collection efficiency can be expected to be low for this type of eliminator.

Figures 3.2.3 and 3.2.4 show similar air velocity fields for a two-layer louver eliminator. The free-slip prediction, Fig. 3.2.3, shows a nearly uniform distribution except at the turn in the eliminator where the velocity decreases as the radius of curvature increases. With the no-slip condition, the velocity distribution plot, Fig. 3.2.4, shows very small velocities at the lower boundary in the first half of the eliminator, and at the upper boundary in the second half of the eliminator. In fact, these are the regions where a wake is expected.
Fig. 3.2.1 Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in Single-Layer Louver Eliminator Using Free-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
Fig. 3.2.2 Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in Single-Layer Louver Eliminator Using No-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
Fig. 3.2.3  Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in Double-Layer Louver Eliminator
Using Free-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
Fig. 3.2.4  Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in Double-Layer Louver Eliminator Using No-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
Figure 3.2.5 compares the air velocity fields for a sinus-shaped eliminator calculated with free-slip and no-slip boundary conditions. In the free-slip case, A, the velocity distribution is approximately uniform. At the mid-length of the eliminator the velocity decreases as the radius of curvature increases. Also, at the high pressure sides of the eliminator the velocity is slightly greater than that at the low pressure sides. It can also be observed at each transverse cross section that the maximum velocity always occurs at the wall. This is not true in the no-slip case, B, where the maximum velocities occur at short distances away from the high pressure walls, and approach a value of zero at the walls. At the mid-length of the eliminator the maximum velocity occurs close to the center of the cross section. Note that the velocities shown at the upper and lower boundaries of the eliminator do not represent the velocities exactly at the walls, but rather at short distances away from the walls. It can also be seen from these plots that the no-slip results predict a more realistic flow because they show the wake regions. This will be illustrated with the help of flow visualization photographs in Chapter 6.

Similar observations can be made regarding the velocity fields of the Hi-V and Zig-Zag type eliminators shown in Figs. 3.2.6 through 3.2.8. For these more complicated geometries it is anticipated that significant recirculating eddies and turbulent wake regions exist at and near the bends.
Fig. 3.2.5 Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in Sinus-Shaped Eliminator.
(A) Free-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries.
(B) No-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
Fig. 3.2.6 Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in Hi-V Eliminator.
(A) Free-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries.
(B) No-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
Fig. 3.2.7 Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in Zig-Zag Eliminator Using Free-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
Fig. 3.2.8 Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in Zig-Zag Eliminator Using No-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
in the flows. From the distributions shown it is concluded that the no-slip results predict more realistic distributions than the free-slip results, which will also be discussed in Chapter 6.

For the Zig-Zag eliminator with no-slip boundary conditions, the calculation fails to achieve a steady-state value. Or, if a small mesh size is used for a more accurate determination of the actual flow, the calculation fails. These effects are due to the fact that in the actual flow, turbulence is very significant for this eliminator. This will be shown in Chapter 6. The effects of turbulence are not taken into account in the current calculation. The recirculating eddies in interior corners are not fully resolved in the solution. This could be done by using a finer calculational mesh. However, this was not done since the mesh size already is in a range for which the calculated droplet capture efficiencies are relatively insensitive to the choice of mesh size. In addition, the droplet capture dynamics are relatively insensitive to whether the calculation of an eddying region is exact or if the region is treated as being approximately stagnant—which is what occurs with an inadequate spatial resolution of the calculated flow field.

The flow structure of any turbulent wake flow cannot be resolved by simply using a finer mesh, but it could be treated explicitly with a "turbulence model" calculation (for which several different computer programs are available). However,
in view of the success of DRIFT in predicting the experimentally observed behavior of the drift eliminators, it was decided that a turbulence model calculation would not be required. Effectively, the error introduced into the capture efficiency prediction by a failure to describe turbulent eddy regions is relatively small. This is mainly true because the devices examined have droplet trajectories that result in captures lying far from these wake regions. This will be discussed further in the following section and in Chapter 6.

Figures 3.2.9 and 3.2.10 show the results for the E-E eliminator designed by Yao and Schrock (Y1, Y2). The criterion for the design is that in order to minimize the air stream total pressure loss, any flow separation of the hydrodynamic boundary layer from the walls is to be avoided. Separation can be avoided if the air velocity increases monotonically along the flow direction. This is done by making the cross section of the flow channel decrease monotonically. After using this criterion and examining several geometries, it was found the E-E eliminator performs satisfactorily. Looking at the velocity distribution calculated by the SOLASUR subroutine using a free-slip boundary condition (Fig. 3.2.9), it is found that the velocity increases monotonically along the flow direction except near the outlet of the eliminator. However, the result predicted with a no-slip calculation (Fig. 3.2.10) indicates that separation does occur and that a wake region exists at the upper boundary just after the
Fig. 3.2.9 Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in E-E Eliminator Using Free-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
Fig. 3.2.10 Velocity Distribution of Air Flow in E-E Eliminator Using No-Slip Conditions at Upper and Lower Boundaries
sharp turn. As a result of this, the pressure loss calculated by the DRIFT code is much higher than that predicted by Yao and Schrock (Y1 and Y2). The collection efficiency calculated by the DRIFT code using the free-slip condition has a velocity distribution that is very close to that calculated by Yao and Schrock. Using a no-slip condition, the collection efficiency calculated by the DRIFT code is not significantly different. These results will be developed in the following sections.

3.3 Droplet Trajectories

The collection efficiency of a drift eliminator at a certain droplet size is determined theoretically by uniformly injecting droplets of that size into the inlet of the eliminators and observing their trajectories inside the eliminators. If the trajectory of a droplet ends at an eliminator wall, then that droplet is assumed to be captured. If the trajectory exits the eliminator without touching the walls, then the droplet is assumed to have escaped the eliminator. By comparing the numbers of escaped and captured droplets, the collection efficiency can be determined.

Droplet trajectories are calculated by solving numerically the droplet equation of motion within the eliminator flow field as described in Chapter 2. Figs. 3.3.1 through 3.3.13 illustrate the droplet trajectory plots for seven different eliminator geometries, with all eliminators assumed
to be in vertical scheme, and droplets entering the eliminators at the left of the figures. For each geometry the trajectories for two droplet sizes are shown. It can be seen in all of the eliminator geometries that larger droplets are more easily captured. In fact, it will be shown in a later section that for any eliminator and any air speed, the calculated droplet collection efficiency increases monotonically with droplet size. This occurs because the net acceleration on a drop varies approximately as $1/R$, where $R$ is the droplet radius. To see this, note that at a given air speed, the aerodynamic drag force increases approximately as $R^2$ (see Fig. 2.3.1), while the particle mass varies in proportion to $R^3$, and the time during which the particle is affected by drag is approximately constant. Thus, the net acceleration on a particle, and the resulting displacement vary approximately as $1/R$, resulting in easier capture for larger droplets.

Figures 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 show the droplet trajectories within a single-layer louver eliminator determined by using a free-slip air velocity distribution. It is observed that the paths of the droplets are essentially parallel to the duct boundary except at the entrance where the inertial motion of the droplets carries them towards the duct boundary. It is because of this inertial effect that the droplets are trapped, and it can be expected that they will be trapped at the boundary towards which they are initially directed, in this case being the upper boundary. Thus, it is concluded that as
Fig. 3.3.1 Droplet Trajectory Plot for Single-Layer Louver Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 40 μm
Fig. 3.3.2 Droplet Trajectory Plot for Single-Layer Louver Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 100 μm
the duct boundary steepness increases the collection efficiency will also increase since the area of the boundary towards which the droplets are initially directed is increased.

Figures 3.3.3 through 3.3.6 display similar sets of data for the two-layer louver and sinus-shaped geometries. In these two cases the length, pitch, and entrance conditions are the same in each of the two geometries in order to compare their drift collection efficiencies. The trajectories are calculated using free-slip boundary conditions in the air velocity determination. Their collection efficiencies are tabulated in Table 3.3.1 as a function of droplet size. The fact that the sinus-shaped geometry has a higher collection efficiency can be explained with the fluid velocity vector and droplet trajectory plots. Comparing these figures, it is seen that the sinus-shaped geometry has a steeper slope at the entrance than does the two-layer louver eliminator, and this is where most of the smaller droplets are trapped (see Figs. 3.3.3 and 3.3.5). For larger droplets, the number trapped near the turn in the duct becomes significant. However, the number is about the same for both geometries, as shown in Figs. 3.3.4 and 3.3.6. Therefore, in order to collect small droplets a geometry that has a steep slope at the entrance should be used, while for large droplets both slopes are important. Thus, if the drift size distribution is known, an optimal drift eliminator for that distribution can be indicated in this manner.
Fig. 3.3.3 Droplet Trajectory Plot for Double-Layer Louver Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 40 μm
Fig. 3.3.4  Droplet Trajectory Plot for Double-Layer Louver Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 100 μm
Fig. 3.3.5  Droplet Trajectory Plot for Sinus-Shaped Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 40 μm
Fig. 3.3.6 Droplet Trajectory Plot for Sinus-Shaped Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 100 μm
Figures 3.3.7 and 3.3.8 show the droplet trajectory plots for the asbestos-cement eliminator using a free-slip air velocity distribution. Trajectory plots for those using no-slip air velocity distributions in a Hi-V eliminator are shown in Fig. 3.3.9. By observing the results of all of the essentially two-layer type eliminator geometries (two-layer louver, sinus-shaped, asbestos-cement, Hi-V), it is concluded that in the first half of those eliminators, the droplets are trapped on the upper duct boundaries, while for the second half of the eliminators, the droplets are trapped on the lower duct boundaries. It can therefore be expected that most of the water loading on these eliminators will occur at these two regions. In designing an effective drainage technique for this water loading, special attention must be paid to these two regions. One drainage technique is to put small grooves on the eliminator surfaces at these two regions to direct the water away.

Another point can be made by observing the trajectories in these two-layer eliminators. The droplet trajectories shown in Fig. 3.3.9 for the Hi-V eliminator are a good example. It is seen that few water droplets enter the two regions where turbulent wakes are expected to occur as discussed in the previous section. These two regions are near the lower boundary for the first layer of the eliminators.
Fig. 3.3.7 Droplet Trajectory Plot for Asbestos-Cement Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 40µm
Fig. 3.3.8 Droplet Trajectory Plot for Asbestos-Cement Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at left of Figure. Droplet Size is 100µm.
Fig. 3.3.9 Droplet Trajectory Plot for Hi-V Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figures. (A) 40 µm Droplet Size. (B) 100 µm Droplet Size.
and near the upper boundary for the second layer of the eliminators. This means that the turbulent wakes will not have a great effect on the droplet trajectories. Therefore, even if these wake regions are not described exactly, the calculated collection efficiency results may approximate the results of an exact flow field, as long as the velocity distribution is calculated using no-slip boundary conditions which will show the general pattern of the flow field. Further discussion will be made in Chapters 5 and 6.

Figures 3.3.10 and 3.3.11 show the droplet trajectories in the Zig-Zag eliminator, using no-slip boundary conditions for the air velocity calculation. It is seen that all droplets that are captured were trapped in the first two layers of the eliminator. Therefore it is doubtful that a third layer is necessary. Figs. 3.3.12 and 3.3.13 display similar data, but with the third layer of the Zig-Zag eliminator removed. It is observed that the capture efficiencies are about the same for the two droplet sizes shown. This is in fact true for all droplet sizes, though the Zig-Zag eliminator has a slightly higher efficiency at smaller droplet sizes. It is expected that the drift collection efficiency for the two cases will not differ significantly, and therefore it is suggested that two layers of the Zig-Zag eliminator will probably suffice. If this is done, then the pressure loss will be significantly reduced.

Figures 3.3.14 and 3.3.15 display the trajectory plots
Fig. 3.3.10  Droplet Trajectory Plot for Zig-Zag Eliminator with Droplets
Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 30 μm
Fig. 3.3.11  Droplet Trajectory Plot for Zig-Zag Eliminator with Droplets
Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 60 μm
DROPLET DIA= 30 MICRON

Fig. 3.3.12 Droplet Trajectory Plot for Two-Layer Zig-Zag Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 30 μm
Fig. 3.3.13 Droplet Trajectory Plot for Two-Layer Zig-Zag Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 60 μm
Fig. 3.3.14 Droplet Trajectory Plot for E-E Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 30 μm
Fig. 3.3.15 Droplet Trajectory Plot for E-E Eliminator with Droplets Entering the Eliminator at Left of Figure. Droplet Size is 50 μm
for the E-E eliminator. It is seen that the capture efficiency of this eliminator is indeed very high, as predicted by Yao and Schrock \((Y_1, Y_2)\). However, it will be shown in Sec. 3.5 that the pressure drop across this eliminator calculated by the DRIFT code is much higher than that predicted by Yao and Shrock.

3.4 Collection Efficiencies

The droplet collection efficiencies of drift eliminators are calculated from the droplet trajectories through the eliminators. These trajectories are obtained by using either no-slip or free-slip predictions of the air velocity field.

Figure 3.4.1 compares the collection efficiency results calculated by the DRIFT code using a free-slip air velocity field with those calculated by Roffman et al. Roffman et al. used an analytical formulation for the estimation of drift eliminator efficiency by assuming that the drift flows longitudinally at the assumed-constant vertical air velocity within the eliminator, and that it experiences transverse viscous drag due to the transverse air velocity component which is obtained by assuming that the air velocity at any point in the eliminator is locally parallel to the eliminator wall. For complex geometries the model uses a Fourier series expansion of the transverse velocity component in terms of the duct contour. Results obtained by the DRIFT code using free-slip boundary conditions for air flow field calculations are shown
Fig. 3.4.1 Collection Efficiency of Droplets as a Function of Droplet Size
(a) DRIFT Calculation
(b) Roffman Calculation
in Fig. 3.4.1 as the curves A, and Roffman's results are the
curves B. The solid curves are the results for the double-
layer louver eliminator, Case D1 as identified in Table 3.1.1.
The broken curves are for the sinus-shaped eliminator, Case
N2 as identified in Table 3.1.1 For both geometries there is
a fair agreement between the two calculations over the range
of droplet sizes considered. However, at small droplet sizes,
the results deviate from each other. The reason for this is
that for small droplets, the trajectory depends strongly on
the air velocity distribution. Therefore, for an air
velocity distribution that is mainly parallel to the duct
walls, even near the entrances and turns as assumed by Roff-
man's model, the smaller droplets will follow the air stream
and escape the eliminator. In this way, a smaller collection
efficiency than the real value is predicted.

It is found from these comparisons that the calculated
results are quite sensitive to the assumptions regarding the
air-stream velocity distribution. It is noted that the
numerical simulation model in this work is physically more
realistic than others which are available.

Figure 3.4.2 shows the drift collection efficiencies for
the two-layer louver and sinus-shaped type geometries of the
same length, pitch, and entrance conditions. The comparisons
of their air velocity distributions and trajectory plots were
given in previous sections. The fact that the sinus-shaped
geometry has a higher collection efficiency can be explained
Fig. 3.4.2 Collection Efficiency of Droplets as a Function of Droplet Size
(a) Sinus-Shaped Eliminator
(b) Double-Layer Louver Eliminator of Same Dimensions.
(Air Inlet Velocity=1 m/s)
by the fluid velocity vector and droplet trajectory plots as explained in the previous section.

The comparison of collection efficiency results will be discussed in Chapter 5. Generally, for simple geometries like the one or two-layer louver eliminators, and sinus-shaped eliminator, the difference in the calculated collection efficiency using a no-slip or free-slip velocity distribution is not significant. This is demonstrated by the results shown in Table 3.4.1 for the two-layer louver eliminator at a 1.5 m/s air velocity. For more complicated geometries, this difference becomes significant, and will be shown in Chapter 5.

Also shown in Table 3.4.1 is the capture efficiency comparison of the DRIFT code calculation with Yao's calculation for the E-E eliminator. It is seen that with free-slip conditions in the DRIFT calculation, the results are very close to Yao's results. This is expected because potential flow is assumed in Yao's calculation. Using a no-slip condition in the DRIFT calculation, the results are different, but not significantly. However, the difference in the pressure drop results is very great, and is demonstrated in the next section.

3.5 Pressure Drops

The SOLASUR subroutine determines the pressure at each nodal point. From this information the total mass-averaged
Table 3.4.1
Collection Efficiency Calculated by DRIFT at 1.5 m/s Air Velocity for Double-Layer Louver Eliminator and E-E Eliminator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Droplet Diameter (µm)</th>
<th>Double-Layer Louver (Case D2 in Table 3.1.1)</th>
<th>E-E</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free-Slip</td>
<td>Yao's Prediction</td>
<td>Free-Slip</td>
<td>No-Slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pressure drop across the eliminator can be determined if a no-slip boundary condition is assumed at the eliminator walls. The results of such calculations will be compared with experimental data in later chapters. In this section the pressure drop distribution along some of the eliminators will be presented to get some insight into the effect of the geometry upon pressure loss across eliminators. The pressure drop distributions presented here are normalized as the ratio of the pressure drop at any location in the eliminator to the total pressure drop across the eliminator.

Figure 3.5.1 shows the pressure drop distribution for the sinus-shaped eliminator. It can be seen that most of the pressure loss occurs near the inlet and outlet regions of the eliminator. This is due to the fact that the slope of the duct boundaries is steeper at these regions. Similar results are obtained for the asbestos-cement eliminator (Fig. 3.5.2) which has a shape similar to the sinus-shaped eliminator except that the slope at the entrance and exit regions is not as steep while it is steeper at other regions. These regions of steeper slope extends farther along the eliminator length than in the sinus-shaped eliminator. It will be shown later that the total pressure loss across the asbestos-cement eliminator is larger than that of the sinus-shaped eliminator.

Figure 3.5.3 shows the results for another smooth geometry, the E-E eliminator designed by Yao and Schrock (Y1,Y2). The flow channel cross-sectional area decreases along the eliminator.
Fig. 3.5.1 Pressure Drop Distribution Along the Length of Sinus-Shaped Eliminator
Fig. 3.5.2 Pressure Drop Distribution Along the Length of Asbestos-Cement Eliminator
Fig. 3.5.3 Pressure Drop Distribution Along the Length of E-E Eliminator
length, which causes the pressure loss to increase steadily along the eliminator length. The pressure loss increases sharply near the outlet region of the eliminator. This is probably due to the occurrence of flow separation as discussed in Sec. 3.2.

Figures 3.5.4 and 3.5.5 show the results of the two eliminators with sharp corners, the double-layer eliminator and the Hi-V eliminator. For both of these eliminators, the pressure distribution curves exhibit a complicated behavior. For the double-layer louver eliminator in Fig. 3.5.4, the first discontinuity occurs near the inlet region, and is probably due to the occurrence of flow separation. The maximum pressure loss occurs at the turn in the eliminator, where it decreases sharply in a very short length. It then increases again to the outlet of the eliminator. Similar results are obtained for the Hi-V eliminator in Fig. 3.5.5. These distributions are not physically reasonable. Therefore, the pressure drop results for geometries with sharp corners are not reasonable, and should be used with care.

Table 3.5.1 lists the calculated pressure losses across some common drift eliminators. They are expressed in terms of the velocity head, which is $\Delta P/\frac{1}{2}\rho V^2$. It can be seen from this table that the pressure loss increases as the eliminator geometry becomes more complex. Since the collection efficiency also increases in this manner, it is necessary to compromise between these two parameters in the design of a
Fig. 3.5.4 Pressure Drop Distribution Along the Length of Double-Layer Louver Eliminator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eliminator Geometry</th>
<th>Case No. in Table 3.1.1</th>
<th>$\Delta P A \over 2 \rho V^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Layer Louver</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-Layer Louver</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinus</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos-Cement</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-V</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zig-Zag</td>
<td>Z1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-E</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-E (Yao's result)</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
drift eliminator with low pressure loss and high collection efficiency.

The pressure loss across the E-E eliminator calculated by Yao and Schrock (Y1,Y2) is also found in the table. Its value is much lower than the one calculated by the DRIFT code. This is because Yao and Schrock assumed that there was no flow separation. This was, however, shown not to be true in Sec. 3.2. If this is true, then this eliminator will be unsuitable for use in cooling towers despite its high capture efficiency.

As mentioned earlier, for eliminators with sharp turns, the pressure loss calculation will not yield reasonable results. This is illustrated in Table 3.5.1; for the double-layer louver, Hi-V, and Zig-Zag eliminators, the results are unreasonably low. The experimental values of the pressure loss are higher, and are reported in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 4

EXPERIMENTAL TECHNIQUES

4.1 Introduction

Experimental evaluations of drift eliminator performance are usually performed by measuring the drift distribution at the exhaust side of an eliminator which is installed in a particular cooling tower or in a simulated cooling tower facility. In most cases only the drift rate (defined as the drift mass current divided by the recirculating water flowrate in the tower) was measured. Very limited experimental work has been done on the droplet size-dependent collection efficiencies of drift eliminators.

Recently it has been realized that the droplet size distribution plays an important part in determining the nature of any drizzle which may arise from the drift (M3). Investigations have therefore been made into the droplet capture efficiency of drift eliminators as a function of droplet size. This data can also validate the calculations performed by the DRIFT code.

This chapter describes the drift elimination facility, the drift measurement techniques, the methods for analyzing the measured data, and the technique for pressure loss measurements. Results obtained from the experiments will be presented and discussed in Chapter 5.
4.2 Drift Elimination Facility

In order to perform comparative performance studies of cooling tower drift eliminators experimentally, a Drift Elimination Facility has been constructed. The facility simulates a cooling tower fill-outlet environment in which drift eliminators can be installed for testing. A schematic diagram of the facility is presented in Fig. 4.2.1.

This facility is a low-speed wind tunnel, 0.8 m by 0.8 m (2.5' x 2.5') with plexiglass walls, supported by a Dexion angle skeleton. Chrome felt gaskets are placed between the plexiglass and Dexion angles to prevent leakage. In order to have access to various regions, most of the plexiglass plates can be removed. Air speeds are adjusted by means of a two-speed exhaust fan at either 1.5 m/s or 2.5 m/s, which simulates natural-draft or mechanical-draft cooling tower conditions, respectively. The fan is placed at the inlet of the tunnel and forces air into the tunnel. To dampen the flow turbulence, some soda straws and honeycomb sheets have been installed downstream from the fan. The turning vanes are made of plastic sheets, and are spaced in such a way that the air flow will remain uniform after turning out of the horizontal section of the facility into the vertical section of the facility. The air is recirculated continuously through a 0.46 m (18") diameter flexible air duct to insure that water vapor saturation is maintained. Recirculating droplets are thought to contribute only an insignificant amount to the drift generated in the
Fig. 4.2.1 Schematic Diagram of Drift Elimination Facility
tunnel and are neglected.

Water droplets are injected into the flow by a spray head which consists of 20 full-cone center-jet nozzles (SPRACO Model 3B), each delivering about 0.3 gallons per minute of water (S8). The drift quantity and droplet size spectrum can be controlled by means of the spray flowrate valve located above the pump. The valve is a PVC ball valve and the pump is rated at two horsepower. The droplets produced by the nozzles lie mainly in the 5 to 200μm diameter range. A Fulflo water filter with a cellulose acetate honeycomb cartridge that has a removal rating of 20 μm filters out any solid particles in the circulating water that might plug the spray nozzles. The facility is slightly tilted so that water will run down to a drain and be collected in the water tank. This recirculating water is changed to fresh, clear water before an experiment is performed.

The vertical test section in which the eliminators are installed is shown in Fig. 4.2.1. Eliminators could also be installed horizontally in the horizontal test section of the facility. However, in the work reported in this thesis the eliminators have all been installed in the vertical test section. This is done so that no significant water film can accumulate on the eliminator walls; also the droplet entrance conditions are simpler and are consistent with the theoretical calculations.

Three types of industrial drift eliminators have been
received from cooling tower vendors. They are the following:

(A) Belgian-Wave (sinus-shaped) eliminator
(B) Hi-V eliminator
(C) Zig-Zag eliminator

The eliminators are cut into suitable lengths so that they can be fitted into the test section of the facility. These eliminators are secured by special eliminator holders, which can hold eliminators of different lengths. The holders can adjust the pitch of the eliminators and the angle inclined to the air flow direction. The holders are made of aluminum to resist corrosion in the humid environment of the facility.

4.3 Drift Measurement Techniques

There are many methods for measuring the water droplet size distribution of water entrained in an air flow stream. In the work reported here, the laser light scattering technique is used because of its capability to measure very small water droplets online. This technique is similar to the PILLS system developed by the Environmental Systems Corporation (S2,S4).

Soon after the laser was developed, it was recognized to be extraordinarily useful for light scattering studies because of its monochromaticity, high power density, spatial coherence in the TEM\textsubscript{00} mode, temporal coherence, and the small divergence of a laser beam. The laser used in the present study is a steady-state, Helium-Neon gas laser (Spectra-
Physics Model 125A) which provides 50 milliwatts of single transverse mode optical power at 632.8 nm. The schematic diagram of the droplet measuring instrument shown in Fig. 4.3.1 illustrates the general principle of this light scattering technique for sensing flowing droplets. The laser light source illuminates a narrow beam in the medium where the water droplets are flowing. The illuminated water droplets scatter light in all directions. The scattered light intensity is related to the parameters of the scattering medium and to the geometry of the apparatus through the familiar Mie theory (M5, V1). It has been found that the scattered light intensity $I_s$, at any angle can be related to the size of the spherical water droplet by the relation

$$I_s = Kd^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.3.1)

where $K$ is the proportionality constant and $d$ is the droplet diameter. Fig. 4.3.2 shows a plot of scattered light intensity versus droplet size calculated by the DAMIE code. A description of the code is given in Appendix B. It can be observed from this figure that Eq. 4.3.1 holds. A scattering volume, designated $V$ in Fig. 4.3.1, is defined by the intersection of the laser beam and a collimated photodetector acceptance cone. The acceptance cone is defined by the two 1000 μm diameter apertures in front of the detector. The photodetector is an RCA Model 7265 photomultiplier tube. This is a 14-stage, head-on type detector having an S-20 spectral response. It is placed at an angle of approximately 30° to
Fig. 4.3.2 Scattered Light Intensity Versus Droplet Size Calculated by DAMIE
the laser beam, which was found to be optimum. When a droplet passes through the scattering volume, light is scattered and detected by the photomultiplier tubes, producing a voltage pulse. The height of the pulse represents the scattered intensity. The pulse is amplified and recorded in a multichannel analyzer. The multichannel analyzer determines the pulse height and records each pulse in an appropriate channel. The analyzer used in this work is an NS 900 pulse height analyzer with 1024 channels. It can record pulse heights of zero to eight volts. In the current work, only 256 channels are used. It has been demonstrated, by using a standard pulse generator, that this analyzer is capable of analyzing the typical pulse shapes encountered in the experiments. The spectrum being recorded represents the droplet size spectrum of the droplets passing through the scattering volume.

This measuring technique was developed from the PILLS system (S2). Limitations of the PILLS system due to fog-induced background signals have been reported in field measurements of drift in cooling towers, but are nonexistent in this laboratory work since cold water is used in the experiments. Multi-particle scattering can be avoided by controlling the size of the scattering volume and by adjusting the drift density appropriately. A single droplet is never counted more than once because a steady-state laser is used rather than a pulsed laser as in the PILLS system, where a slow moving particle may remain in the scattering volume during more than one laser pulse.
Other background signals are derived from the high-voltage power supply, photomultiplier tube, amplifier, and from any surrounding light sources. These contribute very little to the measured signal and are neglected.

4.4 Calibration of the Drift Measurement Instrumentation

A calibration is necessary in order to find the voltage response of the drift measurement instrumentation versus the droplet size. The instrument is calibrated by introducing monodisperse water droplets of certain sizes into the scattering volume and noting the output signals. Monodisperse means that the droplets all have the same size. Monodisperse droplets are generated by a Berglund-Liu Monodisperse Aerosol Generator, on loan from Thermo Systems, Inc. This generator produces water droplets of a certain uniform size by utilizing a vibrating orifice. Its operation is based on the instability and uniform breakup of a cylindrical water jet under mechanical disturbances (B1). When these mechanical disturbances are generated at a constant frequency and with sufficient amplitude in a liquid jet of constant velocity, the jet will break up into equally sized droplets. To form a source of monodisperse droplets, these uniform droplets must be dispersed and diluted before they recombine. The generator is unique in that it can produce droplets of a known size, the droplet size being calculable from the generator operating conditions to an accuracy of 2%. The droplets generated are exceedingly uniform in size—the standard deviation is approximately 1% of the mean droplet diameter (B1).
A schematic diagram of this generator is shown in Fig. 4.4.1. It consists of four major parts: the liquid feed system, the droplet generator, the droplet dispersion system, and the wave generator. The liquid feed system is a syringe pump which forces water through a membrane filter at a constant rate into the droplet generator. The rate is determined by noting the time (using a stop watch) in which a known volume of liquid is forced into the droplet generator.

The droplet generator pictured in Fig. 4.4.2 consists of a stainless steel cup with a 1.15 in. diameter flange and a hole in the bottom. A 0.375 in. O.D. orifice disc is placed in a groove inside the bottom of the cup, a Teflon O-ring is placed on top of the orifice disc, and a stainless steel cap is tightened onto the O-ring holding the orifice disc in place. A ring-shaped piezoelectric ceramic with two silvered faces is epoxied to the flange on the cup with conductive epoxy. The liquid from the liquid feed system is fed through the cap into the cup and is then sprayed through the orifice. An A.C. voltage from the wave generator is applied to the piezoelectric ceramic which vibrates the cup and disturbs the liquid jet at a constant adjustable frequency. Because the syringe pump delivers the liquid at a constant rate, the liquid jet breaks up into uniform droplets at the frequency of the A.C. voltage. The uniform droplet stream then enters the dispersion system. The droplet dispersion system consists of a stainless steel holder and cover for the droplet generator, a pressure
Fig. 4.4.1 Schematic Diagram of the Model 3050 Vibrating Orifice Monodisperse Aerosol Generator
Fig. 4.4.2 Schematic Diagram of the Droplet Generating System
regulator, a flow meter, and an absolute filter. The cover has a dispersion orifice through which both the droplet stream and a turbulent air jet pass. When the droplet stream mixes with this air jet, it is dispersed into a conical shape. The dispersed droplets are then ready to enter the wind tunnel flow stream. The droplet generator is placed under the laser light beam at an appropriate distance so that the droplets are well enough dispersed to avoid multiple scattering, yet it is close enough to avoid significant evaporation of the droplets. The droplets are carried up to the scattering volume by the normal air flow in the Drift Elimination Facility described in Sec. 4.2. The scattered light from these droplets is detected and recorded by the drift measuring instrument in the manner described in Sec. 4.3.

The water droplet size produced by the vibrating orifice monodisperse aerosol generator is deduced from a knowledge of the orifice size, the liquid feed system flowrate, and the wave generator frequency by

\[ D_d = \frac{6Q^{1/3}}{\pi f} \]  

(4.4.1)

where \( D_d \) is the droplet diameter, \( Q \) is the liquid feed flowrate and \( f \) is the disturbance frequency. Table 4.4.1 tabulates some droplet sizes under typical operating parameters. The droplet sizes generated in this work range from 50 \( \mu \)m to 100 \( \mu \)m diameter. More detailed information on this generator is contained in Refs. B1 and T1.
Table 4.4.1
Droplet Diameter As A Function of Typical Droplet Generator Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal Orifice Diameter (μm)</th>
<th>Liquid Feed Rate (cc/min)</th>
<th>Operating Frequency (KHz)</th>
<th>Droplet Diameter (μm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Data Acquisition and Analysis Techniques

Because the laser light intensity is not uniform across the beam cross section, monodisperse water droplets passing through the beam will emit different scattered intensities. The laser light has the Gaussian intensity distribution along its diameter shown in Fig. 4.5.1, where the laser light intensity was measured across the beam cross section using a Spectra-Physics Model 404 laser power meter. Because of this, the pulse heights recorded in the multichannel analyzer will not yield a single sharp peak as would be expected from a beam of uniform intensity if the edge effect is negligible (which is true when the beam size is much greater than the droplet size).

Figure 4.5.2 shows a typical measured monodisperse droplet pulse height distribution using 80 μm diameter droplets. The location of the peak in the distribution is unique to this droplet size. This measurement is repeated for several monodisperse droplet sizes. Fig. 4.5.3 plots the heights of the peaks versus the droplet sizes. The slope of the curve in this logarithm plot is very close to two, which verifies the correlation of Eq. 4.3.1.

Since the measured relationship between an output voltage pulse and an input droplet size is not unique, a complicated matrix operation must be used to analyze the measured voltage distribution. To transform the measured voltage distribution data into a droplet size distribution the following transformation procedure is used.
Fig. 4.5.1 Intensity Distribution Across the Laser Beam Cross Section
Fig. 4.5.2 Measured Pulse Height Distribution for Monodisperse Water Droplets of 80 μm Diameter
Fig. 4.5.3 Calibration Curve - the Peak Voltage of Pulse Height Distribution Versus Droplet Size
If the matrix $R(v;d)$ represents the voltage response function for droplets of diameter $d$, and if vector $A(d)$ is the actual size spectrum of the drift, then the measured voltage distribution vector, $M(v)$, is given as

$$M(v) = R(v;d) A(d) \quad (4.5.1)$$

So the actual size spectrum can be determined as

$$A(d) = R^{-1}(v;d) M(v), \quad (4.5.2)$$

where $R$ and $M$ are found by calibration and field measurements, respectively.

For 256 channels, the $R$ matrix is a 256 by 256 square matrix. This matrix is determined from calibration measurement with the relationship in Eq. 4.3.1. The matrix inversion for Eq. 4.5.2 is done by the LEQT1F subroutine of the IMSL Library (I2). A description of the subroutine is given in Appendix A.

To determine the collection efficiency of the eliminators as a function of droplet size, the droplet size spectra should be measured at the inlet and outlet of the eliminators. In the present experiment, the scattering volume is fixed in space while the eliminators are either placed below the volume or above it. By placing the eliminators above the scattering volume the spectrum measured represents the inlet droplet spectrum, $P_{in}(d)$, and similarly the spectrum measured when the eliminators are below the scattering volume is the outlet spectrum, $P_{out}(d)$. From these two spectra, the collection efficiency as a function of droplet size, $\eta(d)$, can be
calculated by

\[ \eta(d) = 1 - \frac{P_{\text{out}}(d)}{P_{\text{in}}(d)}. \] (4.5.3)

The measured spectra are recorded on paper tape and analyzed by a computer program called DATANA which performs the response matrix multiplication and calculates the collection efficiency if a pair of measured spectra are provided. A description of this code can be found in Appendix A.

A sensitivity analysis of the effect of the response function \( R(v;d) \) on the collection efficiency calculation was performed. This was done by using a typical set of measured voltage distributions at the inlet and outlet of the eliminator, and the calibration curve. By changing the parameters in the calibration curve, the sensitivity of the collection efficiency results are recorded. The parameters include the size of the monodisperse droplets used for calibration, DC, and NC1, NC2, and CC1, which are three parameters that specify the calibration curve (as explained in Appendix A). Table 4.5.1 lists the maximum changes in the calculated collection efficiency from its mean value as the parameters are individually changed by 10% from their mean values. It is observed that the only parameter that yields a significant change in the collection efficiency is DC, and this change is only significant at small droplet sizes. It is concluded that the collection efficiency results are not very sensitive to the response function, and
Table 4.5.1
Sensitivity Analysis of the Collection Efficiency Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter whose value is changed by 10%</th>
<th>Maximum Change in Collection Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>17% at 40 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8% at 50 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% at 60 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC2</td>
<td>8% at 40 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% at 50 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC1</td>
<td>No significant change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>No significant change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the error introduced by the calibration will not amplify the error in the collection efficiency results.

4.6 Pressure Loss and Air Speed Measurement Techniques

The pressure loss across the eliminators is measured with a differential electronic manometer (D4). Two static pressure pitot tubes monitor the static pressure at the inlet and outlet of the eliminators. The tubes are made of 1/16" ID, 18" long, stainless steel. One pitot tube is located 6" downstream of the eliminators and the other is located 10" upstream. They are 21" apart overall. The pressures are measured at these two points, and averaged over a certain time period. The differential pressure is first set to zero with the air flowing, but without the eliminators. In this way the pressure loss due to other structures will not be included in the pressure loss measurement of the eliminators.

The sensor is a Barocell differential pressure transducer (Datametrics Model 570D). The pressure range that can be measured by this sensor is from zero to 10 torr (i.e., zero to 0.1934 psi). The pressure-sensing element in this unit is a high-precision stable capacitive potentiometer; its variable element is a thin, highly prestressed metal diaphragm positioned between two gas-tight enclosures which are connected to the external pressure ports. A difference in pressure between the two enclosures produces a deflection of the diaphragm which varies the capacitance of the diaphragm and the
fixed capacitor plates. The Barocell is wired into a 10 KHz carrier-excited bridge so that the variable capacitance unbalances the bridge and produces a 10 KHz signal whose amplitude is proportional to the applied pressure. This A.C. voltage is measured by a high-precision electronic manometer (Datametrics Model 1173), which gives a zero to 1.0 volt D.C. output. This D.C. voltage is read by a digital voltmeter.

The accuracy of the system is about 0.5% of the reading. The sensitivity of the system is $3 \times 10^{-6}$ torr.

The pressure difference can be accurately measured, but there are other errors in the interpretation due to pressure fluctuations in the flow turbulence and pressure loss contributions by the eliminator holder structure, which have been found to be significant. The measured results will be presented in Chapter 5.

The air velocity is measured with a hot wire anemometer (Datametrics Series 800-VTP Flowmeter (D5)). It measures the average and instantaneous velocities in the flow of air by considering the cooling effect of the stream on a very thin electrically-heated wire filament. The probe that holds the flow-sensing wire filaments is a 3/8" diameter stainless steel wand. It is inserted into the drift measurement facility at any point to measure the local, time-averaged air velocity. The velocity range metered by this system is from zero to 6000 ft/min (0-30 m/s). It has a two volt D.C. output connection for a digital voltmeter. The voltage reading can be converted
to a velocity with a calibration curve. The accuracy of this unit is about 2% of the reading. However, due to flow turbulence and a non-uniform flow distribution, an error of about 10% is introduced.

The results of these measurements will be presented and compared with calculations in Chapter 5.

4.7 Sources of Experimental Error

It is difficult to analyze the contributions of the experimental uncertainties in the final drift measurement results. In this work, the approach is to repeat the measurements several times, so that the experimental accuracy is indicated by the variations in the final results. These measurements include the calibration measurement and the measurements of voltage distributions at the inlet and outlet of the eliminators. The results of this test are presented in Chapter 5. In this section, all possible sources of experimental error are identified.

(1) The position of the laser beam moves in the first few hours after it is turned on. Therefore, a warm up period of at least one hour should be allowed before any measurement. Movement of other drift measuring components is not significant throughout the experiment, which takes about ten to fifteen hours.
(2) Calibration is the most difficult measurement in the experiment. The droplet generator orifice is frequently plugged, and sometimes may be partially plugged, which decreases the pumping flow rate and thus changes the droplet size and the uniformity of generated droplets. Therefore, the flow rate should be constantly checked throughout a measurement.

One important uncertainty in the calibration is that the chance of more than one droplet appearing in the scattering volume is significant, although efforts have been made to reduce this. However, the final results are found not to be very sensitive to the calibration curve except at small droplet sizes, as discussed before.

Since the monodisperse droplets are carried by the flow up to the scattering volume a few inches away from the droplet generator, the droplet size will decrease due to evaporation. It was estimated that this decrease can be as large as 5% for 100 µm droplets. This error could introduce an error of 10% in the final results for small droplet sizes, as was shown previously.

(3) Statistical counting errors are difficult to estimate because they are not uniform for all
droplet sizes, but become larger for bigger droplets. In the data analysis, the distribution is smoothed, and this will eliminate some of this error. Dead time in the pulse height analyzer contributes another uncertainty to the results. Since the drift rate is much higher at the eliminator inlet than at the outlet, the dead time is very different for the two distributions, and it is found that the analyzer used in this work cannot account for this very well.

(4) There is a possibility that more than one droplet may appear in the scattering volume and cause the analyzer to record a wrong signal. This possibility cannot be avoided but can be reduced by decreasing the size of scattering volume and by reducing the quantity of drift. This error is thought to be small.

(5) The quantity of drift fluctuates with time due to the pumping power fluctuations and changing conditions within the Drift Elimination Facility. However, if the data acquisition time is long (three to five hours in the present experiment), this fluctuation will average out in the measured results.
The pressure drop across the filter in the circulating water system increases with time because of the gradual plugging of the filter by foreign particles in the circulating water. This affects the quantity of the drift generated by the facility. But the effect is small during one test.

(6) Signal noises that may contribute to the measurement uncertainty consists of electronic noise in the amplifier and high voltage supply, the dark current of the photomultiplier tube, and scattered light from other sources. It is found that these noises contribute about 10% to the lowest recordable signal and become insignificant for larger signals.

(7) The laser light intensity at the measuring point depends on the drift concentration which shadows some of the laser light. However, by measuring the intensity at the scattering volume with a power meter for different drift concentrations, this effect was found to be almost undetectable.
The above discussion gives possible sources of experimental uncertainties. In Chapter 6, a quantitative analysis of experimental errors is developed.
CHAPTER 5
COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS
WITH THEORETICAL CALCULATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter the experimental results for the drift collection efficiency and pressure loss across some industrial cooling tower drift eliminators are presented. These results are compared with the calculations from the DRIFT code. The experimental measurement techniques are discussed in Chapter 4, and the numerical simulation techniques in the DRIFT code are described in Chapter 2.

Three industrial drift eliminators were donated for this study by cooling tower vendors. These are the Belgian-wave eliminator, the Hi-V eliminator, and the Zig-Zag eliminator. Their geometries and dimensions are shown in Fig. 5.1.1. The Belgian-wave eliminator is made of sinusoidally shaped asbestos cement board, and it has a uniform flow channel cross section. The Hi-V eliminator is made of polyvinyl chloride. Its flow channel cross section is not uniform, as shown in Fig. 5.1.1. The Zig-Zag eliminator is made of fiberglass. Its flow channel cross section is uniform, except at the corners.

The measured pressure losses across these eliminators are compared with calculated pressure losses in Section 5.2, and the collection efficiency comparisons are presented in Section 5.3. The data is developed at two air speeds, 1.5 m/s and 2.5 m/s.
Fig. 5.1.1 Drift Eliminator Geometries. (A) Belgian-Wave Eliminator, (B) Hi-y Eliminator, (C) Zig-Zag Eliminator
5.2 Pressure Drop AcrossEliminators

Table 5.2.1 is a comparison of the theoretically calculated pressure losses across the three types of drift eliminators with the experimentally measured values at an air speed of 1.5 m/s. Table 5.2.2 presents the same comparison at an air speed of 2.5 m/s. The true air speeds are slightly different for each eliminator, since their flow resistances are different.

The calculated and measured results are in good agreement, and are within the bounds of experimental error. It is clear from the data that as the geometry of the drift eliminator becomes more complex, the pressure loss increases. Since the drift collection efficiency also increases with increasing geometrical complexity (shown in Section 5.3), it is necessary to strike a compromise in designing an eliminator that will achieve an acceptable pressure loss and an acceptable collection efficiency. The values in brackets are the resistances of the eliminators to the air flow expressed in terms of velocity heads corresponding to the nominal air speed. This is an advantageous way to report the data since its numerical value for a particular eliminator is independent of the air speed and the working fluid if the flow is fully turbulent.

The theoretical pressure loss calculations for the Zig-Zag eliminator have been unsuccessful because of the complex eliminator geometry and because of the limitations of the calculational method in describing turbulence (see Chapter 3).
Table 5.2.1
Pressure Drop Across Eliminator at Low Fan Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Eliminator</th>
<th>Air Speed (m/s)</th>
<th>Calculated Value (torr)*</th>
<th>Measured Value (torr)</th>
<th>Accuracy of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgian-Wave</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.02868 (2.82)**</td>
<td>0.03054 (3.00)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-V</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.03482 (3.43)</td>
<td>0.03734 (3.68)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zig-Zag</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>does not converge</td>
<td>0.07424 (7.31)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 torr = 1 mm Hg = 0.01934 psi.
** Values in parentheses are expressed in units of velocity head, ΔP/\( \frac{1}{2} \rho V^2 \).
Table 5.2.2
Pressure Drop Across Eliminator at High Fan Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Eliminator</th>
<th>Air Speed (m/s)</th>
<th>Calculated Value (torr)*</th>
<th>Measured Value (torr)</th>
<th>Accuracy of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgian Wave</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.06546 (2.32)**</td>
<td>0.06279 (2.23)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-V</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.07663 (2.72)</td>
<td>0.08119 (2.88)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zig-Zag</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>does not converge</td>
<td>0.16079 (5.70)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 torr = 1 mm Hg = 0.01934 psi.
** Values in parentheses are expressed in units of velocity head, \( \Delta P/\frac{1}{2} \rho V^2 \)
However, the agreement of the calculated and measured results for the other two, more simple geometries, demonstrates that the calculations are valuable in reasonably smooth geometries for predicting pressure loss.

Comparing Table 5.2.1 and Table 5.2.2, it is found that the pressure loss increases approximately as the square of the air speed for all three eliminators. The observations made about Table 5.2.1 also apply to Table 5.2.2.

The pressure losses for these eliminators quoted by their vendors are higher than the values presented here (H6, S9). The reason is that in their measurements, the pressure differences with no eliminators installed were not set to zero. This means that their measured data include the pressure loss due to other structures, which are considerable in comparison with just the pressure loss across the eliminators.

5.3 Collection Efficiency Results

In this section, the calculated and measured collection efficiency results are presented. Fig. 5.3.1 shows the droplet collection efficiency as a function of droplet size for the Belgian wave eliminator at an air speed of 1.5 m/s. The measured data are presented as a broken line in the figure. The experimental technique is described in Chapter 4. The calculated results using both no-slip and free-slip boundary conditions are compared with the experimental results. It is found that the calculated and measured droplet capture
Fig. 5.3.1 Predicted and Measured Droplet Collection Efficiency Functions for Belgian-Wave Eliminator at 1.5 m/s Air Speed
efficiencies agree well for this smooth eliminator geometry, with the no-slip boundary results providing more accurate predictions. It is also found that droplets smaller than 60 μm in diameter can easily escape from the eliminator.

The calculated and measured collection efficiency data for the Hi-V eliminator are shown in Fig. 5.3.2. It is found that this eliminator is more efficient in capturing droplets of any size than the Belgian wave eliminator. Also, the agreement between the no-slip prediction and the measurement is reasonably better than the agreement between the free-slip prediction and the measurement. The no-slip result predicts a higher collection efficiency than the measured data, while the free-slip prediction is generally lower than the measured data.

Figure 5.3.3 displays the data for the Zig-Zag eliminator. The calculation of the air velocity distribution for this eliminator failed to achieve asymptotic values using no-slip boundary conditions, as discussed in Chapter 3. By using the calculated distribution of the nonasymptotic solution, approximate results of droplet collection efficiency for this eliminator were obtained. This is compared with the free-slip prediction and the measured data in Fig. 5.3.3. This approximate result predicts a higher collection efficiency than the free-slip prediction, and agrees with the measured data better than the free-slip prediction in general.

Figure 5.3.4 shows the data at high fan speed, where the calculated results are no-slip prediction. Similar conclusions can be made from this figure.
Fig. 5.3.2 Predicted and Measured Droplet Collection Efficiency Functions for Hi-V Eliminator at 1.5 m/s Air Speed
Fig. 5.3.3 Predicted and Measured Droplet Collection Efficiency Functions for Zig-Zag Eliminator at 1.5 m/s Air Speed
Fig. 5.3.4 Predicted and Measured Droplet Collection Efficiency Functions for Commercial Drift Eliminators at 2.5 m/s Air Speed
5.4 Estimation of Experimental Error

A qualitative discussion of the sources of experimental errors is given in Chapter 4. It was mentioned that the quantitative contributions of those uncertainties in the data are not easily accounted for. In this work only the repeatability of the measured data is established. This is done for each eliminator by repeating the measurements several times under similar conditions.

Table 5.4.1 shows the results of four measurements on the Zig-Zag eliminator at an air speed of 1.5 m/s. The measurements included the calibration run and the droplet size distribution measurements at the inlet and the outlet of the eliminator. The data was taken on different days. From these results it can be seen that the data is repeatable with a maximum standard deviation of about 10% at the smallest droplet size.

The results for the Zig-Zag eliminator are the most consistent among the three eliminators tested in this work. The reason is that this eliminator is constructed in one block so that the pitch and the inclination of the louvres always remains the same even though it was taken out after each measurement. The other two eliminators are furnished in pieces which are installed by using the eliminator holders described in Chapter 4. When taking these eliminators in and out of the test section, it is difficult to repeat the exact pitch and angle of inclination. Therefore, for the Belgian
Table 5.4.1
Measured Collection Efficiencies of the Zig-Zag Eliminator
at 1.5 m/s Air Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Droplet Diameter (µm)</th>
<th>Measured Collection Efficiency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Run 1</td>
<td>Run 2</td>
<td>Run 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wave and the Hi-V eliminators the results are not very repeatable; the maximum standard deviation is as high as 20%.

The discrepancy between the calculated and measured results is discussed further in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Discussion of Results

It was demonstrated in previous chapters that predictions of collection efficiency and pressure drop for some drift eliminators by the DRIFT code agreed fairly well with measured results. The discrepancies are due to the experimental uncertainties and the calculational and experimental assumptions. The results are discussed in this section.

It was indicated earlier that both the calculated and measured pressure drop results of this work are significantly lower than the values quoted by cooling tower vendors. This is due to a difference in the definition of pressure drop. The vendors include in their definition the pressure loss due to structures other than the eliminators themselves, and this contributes a significant amount to the measured pressure loss.

The collection efficiency results reported in this study are higher than expected because these results generally show 100% efficiency for droplets larger than 100 μm, yet droplets much larger than this have been found to escape actual cooling towers. This is probably due to the assumptions made in the calculations and the simplified conditions in the experiments. Droplet growth effects, water film effects, and flow turbulence are thought to be the main factors. These effects are discussed here.
(1) Water film effects

The droplet collection efficiency calculations have ignored the possible effects of the water film on the eliminator walls. Two effects arise from the drag of the exhaust flow on the water film, and another effect arises from the impacting of captured water droplets on the film. The presence of the water film modifies the exhaust flow boundary conditions from simple no-slip conditions to those of matching the air-water velocities at the gas-liquid interface. Except in the case of a thick film, the effect of this complicated boundary condition on the velocity distribution within the eliminator should be small. Also, drag on the liquid film can lead to droplet generation because water can be drawn off of the trailing edge of the eliminator, or droplets can be stripped from the film surface through the formation of Helmholtz instability waves.

The work of Yao and Schrock (Y1) indicates that at an air speed of 2.0 m/s in a smooth drift eliminator geometry the minimum film thickness required for droplet stripping is 0.2 mm, and that substantially higher air speeds are required for droplet generation via pickup from the peaks of Helmholtz instability waves for a film of this thickness. In the present work, the water film thickness on the eliminator walls was not measured, however, visual observations were unable to detect either droplet stripping at the trailing edge of the eliminator or droplet generation on the interior walls. The
absence of droplet stripping at the outlet is implicit evidence for the absence of wave generated droplets in the interior (Y1).

With sufficiently thick films and with droplets impacting at sufficiently acute angles and high velocities, it has been observed that a droplet can rebound from the film, or "bounce" back into the exhaust flow (J2). This droplet bouncing problem is thought to be significant for drift eliminator performance in actual cooling towers where the water loading on the eliminator is high and the water film is thick. Foster et al. (F3) studied this problem and observed that this effect is indeed significant, however, they found that many droplets meeting the impact conditions established by Jayaratne and Mason (J2) did not bounce. It was concluded that it is not possible to estimate the true importance of droplet bouncing in a real tower environment due to the lack of information about the surface water coverage. Further work on this effect is being carried on by Foster in the Central Electricity Research Laboratories (F5).

(2) *Droplet growth effect*

It was mentioned that droplets as large as several hundred microns could escape commercial cooling towers outfitted with the drift eliminators being tested in this work. According to the collection efficiency results for these eliminators, these droplets should have been trapped. It is
suggested that the droplets might bypass the eliminators through the openings around the tower structure. It might also be due to the stripping and rebounding effects in the water film as discussed earlier. Another possibility that has so far been overlooked in the literature is droplet growth in cooling towers. It has been suggested that droplet growth is not significant in a cooling tower because a small drift droplet, moving at a velocity approaching that of the air stream, might leave the top of the tallest natural draft tower in less than one minute from the time it passes through the eliminators. If that is true, then even though the air in the surrounding air stream is generally saturated, the time span is too short for any significant droplet growth. However, this is not true for some droplets in cooling towers. Large droplets (>100 μm) do not travel at the air stream speed because their terminal velocities approach that of the air stream speed as shown in Fig. 6.1.1. Therefore they will stay in the tower for a long time. Another factor that causes some water droplets to reside in a cooling tower for a long time is the air flow pattern inside the cooling tower. The turbulent effect, the quiescent region, and the variation of air velocity at the throat of the shell (in the case of a hyperbolic cooling tower) can prolong the residence time of water droplets inside the tower, thus making the growth effect significant. This effect will not only change the size distribution of the escaping drift, it will also change the
Fig. 6.1.1 Terminal Velocities of Water Droplets
drift chemical concentrations.

(3) **Turbulence effects**

In the theoretical calculation of the performance of a drift eliminator, it is assumed that the air flow is laminar, and that the turbulent wake region is neglected. However, for some eliminator geometries, this wake region extends over a large portion of the eliminator cross section. In this work, flow visualization is performed for three eliminators: the Belgian wave eliminator, the Hi-V eliminator, and the Zig-Zag eliminator. The flow is established in a long, two foot wide free surface flume. The working fluid is water, instead of air. The water depth is about three inches and the water flow velocity was adjusted to be about 0.1 m/s so that the Reynolds number matches that of a flow of air whose velocity is 1.5 m/s. Blue dye was injected at the eliminator entrance and at the middle of the water depth to get away from the free-surface and boundary layer regions, each of which is about half an inch thick. The dye was injected at the eliminator boundaries so that wake regions could be observed. Photographs were taken of these dye traces for the three eliminators. To observe the general flow pattern within these eliminators, tiny paper chips were sprinkled on to the water surface and time-exposure pictures recorded the trajectories of these chips. The results of these simple experiments were
quite satisfactory.

Figure 6.1.2 displays the wake regions in the Belgian wave eliminator by injecting dye into the flow. The water enters at the right side of the picture where the dye injection tubes are shown. It can be seen that a significant wake region exists at the lower boundary and another wake region exists in the second half of the upper boundary. Fig. 6.1.3 shows the flow pattern by using paper chips. The water enters at the right side of the picture where the dye injection tubes are shown. This picture also shows the wake region at the central portion of the lower boundary where recirculation occurs. The calculated velocity distribution using no-slip boundary conditions shown in Fig. 3.2.5b simulates these regions with almost stagnant regions. These regions are poorly represented if free-slip boundary conditions are used (see Fig. 3.2.5a).

Similar observations can be made for the Hi-V eliminator. Figs. 6.1.4 and 6.1.5 show the wake regions and flow pattern respectively. Again, the wake regions exist at the lower boundary and the second half of the upper boundary. These wake regions are larger than those in the Belgian wave eliminator. In the calculation these regions are represented by stagnant regions if no-slip boundary conditions are used, as shown in Fig. 3.2.6b. Again, the free-slip result cannot account for these regions very well.

Figures 6.1.6 and 6.1.7 show the same set of pictures
for the Zig-Zag eliminator. It is seen that the wake regions are very large for this eliminator. In fact, the third layer of this eliminator is so turbulent that the dye is well-mixed. Since the flow is so turbulent in this layer, the pressure drop in this layer will be greater than the pressure drop in either of the other two layers. As discussed in Chapter 3 the third layer has little effect on the capture efficiency of this eliminator, and by taking off this layer great savings can be realized in cooling tower operation without producing additional drift.

The calculated velocity distributions using either no-slip or free-slip boundary conditions, as shown in Figs. 3.2.7 and 3.2.8, cannot account for these turbulent wake regions. However, the no-slip prediction gives a better approximation than the free-slip prediction, and the no-slip results predict the flow pattern quite well in the first two layers where most droplets are captured. Therefore, the collection efficiency calculated using these results should be close to the actual result.

For this eliminator it can also be seen that at the entrance of the upper boundary there is flow diversion. This is caused by a pressure difference above and below the eliminator boundary. It is expected that this would not affect the collection efficiency of the eliminator but would certainly increase the pressure drop, and thus it is not desirable. In order to avoid this flow diversion, the eliminator walls at
the entrance should be more parallel to the inlet flow.

From these flow visualization photographs it is concluded that turbulent wake and eddy regions occur in all the eliminators investigated. These effects are especially significant in complex geometries. In the calculations, the turbulence effects are not accounted for and the wakes are not completely resolved. In order to achieve an exact solution, the mesh size should be reduced enough so that recirculating eddies can be fully resolved, and a turbulence model must be included in the equations. However, in view of the success of the present calculation for predicting the experimentally observed behavior of the drift eliminators, it was decided that this more expensive and complicated approach would not be required. The reason for the success of present approximation is that by using no-slip boundary conditions, the calculated velocity distributions represent the actual flow patterns quite well as observed by comparing the flow pattern photographs in this section with the velocity distribution plots in Chapter 3. Although the eddy and turbulent wake regions are not exactly described in the calculated velocity distribution, these regions are approximated by stagnant regions. Moreover, the water droplets seldom travel into these regions as seen in the droplet trajectory plots displayed in Section 3.3. Therefore, using this approach, the collection efficiency can be fairly accurately calculated. However, the pressure drop depends greatly on the existence
of turbulence, and thus it cannot be accurately predicted
by these calculations if significant turbulence occurs in the
eliminator. For smooth geometries the predictions agree quite
well with measurements, but for complicated geometries (such
as the Zig-Zag eliminator), the calculation predicts a much
smaller pressure drop than the measurement.

Another factor that the calculation does not take into
account is the air turbulence inside cooling towers. In order
to solve this problem, it is necessary to have a turbulence
code to calculate the air velocity distribution inside elimi-
nators, and also to have quantitative information about the
nature of air turbulence inside cooling towers. However, this
quantitative information is not well known. Martin and Barbar
(M3) have indicated the possible variations in the velocity
of air approaching an eliminator, but it is also important
to know the frequency with which this variation occurs. Some
idea of the variation in flow direction was obtained using
an ammonium chloride smoke generator (F3). It was suggested
that the variation was sensitive to the ambient wind conditions,
fluctuating approximately 10° about the vertical with a one
second period when the wind was gusting strongly, and remaining
steady when the ambient conditions were calm. However, these
observations were made close to the tower center, and larger
variations would be expected towards its perimeter. The
positioning of towers relative to other constructions might
also be an important factor in this respect.
The following conclusions are made in this study:

(1) The calculational method can accurately predict the collection efficiencies of cooling tower drift eliminators.

(2) The pressure drop calculations are reasonably good for smooth eliminator geometries. For eliminator geometries with sharp corners the calculation predicts much smaller pressure drops than the actual values.

(3) The design of the Zig-Zag eliminator is economically unsound. The third layer of this eliminator should be removed. By doing this, the drift collection efficiency will not be significantly affected, yet an appreciable savings from the reduced pressure drop will be obtained.

(4) The E-E eliminator designed by Yao and Schrock collects droplets very efficiently as predicted by the designers, yet the pressure drop is much higher due to the occurrence of flow separation. Therefore, this eliminator does not appear as promising as its collection efficiency shows.

(5) In order to achieve a high drift collection efficiency the drift eliminator geometry should be as complex as possible. However, the pressure drop will also increase as the geometry becomes more complex. It is found that an eliminator yielding a higher collection
efficiency will always have a higher pressure drop. Table 6,1,1 demonstrates this point. The table shows the calculated collection efficiency (using no-slip boundary conditions) for some common drift eliminators at an air speed of 1.5 m/s. The values of pressure drop presented in the table are either experimental results, where available, or calculated results. The calculated pressure drop results for complicated geometries with sharp corners might not be reliable. This table shows that more complex geometries have better collection efficiencies yet higher pressure drops.

Up to now, there is no available technique for designing drift eliminators that optimizes between the collection efficiency and the pressure drop. It is therefore suggested that in designing a drift eliminator for a particular cooling tower, a pressure drop limit across the eliminator that can be tolerated should be set first. Then an eliminator geometry should be chosen that has a pressure drop lower than the set limit, yet has the best collection efficiency. This can be done theoretically with the DRIFT code. After selecting the eliminator geometry in this way, it should be constructed and tested in an experimental facility to check that the overall drift emission is lower than the environmental standard set by the Environmental Protection Agency. This approach will


Table 6.1.1
Pressure Drop and Calculated Collection Efficiency Results of Some Drift Eliminators at an Air Speed of 1.5 m/s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Droplet Diameter (µm)</th>
<th>Single Layer (S1)*</th>
<th>Double Layer (D2)</th>
<th>Sinus (N2)</th>
<th>Asbestos Cement (A1)</th>
<th>Hi-V (H1)</th>
<th>E-E (E1)</th>
<th>Zig-Zag (Z1)</th>
<th>Zig-Zag (two layer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ΔP/\frac{1}{2}ρV^2
2.35 0.97 3.01** 3.91 4.54** 14.61 7.31** 1.37

* Case number as identified in Table 3.1.1

** Experimental Results
certainly save a lot of unnecessary effort and money while a better eliminator is designed.

6.2 Recommendations

The results from the DRIFT code in this paper suggest that this code is very useful in the evaluation and design of cooling tower drift eliminators. The following future work on this numerical technique is recommended:

(1) It has been shown that the air velocity distribution inside an eliminator calculated by the SOLASUR subroutine using no-slip boundary conditions approximates the actual flow pattern quite well. In order to further validate this calculation, a spatial measurement of the air velocity distribution inside the eliminator would be appropriate. There are many such measurement techniques; a suitable one would be the Laser Doppler Anemometer (LDA) technique which is commercially available. Fig. 6.2.1 shows a recommended test section for this purpose and for the droplet dynamics experiments which are described later. The LDA technique will not only measure the velocity values but also the turbulent flow parameters. These will be very useful for investigating the eliminator performance.

(2) The droplet trajectory calculation performed by the
Fig. 6.2.1 Schematic Diagram of the Proposed Experimental Setup for Studying Droplet Trajectory and Air Velocity Distribution in Drift Eliminators
DRIFT code can be checked by a simple experiment. The suggested experimental setup is shown in Fig. 6.2.1. A small exhaust fan will induce the required air flow. Drift eliminators are installed in a test section that consists of plexiglass walls and a flow channel that is several inches thick. The nominal air speed can be measured by hot wire anemometer at the inlet region of the eliminator. Colored water droplets generated by a monodisperse droplet generator are introduced below the eliminator. Their trajectories can be observed with a high-speed cine camera. These trajectories can be compared with calculated results. This experiment can also study the droplet rebounding effect at the walls. Water film effects can also be studied by introducing a water film at the eliminator walls. Since the test section is small, it can be placed either horizontally or vertically. As mentioned in (1), the air velocity distribution inside the eliminator can also be measured by an LDA technique with the eliminators installed in this test section. This basic experiment could validate the present calculation as well as provide improvements to the code concerning the droplet rebounding and water film effects.
For the design of drift eliminators, the following recommendations are made:

(1) It is found from the present calculation that the third layer of the Zig-Zag eliminator serves no purpose in capturing drift droplets, and thus should be removed to reduce the pressure drop across the eliminator. Also, to avoid flow diversion at the eliminator entrance, the boundaries should be reshaped so that they are parallel to the flow. An experimental test of the performance of the Zig-Zag eliminator with only two layers and a smoothed entrance is recommended.

(2) The performances of many common drift eliminator geometries have been evaluated in this work either by numerical simulation or experiments. However, there are still many other eliminator designs that have been used commercially, and some potential designs that are worth investigating. These include the Chevron-type eliminator used by French cooling tower vendors, a helical flow channel design with smooth inlet and outlet nozzles, a "polisher" eliminator design, and many others.

(3) Total drift emission is the most important parameter of the environmental acceptance of cooling tower drift. Therefore, after selecting a particular eliminator design, it is necessary to test the
design for its total drift emission. However, none of the available drift measurement techniques has been proven to be generally satisfactory— to the point of being adopted for general use (Al). A reliable technique for drift emission measurement is needed.

It is proposed that future work should be performed to demonstrate the feasibility of using a radioactive tracer for absolute drift rate measurements. The suggested candidate tracer is Na\(^{24}\) (\(T_{1/2} = 15\) hr.; \(E\gamma's = 2.75\) Mev and 1.37 Mev) which can be produced from irradiating stable Na\(^{23}\) (in NaOH form) in a nuclear reactor. After irradiation, the activated solution will be neutralized with HCl, and injected into the recirculating water flow in the experimental drift facility. Because the air flow in the wind tunnel is recirculated and rapidly becomes saturated, it is expected that droplet evaporation will be negligible. Thus, the salt concentration in the entrained droplets should be the same as in the recirculating water, making possible a direct comparison of drift rates measured by drop-size spectra methods, and by deducing the total salt current using the radioactive tracer. This point has been a problem in the past in inter-comparisons between various drift measurement methods.
those methods which observe total salt flow rate (e.g., isokinetiic samplers, cyclone samplers, etc.) do not provide a measure of the droplet spectra, and those methods which observe the droplet spectra (e.g., the PILLS system, sensitive paper sampling) do not provide information regarding the total salt current without some assumption being made regarding the salt concentration in the droplets due to evaporation or growth. This is difficult to provide since evaporation and growth rates vary with droplet sizes.

In the test the salt current will be sampled with an array of NaI detectors that scans a transverse section of the experimental drift facility so that the total amount of radiation observed will be directly proportional to the amount of salt that flows past the measurement station.

For a reasonably accurate (2%) experiment it is estimated that the laboratory demonstration will require approximately 10 mCi of activity injected into the recirculating water. For a field test roughly 10 Ci of activity would be required, depending upon the desired accuracy and the extent of the NaI detector array. It is envisioned that this measurement technique would be used sparingly for absolute drift measurements, and that less accurate
methods would be sufficient for routine drift monitoring. In field applications the total amounts of released activity would be no greater than those currently encountered on a chronic basis with boiling water reactors.

In conclusion, the DRIFT code is quite capable of predicting the performance of cooling tower drift eliminators, although some care should be taken in the pressure drop calculations for complex (sharp-cornered) eliminator geometries. This code should be very useful in evaluating drift eliminator performance to aid in the design of drift eliminators for any cooling tower. Provisions for the effect of water film on the eliminator walls, of flow turbulence within the eliminator, and of droplets rebounding from the eliminator walls should be investigated and developed to supplement the DRIFT code.
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A.1 Introduction

In the drift measurements by laser light scattering the voltage distribution, $M(v)$, recorded by the multichannel analyzer is not the true droplet size distribution, $P(d)$, as mentioned in Chapter 4. However, these two distributions can be related by

$$M(v) = R(v;d) P(d) , \tag{4.4.1}$$

where $R(v;d)$ is the voltage response matrix to droplets of diameter $d$.

In order to recover $P(d)$ from the measured distribution $M(v)$ in Eq. 4.4.1, a system of linear algebraic equations must be solved. The DATANA program transforms the measured spectra at the inlet and outlet sections of the eliminator to the true droplet size spectra so that the collection efficiency as a function of droplet size can be determined.

This appendix describes this program in detail. The necessary input parameters are described in Section B.3. A listing of the program and a sample problem are also given.

A.2 Description of the Program

The DATANA computer code is written in FORTRAN IV and analyzes the measured voltage pulse height distribution. This
distribution represents the scattered light intensity distribution produced when a spectrum of droplets passes through the scattering volume.

The procedures of the code are listed in the flow chart in Fig. A.2.1. The calibration parameters determined from a calibration check of the drift measuring instrument are used by the program to determine the calibration factors and response function. To transform a voltage pulse height distribution into a droplet size distribution, the measured distribution is first smoothed by a least-squares fitting in the LSMARQ subroutine. This subroutine can use any appropriate fitting function that is supplied by the user through the external function YFCN. It is found that a polynomial of the form

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{8} \frac{a_i}{x^{i-1}}$$

provides the best fit of the typical measured distributions. Guessed values of the parameters $a_i$ are input by user, and best fit values of $a_i$ are calculated by the subroutine. The transformation of the measured distribution to the droplet size distribution is performed either by backward substitution method, if the response function is an upper triangular matrix, or otherwise by the LEQT1F subroutine, which obtains a solution of a system of linear equations. The backward substitution method is the simpler approach and takes less computation time. Collection efficiencies as a function of
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Fig. A.2.1 Flow Chart of the DATANA Code
droplet size can be determined when two measured distributions, one at the inlet and one at the outlet of the eliminator, are provided.

The DATANA code uses several subroutines. They are described below.

(A) LSMARQ

The subprogram LSMARQ computes the solutions of nonlinear least-squares curve and surface-fitting problems. That is, LSMARQ finds values of $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p$, which minimizes

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i(y_i - f(x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \ldots, x_{i,m}; b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)), \quad (A.2.2)$$

where the fitting function $f$ depends on $m > 1$ independent variables $(x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \ldots, x_{i,m})$, and on the $p$ unknown parameters, $b_j$. The $i^{\text{th}}$ dependent and independent variables, $y_i$ and $x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \ldots, x_{i,m}$, are known values corresponding to the $i^{\text{th}}$ data point or observation. The number of data points is $n$, and the $w_i$ are parameters that weight the errors at each data point.

LSMARQ uses the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm described in Refs. B2, L4, and M6. It computes the coefficients of a partial Taylor series for the fitting function and then uses the steepest-descent method (or gradient method) to find a "neighborhood" in parameter-space where the series provides an adequate approximation to the data.

This subroutine is called by the main program.
(B) **RSIMQ**

This is a subroutine called by LSMARQ. It performs forward elimination with partial pivoting.

(C) **YFCN**

This is a user-supplied FUNCTION subprogram, which computes the function $f(x,b)$ of Eq. A.2.2. This external function is called from the main program, the LSMARQ, and RSIMQ subroutines.

(D) **LEQT1F**

This subprogram solves a set of linear equations, $AX=B$, for $X$, given the $NxN$ matrix $A$ in full storage mode.

LEQT1F performs Gaussian elimination (Crout algorithm) with equilibration and partial pivoting (P4).

This subroutine is taken from the IMSL library (I2), and is called by the main program.

(E) **LUDATF**

This subroutine decomposes the $N$ by $N$ matrix $A$ into the matrices $L U$, where $L$ is lower triangular with one's on the diagonal, and $U$ is upper triangular.

LUDATF is called by LEQT1F. Its algorithm is described in Ref. I2.
(F) LUELMF
LUELMF performs the elimination part of the solution of a set of simultaneous equations (I2). It is called by LEQT1F.

(G) UERTST
This subprogram prints a message reflecting any error detected by an IMSL subroutine (I2).

A.3 Description of the Input Parameters

Card No. 1

IEFF, IRT
FORMAT (2I5)

IEFF = 1 for data transformation only, no collection efficiency calculation will be performed.

IEFF = 2 for a collection efficiency calculation. In this case two spectra, one at the inlet and one at the outlet of the eliminator, should be provided.

IRT = 0 if the response function is an upper triangular matrix where the simpler transformation method can be used.

IRT ≠ 0 if the response function is not an upper triangular matrix so that the subroutine LEQT1F must be used.

Card No. 2

A, B
FORMAT (2E20.6)

A and B convert the channel number to a voltage pulse
height with

\[ \text{voltage} = A + B \times \text{Channel number}. \]

**Card No. 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NC1, NC2, NC3, DC, CC1, CC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FORMAT (3I5, 3F10.3)**

These are all calibration parameters and are obtained from a calibration check of the drift measurement instrumentation. DC is the monodisperse droplet size used in the calibration, which is about 80 µm in this work. The meanings of other parameters are found in Fig.A.3.1, which is a calibration curve recorded by the multichannel analyzer for monodisperse droplets.

**Card No. 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FORMAT (I5)**

NC is the maximum channel number of the data.

**Card No. 5 and Card No. 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(PARAM(I), I = 1, NPARAM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FORMAT(4E20.6)**

PARAM(I) are the guessed values of the least-square fitting parameters. They can be set to be 1.0, however, values closer to the true values will save a lot of computation time.

NPARAM is the number of parameters. It is 8 in the present work.
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Card No. 7 to Card No. (6+NC/5)

(PV(I), I=1,NC)

FORMAT (4X,5F7.0)

PV(I) is the voltage pulse height distribution measured at the outlet of the eliminator if a collection efficiency calculation is to be performed.

If IEFF equals 2 in Card No. 1, the following insertions are made in the input deck:

Card No. 4A (If IEFF=2)

NC

FORMAT (I5)

NC = the maximum channel number for the distribution measured at the inlet of the eliminator

Card No. 5A and Card No. 6A (If IEFF=2)

(PARAM(I), I = 1, NPARAM)

FORMAT(4E20.6)

PARAM(I) are the guessed values of the least-square fitting parameters for the distribution measured at the inlet of the eliminator.

Card No. 7A to Card No. (6+NC/5)A (If IEFF=2)

(PV(I), I=1,NC)

FORMAT (4X,5F7.0)

PV(I) is the distribution measured at the inlet of the eliminator.
A.4 Listing of the DATANA Code
DIMENSION D(350), PV(350), W(350), W1(350), W2(350), PV1(350)
DIMENSION PARAM(9), W3(9, 2), W4(9, 9), W5(9), SCALE(9), CURV(9)
DIMENSION EFF(350), PP(350), F(350, 350)
EXTERNAL YPCW
NIND=1
NPAPAM=9
1 FORMAT(10I5)
2 FORMAT(4F20.6)
3 FORMAT(15,3F10.3)
4 FORMAT(5X,5F7.0)
5 FORMAT(1H1)
6 FORMAT(///,5X,'MEASURED DISTRIBUTION',//)
7 FORMAT(///,5X,'LEAST SQUARE FITTING PARAMETERS ARE',//)
8 FORMAT(///,5X,'PITTED DISTRIBUTION',//)
9 FORMAT(///,5X,'LAST CHANNEL NUMBER IS',15)
10 FORMAT(///,5X,'DIAMETER DISTRIBUTION',//)
11 FORMAT(///,5X,'TRUE SPECTRUM',//)
12 FORMAT(///,5X,'EFFICIENCY SPECTRUM',///,9X,'DROPLET DIAMETER (MICRO
1 IN),',5X,'COLLECTION EFFICIENCY',///)
13 FORMAT(1X,9P15.4)
14 FORMAT(///,5X,'VOLTAGE DISTRIBUTION',//)
15 FORMAT(///,5X,'IER=',I5)
16 FORMAT(10X,F20.6,7X,F20.6)
17 FORMAT(1H1,///,5X,'EFF=',
1 I5,///,5X,'IRT=',I5,///,5X,'A=',P10.4,///,5X,'B=',P10.4,///,5X,
2 'NC1=',I5,///,5X,'NC2=',I5,///,5X,'NC3=',I5,///,5X,'DC=',P10.2,///,5X,
3 'CC1=',P10.4,///,5X,'CC2=',P10.4)
C IFPF=2 EFFICIENCY CALCULATION IS DONE
C IFPF=1 NO EFFICIENCY CALCULATION IS DONE
C IF IRT=0, THE RESPONSE FUNCTION IS AN UPPER TRIANGULAR MATRIX
C PARAM(I) ARE THE GUESS OF THE LEAST-SQUARE FITTING PARAMETERS
C PV(I) IS THE MEASURED DISTRIBUTION
C NC1, NC2, NC3, CC1, CC2, DC ARE CALIBRATION PARAMETERS
C VOLTAGE=A+P*CHANNEL NUMBER
100 READ(5,1,END=1000) IEFP, IRT
   READ 2,A,B,3
   READ 3,NC1,NC2,NC3,DC,CC1,CC2
   PRINT 17, IEFP, IRT, A, B, NC1, NC2, NC3, DC, CC1, CC2
   VC1=A+B*FLOAT(NC1)
   VC2=A+B*FLOAT(NC2)
   VC3=A+B*FLOAT(NC3)
   XF=VC3/DC**2
   HPC1=(CC1-CC2)/FLOAT(NC1-1)
   TP(NC3-NC2) 90,95,90
85 HPC2=0.0
   GO TO 105
90 HPC2=CC2/FLOAT(NC3-NC2)
105 CONTINUE
   DO 600 K=1,IEFP
      READ 1, NC
      READ 2, (PARAM(I), I=1, NPARAM)
      READ 4, (PV(I), I=1, NC)
      DO 150 I=2, NC
         PV(I)=PV(I)/PV(1)*3600.
150 CONTINUE
         PV(1)=PV(2)*2.-PV(3)
   PRINT 5
   PRINT 6
   PRINT 13, (PV(I), I=1, NC)
   DO 200 I=1, NC
200 D(I)=A+B*FLOAT(I)
   PRINT 14
   PRINT 13, (D(I), I=1, NC)
C
C LEAST-SQUARE FIT OF THE MEASURED DISTRIBUTION
C
   CALL LSMAPO(350, NC, NIND, D, PV, 0, W, 9, NPARAM, PARAM, YFCN, 0.0001, W1, W2, W3, W4, W5, CURV, SCALF, SSO, IFER)
   PRINT 15, IER
   PRINT 7
PRINT 13, (PARAM(I), I=1, NPARAM)
PVI(I) =YPCN(D(I), NIND, PARAM, NPARAM) DO 300 I=2, NC 
PVI(I) =YPCN(D(I), NIND, PARAM, NPARAM) IF (I.LT.50) GO TO 300 IF (PVI(I).LT.0.) PVI(I)=0. PVI(I)=PVI(I-1)-PVI(I) IF (PVI*LP.0.) GO TO 320 300 CONTINUE MC1=NC+1 DO 310 I=MC1, 250 D(I)=D(I-1)+B PVI(I) =YPCN(D(I), NIND, PARAM, NPARAM) IF (PVI(I).LP.0.0) GO TO 320 PVI(I)=PVI(I-1)-PVI(I) IF (PVI*LP.0.) GO TO 320 310 CONTINUE 320 CONTINUE PRINT 9, I PRINT R PRINT 13, (PVI(J), J=1, I) NC=I-1 DO 400 I=1, NC 400 D(I)=SORT(D(I)/KK) PRINT 10 PRINT 13, (D(I), I=1, NC) C TO GENERATE THE RESPONSE FUNCTION C DO 490 JJ=1, NC J=NC-JJ+1 NN1= ((A+R*FLOAT(J))/XK*VC1/DC**2-A)/R NN2=((A+R*FLOAT(J))/XK*VC2/DC**2-A)/B IF (NC3.EQ. NC2) NN2=J DO 490 TI=1, NC I=NC-JJ+1
IF (I-J) 440, 430, 420
420 P(I,J) = 0.0
GO TO 490
430 R(I,J) = 1.0
GO TO 490
440 IF (I.GE.NN2) R(I,J) = R(J,J) + (J-I) * HPC2
IF (I.GE.NN1) R(I,J) = R(NN1,J)
GO TO 490
490 CONTINUE

C TO TRANSFORM THE MEASURED DISTRIBUTION TO TRUE DROPLET DISTRIBUTION

IF (I.INT.EQ.0) GO TO 491
CALL LEOTETP(R,1,NC,350,PV1,0,W,IER)
PRINT 15,IER
GO TO 495
491 PV1(NC) = PV1(NC) / R(NC,NC)
NC = NC - 1
DO 494 II = 1, NC
   T = NC - II + 1
   S = PV1(I)
   NM = I + 1
   DO 492 J = NM, NC
   S = S - R(I,J) * PV1(J)
494 PV1(I) = S / R(I,I)
495 CONTINUE
NC = NC - 1
PRINT 11,
PRINT 13, (PV1(I), I = 1, NC)
IF (K.EQ.2 .OR. IEFF .NE. 2) GO TO 700
N1 = NC
DO 500 I = 1, NC
500 PP(I) = PV1(I)
600 CONTINUE

C TO CALCULATE COLLECTION EFFICIENCY

C

MAIN0109
MAIN0110
MAIN0111
MAIN0112
MAIN0113
MAIN0114
MAIN0115
MAIN0116
MAIN0117
MAIN0118
MAIN0119
MAIN0120
MAIN0121
MAIN0122
MAIN0123
MAIN0124
MAIN0125
MAIN0126
MAIN0127
MAIN0128
MAIN0129
MAIN0130
MAIN0131
MAIN0132
MAIN0133
MAIN0134
MAIN0135
MAIN0136
MAIN0137
MAIN0138
MAIN0139
MAIN0140
MAIN0141
MAIN0142
MAIN0143
MAIN0144
C
700 IF (LEFF .NE. 2) GO TO 100
   NC = MIN0 (N1, NC)
   DO 720 I = 1, NC
   IF (PV1(I) .LE. 0.) GO TO 705
   EFF(I) = 1. - PF(I) / PV1(I)
705 IF (PV1(I) .LE. 0.) EFF(I) = 0.
   IF (EFF(I) .LT. 0.0) EFF(I) = 0.0
   IF (PF(I) .LT. 0.) EFF(I) = 0.
   IF (EFF(I) .GT. 1.0) EFF(I) = 1.0
720 CONTINUE
   PRINT 12
   PRINT 16, (D(I), EFF(I), I = 1, NC)
   GO TO 100
1000 CONTINUE
END
FUNCTION YFCN(D, NIND, PARAM, NPARAM)
DIMENSION PARAM(NPARAM)
YFCN=0.0
DO 1 I=1, NPARAM
1 YFCN=YFCN+PARAM(I)/D**(I-1)
RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE LSMARQ(NDIM, NPTS, NIND, X, Y, IWEIGH, WEIGHT, NDIM2,
  1 NPARAM, PARAM, YFCN, EPSU, WORK1, F, WORK3, A, CHANGE, CURVTR,
  2 SCALE, SSC, IERR)

  REAL A, CHANGE, COSINE, CURVTR, DEL, EPS, EPSU, F, LAMBDA,
  1 MACHEP, NU, PARAM, PSAVE, ONORM, RELTOL, SCALE, SMALL,
  2 SSQ, STEP, SUMB, SUM1, SUM2, TEM, VARY, WEIGHT, WORK1,
  3 WORK3, X, Y, YFCN

  REAL ARS, AWAX1, AMIN1, SIGN, SQRT

  INTEGER I, IERR, IM1, IPT, IWEIGH, J, K, NDIM, NDIM2, NIND,
  1 NPARAM, NPTS

  DIMENSION X(NDIM, NIND), Y(NPTS), WEIGHT(NPTS), PARAM(NPARAM),
  1 WORK1(NIND), SCALE(NPARAM), CHANGE(NPARAM), A(NDIM2, NPARAM),
  2 CURVTR(NDIM2, NPARAM), F(NPTS), WORK3(NDIM2, 2)

  EXTERNAL KSIMU, YFCN

  C SMALL IS THE SMALLEST FLOATING POINT NUMBER FOR THIS MACHINE.
  C MACHEP IS THE SMALLEST FLOATING POINT NUMBER WHICH CAN BE ADDED
  C TO 1.0 AND STILL MAKE A DIFFERENCE.
    DATA SMALL/5.40E-79/, MACHEP/9.55E-7/

  C CHECK FOR ARGUMENT ERRORS.
    IF (NDIM .LT. NPTS .OR. NPTS .LT. NPARAM
        1 .OR. NIND .LE. 0 .OR. NDIM2 .LT. NPARAM
        2 .OR. NPARAM .LE. 0) GO TO 99

  C     IERR = 0

  C DEL IS USED IN NUMERICAL DIFFERENTIATION. DEL SHOULD BE SMALL
  C ENOUGH TO GIVE A GOOD APPROXIMATION, BUT NOT SO SMALL THAT THE
  C DIFFERENTIATED VALUE IS LOST IN ROUND-OFF NOISE. THE VALUE
  C SQRT(MACHEP) IS AN INTUITIVELY DERIVED COMPROMISE.
    DEL = SQRT(MACHEP)
    LAMBDA = 0.1E0
    NU = 10.0E0
EPS = AMAX1(EPSU, MACHEP)  
RELSTOL = SMALL / AMIN1(1.0E0, EPS)  
C  
C COMPUTE SUM OF SQUARES CORRESPONDING TO INITIAL GUESS.  
SSQ = 0.0E0  
DO 20 I = 1, NPTS  
   DO 10 K = 1, NIND  
      WORK1(K) = X(I, K)  
      F(I) = YFCN(WCRK1, NIND, PARAM, NPARAM)  
   10 CONTINUE  
   SSQ = SSQ + WEIGHT(I) *(Y(I) - F(I))**2  
20 CONTINUE  
C  
C COMPUTE WEIGHTS, IF NECESSARY.  
   IF (IWEIGHT .GT. 0) GO TO 15  
      WEIGHT(I) = 1.0E0  
   IF (IWEIGHT .LT. 0) WEIGHT(I) = 1.0E0 / AMAX1(Y(I), 1.0E0)  
15  
C  
C TRY A SMALLER VALUE OF LAMBDA.  
   30 LAMBDA = LAMBDA / NU  
C  
C ZERO ARRAYS BEFORE ACCUMULATING SUMS.  
   DO 50 I = 1, NPARAM  
      WORK3(I, 2) = 0.0E0  
   DO 40 J = 1, I  
      CURVTR(I, J) = 0.0E0  
   50 CONTINUE  
C  
C DO 100 IPT = 1, NPTS  
   TEM = WEIGHT(IPT) * (Y(IPT) - F(IPT))  
   DO 60 K = 1, NIND  
      WORK1(K) = X(IPT, K)  
60  
C  
C DO 90 I = 1, NPARAM  
C VARY I-TH PARAMETER, STORING RESULTING CHANGE OF FUNCTION VALUE  
C IN WORK3(I, 1).  
   PSAVE = PARAM(I)  
203
PARAM(I) = PSAVE * (1.0E0 + DEL)
IF (PSAVE .EQ. 0.0E0) PARAM(I) = DEL
WORK3(I, 1) = YFCN(WORK1, NIND, PARAM, NPARAM) - F(IPT)

C ACCUMULATE GRADIENT OF SSQ IN WORK3(I, 2).
WORK3(I, 2) = WORK3(I, 2) + TEM * WORK3(I, 1)
PARAM(I) = PSAVE

C ACCUMULATE CURVATURE MATRIX.
DO 80 J = 1, I
    CURVTR(I, J) = CURVTR(I, J) + WEIGHT(IPT) * WORK3(I, 1)
    * WORK3(J, 1)
80 CONTINUE
90 CONTINUE
100 CONTINUE

C QNORM = 0.0E0
DO 120 I = 1, NPARAM

C NOW USE WORK3(I, 1) FOR SAVING PARAMETER VALUE.
WORK3(I, 1) = PARAM(I)

C NORMALIZE GRADIENT AND CURVATURE BY PARAMETER VARIATIONS, AND
SCALE THEM SO THAT CURVATURE DIAGONAL ELEMENTS ARE UNITY.
VARY = DEL * PARAM(I)
IF (VARY .EQ. 0.0E0) VARY = DEL
TEM = SIGN(SQRT(CURVTR(I, 1)), VARY)
SCALE(I) = VARY / TEM
WORK3(I, 2) = WORK3(I, 2) / TEM

C ACCUMULATE NORM**2 OF GRADIENT.
QNORM = QNORM + WORK3(I, 2)**2

C IF (I .LE. 1) GO TO 120
IM1 = I - 1
DO 110 J = 1, IM1

VARY = DEL * PARAM(J)
IF (VARY .EQ. 0.0E0) VARY = DEL
CURVTR(I, J) = (CURVTR(I, J) * SCALE(J)) / (TEM * VARY)

110 CONTINUE
120 CONTINUE

C

130 DO 150 I = 1, NPARAM
C
C COPY GRADIENT.
CHANGE(I) = WORK3(I, 2)
C
C ADD LAMBDA TO CURVATURE DIAGONALS.
A(I, I) = 1.0E0 + LAMBDA
C
C COPY REST OF CURVATURE MATRIX.
IF (I .LE. 1) GO TO 150
IM1 = I - 1
DO 140 J = 1, IM1
   A(I, J) = CURVTR(I, J)
   A(J, I) = A(I, J)
140 CONTINUE
150 CONTINUE
C
C SOLVE FOR BEST DIRECTION OF CHANGE.
CALL RSIMQ(NDIM2, NPARAM, A, CHANGE, IERR)
IF (IERR .NE. 0) RETURN
C
C COMPUTE ANGLE BETWEEN CHANGE AND GRADIENT IN SCALED
C COORDINATES . .
SUM1 = 0.0E0
SUM2 = 0.0E0
DO 160 I = 1, NPARAM
   SUM1 = SUM1 + CHANGE(I) * WORK3(I, 2)
   SUM2 = SUM2 + CHANGE(I)**2
160 CONTINUE
C
C AND DE-SCALE CHANGE.
CHANGE(I) = CHANGE(I) * SCALE(I)
160 CONTINUE
C
COSINE = SUM1 / SQRT(SUM2 * QNORM)
C
STEP = 1.0E0
C
IF STEP*CHANGE IS SMALL FOR ALL COORDINATES, RESTORE PARAMETER
C VALUES AND EXIT.
170 DO 180 I = 1, NPARAM
   PARAM(I) = WORK3(I, 1)
   IF (ABS(STEP * CHANGE(I)) .GT. RELTOL + EPS * ABS(PARM(I)))
      1 GO TO 190
180 CONTINUE
RETURN
C
VARY PARAMETERS BY STEP*CHANGE.
190 DO 200 I = 1, NPARAM
   PARAM(I) = STEP * CHANGE(I) + WORK3(I, 1)
C
COMPUTE CORRESPONDING SSQ.
   SUMB = 0.0E0
   DO 220 I = 1, NPTS
      DO 210 K = 1, NIND
         WORK1(K) = X(I, K)
         F(I) = YFCN(WORK1, NIND, PARAM, NPARAM)
         SUMB = SUMB + WEIGHT(I) * (Y(I) - F(I))**2
      210 CONTINUE
   220 CONTINUE
C
IF (SUMB .LE. SSQ) GO TO 240
C
IF NO REDUCTION, THEN ...
   IF (COSINE .LT. 0.866E0) GO TO 230
C
IF CHANGE IS CLOSE TO GRADIENT, REDUCE STEP AND TRY AGAIN.
   STEP = 0.5E0 * STEP
GO TO 170
C
C IF CHANGE IS NOT CLOSE TO GRADIENT, INCREASE LAMBDA AND
C RECOMPUTE CHANGE.
230 LAMBDA = LAMBDA * NU
   GO TO 130
C
C IF REDUCTION, THEN KEEP LAMBDA AND MOVE TO NEW POINT, THEN
C RECOMPUTE GRADIENT AND CURVATURE, AND SO ON.
240 SSQ = SUMB
   GO TO 30
C
C HERE ON ARGUMENT ERROR.
99 WRITE (6, 1001) NDIM, NPTS, NINC, NDIM2, NPARAM
   IERR = 3
   RETURN
C
1001 FORMAT(24H LSMARQ: ARGUMENT ERROR, 5I11)
   END
SUBROUTINE RSIMP(NDIM, NORDER, COEFF, RHS, IERR)
C
REAL COEFF, RHS, BIGC, SAVE, TOL, ABS
INTEGER NORDER, NDIM, I, J, K, IMAX, JP1, JJ, NM1
C
DIMENSION COEFF(NDIM, NORDER), RHS(NORDER)
C
CHECK FOR ARGUMENT ERRORS.
IF (NDIM .GE. NORDER .AND. NORDER .GT. 0) GO TO 10
IERR = 2
WRITE (6, 1001) NDIM, NORDER
RETURN
C
10 TOL = 0.0E0
IERR = 0
C
DO FORWARD ELIMINATION, WITH PARTIAL PIVOTING.
DO 70 J = 1, NORDER
C
CHOOSE LARGEST ELEMENT REMAINING IN THIS COLUMN.
   BIGC = 0.0E0
   DO 20 I = J, NORDER
      IF (ABS(BIGC) .GE. ABS(COEFF(I, J))) GO TO 20
      BIGC = COEFF(I, J)
      IMAX = I
20    CONTINUE
C
IF ALL ELEMENTS HAVE MAGNITUDES LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO TOL, THEN
C MATRIX IS SINGULAR.
IF (ABS(BIGC) .GT. TOL) GO TO 30
IERR = 1
WRITE (6, 1002)
RETURN
C
INTERCHANGE ROWS IF NECESSARY, AND DIVIDE NEW CURRENT ROW BY
C PIVOT ELEMENT.
30    DO 40 K = J, NORDER
       SAVE = COEFF(IMAX, K)
       COEFF(IMAX, K) = COEFF(J, K)
       COEFF(J, K) = SAVE / BIGC
40    CONTINUE
C
C    Do the same for the right-hand side.
    SAVE = RHS(IMAX)
    RHS(IMAX) = RHS(J)
    RHS(J) = SAVE / BIGC
C
C    Subtract multiples of this row from any remaining rows to make
C    leading coefficients vanish.
    IF (J .GE. NORDER) GO TO 80
C
C    JP1 = J + 1
    DO 60 I = JP1, NORDER
       SAVE = COEFF(I, J)
    DO 50 K = JP1, NORDER
       COEFF(I, K) = COEFF(I, K) - SAVE * COEFF(J, K)
50    RHS(I) = RHS(I) - SAVE * RHS(J)
60    CONTINUE
70    CONTINUE
C
C    Now find elements of solution vector in reverse order by direct
C    substitution.
80    NM1 = NORDER - 1
    NP1 = NORDER + 1
    DO 100 JJ = 1, NM1
       J = NORDER - JJ
       JP1 = J + 1
       DO 90 KK = 1, JJ
          K = NP1 - KK
          RHS(J) = RHS(J) - COEFF(J, K) * RHS(K)
90    CONTINUE
100   CONTINUE
C    RETURN
C
1001 FORMAT(23H RSIMQ:  ARGUMENT ERROR, 2I11)
1002 FORMAT(32H RSIMQ:  EQUATIONS ARE SINGULAR.)
END

RSMQ0730
RSMQ0740
RSMQ0750
RSMQ0760
RSMQ0770
RSMQ0780
C SURROUTINE LEQT1F (A,M,N,IA,B,IDGT,WKAREA,IER) LEIF0010
C LEIF0020
C LEIF0030
C LEIF0040
C LEIF0050
C LEIF0060
C LEIF0070
C LEIF0080
C LEIF0090
C LEIF0100
C LEIF0110
C LEIF0120
C LEIF0130
C LEIF0140
C LEIF0150
C LEIF0160
C LEIF0170
C LEIF0180
C LEIF0190
C LEIF0200
C LEIF0210
C LEIF0220
C LEIF0230
C LEIF0240
C LEIF0250
C LEIF0260
C LEIF0270
C LEIF0280
C LEIF0290
C LEIF0300
C LEIF0310
C LEIF0320
C LEIF0330
C LEIF0340
C LEIF0350
C LEIF0360
THE COMPUTED SOLUTION MAY BE IN ERROR LE1F0370
BY MORE THAN CAN BE ACCOUNTED FOR BY LE1F0380
THE UNCERTAINTY OF THE DATA.
LE1F0390
THIS WARNING CAN BE PRODUCED ONLY IF LE1F0400
IDGT IS GREATER THAN 0 ON INPUT.
LE1F0410
SEE CHAPTER L PRELUDE FOR FURTHER LE1F0420
DISCUSSION.
LE1F0430
PRECISION — SINGLE/DUAL
LE1F0440
REQD. IMSL ROUTINES — LUDATF, LUELMF, UERTST
LE1F0450
LANGUAGE — FORTRAN
LE1F0460
LATEST REVISION — AUGUST 15, 1973
LE1F0470
SUBROUTINE LEQT1F (A, M, N, IA, B, IDGT, WKAREA, IER)
LE1F0480
DIMENSION A(IA,1), B(IA,1), WKAREA(1)
LE1F0500
DOUBLE PRECISION A, B, WKAREA, D1, D2, WA
LE1F0510
IER=0
LE1F0520
DECOMPOSE A
LE1F0530
CALL LUDATF (A, A, N, IA, IDGT, D1, D2, WKAREA, WKAREA, WA, IER)
LE1F0540
IF (IER .GT. 128) GO TO 9000
LE1F0550
CALL ROUTINE LUELMF (FORWARD AND
LE1F0560
BACKWARD SUBSTITUTIONS)
LE1F0570
DO 10 J=1, M
LE1F0580
CALL LUELMF (A, B(1,J), WKAREA, N, IA, B(1,J))
LE1F0590
10 CONTINUE
LE1F0600
IF (IER .EQ. 0) GO TO 9005
LE1F0610
9000 CONTINUE
LE1F0620
CALL UERTST (IER, 6HLEQT1F)
LE1F0630
9005 RETURN
LE1F0640
END
LE1F0650
SUBROUTINE LUDATF (A,LU,N,IA,IDGT,D1,D2,IPVT,EQUIL,WA,IER)

FUNCTION
- L-U DECOMPOSITION BY THE CROUT ALGORITHM
  WITH OPTIONAL ACCURACY TEST.

USAGE
- CALL LUDATF(A,LU,N,IA,IDGT,D1,D2,IPVT,EQUIL,WA,IER)

PARAMETERS

A - INPUT MATRIX OF DIMENSION N BY N CONTAINING
  THE MATRIX TO BE DECOMPOSED

LU - REAL OUTPUT MATRIX OF DIMENSION N BY N
  CONTAINING THE L-U DECOMPOSITION OF A
  ROWWISE PERMUTATION OF THE INPUT MATRIX.
  FOR A DESCRIPTION OF THE FORMAT OF LU, SEE LUDA0130
  EXAMPLE.

N - INPUT SCALAR CONTAINING THE ORDER OF THE
  MATRIX A.

IA - INPUT SCALAR CONTAINING THE ROW DIMENSION OF
  MATRICES A AND LU IN THE CALLING PROGRAM.

IDGT - INPUT OPTION.
  IF IDGT IS GREATER THAN ZERO, THE NON-ZERO
  ELEMENTS OF A ARE ASSUMED TO BE CORRECT TO
  IDGT DECIMAL PLACES. LUDATF PERFORMS AN
  ACCURACY TEST TO DETERMINE IF THE COMPUTED
  DECOMPOSITION IS THE EXACT DECOMPOSITION
  OF A MATRIX WHICH DIFFERS FROM THE GIVEN ONE
  BY LESS THAN ITS UNCERTAINTY.
  IF IDGT IS EQUAL TO ZERO, THE ACCURACY TEST IS
  BYPASSED.

D1 - OUTPUT SCALAR CONTAINING ONE OF THE TWO
  COMPONENTS OF THE DETERMINANT. SEE
  DESCRIPTION OF PARAMETER D2, BELOW.

D2 - OUTPUT SCALAR CONTAINING ONE OF THE
  TWO COMPONENTS OF THE DETERMINANT. THE
  DETERMINANT MAY BE EVALUATED AS (D1)(2**D2)

IPVT - OUTPUT VECTOR OF LENGTH N CONTAINING THE
PERMUTATION INDICES. SEE DOCUMENT
(ALGORITHM).

EQUIL - OUTPUT VECTOR OF LENGTH N CONTAINING
RECPICALS OF THE ABSOLUTE VALUES OF
THE LARGEST (IN ABSOLUTE VALUE) ELEMENT
IN EACH ROW.

WA - ACCURACY TEST PARAMETER, OUTPUT ONLY IF
IDGT IS GREATER THAN ZERO.
SEE ELEMENT DOCUMENTATION FOR DETAILS.

IER - ERROR PARAMETER
TERMINAL ERROR=128+N
N = 1 INDICATES THAT MATRIX A IS
ALGORITHMICALLY SINGULAR. (SEE THE
CHAPTER L PRELUDE).

WARNING ERROR=32+N
N = 2 INDICATES THAT THE ACCURACY TEST
FAILED.
THE COMPUTED SOLUTION MAY BE IN ERROR
BY MORE THAN CAN BE ACCOUNTED FOR BY
THE UNCERTAINTY OF THE DATA.
THIS WARNING CAN BE PRODUCED ONLY IF
IDGT IS GREATER THAN 0 ON INPUT.
SEE CHAPTER L PRELUDE FOR FURTHER
DISCUSSION.

PRECISION - SINGLE/DUAL
REQD. IMSL ROUTINES - UERTST
LANGUAGE - FORTRAN

LATEST REVISION - AUGUST 15, 1973

SUBROUTINE LUDATF (A, LU, N, IA, IDGT, D1, D2, IVPT, EQUIL, WA, IER)

DIMENSION A(IA,1), LU(IA,1), IVPT(1), EQUIL(1)

* DOUBLE PRECISION A, LU, D1, D2, EQUIL, WA, ZERO, ONE, FOUR, SIXTH, SIXTH,

* REAL RN, WREL, BIGN, BIGP, SUM, AI, WI, T, TEST, Q

LU
C* DATA ZERO,ONE,FOUR,SIXTN,SIXTH/0.DO,1.DO,4.DO, LUDA0730
C1  * DATA 16.DO,.062500/ LUDA0740
       ZERO,ONE,FOUR,SIXTN,SIXTH/0,0,1,4,16,0625/ LUDA0750
       INITIALIZATION LUDA0760
C IER = 0 LUDA0770
RN = N LUDA0780
WREL = ZERO LUDA0790
D1 = ONE LUDA0800
D2 = ZERO LUDA0810
BIGA = ZERO LUDA0820
DO 10 I=1,N LUDA0830
   BIG = ZERO LUDA0840
   DO 5 J=1,N LUDA0850
      P = A(I,J) LUDA0860
      LU(I,J) = P LUDA0870
      P = DAHS(P) LUDA0880
      P = ABS(P) LUDA0890
      IF (P .GT. BIG) BIG = P LUDA0900
      CONTINUE LUDA0910
      IF (BIG .GT. BIGA) BIGA = BIG LUDA0920
      IF (BIG .EQ. ZERO) GO TO 110 LUDA0930
      EQUIL(I) = ONE/BIG LUDA0940
   5 CONTINUE LUDA0950
10 CONTINUE LUDA0960
DO 105 J=1,N LUDA0970
JM1 = J-1 LUDA0980
IF (JM1 .LT. 1) GO TO 40 LUDA0990
C   COMPUTE U(I,J), I=1,...,J-1 LUDA1000
   DO 35 I=1,JM1 LUDA1010
      SUM = LU(I,J) LUDA1020
      IM1 = I-1 LUDA1030
      IF (IDGT .EQ. 0) GO TO 25 LUDA1040
      WITH ACCURACY TEST LUDA1050
C1   AI = CARS(SUM) LUDA1060
      AI = ABS(SUM) LUDA1070
      WI = ZERO LUDA1080
      IF (IM1 .LT. 1) GO TO 20
LU(I,J) = SUM
      WI = WI+DABS(SUM)
C 50   WI = WI+ABS(SUM)
      IF (AI .EQ. ZERO) AI = BIGA
      TEST = WI/AI
      IF (TEST .GT. WREL) WREL = TEST
      GO TO 65
C 55   WITHOUT ACCURACY TEST
      IF (JM1 .LT. 1) GO TO 65
      DO 60 K=1,JM1
          SUM = SUM-LU(I,K)*LU(K,J)
       60     CONTINUE
      LU(I,J) = SUM
C 65   Q = EQUIL(I)*DABS(SUM)
      Q = EQUIL(I)*ABS(SUM)
      IF (P .GE. Q) GO TO 70
      P = Q
      IMAX = I
      CONTINUE
C 70   TEST FOR ALGORITHMIC SINGULARITY
      IF (RN+P .EQ. RN) GO TO 110
      IF (J .EQ. IMAX) GO TO 80
C 80   INTERCHANGE ROWS J AND IMAX
        D1 = -D1
        DO 75 K=1,N
            P = LU(IMAX,K)
            LU(IMAX,K) = LU(J,K)
            LU(J,K) = P
       75     CONTINUE
        EQUIL(IMAX) = EQUIL(J)
        IPVT(J) = IMAX
        D1 = D1*LU(J,J)
C 85   IF (DABS(D1) .LE. ONE) GO TO 90
      85   IF (ABS(D1) .LE. ONE) GO TO 90
        D1 = D1*SIXTH
        D2 = D2+FOUR
GO TO 85
90 IF (DABS(D1).GE. SIXTH) GO TO 95
   D1 = D1*SIXTN
   D2 = D2-FOUR
   GO TO 90
95 CONTINUE
   JP1 = J+1
   IF (JP1.GT. N) GO TO 105
C   P = LU(J,J)
   DO 100 I=JP1,N
      LU(I,J) = LU(I,J)/P
   CONTINUE
C   DIVIDE BY PIVOT ELEMENT U(J,J)
100 CONTINUE
C   PERFORM ACCURACY TEST
   IF (IDGT.EQ.0) GO TO 9005
      P = 3*N+3
      WA = P*WREL
   C   IF (WA+10.D0**(-IDGT)).NE. WA) GO TO 9005
C   IF (WA+10.D0**(-IDGT)).NE. WA) GO TO 9005
C      IER = 34
      GO TO 9000
110 CONTINUE
C   ALGORITHMIC SINGULARITY
C      IER = 129
      D1 = ZERO
      D2 = ZERO
9000 CONTINUE
C   PRINT ERROR
C      CALL UERSTDIER,6HCLUDATF)
9005 RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE LUELMF (A,B,IPVT,N,IA,X)

C FUNCTION
- ELIMINATION PART OF SOLUTION OF AX=B -
  FULL STORAGE MODE

C USAGE
- CALL LUELMF (A,B,IPVT,N,IA,X)

C PARAMETERS
A - THE RESULT, LU, COMPUTED IN THE SUBROUTINE
  'LUATF', WHERE L IS A LOWER TRIANGULAR
  MATRIX WITH ONES ON THE MAIN DIAGONAL. U IS
  UPPER TRIANGULAR. L AND U ARE STORED AS A
  SINGLE MATRIX A, AND THE UNIT DIAGONAL OF
  L IS NOT STORED

B - B IS A VECTOR OF LENGTH N ON THE RIGHT HAND
  SIDE OF THE EQUATION AX=B

IPVT - THE PERMUTATION MATRIX RETURNED FROM THE
  SUBROUTINE 'LUATF', STORED AS AN N LENGTH
  VECTOR

N - ORDER OF A AND NUMBER OF ROWS IN B

IA - NUMBER OF ROWS IN THE DIMENSION STATEMENT
  FOR A IN THE CALLING PROGRAM.

X - THE RESULT X

C PRECISION
- SINGLE/DUPLICATE

C LANGUAGE
- FORTRAN

C LATEST REVISION - APRIL 11,1975

SUBROUTINE LUELMF (A,B,IPVT,N,IA,X)

DIMENSION A(IA,1),B(1),IPVT(1),X(1)

DOUBLE PRECISION A,B,X,SUM

DO 5 I=1,N
  5 X(I) = B(I)
  IW = 0
  DO 20 I=1,N

SOLVE LY = B FOR Y

LUEF0010
LUEF0020
LUEF0030
LUEF0040
LUEF0050
LUEF0060
LUEF0070
LUEF0080
LUEF0090
LUEF0100
LUEF0110
LUEF0120
LUEF0130
LUEF0140
LUEF0150
LUEF0160
LUEF0170
LUEF0180
LUEF0190
LUEF0200
LUEF0210
LUEF0220
LUEF0230
LUEF0240
LUEF0250
LUEF0260
LUEF0270
LUEF0280
LUEF0290
LUEF0300
LUEF0310
LUEF0320
LUEF0330
LUEF0340
LUEF0350
LUEF0360
IP = IPVT(I)
SUM = X(IP)
X(IP) = X(I)
IF (IW .EQ. 0) GO TO 15
IM1 = I-1
DO 10 J=IW,IM1
   SUM = SUM-A(I,J)*X(J)
10    CONTINUE
GO TO 20
15    IF (SUM .NE. 0.) IW = I
20    X(I) = SUM

SOLVE UX = Y FOR X

DO 30 IB=1,N
   I = N+1-IB
   IP1 = I+1
   SUM = X(I)
   IF (IP1 .GT. N) GO TO 30
   DO 25 J=IP1,N
      SUM = SUM-A(I,J)*X(J)
25    CONTINUE
30    X(I) = SUM/A(I,I)
RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE UERTST (IER, NAME)

FUNCTION - ERROR MESSAGE GENERATION

USAGE - CALL UERTST(IER, NAME)

PARAMETERS IER - ERROR PARAMETER. TYPE + N WHERE

   TYPE= 128 IMPLIES TERMINAL ERROR
   64 IMPLIES WARNING WITH FIX
   32 IMPLIES WARNING

   N = ERROR CODE RELEVANT TO CALLING ROUTINE UERT0110

NAME - INPUT VECTOR CONTAINING THE NAME OF THE

   CALLING ROUTINE AS A SIX CHARACTER Literal

   STRING.

LANGUAGE - FORTRAN

LATEST REVISION - JANUARY 18, 1974

SUBROUTINE UERTST(IER, NAME)

DIMENSION ITYP(5,4), IBIT(4)

INTEGER*2 NAME(3)

INTEGER WARN, WARF, TERM, PRINTR

EQUIVALENCE (IBIT(1), WARN), (IBIT(2), WARF), (IBIT(3), TERM)

DATA ITYP /'WARN', 'ING', 'Fix', '','/

   'WARN', 'ING', 'WITH', 'FIX', '','/

   'TERM', 'NAT', '','','/

   'NON-', 'DEFI', 'NED', '','','/

   IBIT / 32, 64, 128, 0/

DATA PRINTR / 6/

IER2=IER

IF (IER2 .GE. WARN) GO TO 5

IER1=4

GO TO 20

5 IF (IER2 .LT. TERM) GO TO 10
C
I E R 1 = 3
G O T O 2 0
1 0  I F ( I E R 2 . L T . W A R F ) G O T O 1 5
C
I E R 1 = 2
G O T O 2 0
C
1 5  I E R 1 = 1
C
2 0  I E R 2 = I E R 2 - I B I T ( I E R 1 )
C
2 5  F O R M A T ( ' * * * I M S L ( U E R T S T ) * * * ' , 5 A 4 , 4 X , 3 A 2 , 4 X , 1 2 ,
* ' ( I E R = ' , 1 3 , ' ) ' )
R E T U R N
E N D

T E R M I N A L
U E R T 0 3 7 0
U E R T 0 3 8 0
U E R T 0 3 9 0
U E R T 0 4 0 0
U E R T 0 4 1 0
U E R T 0 4 2 0
U E R T 0 4 3 0
U E R T 0 4 4 0
U E R T 0 4 5 0
U E R T 0 4 6 0
U E R T 0 4 7 0
U E R T 0 4 8 0
U E R T 0 4 9 0
U E R T 0 5 0 0
U E R T 0 5 1 0
U E R T 0 5 2 0
U E R T 0 5 3 0
A.5 Sample Problem

Table A.5.1 lists the input data for a sample problem, and Table A.5.2 displays the output from the DATANA code.
Table A.5.1

INPUT DATA FOR DATANA SAMPLE PROBLEM

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.033333</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85.394</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0512</td>
<td>010000</td>
<td>005520</td>
<td>006089</td>
<td>005820</td>
<td>005642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0517</td>
<td>005373</td>
<td>005049</td>
<td>004685</td>
<td>004508</td>
<td>004323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0522</td>
<td>004036</td>
<td>003772</td>
<td>003622</td>
<td>003311</td>
<td>003129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0527</td>
<td>002995</td>
<td>002728</td>
<td>002620</td>
<td>002525</td>
<td>002255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0532</td>
<td>002260</td>
<td>002092</td>
<td>001882</td>
<td>001852</td>
<td>001696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0537</td>
<td>001683</td>
<td>001483</td>
<td>001481</td>
<td>001372</td>
<td>001327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0542</td>
<td>001249</td>
<td>001121</td>
<td>001106</td>
<td>001029</td>
<td>000950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0547</td>
<td>000956</td>
<td>000880</td>
<td>000880</td>
<td>000811</td>
<td>000760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0552</td>
<td>000725</td>
<td>000728</td>
<td>000650</td>
<td>000677</td>
<td>000616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0557</td>
<td>000564</td>
<td>000574</td>
<td>000517</td>
<td>000498</td>
<td>000516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0562</td>
<td>000459</td>
<td>000417</td>
<td>000418</td>
<td>000407</td>
<td>000367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0567</td>
<td>000377</td>
<td>000365</td>
<td>000336</td>
<td>000322</td>
<td>000307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0572</td>
<td>000284</td>
<td>000290</td>
<td>000272</td>
<td>000253</td>
<td>000244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0577</td>
<td>000233</td>
<td>000223</td>
<td>000222</td>
<td>000178</td>
<td>000212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0582</td>
<td>000185</td>
<td>000166</td>
<td>000165</td>
<td>000167</td>
<td>000160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0587</td>
<td>000146</td>
<td>000129</td>
<td>000127</td>
<td>000126</td>
<td>000121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0592</td>
<td>000106</td>
<td>000100</td>
<td>000095</td>
<td>000089</td>
<td>000084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0597</td>
<td>000080</td>
<td>000091</td>
<td>000075</td>
<td>000073</td>
<td>000091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0602</td>
<td>000065</td>
<td>000057</td>
<td>000065</td>
<td>000081</td>
<td>000068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0607</td>
<td>000062</td>
<td>000056</td>
<td>000071</td>
<td>000054</td>
<td>000043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0612</td>
<td>000052</td>
<td>000063</td>
<td>000052</td>
<td>000050</td>
<td>000051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0617</td>
<td>000049</td>
<td>000041</td>
<td>000045</td>
<td>000032</td>
<td>000033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0622</td>
<td>000039</td>
<td>000033</td>
<td>000036</td>
<td>000021</td>
<td>000024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0627</td>
<td>000033</td>
<td>000032</td>
<td>000021</td>
<td>000031</td>
<td>000031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.1 Introduction

DAMIE (D2) is a FORTRAN subroutine which computes the so-called "Efficiency Factors" and Stokes parameters for electromagnetic radiation scattered by a sphere. The formulas calculated in this subroutine were first derived by G. Mie (M5), and thus this scattering process is referred to as Mie scattering.

Mie's expressions for the radiation scattered by a sphere are valid when the radius of the sphere is comparable to or greater than the wavelength of the incident radiation. The index of refraction of the material of the sphere is assumed to have the form $n_1 - i n_2$. In the DAMIE subroutine, all functions are computed with an upward recurrence procedure. This procedure is stable for non-absorbing ($n_2 = 0$), moderate or large-sized spheres. For partially-absorbing ($n_2 > 0$) spheres, the DBMIE subroutine (D2), which uses a downward recurrence procedure, gives more reliable results.

In the present study, the scattered intensity of water droplets is found as a function of droplet size. Since water is essentially a non-absorbing medium, and the droplet sizes under consideration are large, the DAMIE subroutine is used, requiring much less computer storage.
This appendix describes the part of the DAMIE code that finds the relationship between the scattered light intensity and droplet size. Other features of the subroutine will not be presented here. They are described in Ref. D2. A listing of the program and a sample problem are included at the end of this appendix.

B.2 Description of the Program

The expressions for Mie scattering can be written as

\[ I_s = F' \cdot I_i, \quad (B.2.1) \]

where \( I_i \) and \( I_s \) respectively represent the Stokes parameters of the incident and scattered radiation, and \( F' \) is a four-by-four matrix referred to as a "transformation matrix". It has the following form:

\[
F' = \begin{pmatrix}
M_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & M_1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & S_{21} & -D_{21} \\
0 & 0 & D_{21} & S_{21}
\end{pmatrix} \quad (B.2.2)
\]

The DAMIE subroutine calculates the elements in this transformation matrix at any scattering angle. The scattered intensity, \( I_s \), at any scattering angle, can simply be expressed as

\[ I_s(\theta) = \frac{1/2(M_1(\theta) + M_2(\theta))}{k^2 \cdot L^2} I_i, \quad (B.2.3) \]

where
\[ k = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \quad \text{(B.2.4)} \]

where \( \lambda \) is the wavelength of the incident radiation, and \( L \) is the distance from the scattering location. In the program output, the value of \((1/2)(M_1+M_2)\) is also given under the heading "INTENSITY" for each scattering angle, as shown in Section B.5. The only purpose of using this subroutine in the present study is to find this value as a function of droplet size.

All of the necessary information for this computation are input through the main program. These include the refractive index of water, the wavelength of the incident radiation, the scattering angle, and the droplet size. The subroutine is called to compute the transformation matrix elements, which are then used to compute the scattered intensity factor.

B.3 Description of the Input Parameters

Card No. 1

RFR, RFI, ALAM

FORMAT (4D15.5)

RFR is \( n_1 \), the real part of the refractive index of the material of the sphere. RFR equals 1.341 for water.

RFI is \( n_2 \), the imaginary part of the refractive index of the material of the sphere. RFI equals 0.0 for water.

ALAM is the wavelength of the incident light source expressed in microns.
Card No. 2

THETD(1), AJX, JX

FORMAT(2D15.5, I5)

THETD(1) is $\theta_1$, the smallest angle between the direction of the scattered light and the direction of the incident light in the calculations. It is expressed in degrees, and its value should not exceed $90^\circ$.

AJX is $\Delta \theta$, the interval between successive $\theta$'s for calculations.

JX is the total number of $\theta$'s for calculations of a scattered intensity. Its value should not exceed 100, unless the dimensions in all related statements are appropriately changed. It must be greater than or equal to 1.

Card No. 3 and Onward

X

FORMAT (D15.5)

X is the water droplet radius expressed in microns, for the calculations. Execution will be terminated when there are no more data cards.
B.4 Listing of the DAMIE Code
C
C DAMIE - CALCULATION OF SCATTERED INTENSITY AS A FUNCTION
C OF DROPLET SIZE
C
C RFR=REAL PART OF THE REFRACTIVE INDEX OF THE MATERIAL
C OF THE SPHERE
C RFI=IMAGINARY PART OF THE REFRACTIVE INDEX OF THE MATERIAL
C OF THE SPHERE
C ALAM=WAVE LENGTH OF THE LIGHT SOURCE IN MICRO
C THETD(1)=SCATTERING ANGLE IN DEGREE
C AJX=INTERVAL BETWEEN SCATTERING ANGLES FOR WHICH COMPUTATION
C IS PERFORMED
C JX=TOTAL NUMBER OF SCATTERING ANGLES FOR WHICH COMPUTATION
C WILL BE PERFORMED
C X=DROPLET SIZE IN MICRON
C
100 FORMAT(4D15.5)
101 FORMAT(2D15.5,15)
105 FORMAT(1H1)
110 FORMAT(/,/,T10,6D15.5,15)
200 FORMAT(/,T10,'ELEMENTS OF THE TRANSFORMATION MATRIX FOR A SPHERE
1 WITH SIZE PARAMETER = ',F15.5)
300 FORMAT(/,T10,'REFRACTIVE INDEX. REAL = ',D15.5,T60,'IMAGINARY =',
1 T15.5/)
400 FORMAT(T3,'ANGLE',T17,'M SUB 2 ',T32,'M SUB 1',T46,' S SUB 21',
1 T61,'U SUB 21',T76,'INTENSITY',T91,'POLARIZATION'//)
500 FORMAT(F10.4,5E15.6,F15.4)
600 FORMAT(/,T10,' EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION',E15.6)
700 FORMAT(/,T10,' EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING',E15.6)
800 FORMAT(/,T10,' EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION',E15.6)
900 FORMAT(/,T10,' ASYMMETRY FACTOR',E15.6)
REAL*8 RFR,RFI,X,QEXT,QSCAT,QABS,THETD(100),FLTRMX(4,100,2)
REAL*8 ALAM,CON,CTBRSQS,AVCSFH
REAL*4 AIN(100,2),POLR(100,2)
CON=3.1415926535897932D+0
READ 100,RFR,RFI,ALAM
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READ 101, THETD(1), AJX, JX
THETD(2) = 180.000 - THETD(1)
10 READ(5, 100, END=1000) X
PRINT 105
PRINT 110, X, RFR, RFI, ALAM, THETD(1), AJX, JX
X = (2.000*COS*X)/ALAM
CALL DAMIE(X, RFR, RFI, THETD, JX, QEXT, QSCAT, CTBRQS, ELTRMX)
QABS=QEXT-QSCAT
AVCSTH=CTBRQS/QSCAT
DO 2 K=1, 2
DO 2 J=1, JX
AIN(J,K)=ELTRMX(1, J, K)+ELTRMX(2, J, K)
PQR(J,K)=(ELTRMX(2, J, K)-ELTRMX(1, J, K))/AIN(J,K)
AIN(J,K)=0.5*AINE(J,K)
2 CONTINUE
PRINT 200, X
PRINT 300, RFR, RFI
PRINT 400
PRINT 500, (THETD(J), (ELTRMX(I, J, 1)), I=1, 4, AIN(J, 1), PQR(J, 1)), 1J=1, JX)
PRINT 500, (THETD(2), (ELTRMX(I, JX, 2)), I=1, 4, AIN(JX, 2), PQR(JX, 2))
PRINT 600, QEXT
PRINT 700, QSCAT
PRINT 800, QABS
PRINT 900, AVCSTH
GO TO 10
1000 CONTINUE
END
SUBROUTINE DAMIE (X,RFR,RFI,THETD,JX,QEXT,QSCAT,CBRQCS,ELTRMX)
5 FORMAT(T10,'THE VALUE OF THE SCATTERING ANGLE IS GREATER THAN
1 90.0 DEGREES. IT IS ',D15.4)
6 FORMAT(/T10,'PLEASE READ COMMENTS '/)
7 FORMAT(/T10,'THE VALUE OF THE ARGUMENT JX IS GREATER THAN 100*')
8 FORMAT(/T10,'THE VALUE OF RFI*X IS GREATER THAN 80.0. IT IS',
1 D15.4,/) 
   REAL*8 X,RX,RFR,RFI,QEXT,QSCAT,T(5),TA(4),TB(2),TC(2)
   REAL*8 TD(2),TE(2),CBRQCS
   REAL*8 ELTRMX(4,100,2),PI(3,100),TAU(3,100),CSTHT(100),SI2THT(100)
1,THETD(100)
   COMPLEX*16 RF,RRF,RRFX,WM1,FNA,FNB,TC1,TC2,WFN(2),ACAP(2)
   COMPLEX*16 FNAP,FNBP
   EQUIVALENCE (WFN(1),TA(1)),(FNA,TB(1)),(FNB,TC(1))
   EQUIVALENCE (FNAP,TD(1)),(FNBP,TE(1))
   IF ( JX ,LE. 100 ) GO TO 20
   WRITE(6,7)
   WRITE(6,6)
   CALL EXIT
20 RF=DCMPLX(RFR,-RFI)
   RRF=1.000/RF
   RX=1.000/X
   RRFX=RRF*RX
   DO 30 J=1,JX
   IF ( THETD(J) ,LT.0.000 ) THETD(J)=DABS(THETD(J))
   IF ( THETD(J) ,GT.0.000 ) GO TO 23
   CSTHT(J)=1.000
   SI2THT(J)=0.000
   GO TO 30
23 IF ( THETD(J) ,GE.90.000 ) GO TO 25
   T(1)=(3.1415926535897932 * THETD(J))/180.000
   CSTHT(J)=DCS(T(1))
   SI2THT(J)=1.000-CSTHT(J)**2
   GO TO 30
25 IF(THETD(J) ,GT.90.000) GO TO 28
   CSTHT(J)=0.000
   }
SI2THT(J)=1.0D0
GO TO 30
28 WRITE(6,5) THETD(J)
WRITE(6,6)
CALL EXIT
30 CONTINUE
DO 35 J=1,JX
PI(1,J)=0.0D0
PI(2,J)=1.0D0
TAU(1,J)=0.0D0
TAU(2,J)=CSTHT(J)
35 CONTINUE
T(1)=DCOS(X)
T(2)=DSIN(X)
WM1=DCMPLX(T(1),-T(2))
WFN(1)=DCMPLX(T(2),T(1))
WFN(2)=RX*WFN(1)-WM1
T(1)=RFI*X
IF(T(1).GT.80.0D0) GO TO 40
T(3)=0.5D0*DEXP(T(1))
T(4)=0.2500/T(3)
T(1)=T(3)+T(4)
T(2)=T(3)-T(4)
T(3)=T(2)**2
T(2)=T(1)*T(2)
T(1)=T(3)
T(3)=RFRI X
T(4)=DSIN(T(3))
T(3)=DCOS(T(3))
T(1)=T(1)+T(4)**2
T(3)=T(3)*T(4)
ACAP(1)=DCMPLX(T(3),T(2))/T(1)
GO TO 50
40 ACAP(1)=DCMPLX(0.0D0,1.0D0)
WRITE(6,8) T(1)
WRITE(6,6)
50 ACAP(2)=-RRFX+(1.0DO/(RRFX-ACAP(1)))
TC1=ACAP(2)*RRF+RX
TC2=ACAP(2)*RF+RX
FNA=(TC1*TA(3)-TA(1))/(TC1*WFN(2)-WFN(1))
FNB=(TC2*TA(3)-TA(1))/(TC2*WFN(2)-WFN(1))
FNAP=FNA
FNBP=FNB
T(1)=1.50DO
TB(1)=T(1)*TB(1)
TB(2)=T(1)*TB(2)
TC(1)=T(1)*TC(1)
TC(2)=T(1)*TC(2)
DO 60 J=1,JX
EL TRMX(1,J,1)=TB(1)*PI(2,J)+TC(1)*TAU(2,J)
EL TRMX(2,J,1)=TB(2)*PI(2,J)+TC(2)*TAU(2,J)
EL TRMX(3,J,1)=TC(1)*PI(2,J)+TB(1)*TAU(2,J)
EL TRMX(4,J,1)=TC(2)*PI(2,J)+TB(2)*TAU(2,J)
EL TRMX(1,J,2)=TB(1)*PI(2,J)-TC(1)*TAU(2,J)
EL TRMX(2,J,2)=TB(2)*PI(2,J)-TC(2)*TAU(2,J)
EL TRMX(3,J,2)=TC(1)*PI(2,J)-TB(1)*TAU(2,J)
EL TRMX(4,J,2)=TC(2)*PI(2,J)-TB(2)*TAU(2,J)
60 CONTINUE
QEXT=2.0DO*(TB(1)+TC(1))
QSCAT=(TB(1)**2+TB(2)**2+TC(1)**2+TC(2)**2)/0.75DO
CTBRQS=0.0DC
N=2
65 T(1)=2*N-1
T(2)=N-1
T(3)=2*N+1
DO 70 J=1,JX
PI(3,J)=T(1)*PI(2,J)+CSTHT(J)-N*PI(1,J))/T(2)
TAU(3,J)=CSTHT(J)*(PI(3,J)-PI(1,J))-T(1)*S12THT(J)*PI(2,J)+TAU(1,J)
70 CONTINUE
WMI=WFN(1)
WFN(1)=WFN(2)
WFN(2)=T(1)RF*WFN(1)-WM1
ACAP(1)=ACAP(2)
ACAP(2)=I-RRF/(1.000/(N*RRF-ACAP(1)))
TC1=ACAP(2)*RRF+N*RX
TC2=ACAP(2)*RF+N*RX
FN1=(TC1+TA(1)-TA(1))/((TC1+WFN(2)-WFN(1)))
FN2=(TC2+TA(1)-TA(1))/((TC2+WFN(2)-WFN(1)))
T(5)=N
T(4)=T(1)/(T(5)*T(2))
T(2)=(T(2)*(T(5)+1.000))/T(5)
C[m]Q=CTBQS+TC(2)*(TD(1)*TB(1)+TD(1)*TB(1)+TE(1)*TC(1)+
T(2)*TC(2)+T(4)*TD(1)*TE(1)+TD(2)*TE(2))
QEXT=QEXT+T(3)*TB(1)+TC(1))
T(4)=TB(1)**2+TB(2)**2+TC(1)**2+TC(2)**2
QSCAT=QSCAT+T(3)*T(4)
T(2)=N*(N+1)
T(1)=T(3)/T(2)
K=(N/2)**2
DO 80 J=1,N
ELTRM(1,J)=ELTRM(1,J)+T(1)*(TB(1)*PI(3,J)+TC(1)*TAU(3,J))
ELTRM(2,J)=ELTRM(2,J)+T(1)*(TB(2)*PI(3,J)+TC(2)*TAU(3,J))
ELTRM(3,J)=ELTRM(3,J)+T(1)*(TC(1)*PI(3,J)+TB(1)*TAU(3,J))
ELTRM(4,J)=ELTRM(4,J)+T(1)*(TC(2)*PI(3,J)+TB(2)*TAU(3,J))
IF(K.EQ.N) GO TO 75
ELTRM(1,N)=ELTRM(1,N)+(TB(1)*PI(3,J)-TC(1)*TAU(3,J))
ELTRM(2,N)=ELTRM(2,N)+(TB(2)*PI(3,J)-TC(2)*TAU(3,J))
ELTRM(3,N)=ELTRM(3,N)+(TC(1)*PI(3,J)-TB(1)*TAU(3,J))
ELTRM(4,N)=ELTRM(4,N)+(TC(2)*PI(3,J)-TB(2)*TAU(3,J))
GO TO 80
75 ELTRM(1,J)=ELTRM(1,J)+(TB(1)*PI(3,J)-TC(1)*TAU(3,J))
ELTRM(2,J)=ELTRM(2,J)+(TB(2)*PI(3,J)-TC(2)*TAU(3,J))
ELTRM(3,J)=ELTRM(3,J)+(TC(1)*PI(3,J)-TB(1)*TAU(3,J))
ELTRM(4,J)=ELTRM(4,J)+(TC(2)*PI(3,J)-TB(2)*TAU(3,J))
GO TO 80
80 CONTINUE
IF(T(4).LT.1.0D-14) GO TO 100
N=N+1
DO 90 J=1,JX
PI(1,J)=PI(2,J)
PI(2,J)=PI(3,J)
TAU(1,J)=TAU(2,J)
TAU(2,J)=TAU(3,J)
90 CONTINUE
FNAP=FNA
FNRP=FNB
GO TO 65
100 DO 120 J=1,JX
   DO 120 K=1,2
      DO 115 I=1,4
         T(I)=ELTRMX(I,J,K)
      115 CONTINUE
      ELTRMX(2,J,K)=T(1)**2+T(2)**2
      ELTRMX(1,J,K)=T(3)**2+T(4)**2
      ELTRMX(3,J,K)=T(1)*T(3)+T(2)*T(4)
      ELTRMX(4,J,K)=T(2)*T(3)-T(4)*T(1)
120 CONTINUE
   T(1)=2.000*RX**2
   QEXT=QEXT*T(1)
   QSCAT=QSCAT*T(1)
   CTBRQS=2.000*CTBRQS*T(1)
RETURN
END
B.5 Sample Problem

A sample problem is given here to demonstrate the use of the DAMIE code. The material of the scattering medium is pure water which has a refractive index of $1.34 - 10$. The wavelength of the incident light source is $0.6328 \, \mu m$. The scattering angle is set to be $26.5^\circ$. The radii of the water droplets for this computation are listed in the input section of the sample problem.

The output of the code gives the input information as well as the elements of the transformation matrix for the input scattering angle and its complementary angle. In the present study only the values of the intensity are used. All of this information is repeated for each input droplet size.
INPUT OF SAMPLE PROGRAM FOR DAMIE PROGRAM

1.342000
0.000
0.00

26.5000
5.000
10.000
20.000
30.000
40.000
50.000
60.000
70.000
80.000
90.000
100.000
0.50000D+01  0.13420D+01  0.0  0.63280D+00  0.26500D+02  0.0  1

ELEMENTS OF THE TRANSFORMATION MATRIX FOR A SPHERE WITH SIZE PARAMETER = 49.64590

REFRACTIVE INDEX. REAL = 0.13420D+01  IMAGINARY = 0.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
<th>POLARIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.190689D+04</td>
<td>0.123446D+04</td>
<td>0.150990D+04</td>
<td>0.272378D+03</td>
<td>0.157067E+04</td>
<td>-0.2141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.394814D+03</td>
<td>0.352423D+02</td>
<td>-0.793190D+02</td>
<td>0.873078D+02</td>
<td>0.215028E+03</td>
<td>-0.8361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION 0.205035D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING 0.205035D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION 0.0

ASYMMETRY FACTOR 0.853527D+00
0.10000D+02  0.13420D+01  0.0  0.63280D+00  0.26500D+02  0.0  1

ELEMENTS OF THE TRANSFORMATION MATRIX FOR A SPHERE WITH SIZE PARAMETER = 99.29180

REFRACTIVE INDEX. REAL = 0.13420D+01
IMAGINARY = 0.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
<th>POLARIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.219803D+05</td>
<td>0.240829D+05</td>
<td>0.229522D+05</td>
<td>-0.159597D+04</td>
<td>0.230316E+05</td>
<td>0.0456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.178566D+03</td>
<td>0.145557D+04</td>
<td>0.185881D+03</td>
<td>0.474726D+03</td>
<td>0.817070E+03</td>
<td>0.7815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION 0.214774D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING 0.214774D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION 0.0

ASYMMETRY FACTOR 0.878025D+00
0.20000D+02  0.13420D+01  0.0  0.63280D+00  0.26500D+02  0.0  1

ELEMnts of the Transformation Matrix for a Sphere with Size Parameter = 198.58361

Refractive Index. Real = 0.13420D+01 Imaginary = 0.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Polarization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.788699D+05</td>
<td>0.885268D+05</td>
<td>0.831022D+05</td>
<td>-0.872497D+04</td>
<td>0.836984E+05</td>
<td>0.0577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.193841D+04</td>
<td>0.212137D+04</td>
<td>0.116681D+04</td>
<td>0.165850D+04</td>
<td>0.202989E+04</td>
<td>0.0451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficiency Factor for Extinction 0.208603D+01

Efficiency Factor for Scattering 0.208603D+01

Efficiency Factor for Absorption 0.0

Asymmetry Factor 0.870171D+00
0.30000D+02  0.13420D+01  0.0  0.63280D+00  0.26500D+02  0.0  1

Elements of the transformation matrix for a sphere with size parameter = 297.87541

Refractive Index, Real = 0.13420D+01 Imaginary = 0.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>M Sub 2</th>
<th>M Sub 1</th>
<th>S Sub 21</th>
<th>D Sub 21</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Polarization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.154489D+06</td>
<td>0.164404D+06</td>
<td>0.159151D+06</td>
<td>-0.835008D+04</td>
<td>0.159447E+06</td>
<td>0.0311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.112530D+05</td>
<td>0.539753D+03</td>
<td>0.885705D+03</td>
<td>-0.229987D+04</td>
<td>0.589639E+04</td>
<td>-0.9085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficiency factor for extinction 0.203613D+01

Efficiency factor for scattering 0.203613D+01

Efficiency factor for absorption 0.0

Asymmetry factor 0.869208D+00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
<th>POLARIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.253297D+06</td>
<td>0.251485D+06</td>
<td>0.252116D+06</td>
<td>-0.117470D+05</td>
<td>0.252391E+06</td>
<td>-0.0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.140381D+04</td>
<td>0.326051D+05</td>
<td>0.841257D+03</td>
<td>-0.671294D+04</td>
<td>0.170044E+05</td>
<td>0.9174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION 0.201977D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING 0.201977D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION 0.0

ASYMMETRY FACTOR 0.873835D+00

ELEMENTS OF THE TRANSFORMATION MATRIX FOR A SPHERE WITH SIZE PARAMETER = 397.16721

REFRACTIVE INDEX. REAL = 0.13420D+01 IMAGINARY = 0.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
<th>POLARIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.379813D+06</td>
<td>0.342664D+06</td>
<td>0.360461D+06</td>
<td>-0.147120D+05</td>
<td>0.361239E+06</td>
<td>-0.0514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.189627D+05</td>
<td>0.163937D+05</td>
<td>0.343393D+03</td>
<td>0.176281D+05</td>
<td>0.176782E+05</td>
<td>-0.0727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION  \(0.203422D+01\)

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING  \(0.203422D+01\)

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION  \(0.0\)

ASYMMETRY FACTOR  \(0.873846D+00\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
<th>POLARIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.575563D+06</td>
<td>0.482253D+06</td>
<td>0.523860D+06</td>
<td>-0.560139D+05</td>
<td>0.528908E+06</td>
<td>-0.0882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.260394D+05</td>
<td>0.163721D+04</td>
<td>0.642192D+04</td>
<td>-0.117941D+04</td>
<td>0.138383E+05</td>
<td>-0.8817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION 0.204117D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING 0.204117D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION 0.0

ASYMMETRY FACTOR 0.876979D+00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
<th>POLARIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.726696D+06</td>
<td>0.636103D+06</td>
<td>0.674361D+06</td>
<td>-0.865502D+05</td>
<td>0.681400E+06</td>
<td>-0.0665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.338620D+05</td>
<td>0.277975D+05</td>
<td>0.133752D+04</td>
<td>-0.308511D+05</td>
<td>0.308297E+05</td>
<td>-0.0984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION 0.203400D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING 0.203400D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION 0.0

ASYMMETRY FACTOR 0.879728D+00
0.80000D+02  0.13420D+01  0.0  0.63280D+00  0.26500D+02  0.0  1

ELEMENTS OF THE TRANSFORMATION MATRIX FOR A SPHERE WITH SIZE PARAMETER = 794.33443

REFRACTIVE INDEX. REAL = 0.13420D+01 IMAGINARY = 0.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
<th>POLARIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.888014D+06</td>
<td>0.799425D+06</td>
<td>0.836368D+06</td>
<td>-0.101925D+06</td>
<td>0.843719E+06</td>
<td>-0.0525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.503774D+04</td>
<td>0.110838D+06</td>
<td>-0.387128D+04</td>
<td>0.233106D+05</td>
<td>0.579378E+05</td>
<td>0.9130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION  0.202200D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING  0.202200D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION  0.0

ASYMMETRY FACTOR  0.877414D+00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
<th>POLARIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.103699D+07</td>
<td>0.937279D+06</td>
<td>0.980783D+06</td>
<td>-0.100051D+06</td>
<td>0.987133E+06</td>
<td>-0.0505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.882246D+05</td>
<td>0.772380D+04</td>
<td>-0.923185D+04</td>
<td>0.244173D+05</td>
<td>0.479742E+05</td>
<td>-0.9390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION 0.201132D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING 0.201132D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION 0.0

ASYMMETRY FACTOR 0.8781113D+00
0.10000D+03  0.13420D+01  0.0  0.63280D+00  0.26500D+02  0.0  1

ELEMENTS OF THE TRANSFORMATION MATRIX FOR A SPHERE WITH SIZE PARAMETER = 992.91803

REFRACTIVE INDEX. REAL = 0.13420D+01  IMAGINARY = 0.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>M SUB 2</th>
<th>M SUB 1</th>
<th>S SUB 21</th>
<th>D SUB 21</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
<th>POLARIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>0.119919D+07</td>
<td>0.104623D+07</td>
<td>0.111688D+07</td>
<td>-0.849762D+05</td>
<td>0.112271E+07</td>
<td>-0.0681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.5000</td>
<td>0.513284D+05</td>
<td>0.197524D+05</td>
<td>0.190377D+05</td>
<td>-0.255231D+05</td>
<td>0.355404E+05</td>
<td>-0.4442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR EXTINCTION 0.201675D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR SCATTERING 0.201675D+01

EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR ABSORPTION 0.0

ASYMMETRY FACTOR 0.878813D+00