# Densities and Mixture Virial Coefficients for Wet Natural Gas Mixtures

# Philip T. Eubank,\* John J. Scheloske,<sup>†</sup> Kenneth R. Hall, and James C. Holste

Texas A&M University, Department of Chemical Engineering, College Station, Texas 77843-3122

Experimental densities plus second and third mixture virial coefficients are reported for two well-defined natural gases, one sweet and one sour, with varying amounts of water vapor to 10% (mole basis). The Burnett-Isochoric densities, which range from 50 to 210 °C and 0.1–18.9 MPa, are precise to  $\pm 0.01\%$  and are considered accurate to  $\pm 0.04\%$ .

### Introduction

Few experimental measurements exist for the density of wet (water containing) natural gas mixtures in the temperature range from 50 to 210 °C at pressures to the dew point. Comprehensive and accurate densities over a range of temperature, density, and water level are necessary to test equation of state (EOS) predictions used by the natural gas industry. Our present sweet and sour dry gases were selected to represent those natural gases found in practice.

#### **Composition of Dry Natural Gases**

Tables I and II contain the composition of the dry, sweet gas and the dry, sour gas, respectively. Both gases were obtained from the Phillips Petroleum Co. The sour gas decomposition disclaimer published by Phillips at the bottom of Table II was not a serious consideration. Periodic chromatographic analyses indicated no significant decomposition of the sour gas in the original cylinder, even after 2 years.

Because water is simply added to the dry gas (sweet or sour) to make up the wet gas mixtures, the composition of our 5 mol % water/sweet gas, for example, is 5 mol % water plus 95 mol % dry, sweet gas or 0.95 is multiplied by the mole percentages of Table I to obtain the mole percent of each dry gas component in the wet gas mixture.

#### **Experimental Apparatus**

The Burnett-isochoric (B-I) density apparatus was described previously by Mansoorian et al. (1) and Eubank et al. (2). A complete description of the apparatus and experimental techniques may be found in the dissertation of Scheloske (3). Water was weighed before mixing with the natural gas in a variation of the Burnett mixing method of ref 2.

Because the water content did not exceed 10% (mole basis), the usual adsorption diagnostics (4) were negative even for the sour gas mixtures. That is, the limiting pressure ratio (or apparatus constant) on a Burnett isotherm was the same as for helium at the same temperature.

## Results

The experimental dew point pressures and enthalpy residuals for these same systems have been published previously (5). A

Table I. Composition of Sweet Natural Gas (G-8	Composition of Swee	t Natural Gas (G-8) <sup>a</sup>
--	---------------------	----------------------------------

	chromatog	
components	comp, mol %	wt %
hydrogen	0.01	0.001
helium	0.14	0.03
oxygen	< 0.01	
nitrogen	1.67	2.54
methane	90.31	78.48
ethane	2.99	4.87
carbon dioxide	0.30	0.72
propane	2.00	4.78
propylene	0.01	0.2
isobutane	0.97	3.05
<i>n</i> -butane	0.97	3.05
isopentane	0.31	1.21
<i>n</i> -pentane	0.32	1.25
total	100.00	100.00

<sup>a</sup> Molecular weight = 18.460.

Table	II.	Com	position	of	Sour	Natural	Gas <sup>a</sup>
-------	-----	-----	----------	----	------	---------	------------------

component	gravimetr comp, <sup>b</sup> mol %	wt %
methane	89.26	77.73
nitrogen	0.04	0.05
octenes		0.02
water	0.01	0.01
propylene	0.01	0.03
carbonyl sulfide	0.01	0.04
carbon dioxide	4.29	10.29
hydrogen sulfide	3.05	5.65
isobutane	0.01	0.02
ethane	2.26	3.68
propane	1.06	2.53
total	100.00	100.00

<sup>a</sup> Molecular weight = 18.424. <sup>b</sup> Composition as weighed into cylinder. Composition will change with time because of hydrogen sulfide activity.

detailed account of all the experimental results is also contained in a research report to the principal sponsor (6). Because dew points and densities are measured for the same systems in the same apparatus, the combined data are particularly useful for testing dew-point prediction methods (vapor/liquid equilibria) from EOS (7).

Tables III-V contain the pressures and temperatures of 1.85%, 5.0%, and 10.0% water, respectively, in with the dry, sweet natural gas of Table I. The measurements were made along pseudoisochores (or isomasses) because the 304 stainless steel cell distorts in volume with temperature T and, very slightly, with pressure P. The distortion of the primary cell is described by

$$V(P,T) = V_0(1 + \gamma P)[(1 + \bar{\alpha}(T - T_0)]^3$$
(1)

where  $V_0$  is the volume at zero pressure and the reference temperature  $T_0$  (K),  $\gamma = [28.72 + (4.50 \times 10^{-3})T]10^{-6}/MPa$ , *P* is in megapascals,  $\bar{\alpha} = [14.77 + (2.915 \times 10^{-3})(T + T_0)] \times 10^{-6}/K$ , and *T* is in degrees kelvin. To obtain the true density at the experimental *P* and *T* (K = 273.15 + °C) for Tables

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> Present address: Department of Chemical Engineering, McNeese State University, Lake Charles, LA 70609.

isochore				density at 210 °C × 10 <sup>3</sup> ,				
no.	75 °C	100 °C	125 °C	150 °C	175 °C	200 °C	210 °C	mol/cm <sup>3</sup>
1				14.24265	15.34466	16.439 83	16.873 08	4.18175
2				9.65416	10.342 49	11.02714	11.299 22	2.82893
3			6.131 19	6.57410	7.01434	7.45293	7.62721	1.91364
4			4.188 90	4.47692	4.763 69	5.04926	5.16307	1.294 43
5		2.66471	2.85548	3.044 97	3.233 86	3.42215	3.497 23	0.875 56
6		1.81586	1.94254	2.06832	2.19367	2.318 84	2.36871	0.59223
7	1.15006	1.234 86	1.31926	1.40335	1.487 04	1.57072	1.604 08	0.400 57
8	0.78151	0.83834	0.894 94	0.951 30	1.00753	1.06362	1.086 04	0.27094
9	0.530 28	0.568 50	0.606 55	0.644 47	0.68227	0.72025	0.735 09	0.183 26
10	0.35944	0.38516	0.41094	0.436 35	0.461 85	0.487 28	0.497 46	0.12395
11	0.24347	0.260 82	0.27811	0.295 34	0.312 53	0.32971	0.336 59	0.083 84
12	0.16482	0.17656	0.188 25	0.199 88	0.21147	0.223 06	0.22772	0.05670
13	0.11152	0.11944	0.12732	0.135 20	0.143 00	0.150 85	0.15404	0.03835

isochore		pressure, MPa						
no.	75 °C	100 °C	125 °C	150 °C	175 °C	200 °C	210 °C	210 °C × $10^3$ , mol/cm <sup>3</sup>
1					13.261 85	14.18376	14.550 59	3.637 77
2					8.98298	9.565 25	9.797 <del>99</del>	2.46011
3				5.72282	6.100 77	6.476 28	6.62547	1.66361
4				3.897 18	4.144 26	4.390 04	4.48781	1.12495
5			2.48556	2.649 87	2.81239	2.97475	3.039 53	0.76069
6			1.68983	1.79867	1.43150	2.01540	2.05854	0.51436
7			1.146 93	1.21963	1.292 38	1.364 66	1.393 49	0.34780
8		0.72835	0.77753	0.826 21	0.874 99	0.92361	0.94290	0.23517
9		0.49360	0.52676	0.559 39	0.59218	0.62481	0.63781	0.15902
10		0.334 08	0.356 28	0.37832	0.400 40	0.422 40	0.431 19	0.10752
11	0.21086	0.22600	0.240 99	0.25576	0.27061	0.285 39	0.291 35	0.07270
12	0.14265	0.15275	0.16284	0.17281	0.18284	0.19279	0.196 80	0.04916
13	0.096 40	0.103 20	0.109 96	0.11662	0.12342	0.13010	0.13282	0.033 24
14	0.065 21	0.06978	0.07432	0.07879	0.083 37	0.087 85	0.08970	0.022 48

# Table V. P-V-T Surface of 10.0% Water-90.0% Sweet Natural Gas

isochore			pressu	ıre, MPa			density at 210 °C × 10³.
no.	100 °C	125 °C	150 °C	175 °C	200 °C	210 °C	mol/cm <sup>3</sup>
1					15.76675	16.19173	4.079 55
2					10.647 32	10.91251	2.75918
3				6.809 10	7.22296	7.393 07	1.866 05
4				4.625 67	4.903 90	5.01465	1.261 98
5			2.959 49	3.14412	3.32765	3.400 80	0.85343
6			2.011 92	2.134 49	2.256 41	2.30502	0.577 13
7			1.36554	1.44745	1.52891	1.561 38	0.390 28
8		0.87077	0.925 85	0.98075	1.03545	1.05720	0.26392
9		0.590 13	0.62715	0.664 03	0.700 84	0.71557	0.17847
10	0.37468	0.39971	0.42464	0.44951	0.47442	0.48421	0.12069
11	0.253 59	0.270 49	0.28735	0.304 13	0.32092	0.327 56	0.08161
12	0.17153	0.18293	0.19438	0.205 70	0.21706	0.22155	0.055 19
13	0.11714	0.12485	0.13270	0.14042	0.14812	0.15088	0.037 32
14	0.07925	0.084 56	0.08988	0.095 01	0.100 34	0.10227	0.025 24
15	0.053 59	0.057 18	0.06072	0.064 23	0.067 86	0.069 22	0.017 06
16	0.03618	0.03864	0.041 03	0.04334	0.04582	0.04678	0.011 54

# Table VI. P-V-T Surface of 100% Sour Natural Gas

isochore	pressure, MPa							density at 200 °C × 10³,
no.	50 °C	75 °C	100 °C	125 °C	150 °C	175 °C	200 °C	mol/cm <sup>3</sup>
1	9.950 24	11.093 84	12.22265	13.34307	14.454 43	15.556 21	16.650 25	4.231 81
2	6.98346	7.69709	8.40319	9.10375	9.799 57	10.490 53	11.17707	2.86377
3	4.869 09	5.325 09	5.77648	6.225 62	6.67160	7.11492	7.55583	1.937 86
4	3.369 47	3.665 65	3.959 31	4.25147	4.54217	4.831 24	5.119 20	1.31127
5	2.31664	2.51159	2.70483	2.897 35	3.089 08	3.27989	3.469 85	0.887 25
6	1.58536	1.714 54	1.84281	1.97074	2.09813	2.22501	2.35141	0.60034
7	1.08099	1.16733	1.25302	1.33845	1.42356	1.50840	1.59294	0.406 20
8	0.73542	0.793 19	0.85063	0.90796	0.96511	1.02206	1.07876	0.27484
9	0.499 34	0.538 29	0.57691	0.615 49	0.65397	0.692 23	0.73046	0.18596
10	0.33870	0.36491	0.39092	0.41694	0.44281	0.46868	0.494 39	0.12582
11	0.22955	0.247 29	0.264 85	0.28240	0.299 84	0.317 26	0.33462	0.08513
12	0.15552	0.16752	0.17933	0.191 26	0.20299	0.21478	0.22652	0.057 60

Table VII.	P-V-T Surface	of 5.5%	Water-94.5%	Sour Natural Ga	15
------------	---------------	---------	-------------	-----------------	----

isochore		pressure, MPa						
no.	75 °C	100 °C	125 °C	150 °C	175 °C	200 °C	200 °C × 10 <sup>3</sup> , mol/cm <sup>3</sup>	
1					15.345 45	16.434 80	4.21376	
2					10.409 64	11.095 53	2.858 49	
3				6.64849	7.09219	7.53407	1.939 00	
4				4.54366	4.834 03	5.12315	1.31523	
5			2.90750	3.100 31	3.29225	3.48362	0.89211	
6			1.983 85	2.11218	2.24023	2.36780	0.605 09	
7		1.264 62	1.351 13	1.437 16	1.52291	1.60846	0.41042	
8		0.860 82	0.91906	0.97692	1.03463	1.092 20	0.27837	
9		0.585 36	0.62452	0.66367	0.70257	0.74140	0.18881	
10	0.37110	0.397 67	0.42417	0.450 59	0.476 85	0.503 10	0.12806	
11	0.25212	0.270 09	0.28799	0.305 82	0.323 59	0.341 34	0.08686	
12	0.17121	0.18336	0.195 46	0.20761	0.21969	0.231 62	0.05891	
13	0.116 29	0.12452	0.13278	0.141 00	0.14918	0.15731	0.03997	

isochore no.	pressure, MPa						density at $200 \text{ °C} \times 10^3$ ,
	75 °C	100 °C	125 °C	150 °C	175 °C	200 °C	mol/cm <sup>3</sup>
1						14.034 91	3.635 62
2					8.91913	9.496 43	2.45865
3					6.07047	6.443 50	1.66262
4				3.882 84	4.12883	4.37275	1.12428
5				2.641 91	2.80461	2.966 24	0.76024
6			1.68576	1.794 49	1.90282	2.010 43	0.51406
7			1.144 59	1.21727	1.28977	1.361 95	0.347 60
8		0.72691	0.77613	0.824 86	0.87355	0.92206	0.23504
9		0.49276	0.52570	0.55853	0.591 32	0.62399	0.15892
10	0.311 39	0.33364	0.356 03	0.37813	0.400 22	0.42221	0.107 46
11	0.21078	0.22583	0.24093	0.25581	0.27070	0.285 64	0.07266
12	0.14252	0.15275	0.163 02	0.17304	0.18310	0.19258	0.04913
13	0.096 19	0.103 30	0.110 28	0.11703	0.123 83	0.130 32	0.03322

Table IX. Mixture Second and Third Virial Coefficients for Wet Natural Gases

Sweet Natural Gases

temp, °C	water content							
	1.85%		5.0	)%	10.0%			
	$\overline{-B_{\rm m},{\rm cm}^3/{ m mol}}$	$C_{\rm m}$ , cm <sup>3</sup> /mol <sup>2</sup>	$-B_{\rm m}$ , cm <sup>3</sup> /mol	$C_{\rm m}$ , cm <sup>6</sup> /mol <sup>2</sup>	$-B_{\rm m}$ , cm <sup>3</sup> /mol	$C_{\rm m},{\rm cm^6/mol^2}$		
210	$8.439 \pm 0.054$	$2277.6 \pm 12.5$	$8.457 \pm 0.112$	$2005.9 \pm 27.5$	$11.134 \pm 0.030$	$2009.7 \pm 7.3$		
200	$9.881 \pm 0.074$	$2290.4 \pm 16.6$	$9.925 \pm 0.069$	$2015.0 \pm 17.0$	$12.621 \pm 0.063$	$2006.7 \pm 14.9$		
175	$13.825 \pm 0.058$	$2334.3 \pm 12.9$	$13.925 \pm 0.078$	$2040.7 \pm 31.6$	$16.488 \pm 0.134$	$1811.1 \pm 67.7$		
150	$18.338 \pm 0.040$	$2399.6 \pm 9.0$	$18.468 \pm 0.228$	$2071.3 \pm 207.9$	$20.564 \pm 0.403$	$1268.4 \pm 423.3$		
125	$23.545 \pm 0.200$	$2493.3 \pm 96.6$	$23.671 \pm 0.019$	$2108.1 \pm 509.3$	$24.841 \pm 1.399$	$248.1 \pm 436.7$		
100	$29.615 \pm 0.469$	$2625.8 \pm 490.1$						
75	$36.771 \pm 1.503$	$2811.2 \pm 1312.8$						

## Sour Natural Gases

temp, °C	water content								
	0%		5.1	50%	10.0%				
	$-B_{\rm m},  {\rm cm^3/mol}$	$C_{\rm m},  {\rm cm^6/mol^2}$	$-B_{\rm m}$ , cm <sup>3</sup> /mol	$C_{\rm m},  {\rm cm^6/mol^2}$	$-B_{\rm m}$ , cm <sup>3</sup> /mol	$C_{\rm m}$ , cm <sup>6</sup> /mol <sup>2</sup>			
200	$8.484 \pm 0.054$	$2013.295 \pm 11.6$	$10.045 \pm 0.065$	$1896.3 \pm 15.4$	$12.168 \pm 0.065$	$1935.3 \pm 17.6$			
175	$12.215 \pm 0.045$	$2060.099 \pm 10.2$	$13.832 \pm 0.069$	$1941.5 \pm 16.2$	$16.036 \pm 0.059$	$1963.6 \pm 22.7$			
150	$16.470 \pm 0.051$	$2118.078 \pm 11.2$	$18.061 \pm 0.097$	$1931.3 \pm 47.4$	$20.216 \pm 0.260$	$1851.7 \pm 207.5$			
125	$21.365 \pm 0.092$	$2190.468 \pm 21.1$	$22.813 \pm 0.330$	$1843.0 \pm 339.9$	$24.738 \pm 0.268$	$1544.6 \pm 2274.7$			
100	$27.051 \pm 0.041$	$2281.694 \pm 9.4$	$28.193 \pm 0.348$	$1644.4 \pm 2552.9$	$29.631 \pm 0.816$	$964.0 \pm 1419.7$			
75	$33.730 \pm 0.088$	$2397.924 \pm 18.2$	$34.333 \pm 5.050$	$1289.1 \pm 3886.7$	$34.922 \pm 5.751$	$-2.5 \pm 2090.8$			
50	$41.677 \pm 0.033$	$2547.938 \pm 7.4$							

III-V, divide the density given at 210 °C by  $(1 + \gamma P)[1 + \bar{\alpha}(T - T_0)]^3$  with  $T_0 = 483.15$  K. That is

$$\rho = \rho(210 \text{ °C}) [1 + \gamma P]^{-1} [1 + \bar{\alpha}(T - T_0)]^{-3}$$
(2)

Cell distortions with pressure do not exceed 6/10 000 but the lowest temperatures cause distortions approaching 0.8%.

Tables VI–VIII contain the pressures and temperatures of 0% (dry sour gas), 5.5%, and 10.0% water, respectively, in with the dry, sour natural gas of Table II. The base Burnett isotherm is now 200 °C rather than 210 °C. Thus the densities of Tables VI–VIII should be divided by  $(1 + \gamma P)[1 + \bar{\alpha}(T - T_0)]^3$  as previously except with  $T_0 = 473.15$  K.

The densities of Tables III-VIII are precise (reproducible) to  $\pm 0.01\%$  or 3 times the standard deviation as provided by the maximum likelihood computer program which accounts for random errors in (1) temperature, (2) pressure, and (3) the density measurement itself. This random error analysis is described in detail in ref 1 which also shows previous density measurements for pure ethane to agree to  $\pm 0.01\%$  with two other laboratories. For the present mixtures, systematic errors are difficult to estimate; we have assumed that they are 3 times the precision to provide an accuracy of  $\pm 0.04\%$ .

Table IX provides the mixture second and third virial coefficients for 1.85%, 5.0%, and 10.0% water in the sweet

natural gas plus 0%, 5.5%, and 10.0% water in the sour natural gas. The uncertainty bands reflect three standard deviations as provided by the maximum likelihood computer program. They do not contain the unknown systematic errors. While the usual experimental diagnostics for adsorption were absent, the adsorption of one molecule out of 1000 causes about  $\pm 0.3$  cm<sup>3</sup>/mol in  $B_m$  and  $\pm 75$  cm<sup>6</sup>/mol<sup>2</sup> in  $C_m$ . The usual effect of adsorption is to make the computed B<sub>m</sub> too negative with  $C_m$  too positive for compensation.

#### Conclusions

PVT data plus second and third virial coefficients have been reported for six wet natural gas mixtures. The presence of small amounts of water is seen to have a major influence on the densities,  $B_m$  and, particularly,  $C_m$ .

It has been shown elsewhere (7) that  $B_m$  and  $C_m$  for the sweet natural gas mixtures to 5.0% water content are predicted within experimental uncertainties by the correlations of Tsonopoulos (8) and Orbey and Vera (9), respectively. The prediction is a priori in that the binary interaction constants  $k_{\mu}$ contained in both correlations were not adjusted to fit the data but rather the values used were those of Prausnitz (10). The 10.0% water/sweet gas virial coefficients are not so well predicted possibly due to poor values of  $B_{ii}$  and  $C_{iii}$  for pure water. These correlations generally predict reasonable values

of  $B_{ij}$  and  $C_{ijk}$  as long as no more than one polar molecule is involved in the interaction. Thus, a priori prediction of B<sub>m</sub> and C<sub>m</sub> for any of the sour gas systems is poor due to the presence of CO<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S, and, in the last two systems, water.

## Literature Cited

- Mansoorian, H.; Hali, K. R.; Hoiste, J. C.; Eubank, P. T. J. Chem. Thermodyn. 1981, 13, 1001.
   Eubank, P. T.; Kreglewski, A.; Hall, K. R.; Holste, J. C.; Mansoorian, H.
- AIChE J. **1985**, 31, 849.
- Scheloske, J. J. Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, 1981. Eubank, P. T.; Kerns, W. J. AIChE J. 1973, 19, 711. (3)
- Scheloske, J. J.; Hall, K. R.; Holste, J. C.; Eubank, P. T. Energy Prog. 1983, 2, 27
- Scheloske, J. J.; Hall, K. R.; Eubank, P. T.; Holste, J. C. "Experimental Densities and Enthalpies for Water-Natural Gas Systems"; GPA RR No. (6) 53, Sept. 1981. Available from the Gas Processors Association, 6526 East 60th St., Tulsa, OK 74145. Eubank, P. T.; Scheloske, J. J.; Joffrion, L. L. J. Fluid Phase Equilib.
- (7) 1986. 30. 255.
- Tsonopoulos, C. AIChE J. 1974, 20, 263. Orbey, H.; Vera, J. H. AIChE J. 1983, 29, 107.
- Prausnitz, J. M. Molecular Thermodynamics of Fluid Phase Equilibria; (10)Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1969.

Received for review June 24, 1986. Accepted January 27, 1987. Principal financial support was provided by the Gas Processors Association, Project No. 772. We also thank the National Science Foundation (CPE-8023182) and Texas Engineering Experiment Station for partial support.

# Solubilities of Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Mixtures of **Common Organic Solvents**

#### John E. Coon, Mayann Troth, and Edward McLaughlin\*

Department of Chemical Engineering, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

The solubilities of naphthalene, acenaphthene, fluorene, and phenanthrene have been determined experimentally in five binary mixtures and one quaternary mixture of four common organic solvents (benzene, cyclohexane, thiophene, and pyridine) from 25 °C to the melting points of the solutes. The results have been correlated by using the classical equation for solid-liquid solubility and the experimental activity coefficients obtained have been compared to the values predicted by regular solution theory, extended regular solution theory, Wilson's equation, and UNIQUAC, after obtaining binary parameters from the solubility of each solute in the pure solvents.

#### Introduction

With the present trend in the petroleum industry toward heavier feedstocks and coal-derived liquids, there is a strong need for expansion of the small database of thermodynamic data on heavier compounds that presently exists. As these heavier feedstocks, rich in polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH's), become more common, there will be a corresponding increase in the need for thermodynamic data for design purposes. Activity coefficient data will be needed as will solubility limit data, which are important to ensure that precipitation of these heavy components, with consequent plugging of lines and vessels, does not occur.

The activity coefficient data, usually obtained from VLE results, will have to be obtained by other methods as VLE data will be difficult or impossible to obtain for binary mixtures of species with such widely disparate vapor pressures. The obvious source of the necessary data is solid-liquid solubility results. Because of the need for this type of data, there has been a renewed interest in investigations such as we report here, which have substantially extended the available database (1-7). A good discussion of this area through 1984 is available (8). In this work, we have extended the studies of McLaughlin and Zainal (1-3) and Choi and McLaughlin (4) to mixtures of solvents. This is a continuation of the work presented in Choi et al. (5).

The calculation of activity coefficients from solid-liquid solubility data is discussed in the next section. The third section presents the activity coefficient models used. The fourth and fifth sections present our experimental results and discuss our conclusions concerning the appropriate choice of activity coefficient models.

## **Experimental Procedures**

The chemicals used in this study were purchased and purified by methods discussed in previous papers (4, 5). These chemicals (the solutes) are recovered by rotary evaporation of the solvents in vacuo and reused. The purities of the recovered materials relative to the original are monitored by melting point determinations to ensure that no contamination or degradation