

5-1991

# Modeling of Integrated Environmental Control Systems for Coal-Fired Power Plants

Edward S. Rubin

*Carnegie Mellon University*, [rubin@cmu.edu](mailto:rubin@cmu.edu)

J. S. Salmento

*Carnegie Mellon University*

H. C. Frey

*Carnegie Mellon University*

A. Abu-Baker

*Carnegie Mellon University*

M. Berkenpas

*Carnegie Mellon University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.cmu.edu/epp>

 Part of the [Engineering Commons](#)

---

This Technical Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Carnegie Institute of Technology at Research Showcase @ CMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Engineering and Public Policy by an authorized administrator of Research Showcase @ CMU. For more information, please contact [research-showcase@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:research-showcase@andrew.cmu.edu).

# **Modeling of Integrated Environmental Control Systems for Coal-Fired Power Plants**

Final Report

to

U.S. Department of Energy  
Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center  
Pittsburgh, PA 15236

from

Center for Energy and Environmental Studies  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Prepared by

E.S. Rubin, P.I.  
J.S. Salmento  
H.C. Frey  
A. Abu-Baker  
M. Berkenpas

May, 1991

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2 ENHANCEMENTS TO BASELINE PLANT MODEL</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1 Nomenclature .....	3
2.2 Stream Properties and Composition.....	8
2.2.1 Fuel and Other Solid Streams .....	8
2.2.2 Air and Flue Gas Streams .....	12
2.2.3 Thermodynamic Data.....	15
2.3 Boiler Efficiency .....	20
2.4 Air Preheater .....	21
2.5 Wet FGD Performance.....	28
2.5.1 Reagent and SO <sub>2</sub> Efficiency .....	28
2.5.2 Water Balance .....	29
2.5.3 Flue Gas Composition and Reheat.....	32
2.5.4 Waste Stream Composition.....	34
2.5.5 Economics Algorithm .....	35
2.6 Spray Dryer Performance.....	35
2.6.1 Reagent and SO <sub>2</sub> Efficiency .....	36
2.6.2 Water Balance .....	38
2.6.3 Flue Gas Composition and Reheat.....	38
2.6.4 Waste Stream Composition.....	40
2.6.5 Economics Algorithm .....	41
2.7 Power Plant Economics .....	41
2.7.1 Base Plant Costs.....	41
2.7.2 Pollution Control Equipment Energy Penalties .....	42
2.7.3 Pollution Control Equipment Energy Credits.....	44
2.7.4 Total Pollution Control Cost.....	46
2.8 Key Financial Parameters .....	47
2.8.1 Fixed Charge Factor.....	47
2.8.2 Levelization Factor .....	50
2.8.3 Year-by-Year Revenue Requirement Analysis.....	50
2.8.4 Accumulated Funds Used During Construction .....	50
2.9 Conventional Coal Cleaning .....	51
2.9.1 Introduction.....	51
2.9.2 Level 4 Plant Cost.....	51
2.9.3 Moisture Content of Cleaned Coal .....	51

---

<b>3</b>	<b>COPPER OXIDE PROCESS MODEL .....</b>	<b>59</b>
3.1	Nomenclature .....	59
3.2	Introduction .....	59
3.3	Sulfation Reaction Algorithm .....	62
3.4	Enthalpy Functions .....	65
<b>4</b>	<b>NOXSO PROCESS MODEL.....</b>	<b>67</b>
4.1	Nomenclature .....	67
4.2	Introduction.....	69
4.3	Performance Model.....	72
4.4	Economic Model.....	81
4.4.1	Capital Costs .....	81
4.4.2	Operating and Maintenance Costs .....	84
4.5	Deterministic Analysis for the NOXSO Process .....	85
4.5.1	Cost Results .....	86
4.5.2	NO <sub>x</sub> Removal Efficiency.....	91
4.5.3	Effects of Stoichiometry .....	91
4.5.4	Process Energy Requirements.....	93
4.6	Sensitivity Analysis for the NOXSO Process.....	93
4.6.1	Combustion of Acid Plant Gases .....	93
4.6.2	Air Preheater Effects.....	94
4.6.3	Other Process Parameters.....	95
4.6.4	NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction Efficiency.....	98
4.6.5	Sorbent Regenerator Efficiency .....	98
4.7	Conclusion .....	99
<b>5</b>	<b>ELECTRON BEAM PROCESS MODEL .....</b>	<b>102</b>
5.1	Nomenclature.....	102
5.2	Introduction.....	103
5.3	Spray Dryer Model Modifications .....	103
5.4	Electron Beam Dose .....	104
5.5	Flue Gas Composition .....	105
5.6	Waste Composition.....	106
5.7	Economics Algorithm .....	107
<b>6</b>	<b>SULFURIC ACID PLANT MODEL .....</b>	<b>108</b>
6.1	Nomenclature.....	108
6.2	Introduction.....	110
6.3	Performance Model.....	114
6.4	Economic Model.....	127
6.4.1	Capital Cost.....	127
6.4.2	Operating and Maintenance Costs .....	129
6.5	Numerical Example .....	130
<b>7</b>	<b>CLAUS PLANT MODEL .....</b>	<b>145</b>
7.1	Nomenclature.....	145

---

7.2	Introduction.....	145
7.3	Performance Model.....	146
7.4	Economic Model.....	148
<b>8</b>	<b>FROTH FLOTATION PROCESS MODEL.....</b>	<b>150</b>
8.1	Nomenclature.....	150
8.2	Introduction.....	151
8.3	Process Description.....	151
8.4	Froth Flotation Performance Model.....	153
8.5	Process Economics.....	154
<b>9</b>	<b>SELECTIVE AGGLOMERATION PROCESS MODEL.....</b>	<b>156</b>
9.1	Nomenclature.....	156
9.2	Introduction.....	157
9.3	Process Description.....	158
9.3.1	Grinding Operation.....	158
9.3.2	Agglomeration and Separation.....	158
9.3.3	Solvent Recovery and Refuse Thickening.....	159
9.4	Performance Model.....	160
9.5	Economic Model.....	163
9.5.1	Capital Cost.....	163
9.5.2	Operating and Maintenance Cost.....	165
9.6	Illustrative Example.....	166
9.6.1	Performance Model.....	166
9.6.2	Economic Model.....	168
9.7	Sensitivity Analysis.....	173
9.7.1	Coal Grind.....	173
9.7.2	Pulp Density.....	176
9.7.3	Agglomerant Dosage.....	176
9.7.4	Asphalt Dosage.....	176
9.7.5	Effects on Economics.....	176
<b>10</b>	<b>HEAVY LIQUID SEPARATION PROCESS MODEL.....</b>	<b>178</b>
10.1	Nomenclature.....	178
10.2	Introduction.....	179
10.3	Process Description.....	180
10.3.1	Precleaning Subcircuit.....	180
10.3.2	Comminution Subcircuit.....	181
10.3.3	Heavy Liquid Cyclone (HLC) Subcircuit.....	181
10.3.4	Heavy Liquid Recovery Subcircuit.....	182
10.4	Performance Model.....	183
10.4.1	Precleaning Subcircuit.....	183
10.4.2	Comminution Subcircuit.....	183
10.4.3	HLC Subcircuit.....	183
10.4.4	HLR Subcircuit.....	183

---

10.4.5 Thermal Drier Subcircuit .....	185
10.5 Economic Model.....	185
10.5.1 Capital Cost.....	186
10.5.2 Operating and Maintenance Cost.....	187
10.6 Illustrative Results .....	188
10.7 Sensitivity Results.....	190
10.7.1 Illinois Coal.....	190
10.7.2 Pittsburgh No. 8 Coal.....	193
10.8 Numerical Example .....	197
10.8.1 Performance Model.....	197
10.8.2 Economic Model.....	200
<b>11 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>204</b>
<b>APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>1</b>

---

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 2-1:</b> Standard Heat of Formation .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Table 2-2:</b> Heats of Reactions .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Table 2-3:</b> Constants for the Specific Heat Correlations .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Table 2-4:</b> Federal Tax Depreciation Schedule.....	<b>48</b>
<b>Table 4-1:</b> Area Cost Multipliers for NOXSO Process.....	<b>81</b>
<b>Table 4-2:</b> Properties of Illinois No. 6 Coal Used for Case Studies (As-Fired Basis)....	<b>84</b>
<b>Table 4-3:</b> NOXSO Performance and Economic Assumptions .....	<b>85</b>
<b>Table 4-4:</b> Financial and Emission Assumptions for Case Studies .....	<b>86</b>
<b>Table 4-5:</b> Summary of Total Pollution Control Costs.....	<b>87</b>
<b>Table 4-6:</b> Breakdown of Cost for NOXSO Process .....	<b>88</b>
<b>Table 4-7:</b> NOXSO Performance Parameters .....	<b>89</b>
<b>Table 4-8:</b> Effects of Gas Burner for Sulfuric Acid Plant with the Unwashed Coal .....	<b>93</b>
<b>Table 4-9:</b> Effects of the Air Preheater for the Unwashed Coal .....	<b>94</b>
<b>Table 6-1:</b> Input Parameters for Sulfuric Acid Plant Numerical Example .....	<b>129</b>
<b>Table 9-1:</b> Properties of n-heptane and n-pentane .....	<b>157</b>
<b>Table 9-2:</b> Feed Coal and Clean Coal quality .....	<b>159</b>
<b>Table 9-3:</b> Operating Cost Factors (1980 \$) .....	<b>164</b>
<b>Table 9-4:</b> Components of Cleaning Cost (1984\$ / dry ton of clean coal) .....	<b>168</b>
<b>Table 9-5:</b> Breakdown of the Operating and Maintenance Cost s ( 1984\$ / dry to of clean coal ).....	<b>169</b>
<b>Table 9-6:</b> Breakdown of the Capital Cost ( Million 1984\$ ).....	<b>169</b>
<b>Table 9-7:</b> Multiple Variable Results on Pittsburgh#8.....	<b>171</b>
<b>Table 9-8:</b> Multiple Variable Results on Illinois #6 .....	<b>172</b>
<b>Table 9-9:</b> Multiple Variable Results on Upper Freeport .....	<b>173</b>
<b>Table 10-1:</b> Operating Cost Factors (1980 \$) .....	<b>186</b>
<b>Table 10-2:</b> Feed Coal and Clean Coal quality .....	<b>187</b>
<b>Table 10-3:</b> Properties of Heavy Liquids.....	<b>188</b>
<b>Table 10-4:</b> The effect of precleaned subcircuit on Pittsburgh coal .....	<b>189</b>
<b>Table 10-5:</b> Quality vs. Coal Size .....	<b>191</b>
<b>Table 10-6:</b> Quality vs. Coal Size .....	<b>192</b>
<b>Table 10-7:</b> Components of Cleaning Cost (1984\$ / dry ton of clean coal) .....	<b>200</b>
<b>Table 10-8:</b> Breakdown of the Operating and Maintenance Cost ( 1984\$ / dry to of clean coal).....	<b>200</b>
<b>Table 10-9:</b> Breakdown of the Capital Cost ( Million 1984\$ ).....	<b>200</b>

---



## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 1-1:</b> Schematic of Control Model Technologies .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Figure 2-1:</b> Schematic Diagram of the Gaseous and Solid Streams in IECM.....	<b>9</b>
<b>Figure 2-2:</b> Schematic Diagram of Air Preheater .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Figure 2-3:</b> Schematic Diagram of the Wet FGD Model.....	<b>27</b>
<b>Figure 2-4:</b> Flue Gas Specific Heat versus Exit Temperature .....	<b>30</b>
<b>Figure 2-5:</b> Enthalpy Difference between Saturated Steam and Saturated Water at 120°F.....	<b>30</b>
<b>Figure 2-6:</b> Saturation Pressure of Water versus Temperature .....	<b>31</b>
<b>Figure 2-7:</b> Evaporated Water versus Temperature .....	<b>32</b>
<b>Figure 2-8:</b> Schematic Diagram of the Spray Dryer Model.....	<b>36</b>
<b>Figure 2-9:</b> Schematic Diagram of a Level 2 Conventional Coal Cleaning Plant.....	<b>55</b>
<b>Figure 2-10:</b> Schematic Diagram of a Level 3 Conventional Coal Cleaning Plant.....	<b>56</b>
<b>Figure 2-11:</b> Schematic Diagram of a Level 4 Conventional Coal Cleaning Plant.....	<b>57</b>
<b>Figure 3-1:</b> Schematic Diagram of the Copper Oxide Process .....	<b>60</b>
<b>Figure 3-2:</b> Comparison of Experimental and Predicted Copper-to-Sulfur Ratio .....	<b>64</b>
<b>Figure 3-3:</b> Typical Device in Copper Oxide Process .....	<b>65</b>
<b>Figure 4-1:</b> NOXSO Process Diagram.....	<b>70</b>
<b>Figure 4-2:</b> Simplified Diagram of Mass Flows for Sulfur Compounds .....	<b>72</b>
<b>Figure 4-3:</b> Simplified Diagram of Mass Flows for NO <sub>x</sub> .....	<b>74</b>
<b>Figure 4-4:</b> Sulfur Removal Efficiency versus Molar Stoichiometry .....	<b>91</b>
<b>Figure 4-5:</b> Capital Cost Sensitivity Analysis for Unwashed Coal .....	<b>95</b>
<b>Figure 4-6:</b> Total Revenue Requirement Sensitivity Analysis .....	<b>96</b>
<b>Figure 4-7:</b> Effect of NO <sub>x</sub> Destruction Efficiency in Boiler.....	<b>98</b>
<b>Figure 4-8:</b> Effect of Overall Regenerator Efficiency .....	<b>99</b>
<b>Figure 5-1:</b> Schematic Diagram of Electron Beam Process.....	<b>101</b>
<b>Figure 6-1:</b> Schematic Diagram of Sulfuric Acid Plant.....	<b>109</b>
<b>Figure 6-2:</b> Schematic Diagrams of Inlet Compressor and Gas Burner .....	<b>110</b>
<b>Figure 6-3:</b> Inlet Gas Cooling Heat Exchangers .....	<b>119</b>
<b>Figure 7-1:</b> Schematic Diagram of Claus Sulfur Plant .....	<b>144</b>
<b>Figure 8-1:</b> Coal Cleaning Plant with Froth Flotation of Fine Stream .....	<b>150</b>
<b>Figure 9-1:</b> Schematic Diagram of Selective Agglomeration Process.....	<b>156</b>
<b>Figure 9-2:</b> Schematic Diagram of Selective Agglomeration Process with Flow Rates .....	<b>160</b>
<b>Figure 9-3:</b> Components of Total Coal Cost (1984\$/dry ton of cleaned coal) .....	<b>170</b>
<b>Figure 9-4:</b> Breakdown of Capital Cost (Million 1984\$) .....	<b>170</b>
<b>Figure 9-5:</b> Cleaning Cost (1984\$/dry ton of cleaned coal) vs. Sulfur Reduction (%) on Different Grind Size.....	<b>175</b>
<b>Figure 9-6:</b> Cleaning Cost (1984\$/dry ton of cleaned coal) vs. Sulfur Reduction (%) on Different Pulp Density .....	<b>175</b>
<b>Figure 10-1:</b> Heavy Liquid Cyclone Subcircuit (HLC) .....	<b>179</b>
<b>Figure 10-2:</b> Heavy Liquid Recovery Subcircuit (HLR) .....	<b>180</b>

---

<b>Figure 10-3:</b> Illinois #6: Grind Size vs. Grade Recovery .....	<b>190</b>
<b>Figure 10-4:</b> Illinois #6: Effect of Solid Concentration on Performance.....	<b>190</b>
<b>Figure 10-5:</b> Pittsburgh: Grind Size vs. Grade Recovery .....	<b>193</b>
<b>Figure 10-6:</b> Pittsburgh: Effect of Solid Concentration on Performance .....	<b>193</b>
<b>Figure 10-7:</b> Grade / Recovery vs. $A_{\text{clean}}$ .....	<b>194</b>
<b>Figure 10-8:</b> Grade / Recovery vs. $PS_{\text{clean}}$ .....	<b>195</b>
<b>Figure 10-9:</b> Components of Total Coal Cost .....	<b>201</b>
<b>Figure 10-10:</b> Components of Capital Cost .....	<b>201</b>

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work described in this report was carried out under Contract No. DE-AC22-87PC79864 for the U.S. Department of Energy, Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center (DOE/PETC). The authors acknowledge the support and assistance of Mr. Charles Drummond, Mr. Richard Hucko, Dr. Soung Kim, Mr. Charles Schmidt and Ms. Felix Eskey of DOE/PETC in the conduct of this research.

---

# 1 INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the analytical improvements and model updates to the Integrated Environmental Control Model (IECM) originally developed for the U.S. Department of Energy's Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center (DOE/PETC) under Contract No. DE-FG22-83PC60271. The result of that initial effort was documented in a final report detailing the background and analytical basis for the IECM computer model (1). The current report, conducted under Contract No. DE-AC22-87PC79864, builds upon that initial effort.


An overview of the current IECM structure appears in Figure 1-1. Briefly, the IECM was designed to permit the systematic evaluation of environmental control options for pulverized coal-fired (PC) power plants. Of special interest was the ability to compare the performance and cost of advanced pollution control systems to “conventional” technologies for the control of particulate, SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>. Of importance also was the ability to consider pre-combustion, combustion and post-combustion control methods employed alone or in combination to meet tough air pollution emission standards. Finally, the ability to conduct probabilistic analyses is a unique capability of the IECM. Key results are characterized as distribution functions rather than as single deterministic values.

In this report we document the analytical basis for several model enhancements and also document updates to various process technology models described in Reference (1). Chapter 2 begins with a summary of refinements to the base power plant model representing conventional technology. Chapters 3 through 7 describe several improvements for advanced post-combustion control methods, including new models of byproduct recovery systems. Finally, Chapters 8 to 10 present several new models for pre-combustion control methods employing advanced coal beneficiation techniques. Illustrative examples of model applications are contained within the various chapters. An additional Case study illustrating the use of the IECM for probabilistic analyses and process evaluations appears in the Appendix.

A companion document to this report is the IECM Technical Manual (2) that gives detailed documentation of the IECM computer code and model default values. Other background information is contained in Reference (1), upon which this report builds.

---

Figure 1-1: Schematic of Control Model Technologies



## 2 ENHANCEMENTS TO BASELINE PLANT MODEL

The “baseline” power plant in the IECM is a plant consisting of a conventional PC boiler with low NO<sub>x</sub> burners plus a selective catalytic reduction (SCR) system for NO<sub>x</sub> control, either a wet or dry flue gas desulfurization (FGD) system for SO<sub>2</sub> removal and (depending on the choice of FGD system) either a cold-side electrostatic precipitator (ESP) or fabric filter for particulate control. Physical coal cleaning with post-combustion controls also is part of the baseline system.

Enhancements to the original model were made to improve the characterization of plant stream quantities and composition, update certain process performance algorithms and expand the capabilities of the economic analysis modules. The sections below detail these enhancements. The format employed throughout this report begins with a detailed nomenclature list to support the equations used in each chapter.

### 2.1 Nomenclature

#### English Symbols

a	Advalorem tax rate (fraction)
A <sub>n</sub>	Annuity factor per year (fraction)
A <sub>overhead</sub>	Overhead ash (fraction)
AC	Annual cost (M\$/yr)
AFUDC	Accumulated funds used during construction (M\$)
B	Rate of return for bonds in current dollars (fraction)
B <sub>l</sub>	Booklife (years)
B <sub>r</sub>	Rate of return for bonds in constant dollars (fraction)
B <sub>yp</sub>	Bypass (fraction)
C	Weighted cost of capital or return on investment (fraction)
C <sub>ash</sub>	Carbon in collected ash (mass fraction)
CCO	Carbon in fuel oxidized to carbon monoxide (fraction)
C <sub>f</sub>	Capacity factor (fraction)
C <sub>idx</sub>	Chemical Engineering Plant cost index for current year
C <sub>idx,#</sub>	Chemical Engineering Plant cost index for year #
c <sub>k</sub>	Chemical cost for k <sup>th</sup> level coal cleaning plant (78\$/dry ton of cleaned coal)
C <sub>Unburned</sub>	Unburned carbon (lb carbon/lb fuel)
CC <sub>l,n</sub>	Levelized carrying charge per year (fraction)
CC <sub>n</sub>	Carry charges per year (fraction)
CC <sub>pv,n</sub>	Cumulative present value of carrying charges per year (fraction)
C <sub>p</sub>	Heat capacity of fluid (Btu•R)
C <sub>p'</sub>	Specific heat (Btu/lb•mole •R)
C <sub>p#,avg</sub>	Average heat capacity of flue gas at point # (Btu•R)
CS	Rate of return for common stock in current dollars (fraction)
CS <sub>r</sub>	Rate of return for common stock in constant dollars (fraction)
d	Temporary variable used in heat exchanger analysis (dimensionless)
D <sub>b</sub>	Book depreciation per year including investment tax credit (fraction)
D <sub>f</sub>	Fraction of capital cost financed by bonds
D <sub>s,n</sub>	Depreciation schedule per year for tax purposes (fraction)
DC	Direct capital cost (M\$)
DCC	Cost coefficient for cleaning equipment (78\$/dry ton of raw coal)
dis	Nominal discount rate (fraction)

---

E	Weighted rate of return for preferred and common stock (fraction)
e <sub>boiler</sub>	Excess air for boiler (fraction of stoichiometric air)
E <sub>cost</sub>	Cost of electricity (mills/kWhr)
E <sub>d</sub>	Energy needed for thermal drier (Btu/lb of dry coal)
E <sub>wetfgd</sub>	Energy needed to reheat flue gas (Btu/hr)
e <sub>f</sub>	Apparent escalation rate of variable and fuel costs (fraction)
e <sub>i</sub>	Inflation rate (fraction)
e <sub>k</sub>	Electricity cost for k <sup>th</sup> level coal cleaning plant (78\$/dry ton of cleaned coal)
e <sub>leak</sub>	Leakage air across the air preheater (fraction of stoichiometric air)
e <sub>r</sub>	Real escalation rate of variable and fuel costs (fraction)
EF <sub>NO<sub>2</sub></sub>	Emission factor for NO <sub>x</sub> (lb equivalent of NO <sub>2</sub> per ton fuel)
ES	Emission standard (lb/million Btu into furnace)
f <sub>k</sub>	Mass fraction of component k in fuel (fraction)
f <sub>s<sub>i</sub></sub>	Weight fraction of coal in stream i (fraction)
FCF	Fixed charge factor (fraction)
h <sub>j</sub> (T)	Enthalpy of component j in flue gas at temperature, T (Btu/lb•mole)
H <sub>h<sub>v</sub></sub>	Higher heating value of fuel (Btu/lb)
H <sub>h<sub>v</sub>natgas</sub>	Higher heating value of natural gas (Btu/ft <sup>3</sup> )
HR	Heat rate of power plant (Btu/kWhr)
HR <sub>cycle</sub>	Gross cycle heat rate, includes the boiler efficiency (Btu/kWhr)
HR <sub>steam</sub>	Steam cycle heat rate (Btu/kWhr)
HW <sub>idx</sub>	Handy - Whitman electric utility cost index for current year
HW <sub>idx,#</sub>	Handy - Whitman electric utility cost index for year #
ICF	Indirect charge factor (fraction)
itc	Investment tax credit (fraction)
k	Temporary variable used in levelization factor (fraction)
L <sub>i</sub>	Losses from category i (fraction)
LE	Latent heat of vaporization loss (Btu/lb fuel)
LHV	Lower heating value of coal (Btu/lb)
m'	Total moisture content of coal (fraction)
m <sub>i</sub> '	Inherent moisture content of coal (fraction)
m <sub>s</sub> '	Surface moisture content of coal (fraction)
m <sub>#,j</sub>	Pound moles of component j in gas at point # (lb•mole/lb fuel)
m̄ <sub>#,j</sub>	Molar flow rate of component j at point # (lb•mole/hr)
M̄ <sub>#,j</sub>	Mass flow rate of component j at point # (tons/hr)
MW <sub>g</sub>	Gross electrical output of power plant (MW)
N	Years of construction (integer)
N <sub>NO</sub>	Fraction of NO <sub>x</sub> that is NO
NTU	Number of transfer units (dimensionless)
O <sub>comb</sub>	Stoichiometric oxygen needed for combustion (lb•mole/lb fuel)
O <sub>x</sub>	Oxidation of calcium sulfite to calcium sulfate (fraction)
P <sub>atm</sub>	Atmospheric pressure (psia)
P <sub>fuel</sub>	Price of fuel (\$/ton)
P <sub>g</sub>	Gauge pressure (inches of water)
PS	Rate of return for preferred stock in current dollars (fraction)
PS <sub>f</sub>	Fraction of capital cost financed by preferred stock
PS <sub>r</sub>	Rate of return for preferred stock in constant dollars (fraction)
PV <sub>n</sub>	Present value factor per year
Q	Heat transfer (Btu/hr)
R <sub>H<sub>2</sub>O</sub>	Moisture content of reagent (fraction)
R <sub>purity</sub>	Purity of reagent (fraction)
RB <sub>n</sub>	Remaining balance per year (fraction)

$RD_n$	Return on debt per year (fraction)
$RE_n$	Return on equity per year (fraction)
$S_{ret}$	Sulfur retained in bottom ash and fly ash streams (fraction)
$S_{SO_2}$	Sulfur in fuel oxidized to sulfur dioxide (fraction)
$SE_i$	Sensible heat losses from category i (Btu/lb fuel)
$t$	Overall tax rate (fraction)
$t_{d,n}$	Deferred income tax per year (fraction)
$t_f$	Federal tax rate (fraction)
$t_{p,n}$	Taxes paid per year (fraction)
$t_s$	State tax rate (fraction)
$T_{\#}$	Temperature at point # ( $^{\circ}R$ )
$TDC$	Direct capital cost (M\$)
$TCC$	Total capital cost (M\$/yr)
$TCC_n$	Total capital charges in a given year (current M\$/yr)
$TCE$	Total cash expended (M\$)
$TPI$	Total plant investment (M\$)
$TRR$	Levelized total revenue requirement (M\$/yr)
$TRR_n$	Total revenue requirement in a given year (current M\$/yr)
$TVC$	Total variable cost without utilities (M\$/yr)
$TVC_n$	Total variable cost in a given year (current M\$/yr)
$UA_{aph}$	Overall heat transfer coefficient times the surface area for the air preheater (Btu/ $^{\circ}R$ )
$v_j$	Volume fraction of component k (fraction)
$VCLF$	Levelization factor (fraction)
$w_k$	Water cost for $k^{th}$ level coal cleaning plant (78\$/dry ton of cleaned coal)
$W$	Water content (fraction)
$W_{evp}$	Evaporated water in scrubber (lb•mole/hr)
$w'$	Weight of water evaporated in thermal drier per pound of dry coal processed (fraction)
$w'_e$	Weight of water evaporated in thermal drier (tons/hr)
$x_i$	Electricity or steam consumption (fraction)
$Y$	Mass yield (fraction)
$Y_i$	Mass yield of the stream i in coal cleaning plant (fraction)
$Y_{od}$	Ratio of coal mass exiting wash streams to coal mass exiting plant (fraction)

### Greek Symbols

$\delta_i$	Equals 0 if wash stream i is not thermally dried and 1 if it is thermally dried.
$\Delta h$	Enthalpy difference (Btu/lb•mole)
$\Delta T$	Temperature difference ( $^{\circ}F$ )
$\varepsilon$	Heat exchanger effectiveness (fraction)
$\eta$	Efficiency (fraction)
$\sigma$	Molar stoichiometry (fraction)
$\omega$	Specific humidity of air (mass of moisture per mass of dry air)

### Subcategories for Losses

$C$	Losses from unburned and incomplete combustion of carbon
$Gas$	Sensible heat losses for dry flue gas
$H_2O$	Latent and sensible heat losses for moisture
$R$	Radiation losses
$Unacc$	Unaccounted losses

### Subcategories for Combustion Air and Flue Gas Components

$CO$	Carbon monoxide
$CO_2$	Carbon dioxide

---



H <sub>2</sub> O	Moisture
N <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen
NO	Nitrogen oxide
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen dioxide
O <sub>2</sub>	Oxygen
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide
SO <sub>3</sub>	Sulfur trioxide

### Subcategories for Fuel Components

Ash	Ash
C	Carbon
H	Hydrogen (monatomic)
H <sub>2</sub> O	Moisture
N	Nitrogen (monatomic)
O	Oxygen (monatomic)

### Subcategories for Natural Gas Components

CH <sub>4</sub>	Methane
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>6</sub>	Ethane
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
N <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen
O <sub>2</sub>	Oxygen

### Subcategories for Solid Stream Components

Ash	Ash
CaO	Lime
CaCO <sub>3</sub>	Limestone
CaSO <sub>3</sub> •.5H <sub>2</sub> O	Hydrated calcium sulfite
CaSO <sub>4</sub>	Calcium Sulfate
CaSO <sub>4</sub> •2H <sub>2</sub> O	Hydrated calcium sulfate
H <sub>2</sub> O	Water or Moisture
Misc	Miscellaneous

### Subcategories for Stream Location

apho	Exiting air preheater on combustion air side
botash	Bottom ash stream
econo	Exiting the economizer
fdfan	Exiting forced draft fan
fg1	Located at point 1 in flue gas stream (see Figure 2-1)
fg2	Located at point 2 in flue gas stream (see Figure 2-1)
fg3	Located at point 3 in flue gas stream (see Figure 2-1)
fgaphi	Entering air preheater on flue gas side
fgapho	Exiting air preheater on flue gas side
fuel	Fuel stream
furn	In furnace after combustion
leak	Leakage across air preheater
stack	Entering stack
unc	“Uncorrected” flue gas temperature

### Subcategories for Utility Consumption

c	Cooling system
f	Fans

misc	Miscellaneous
p	Pulverizers
sp	Steam pumps

### Subcategories for Economic Variables

fuel	Fuel charges
non	Non fuel charges
util	Utility charges, i.e. steam and electricity consumption (M\$/yr)
w/o cc	Without coal cleaning
w/o util	Without utility charges

### Subcategories for FGD Variables

evp	Evaporated
max	Maximum
min	Minimum
reag	Reagent
rem	Removed
rh	Reheater
S	Sulfur or sulfur compound
sd	Spray dryer
sat	Saturation
sludge	Sludge exiting bottom of scrubber
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide
std	Based on emission standard
TSP	Total suspended particulates in flue gas

### General Subcategories

aph	Air preheater
bp	Base power plant
c	Coal exiting the washing equipment
credit	Credit
d	Thermal drier
delta	Change between current and original
exit	Exiting device
ff	Fabric filter
in	Entering device
natgas	Natural gas
new	Current or modified
o	Final product of coal cleaning plant
orig	Original or without pollution control equipment
oil	Fuel oil
op	Overall power plant (including pollution control equipment)
out	Exiting device
p	Cleaning equipment in coal cleaning plant
pce	Pollution control equipment
ref	Refuse stream in coal cleaning plant
ROM	Run-of-mine coal
t	Overall coal cleaning plant
total	Sum or total

---

## 2.2 Stream Properties and Composition

This section describes how the IECM calculates the quantity and quality of solid and gaseous streams in fossil-fuel fired power plants. A schematic of the solid and gaseous streams for the base power plant is shown in Figure 2-1. These basic streams are always present in the model. As the plant is configured with pollution control equipment, additional streams are created and the equations defining the streams in Figure 2-1 may be modified.

The phrases in quotation marks in Figure 2-1 are the stream labels. They are used as variable subscripts in this documentation to show the variable location in the power plant. For example, the variable  $T_{fgaphi}$  refers the temperature of the flue gas at the air preheater inlet. The subscripts “fg1”, “fg2” and “fg3” refer to locations downstream from the air preheater. Pollution control equipment is placed between these locations. For example, an ESP is placed between “fgapho” and “fg1”. The variables at “fgapho” and “fg1” are respectively the inlet and outlet variables for the ESP. The equations for some variables at “fg1” are redefined to reflect the changes caused by the ESP. The following section describes in more detail the stream variables and their equations.

### 2.2.1 Fuel and Other Solid Streams

This section describes the fuel and other solid streams in the base power plant. The IECM tracks the following chemical compounds in most solid streams (tons per hour): final ash, lime, limestone, hydrated calcium sulfite, calcium sulfate, hydrated calcium sulfate, moisture and miscellaneous<sup>1</sup>. The total mass flow of any stream is the sum of these chemical compounds. For the fuel stream, the total mass flow rate is determined instead of the mass flow rates of the chemical components.

Oil or natural gas is added to coal in the IECM as boiler fuels. The model requires the following property variables for coal and oil:

Hhv	Higher heating value of the fuel (Btu/lb)
$f_{Ash}$	Ash content (mass fraction)
$f_C$	Carbon content (mass fraction)
$f_H$	Hydrogen content (mass fraction)
$f_{H_2O}$	Moisture content (mass fraction)
$f_N$	Nitrogen content (mass fraction)
$f_O$	Oxygen content (mass fraction)
$f_S$	Sulfur content (mass fraction)


For coal and oil these variables define the ultimate analysis of the fuel. Natural gas analysis usually reports methane, ethane, carbon dioxide, nitrogen and oxygen content on a percent volume basis and the higher heating value in Btu per standard cubic foot. The standard temperature and pressure are 80°F and 30 inches of mercury respectively. Therefore the input parameters for natural gas are:

$Hh_{natgas}$	Higher heating value of the natural gas (Btu/ft <sup>3</sup> )
$v_{CH_4}$	Methane content (volume fraction)
$v_{C_2H_6}$	Ethane content (volume fraction)

<sup>1</sup> The exceptions are the fuel stream and some solid streams used by pollution control equipment. For example a wet scrubber has a lime or limestone slurry, which only contains the reagent plus miscellaneous material.

$v_{CO_2}$	Carbon dioxide content (volume fraction)
$v_{N_2}$	Nitrogen content (volume fraction)
$v_{O_2}$	Oxygen content (volume fraction)

**Figure 2-1:** Schematic Diagram of the Gaseous and Solid Streams in IECM



Since the analysis of natural gas is not in elemental units, it has to be converted to the mass fraction of carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen and sulfur. In addition, the higher value has to be converted to Btu per pound. Natural gas is assumed to behave as an ideal mixture, so volume fractions are equivalent to molar fractions. Therefore, the average molecular weight and density are estimated by<sup>2</sup>

$$\hat{M}_{natgas} = 16.04v_{CH_4} + 30.07v_{C_2H_6} + 44.01v_{CO_2} + 28.01v_{N_2} + 32.00v_{O_2}$$

$$\rho_{natgas} = 0.04246v_{CH_4} + 0.08029v_{C_2H_6} + 0.1170v_{CO_2} + 0.07439v_{N_2} + 0.08461v_{O_2}$$

<sup>2</sup> The values for the densities are from "Combustion: Fossil Power Systems" (3)

The higher heating value on a mass basis can be determined by dividing the higher heating value on a volume basis by the density.

$$\text{Hh}_v = \frac{\text{Hh}v_{\text{natgas}}}{\rho_{\text{natgas}}}$$

The mass fractions of carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen and oxygen are found by determining the mass of the individual components (i.e. carbon, hydrogen, etc.) and dividing by the average molecular weight. Since the natural gas is assumed to be free of ash, sulfur and moisture, these values are set to zero.

$$f_C = \frac{12.01v_{\text{CH}_4} + 24.02v_{\text{C}_2\text{H}_4} + 12.01v_{\text{CO}_2}}{\widehat{M}_{\text{natgas}}}$$

$$f_H = \frac{4.04v_{\text{CH}_4} + 6.06v_{\text{C}_2\text{H}_4}}{\widehat{M}_{\text{natgas}}}$$

$$f_N = \frac{28.01v_{\text{N}_2}}{\widehat{M}_{\text{natgas}}}$$

$$f_O = \frac{32.00v_{\text{O}_2} + 32.00v_{\text{CO}_2}}{\widehat{M}_{\text{natgas}}}$$

$$f_{\text{Ash}} = f_S = f_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} = 0$$

With the fuel characteristics it is possible to calculate the mass flow rates and composition of the gaseous and solid streams in the power plant. The mass flow rate of fuel must be calculated first.

The base power plant is sized to produce a specified amount of electricity,  $\text{MW}_g$ , which is the amount of electricity that the generators produce. The amount of fuel needed to produce the gross electric capacity,  $\text{MW}_g$ , depends upon the gross cycle heat rate, boiler efficiency and higher heating value of the fuel. It is determined by

$$\dot{M}_{\text{fuel}} = \frac{\text{MW}_g \text{HR}_{\text{cycle}}}{2 \text{Hh}_v}$$

where

$$\text{HR}_{\text{cycle}} = \frac{\text{HR}_{\text{steam}}}{\eta_{\text{boiler}}}$$

The gross electrical capacity, steam cycle heat rate and the higher heating value of the fuel are input parameters. The boiler efficiency is calculated and described in more detail in Section 2.3.

With the mass flow rate of fuel determined, it is now possible to determine the mass flow rates of the other solids streams in the power (e.g. the bottom ash or flyash). The solids produced by combustion are from three sources: ash in the fuel, sulfur retained in the ash and any unburned carbon. The mass from sulfur in the ash and the unburned carbon is accounted for in the variable  $\dot{M}_{\text{furn,misc}}$ . The base power plant does not inject lime or limestone slurries into the flue gas stream. Therefore, mass flow rates of lime, limestone, calcium sulfate, hydrated calcium sulfate calcium sulfite and moisture are zero.

$$\dot{M}_{\text{furn,ash}} = f_{\text{Ash}} \dot{M}_{\text{fuel}} \quad ; \quad \dot{M}_{\text{furn,Misc}} = (f_{\text{S}} S_{\text{ret}} + f_{\text{C}} C_{\text{Unburned}}) \dot{M}_{\text{fuel}}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{furn,k}} = 0 \quad \text{for } k = \text{CaO, CaCO}_3, \text{CaSO}_3 \cdot 0.5\text{H}_2\text{O, CaSO}_4, \text{CaSO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O, H}_2\text{O}$$

The unburned carbon is a solid entrained in the bottom ash and flyash streams. Utilities measure the fraction of carbon in their collected ash streams. This value is called the percent carbon in refuse and is used in the following formula to determine the amount of unburned carbon per pound of fuel.

$$C_{\text{Unburned}} = f_{\text{ash}} \frac{C_{\text{ash}}}{1 - C_{\text{ash}}} \quad (2.1)$$

The solids produced by combustion can either exit the furnace with the flue gas or drop out the bottom of the furnace. The fraction that exists with the flue gas is the overhead ash fraction and is a function of the furnace design and coal rank. The bottom ash flow rate is determined by

$$\dot{M}_{\text{botash,k}} = \dot{M}_{\text{furn,k}} (1 - A_{\text{overhead}}) \quad \text{for all } k$$

The solids exiting the economizer is equal to the overhead ash fraction times the solids produced by combustion.

$$\dot{M}_{\text{econo,k}} = \dot{M}_{\text{furn,k}} A_{\text{overhead}} \quad \text{for all } k$$

For the base power plant, no pollution control equipment can change the mass flow rates of solids in the flue gas. The mass flow rates of solids at each location are the mass flow rate of solids at the previous location. When pollution control equipment is added the definitions of these variables change depending upon the specific choice of equipment.

---

$$\dot{M}_{\text{stack},k} = \dot{M}_{\text{fg}3,k} = \dot{M}_{\text{fg}2,k} = \dot{M}_{\text{fg}1,k} = \dot{M}_{\text{fgapho},k} = \dot{M}_{\text{fgaphi},k} = \dot{M}_{\text{econo},k} \quad \text{for all } k$$

### 2.2.2 Air and Flue Gas Streams

This section describes the gaseous streams in the base power plant. The IECM tracks the following chemical compounds in all gaseous streams (lb•mole/lb fuel and lb•mole/hour): diatomic nitrogen, diatomic oxygen, moisture, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, sulfur trioxide, nitrogen oxide and nitrogen dioxide. At every location in Figure 2-1, the IECM determines the gaseous stream flow rate in lb•mole/lb fuel and lb•mole/hour. The gaseous stream variables with units of lb•mole/lb fuel describe the gas stream created by the base power plant. They do not change as pollution control equipment is added. These variables are needed by different algorithms in the IECM for comparison with the base power plant<sup>3</sup>. The gaseous stream variables with units of lb•mole/hour describe the gas stream for the current power plant configuration.

The gas streams are assumed to act as ideal mixtures and obey the ideal gas law. Therefore, the total value of a stream property can be determined by summing the values of the property of the individual components. Since the gases obey the ideal gas law, the enthalpy is a function of temperature only. The enthalpy functions are described in more detail in Section 2.2.3. The total volumetric flow rate and enthalpy of a gaseous stream are determined by

$$\dot{V} = \frac{1545 T}{144 * 60 (P_{\text{atm}} + 0.036127P_g)} \sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_j$$

$$h(T) = \sum_{j=1}^9 h_j(T)$$

The IECM assumes that dry air consist of 79% nitrogen and 21% oxygen. The specific humidity is an input parameter. The volumetric fraction of nitrogen, oxygen and moisture can be determined from

$$v_{\text{N}_2} = \frac{0.79}{1 + \frac{0.79*28.01 + 0.21*32.00}{18.02} \omega} = \frac{0.79}{1 + 1.601\omega}$$

$$v_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} = \frac{1.601\omega}{1 + 1.601\omega} ; v_{\text{O}_2} = \frac{0.21}{1 + 1.601\omega}$$

The amount of oxygen needed for stoichiometric combustion of the fuel is the sum of the oxygen needed to convert of carbon to carbon dioxide, hydrogen to water and sulfur to sulfur

<sup>3</sup> The boiler efficiency algorithm uses the gaseous stream variables in units of lb•mole/lb fuel to prevent a cyclic dependency between the boiler efficiency and the mass flow rate of fuel.

dioxide minus any oxygen in the fuel. To minimize incomplete combustion losses, the combustion air entering the furnace is more than the stoichiometric air requirement. This additional air is called excess air and is an input parameter.

$$O_{\text{comb}} = \frac{f_C}{12.01} + \frac{f_H}{1.01} + \frac{f_S}{32.06} - \frac{f_O}{16.00}$$

$$m_{\text{apho},N_2} = \frac{v_{N_2}(1 + e_{\text{boiler}})O_{\text{comb}}}{v_{O_2}} ; m_{\text{apho},H_2O} = \frac{v_{H_2O}(1 + e_{\text{boiler}})O_{\text{comb}}}{v_{O_2}}$$

$$m_{\text{apho},O_2} = (1 + e_{\text{boiler}})O_{\text{comb}} ; m_{\text{apho},j} = 0 \text{ for } j = CO_2, CO, SO_2, SO_3, NO, NO_2$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{apho},j} = 2000 \dot{M}_{\text{fuel}} m_{\text{apho},j}$$

The leakage air across the air preheater is based upon the stoichiometric air requirement and is an input parameter. The air entering the forced draft fans is the sum of the leakage air and the air entering the furnace.

$$m_{\text{leak},N_2} = \frac{v_{N_2}(1 + e_{\text{leak}})O_{\text{comb}}}{v_{O_2}} ; m_{\text{leak},H_2O} = \frac{v_{H_2O}(1 + e_{\text{leak}})O_{\text{comb}}}{v_{O_2}}$$

$$m_{\text{leak},O_2} = (1 + e_{\text{leak}})O_{\text{comb}} ; m_{\text{leak},j} = 0$$

$$\text{for } j = CO_2, CO, NO, NO_2, SO_2, SO_3$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{leak},j} = 2000 \dot{M}_{\text{fuel}} m_{\text{leak},j}$$

$$m_{\text{fdfan},j} = m_{\text{apho},j} + m_{\text{leak},j} ; \dot{m}_{\text{fdfan},j} = \dot{m}_{\text{apho},j} + \dot{m}_{\text{leak},j}$$

The products of combustion are determined by specifying extent of combustion for carbon, sulfur and nitrogen and an emission factor for  $NO_2$ . The carbon in the fuel can oxidize to carbon monoxide or carbon dioxide or it can remain unburned. The amount of unburned carbon,  $C_{\text{Unburned}}$ , is determined with Equation (2.1). The amount of carbon monoxide is determined by the input parameter  $C_{CO}$ , the fraction of carbon that oxidizes to carbon monoxide. The sulfur in the fuel can oxidize to either sulfur dioxide or sulfur trioxide. It also can be captured in the ash. The amount sulfur retained in the ash is determined by the input parameter,  $S_{\text{ret}}$ . The amount of

---



sulfur dioxide is determined by the input parameter  $S_{SO_2}$ . The nitrogen in the fuel can remain unchanged or oxidize to nitrogen oxide or nitrogen dioxide. The amount of  $NO_x$  formed is controlled by the  $NO_2$  emission factor. The units of the  $NO_2$  emission factor for coal, oil and natural gas are pounds  $NO_2$  per ton, pounds  $NO_2$  per thousand gallons and pounds  $NO_2$  per million cubic feet respectively. The  $NO_2$  emission factor for oil is converted to pounds  $NO_2$  per ton if the density of oil is 7.8 pounds per gallon (4). The fraction of  $NO_x$  that is nitrogen oxide is determined by the input parameter  $N_{NO}$ .

$$EF_{NO_2} = \frac{2000 EF_{oil}}{7.8 * 1000} = 0.2564 EF_{oil} ; EF_{NO_2} = \frac{2000 EF_{natgas}}{1,000,000 \rho_{natgas}} = \frac{2 \times 10^{-3} EF_{natgas}}{\rho_{natgas}}$$

With these parameters, it is possible to find the combustion products from a molar balance of the air and the fuel entering the furnace.

$$m_{furn,N_2} = m_{apho,N_2} + \frac{f_N}{2 * 14.01} - \frac{EF_{NO_2}}{2 * 46.01 * 2000}$$

$$m_{furn,O_2} = m_{apho,O_2} + \frac{f_O}{2 * 16.00} - \frac{f_C (1 - C_{Unburned} - 0.5C_{CO})}{12.01} - \frac{f_H}{4 * 1.01} \\ - \frac{f_S (1 - S_{ret})(1.5 - 0.5S_{SO_2})}{32.06} - \frac{EF_{NO_2} (1 - 0.5N_{NO})}{46.01 * 2000}$$

$$m_{furn,H_2O} = m_{apho,H_2O} + \frac{f_H}{2 * 1.01} + \frac{H_{H_2O}}{18.02}$$

$$m_{furn,CO_2} = m_{apho,CO_2} + \frac{f_C (1 - C_{Unburned} - C_{CO})}{12.01} ; m_{furn,CO} = m_{apho,CO} + \frac{f_C C_{CO}}{12.01}$$

$$m_{furn,SO_2} = m_{apho,SO_2} + \frac{f_S S_{SO_2} (1 - S_{ret})}{32.06} ; m_{furn,SO_3} = m_{apho,SO_3} + \frac{f_S (1 - S_{SO_2})(1 - S_{ret})}{32.06}$$

$$m_{furn,NO} = m_{apho,NO} + \frac{EF_{NO_2} N_{NO}}{46.01 * 2000} ; m_{furn,NO_2} = m_{apho,NO_2} + \frac{EF_{NO_2} (1 - N_{NO})}{46.01 * 2000}$$

$$m_{furn,j} = 2000 \dot{M}_{fuel} m_{furn,j}$$

The flue gas flow rate remains the same until it exits the air preheater in the base power plant. At the air preheater, the leakage air is added to the flue gas. Pollution control equipment do not alter the flue gas flow rates after the air preheater in the base power plant. The molar flow rates of the gases at each location are defined to be the molar flow rate of the gases at the previous

location. When pollution control equipment is added, the definitions of these variables will change depending upon the specific pollution control equipment added.

$$m_{fgaphi,j} = m_{econo,j} = m_{furn,j} ; m_{fgaphi,j} = m_{econo,j} = m_{furn,j}$$

$$m_{fgapho,j} = m_{fgaphi,j} + m_{leak,j} ; \dot{m}_{fgapho,j} = \dot{m}_{fgaphi,j} + \dot{m}_{leak,j}$$

$$m_{stack,j} = m_{fg3,j} = m_{fg2,j} = m_{fg1,j} = m_{fgapho,j}$$

$$\dot{m}_{stack,j} = \dot{m}_{fg3,j} = \dot{m}_{fg2,j} = \dot{m}_{fg1,j} = \dot{m}_{fgapho,j}$$

### 2.2.3 Thermodynamic Data

This section documents the thermodynamic data used in the IECM. This data includes the heats of reaction for chemical processes occurring in the copper oxide, NOXSO and sulfuric acid plant systems. All the data except the enthalpy for the alumina substrate is from Barin and Knacke (5) or Barin, Knacke and Kubaschewski (6). This data is from the SMC report (7). All the enthalpies are set to zero at 77°F and are assumed to be at a constant pressure. The heats of reaction and formation are calculated at this temperature. Although most data are shown to four significant digits, at least six significant digits were used to calculate the heats of reaction.<sup>4</sup> Table 2-1 shows the heats of formation for 18 species. Table 2-2 shows the heats of reaction for 21 chemical reactions.

The enthalpy data for all the compounds is obtained by integrating polynomial correlations for the specific heat at constant pressure between 77°F and the specified temperature. The correlations are in cal/(g-mole °K), except the alumina substrate, and must be converted to Btu/(lb•mole °R). The polynomial correlations are shown below. The values of the constants for all the species are shown in Table 2-3.

$$C_p = A + B e^{-3T} + \frac{C e^5}{T^2} + D e^{-6T^2} \quad (2.2)$$

The correlation for the alumina substrate in J/(g-mole •K) is

$$C_{p_{Al_2O_3}} = A e^2 + B e^{-3T} + \frac{C e^2}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{D e^6}{T^2}$$

---

<sup>4</sup> All the original data are in metric units and had to be converted to English units.

Integrating Equation (2.2) with respect to temperature and choosing 298.15•K as a reference temperature gives

$$h(T) = \int_{298.15}^{T_K} \left( A + Be^{-3}T + \frac{Ce^5}{T^2} + De^{-6}T^2 \right) dT$$

$$h(T_K) = AT_K + \frac{Be^{-3}T_K^2}{2} - \frac{Ce^5}{T_K} + \frac{De^{-6}T_K^3}{3} - \quad (2.3)$$

$$\left( A 298.15 + \frac{Be^{-3}298.15^2}{2} - \frac{Ce^5}{298.15} + \frac{De^{-6}298.15^3}{3} \right)$$

Next, evaluate Equation (2.3) and substitute  $H_{298}$  for the sum of the terms evaluate at 298.15•K. Converting this from cal/g•mole to Btu/lb•mole by multiplying by 1.8 gives

$$h(T_K) = 1.8AT_K + \frac{1.8Be^{-3}T_K^2}{2} - \frac{1.8Ce^5}{T_K} + \frac{1.8De^{-6}T_K^3}{3} - 1.8H_{298.15}$$

Yet the input temperature is still in degrees Kelvin and it is desirable to the temperature in degrees Rankine. Substituting  $T_K = T_R/1.8$  gives

$$h(T_R) = \frac{1.8AT_R}{1.8} + \frac{1.8Be^{-3}T_R^2}{2*1.8^2} - \frac{1.8^2Ce^5}{T_R} + \frac{1.8De^{-6}T_R^3}{3*1.8^3} - 1.8H_{298.15}$$

Simplifying  $h(T_R)$  yields

$$h(T_R) = AT_R + \frac{Be^{-3}T_R^2}{3.6} - \frac{3.24Ce^5}{T_R} + \frac{De^{-6}T_R^3}{9.72} - 1.8H_{298.15} \quad (2.4)$$

Equation (2.4) is used as a function for all the species except the alumina substrate, since its units are Btu/lb and the correlation for the specific heat has a different form. The final form of the enthalpy equation for the alumina substrate is

$$h_{Al_2O_3}(T_R) = 0.23901 \left( Ae^2T_R + \frac{Be^3T_R}{3.6} + Ce^2\sqrt{7.2T_R} - \frac{3.24De^6}{T_R} - 1.8H_{298.15} \right) / 102$$

The constant 0.23901 converts joules to calories. 102 is the molecular weight.

**Table 2-1:** Standard Heat of Formation

Species	$H_O$ (77•F) Btu/lb•mole
---------	-----------------------------

CH <sub>4</sub>	-32,180
CO	-47,560
CO <sub>2</sub>	-169,300
COS	-61,020
Cu	0
CuO	-67,050
CuSO <sub>4</sub>	-331,300
H <sub>2</sub>	0
H <sub>2</sub> O	-104,000
H <sub>2</sub> S	-8820
N <sub>2</sub>	0
NH <sub>3</sub>	-19,760
NO	38,840
NO <sub>2</sub>	14,240
O <sub>2</sub>	0
S <sub>2</sub>	55,350
SO <sub>2</sub>	-127,700
SO <sub>3</sub>	-170,300

---

**Table 2-2: Heats of Reactions**

Reaction	•H (77°F) Btu/lb•mole
$\text{CH}_4 + \text{O}_2 = \text{CO}_2 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$	-345,200
$\text{CO} + 0.5\text{O}_2 = \text{CO}_2$	-121,700
$\text{COS} + 1.5\text{O}_2 = \text{CO}_2 + \text{SO}_2$	-236,000
$\text{COS} + 1.85\text{O}_2 = \text{CO}_2 + 0.3\text{SO}_2 + 0.7\text{SO}_3$	-265,800
$\text{Cu} + 0.5\text{O}_2 = \text{CuO}$	-67,050
$\text{CuO} + 0.25\text{CH}_4 = \text{Cu} + 0.25\text{CO}_2 + 0.5\text{H}_2\text{O}$	-19,240
$\text{CuO} + \text{CO} = \text{Cu} + \text{CO}_2$	-54,680
$\text{CuO} + \text{H}_2 = \text{Cu} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	-36,980
$\text{CuO} + \text{SO}_2 + 0.5\text{O}_2 = \text{CuSO}_4$	-136,500
$\text{CuO} + \text{SO}_3 = \text{CuSO}_4$	-93,940
$\text{CuSO}_4 + 0.5\text{CH}_4 = \text{Cu} + \text{SO}_2 + 0.5\text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	30,980
$\text{CuSO}_4 + 2\text{CO} = \text{Cu} + \text{SO}_2 + 2\text{CO}_2$	-39,910
$\text{CuSO}_4 + 2\text{H}_2 = \text{Cu} + \text{SO}_2 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$	-4500
$\text{H}_2 + 0.5\text{O}_2 = \text{H}_2\text{O}$	-104,000
$\text{H}_2\text{S} + 1.5\text{O}_2 = \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{SO}_2$	-222,900
$\text{H}_2\text{S} + 1.85\text{O}_2 = \text{H}_2\text{O} + 0.3\text{SO}_2 + 0.7\text{SO}_3$	-261,500
$\text{NO} + \text{NH}_3 + 0.25\text{O}_2 = \text{N}_2 + 1.5\text{H}_2\text{O}$	-175,100
$\text{NO}_2 + 2\text{NH}_3 + 0.5\text{O}_2 = 1.5\text{N}_2 + 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$	-286,800
$\text{S}_2 + 2\text{O}_2 = 2\text{SO}_2$	-255,400
$\text{S}_2 + 2.7\text{O}_2 = 0.3*2*\text{SO}_2 + 0.7*2*\text{SO}_3$	-315,000
$\text{SO}_2 + 0.5\text{O}_2 = \text{SO}_3$	-42,570

**Table 2-3:** Constants for the Specific Heat Correlations

Species	A	B	C	D	H <sub>298.15</sub> cal/g-mole	Temperature Range •K
CH <sub>4</sub>	2.975	18.329	0.346	-4.303	1,547.6	298 - 2000
CO	6.790	0.980	-0.110	-	2,104.9	298 - 2500
CO <sub>2</sub>	10.550	2.160	-2.040	-	3,925.7	298 - 2500
COS	11.330	2.180	-1.830	-	4,088.7	298 - 1800
Cu (s)	5.940	0.905	-0.332	-	1,922.6	298 - 1357
CuO (s)	10.476	4.007	-1.406	-	3,773.1	298 - 1359
CuSO <sub>4</sub> (s)	17.545	36.532	-2.942	-17.110	7,690.4	298 - 1078
H <sub>2</sub>	6.520	0.780	0.120	-	1,938.4	298 - 3000
H <sub>2</sub> O	7.170	2.560	0.080	-	2,224.7	298 - 2500
H <sub>2</sub> S	7.020	3.680	-	-	2,256.6	298 - 1800
N <sub>2</sub>	6.660	1.020	-	-	2,031.0	298 - 2500
NH <sub>3</sub>	6.165	7.558	0.084	-	2,145.9	298 - 800
	12.601	2.500	-15.231	-	7,590.5 <sup>5</sup>	800 - 2000
NO	6.616	1.778	-0.036	-0.342	2,060.6	298 - 3000
NO <sub>2</sub>	8.529	5.475	-1.124	-1.514	3,149.9	298 - 1500
	12.848	0.305	-	-	5,440.5 <sup>6</sup>	1,500 - 3000
O <sub>2</sub>	7.160	1.000	-0.400	-	2,313.4	298 - 3000
S <sub>2</sub>	8.720	0.160	-0.900	-	2,908.8	298 - 2000
SO <sub>2</sub>	10.380	2.540	-1.420	-	3,684.0	298 - 1800
SO <sub>3</sub>	13.658	6.536	-3.086	-1.847	4,972.4	298 - 2000
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (s) <sup>7</sup>	1.534	1.968	-9.006	-2.031	20,804	298 - 1800

Note all species are assumed to be gaseous, except where noted.

<sup>5</sup> Value of enthalpy at 800•K.

<sup>6</sup> Value of enthalpy at 1,500•K.

<sup>7</sup> Units of correlations J/(g-mole •K)

### 2.3 Boiler Efficiency

This section describes the algorithm used to calculate the boiler efficiency. The boiler efficiency is determined for a power plant without any pollution control equipment. This fixes the amount of fuel entering the furnace. Any changes in the energy efficiency of the boiler caused by pollution control equipment is considered by the energy credit algorithm. The air preheater is described in more detail in the next section. Yet, it is necessary to understand that the air preheater is divided into an ideal heat exchanger (i.e., no leakage) followed by a section where air leaks into the flue gas (see Figure 2-2). The uncorrected air preheater temperature,  $T_{unc,orig}$ , is the flue gas temperature after the heat exchanger.

The boiler efficiency in the IECM is based on the algorithm in “Steam/ Its Generation and Use”, by Babcock and Wilcox (8) and “Combustion, Fossil Power Systems”, by Combustion Engineering, Inc (9). The boiler efficiency is the energy absorbed by the steam cycle divided by the energy in the fuel. The energy that is not absorbed by the steam cycle is lost to the environment. These losses can be categorized into five areas:

- sensible heat loss of the dry flue gas
- sensible and latent heat loss from water vapor
- unburned carbon and carbon monoxide
- radiation loss
- unaccounted losses

Therefore, the boiler efficiency is

$$\eta_{boiler} = 1 - L_{Gas} - L_{H_2O} - L_C - L_R - L_{Unacc}$$

The sensible heat loss of the dry flue gas is the energy that could be used if the dry flue gas were cooled to the inlet air temperature of the air preheater,  $T_{fdfan,orig}$ . The inlet fuel temperature is assumed to be the same as the combustion air. This energy loss in Btu per pound of fuel can be defined as

$$SE_{Gas} = \sum_{j=1}^8 m_{fgaphi,j,orig} (h_j(T_{unc,orig}) - h_j(T_{fdfan,orig}))$$

where j equals all the flue gas components except H<sub>2</sub>O

This energy loss can be expressed as a fraction of the fuel’s energy content by dividing it by the higher heating value.

$$L_{Gas} = \frac{SE_{Gas}}{Hhv}$$

The heat loss due to water vapor in the flue gas can be split into the latent heat of vaporization and the sensible heat loss. The latent heat loss is the energy that could be used if the water vapor in the flue gas was condensed. Every pound of water vapor that is condensed releases 1,040 Btu of energy. The water vapor in the flue gas is produced by the vaporization of

moisture in the fuel and the combustion of hydrogen in the fuel. The latent heat loss can be calculated as follows:

$$LE = \left( f_{H_2O} + \frac{18.02f_H}{2*1.01} \right) 1,040$$

The sensible heat loss due to water vapor is the energy that could be used if the water vapor could be cooled to the inlet air temperature,  $T_{fdfan,orig}$ . This energy loss can be calculated as follows:

$$SE_{H_2O} = m_{fgaphi,H_2O,orig}(h_{H_2O}(T_{unc,orig}) - h_{H_2O}(T_{fdfan,orig}))$$

The total loss from moisture expressed as a fraction is the sum of the latent heat and sensible heat losses divided by the higher heating value of the fuel.

$$L_{H_2O} = \frac{(LE + SE_{H_2O})}{Hhv}$$

Since the fuel's higher heating value is based on the complete oxidation of carbon to carbon dioxide, the boiler efficiency has to account for energy loss from unburned carbon and carbon monoxide. Pure carbon has a higher heating value of 14,100 Btu/lb. The energy lost per pound of unburned carbon is 14,100 Btu. For every pound of carbon converted to carbon monoxide, 9755 Btu of energy are lost. The total energy loss due to unburned carbon and carbon monoxide is

$$L_C = (12.01*9,755m_{fgaphi,co} + 14,100C_{Unburned}) / Hhv$$

The loss from radiation exchange with the surroundings is estimated based on Figure 27 in reference (8) and Figure 6-5 in reference (9). Modern utility boilers usually have four water cooled walls and range in output from 800 to 6,000 million Btu per hour. Therefore, this curve was fitted to the following equation between 800 and 6,000 million Btu per hour:

$$L_R = 0.0015 + \frac{6000}{MW_g HR_{steam}}$$

There are other minor losses that are not determined in this algorithm. An example of one of these losses is the sensible heat loss from the ash exiting the boiler. These losses and other miscellaneous tolerance errors are entered as an input parameter in  $L_{Unacc}$ .

## 2.4 Air Preheater


This section describes the performance and economic algorithms for the air preheater. Figure 2-2 shows a schematic the air preheater. The purpose of the air preheater is to heat the combustion air entering the boiler by cooling the flue gas exiting the boiler. Typically, there is a

---



significant amount of leakage between the inlet boiler air and the outlet flue gas. The model assumes that the mixing due to the leakage air occurs independently of the heat transfer across the heat exchanger. This allows separate consideration of the effect of the leakage air and the characteristics of the heat exchanger. The heat exchanger is assumed to be a counterflow type.

**Figure 2-2:** Schematic Diagram of Air Preheater



The air preheater algorithms must calculate the performance of the air preheater for a power plant with and without pollution control equipment so that the effects of adding pollution control equipment can be determined. When the term “original” or “design” is used to describe a parameter, it signifies that the parameter is determined for a power plant without pollution control equipment. The term “modified” or “actual” signifies that the parameter is determined for a power plant with pollution control equipment. The purpose of the air preheater model is to calculate

- the design “uncorrected” air preheater temperature for the boiler efficiency algorithm
- the original amount of heat transferred by the air preheater
- the original size of the air preheater
- the actual “uncorrected” air preheater temperature
- the actual amount of heat transferred by the air preheater
- the difference in the amount of energy captured by the air preheater due to the addition of pollution control equipment
- the new size of the air preheater if requested
- the additional capital cost for a larger air preheater if requested

The “uncorrected” flue gas temperature,  $T_{unc,orig}$ , can be determined from an energy balance of the streams “leak”, “fgaphi” and “fgapho” shown in Figure 2-2. This energy balance is shown below, where the temperature of the flue gas exiting the air preheater,  $T_{fgapho,orig}$ , and the leakage air temperature,  $T_{leak,orig}$ , are known.

$$\sum_{j=1}^9 (m_{leak,j,orig} h_j(T_{leak,orig}) + m_{fgaphi,j,orig} h_j(T_{unc,orig})) = \sum_{j=1}^9 m_{fgapho,j,orig} h_j(T_{fgapho,orig})$$

Stream “fgapho” is equal to the sum of streams “leak” and “fgaphi”. Therefore, the energy balance can be rearranged as follows

$$\sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{fgaphi},j,\text{orig}}(h_j(T_{\text{unc,orig}}) - h_j(T_{\text{fgapho,orig}})) = \sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{leak},j,\text{orig}}(h_j(T_{\text{fgapho,orig}}) - h_j(T_{\text{leak,orig}}))$$

The temperature difference between  $T_{\text{fgapho,orig}}$  and  $T_{\text{unc,orig}}$  is usually less than 40°F, so the left hand side of this equation can be estimated by the average heat capacity times the temperature difference between  $T_{\text{unc,orig}}$  and  $T_{\text{fgapho,orig}}$ . The average heat capacity is estimated between  $T_{\text{fgapho,orig}}$  and  $T_{\text{fgapho,orig}} + 40$ °F. Therefore,  $T_{\text{unc,orig}}$  is determined by

$$T_{\text{unc,orig}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{leak},j,\text{orig}}(h_j(T_{\text{fgapho,orig}}) - h_j(T_{\text{leak,orig}}))}{C_{p\text{fgaphi,avg,orig}}} + T_{\text{fgapho,orig}}$$

where

$$C_{p\text{unc,avg,orig}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{fgaphi},j,\text{orig}}(h_j(T_{\text{fgapho,orig}}+40) - h_j(T_{\text{fgapho,orig}}))}{40}$$

The amount of energy transferred from the flue gas to the combustion air for a power plant without pollution control equipment is

$$Q_{\text{aph,orig}} = 2000\dot{M}_{\text{fuel}} \sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{fgaphi},j,\text{orig}}(h_j(T_{\text{fgaphi,orig}}) - h_j(T_{\text{unc,orig}}))$$

The temperature of the combustion air exiting the air preheater is typically less than 535°F. It can be estimated by

$$T_{\text{apho,orig}} = \frac{Q_{\text{aph,orig}}}{2000\dot{M}_{\text{fuel}}C_{p\text{apho,avg,orig}}} + T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}$$

where

$$C_{p\text{apho,avg,orig}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{apho},j,\text{orig}}(h_j(985) - h_j(T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}))}{985 - T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}}$$

The size of the air preheater is estimated by the quantity UA, where U is the overall heat transfer coefficient and A is the surface area. For a given heat exchanger, the heat transfer can be estimated by the equation below, where the subscripts “i” and “o” represent “in” and “out” and “h” and “c” represent “hot” and “cold” respectively (10).

$$Q = \frac{UA[(T_{h,i} - T_{c,o}) - (T_{h,o} - T_{c,i})]}{\ln\left(\frac{T_{h,i} - T_{c,o}}{T_{h,o} - T_{c,i}}\right)}$$

Solving the above equation for UA for the original air preheater. Substituting the appropriate subscripts yields

$$UA_{\text{aph,orig}} = \frac{Q_{\text{aph,orig}}}{(T_{\text{fgaphi,orig}} - T_{\text{apho,orig}}) - (T_{\text{unc,orig}} - T_{\text{fdfan,orig}})} \ln \left( \frac{T_{\text{fgaphi,orig}} - T_{\text{apho,orig}}}{T_{\text{unc,orig}} - T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}} \right) \quad (2.65)$$

Certain pollution control equipment, such as the copper oxide and NOXSO processes, significantly change the composition and temperature of the flue gas entering the air preheater. These changes may increase or decrease the amount of energy captured by the air preheater or change the exit temperature of the flue gas exiting the air preheater. Two cases can be considered. The first (or base) case is using the original air preheater without modifications. The alternative is to resize the air preheater so that additional energy can be captured by the air preheater.

For the base case, the original air preheater is used so its size is fixed and the overall heat transfer coefficient is assumed to be constant. Therefore, the known values are

- flue gas flow rate,  $m_{\text{fgaphi}}$  and inlet temperature,  $T_{\text{fgaphi}}$
- combustion air flow rate,  $m_{\text{apho}}$  and inlet temperature,  $T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}$
- leakage air flow rate,  $m_{\text{leak,orig}}$  and inlet temperature,  $T_{\text{leak,orig}}$
- the product of the overall heat transfer coefficient and surface area, UA

It should be noted that  $m_{\text{apho}}$ ,  $m_{\text{fgaphi}}$  and  $T_{\text{fgaphi}}$  are known, but their values may be different from their value for the original power plant without pollution control equipment.

The output parameters are the energy transferred across the air preheater,  $Q_{\text{aph}}$ , the flue gas exit temperature,  $T_{\text{fgapho}}$ , the “uncorrected” flue gas temperature,  $T_{\text{unc}}$  and the combustion air exit temperature,  $T_{\text{apho}}$ . To simplify the algorithms the average heat capacity of the flue gas entering the air preheater and the combustion air exiting the air preheater is determined.

$$C_{\text{papho,avg}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{apho},j} (h_j(T_{\text{fgaphi}} - 100) - h_j(T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}))}{T_{\text{fgaphi}} - 100 - T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}}$$

$$C_{\text{pfgaphi,avg}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{fgaphi},j} (h_j(T_{\text{fgaphi}}) - h_j(T_{\text{fgapho,input}}))}{T_{\text{fgaphi}} - T_{\text{fgapho,input}}}$$

The variable  $T_{\text{fgapho,input}}$  is the new flue gas exit temperature when the air preheater is resized. It is used for the base case as a matter of convenience to determine the average heat capacity of the flue gas. Once the average heat capacities are calculated, the “uncorrected” flue gas temperature,  $T_{\text{fgapho}}$ , is determined using the *effectiveness-NTU* method. The effectiveness,  $\varepsilon$ , is the ratio of the actual heat transfer rate for the heat exchanger to the maximum heat transfer rate.

$$\varepsilon = \frac{Q}{Q_{\text{max}}} = \frac{C_{\text{ph}}(T_{\text{h,i}} - T_{\text{h,o}})}{C_{\text{pmin}}(T_{\text{h,i}} - T_{\text{c,i}})} \quad (2.5)$$

The subscript “min” indicates the stream with the lower heat capacity, while the subscript “max” indicates the stream with the higher heat capacity. For a counterflow heat exchanger with both fluids unmixed, the effectiveness can be approximated with the following relation.

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1 - \exp\left[-NTU\left(1 - \frac{C_{p_{\min}}}{C_{p_{\max}}}\right)\right]}{1 - \frac{C_{p_{\min}}}{C_{p_{\max}}}\exp\left[-NTU\left(1 - \frac{C_{p_{\min}}}{C_{p_{\max}}}\right)\right]} \quad (2.6)$$

In fossil fuel fired power plants, the hot fluid stream (flue gas) is significantly larger than the cold fluid stream. Therefore, the hot fluid stream has a greater heat capacity rate than the cold fluid. Equations (2.5) and (2.6) can be solved for  $T_{h,o}$  by substituting  $C_c$  for  $C_{\min}$  and  $C_h$  for  $C_{\max}$  and eliminating  $\varepsilon$ .

$$T_{h,o} = T_{h,i} - (T_{h,i} - T_{c,i}) \frac{1 - \exp\left[-NTU\left(1 - \frac{C_{p_{\min}}}{C_{p_{\max}}}\right)\right]}{\frac{C_{p_h}}{C_{p_c}} - \exp\left[-NTU\left(1 - \frac{C_{p_{\min}}}{C_{p_{\max}}}\right)\right]} \quad (2.7)$$

The number of transfer units (NTU) is a dimensionless parameter in heat exchanger analysis and is

$$NTU = \frac{UA}{C_{p_{\min}}}$$

Since  $UA$  is known, the term in the exponential of Equation (2.7) can be replaced by

$$d = -NTU\left(1 - \frac{C_{p_c}}{C_{p_h}}\right) = \frac{-UA}{C_{p_c}}\left(1 - \frac{C_{p_c}}{C_{p_h}}\right) = UA(C_{p_h}^{-1} - C_{p_c}^{-1})$$

Therefore, Equation (2.7) can be written as

$$T_{h,o} = T_{h,i} - (T_{h,i} - T_{c,i}) \frac{1 - e^d}{\frac{C_{p_h}}{C_{p_c}} - e^d}$$

Substituting the appropriate subscripts for the air preheater into the above equations yields

$$T_{unc} = T_{fgaphi} - (T_{fgaphi} - T_{fdfan}) \frac{1 - e^d}{\frac{C_{p_{fgaphi,avg}}}{C_{p_{apho,avg}}} - e^d}$$

$$d = UA_{aph,orig}(C_{p_{fgaphi,avg}}^{-1} - C_{p_{apho,avg}}^{-1})$$

Once the “uncorrected” flue gas temperature is determined the flue gas and combustion temperatures exiting the air preheater and the heat transfer across the air preheater can be determined.

$$C_{p\text{leak,avg}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{leak},j} (h_j(T_{\text{unc}}) - h_j(T_{\text{leak,orig}}))}{T_{\text{unc}} - T_{\text{leak,orig}}}$$

$$T_{\text{fgapho}} = \frac{C_{p\text{leak,avg}} T_{\text{leak,orig}} + C_{p\text{fgaphi,avg}} T_{\text{unc}}}{C_{p\text{leak,avg}} + C_{p\text{fgaphi,avg}}}$$

$$Q_{\text{aph}} = C_{p\text{fgaphi,avg}} (T_{\text{fgaphi}} - T_{\text{unc}})$$

$$T_{\text{apho}} = \frac{Q_{\text{aph}}}{C_{p\text{apho,avg}}} + T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}$$

For the resize case, the air preheater is resize so that the flue gas has an exit temperature of  $T_{\text{fgapho,input}}$ . Therefore, the known values are

- flue gas flow rate,  $m_{\text{fgaphi}}$  and inlet temperature,  $T_{\text{fgaphi}}$
- combustion air flow rate,  $m_{\text{fgapho}}$  and inlet temperature,  $T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}$
- leakage air flow rate,  $m_{\text{leak,orig}}$  and inlet temperature,  $T_{\text{leak,orig}}$
- the flue gas exit temperature,  $T_{\text{fgapho,input}}$

The output parameters are the energy transferred across the air preheater,  $Q_{\text{aph}}$ , the “uncorrected” flue gas temperature,  $T_{\text{fgapho}}$  and the combustion air exit temperature,  $T_{\text{fgapho}}$  and the air preheater size,  $UA$ . Since  $T_{\text{fgapho,input}}$  is specified, the “uncorrected” flue gas temperature is

$$T_{\text{unc}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{leak},j,\text{orig}} (h_j(T_{\text{fgapho,input}}) - h_j(T_{\text{leak,orig}}))}{C_{p\text{fgaphi,avg}}} + T_{\text{fgapho,input}}$$

With the “uncorrected” flue gas temperature, the flue gas and combustion temperatures exiting the air preheater and the heat transfer across the air preheater can be determined. The flue gas exit temperature,  $T_{\text{fgapho}}$ , should be very close to  $T_{\text{fgapho,input}}$ .

$$T_{\text{fgapho}} = \frac{C_{p\text{leak,avg}} T_{\text{leak,orig}} + C_{p\text{fgaphi,avg}} T_{\text{unc}}}{C_{p\text{leak,avg}} + C_{p\text{fgaphi,avg}}}$$

$$Q_{\text{aph}} = C_{p\text{fgaphi,avg}} (T_{\text{fgaphi}} - T_{\text{unc}})$$

$$T_{\text{apho}} = \frac{Q_{\text{aph}}}{C_{p\text{apho,avg}}} + T_{\text{fdfan,orig}}$$

Once all the exit temperatures are determined, the new air preheater size,  $UA_{aph}$ , can be determined with

$$UA_{aph} = \frac{Q_{aph}}{(T_{fgaphi} - T_{apho}) - (T_{unc} - T_{dfan,orig})} \ln \left( \frac{T_{fgaphi} - T_{apho}}{T_{unc} - T_{dfan,orig}} \right)$$

Once the new size is determined, the additional capital cost in millions of current dollars can be estimated by


$$Cap_{aph} = 2.6 \times 10^3 (UA_{aph}^{0.6} - UA_{aph,orig}^{0.6}) \frac{C_{idx}}{C_{idx,1984}}$$

For either the base case or the resize case, the difference in the energy transfer across the air preheater can be determined by

$$Q_{aph,delta} = Q_{aph} - Q_{aph,orig}$$

This difference in the energy transfer is an energy credit and how it affects the economics of the power plant is discussed in Section 2.7.

**Figure 2-3:** Schematic Diagram of the Wet FGD Model



## 2.5 Wet FGD Performance

This section describes the improvements to the wet flue gas desulfurization (FGD) model since the original model development (1). The quantities that were modified are the reagent composition, water evaporation in the scrubber, flue gas composition exiting scrubber, energy needed for reheat, characterization of the scrubber waste and the capital cost when using lime as a reagent. A schematic diagram of the wet scrubber is shown in Figure 2-3. The diagram shows a configuration with bypass and a reheater. These options are mutually exclusive, since it is not likely that a scrubber would be built with both. So, if there is a bypass, the reheater is not used. Conversely, if there is no bypass, the reheater is used to raise the flue gas temperature to a specified value.

### 2.5.1 Reagent and SO<sub>2</sub> Efficiency

The SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency is a key parameter governing the performance of the FGD system. The removal efficiency can either be specified or it can be calculated to meet a desired SO<sub>2</sub> emission standard. The SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2}$ , based on the emission standard is calculated by

$$\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{std}} = 1 - \frac{2000 \text{ ES}_{\text{SO}_2} \dot{M}_{\text{fuel}} \text{Hh}v_{\text{fuel}}}{64.06 * 1,000,000 (\dot{m}_{\text{in}, \text{SO}_2} + \dot{m}_{\text{in}, \text{SO}_3})}$$

$$\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{std}} = 1 - \frac{\text{ES}_{\text{SO}_2} \dot{M}_{\text{fuel}} \text{Hh}v_{\text{fuel}}}{64.06 * 500 (\dot{m}_{\text{in}, \text{SO}_2} + \dot{m}_{\text{in}, \text{SO}_3})} \quad (2.8)$$

The wet FGD system has an option to allow bypassing of some flue gas around the scrubber. This option may lower the cost of the wet FGD system if the efficiency calculated by Equation (2.8) is not very high. When the bypass option is chosen the scrubber operates at its maximum removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{max}}$ , provided the amount of bypass is greater than the minimum bypass specified by the user,  $\text{By}_{\text{pmin}}$ . Since the bypass does not affect the total amount of sulfur removed, the moles of sulfur removed by the scrubber are determined from the Equation (2.8).

$$\text{if } \left( 1 - \frac{\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{std}}}{\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{max}}} \right) \text{ By}_{\text{pmin}} \text{ then}$$

$$\text{By}_{\text{p}} = 1 - \frac{\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{std}}}{\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{max}}}; \quad \eta_{\text{SO}_2} = \eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{max}}$$

$$\text{else By}_{\text{p}} = 0.0; \quad \eta_{\text{SO}_2} = \eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{std}}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{rem}, \text{S}} = \eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{std}} (\dot{m}_{\text{in}, \text{SO}_2} + \dot{m}_{\text{in}, \text{SO}_3})$$

The reagent for the wet scrubber can be either lime or limestone. The reagent purity,  $R_{\text{purity}}$  and moisture content,  $W_{\text{reag}}$ , must be specified. Any remaining material is considered inert. The

molar stoichiometry,  $\sigma$ , (moles of calcium required per mole of sulfur removed) must be specified. The default values for the molar stoichiometry are 1.15 and 1.05 for limestone and lime, respectively. With the molar stoichiometry, the mass flow rate of reagent is calculated by

$$\dot{M}_{\text{reag}} = \frac{100.09 \dot{m}_{\text{rem,S}} \sigma}{2000 R_{\text{purity}}} \text{ for CaCO}_3 ; \dot{M}_{\text{reag}} = \frac{56.08 \dot{m}_{\text{rem,S}} \sigma}{2000 R_{\text{purity}}} \text{ for CaO}$$

### 2.5.2 Water Balance

Makeup water to the FGD system is required principally to offset evaporative losses in the scrubber. The mass of water evaporated in the FGD system is determined by an energy balance assuming adiabatic conditions and neglecting the solid mass flow rates in the scrubber. With these assumptions, the sensible energy released by the flue gas entering the scrubber has to equal the energy needed to evaporate the water evaporated and raise it to the exit temperature. The equation for the energy balance is shown by Equation (2.9) for a scrubber without bypass<sup>8</sup>. The function,  $Cp'_{\text{in,avg}}$  is the average specific heat of the flue gas between the inlet temperature and the  $T_{\text{exit}}$ . The function,  $\Delta h$ , is the energy needed to raise the makeup water to saturated steam at  $T_{\text{exit}}$ .

$$Cp'_{\text{in,avg}}(T_{\text{in}}, T_{\text{exit}}) (T_{\text{in}} - T_{\text{exit}}) \sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_{\text{in},j} = \dot{W}_{\text{evp}} \Delta h(T_{\text{exit}}) \quad (2.9)$$

$$T_{\text{in}} = T_{\text{fg1}} + \Delta T_{\text{idfan}}$$

The temperature  $T_{\text{in}}$  is higher than  $T_{\text{in}}$ , since the induce draft fan raises the inlet temperature by  $\Delta T_{\text{idfan}}$ . The induced draft fan is assumed to be located between the scrubber and the particulate collector. The flue gas is assumed to behave as an ideal mixture, so the molar fraction of water in the flue gas is equal to the parcel pressure of water divided by the total pressure of the flue gas. Since the flue gas is saturated when it exits the scrubber, the amount of water evaporated is constrained by the saturation pressure of the water in the flue gas at the exit temperature. Since the change in the flue gas' total molar flow rate caused by the chemical equations is very small, the water evaporation constraint is show in Equation (2.10).

$$\frac{P_{\text{sat}}(T_{\text{exit}})}{P_{\text{atm}} + P_{\text{g,exit}}} = \frac{\dot{W}_{\text{evp}} + \dot{m}_{\text{in,H}_2\text{O}}}{\dot{W}_{\text{evp}} + \sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_{\text{in},j}} \quad (2.10)$$

Equations (2.9) and (2.10) represent two non-linear equations in two unknowns,  $T_{\text{exit}}$  and  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp}}$ . These two equations can be turned into a quadratic equation of  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp}}$ , provided the  $P_{\text{sat}}$  and  $\Delta h$  are linear functions of the exit temperature and  $Cp'_{\text{in,avg}}$  is constant. Figure 2-4 shows the typical variation in the average specific heat between 300°F and the exit temperature. The flue gas for Figure 2-4 is from an Illinois #6 coal and the average specific heat is determined using


<sup>8</sup> Bypassing flue gas around the scrubber does not change the exit temperature, but it does change the amount of water evaporated. For these reasons, the bypass variable is excluded from the derivation of the flue gas exit temperature. Once the exit temperature is determined, the amount of evaporated water can be determined for the scrubber with bypass.




the enthalpy functions presented in Section 2.2. The initial estimate of the average specific heat,  $C_{p',in,avg}$ , is determined by guessing the exit temperature.

$$C_{p',in,avg}(T_{in}, T_{guess}) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_{in,j} (h_j(T_{in}) - h_j(T_{guess}))}{(T_{in} - T_{guess}) \sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_{in,j}}$$

**Figure 2-4: Flue Gas Specific Heat versus Exit Temperature**



**Figure 2-5: Enthalpy Difference between Saturated Steam and Saturated Water at 120°F**



The linear equation, (2.11), for energy absorbed by the evaporating water was determined from a linear regression of the enthalpy of saturated steam minus the enthalpy of saturated water at 120°F, between 125°F and 185°F (10). Figure 2-5 shows the enthalpy difference between saturated steam versus saturated water at 120°F. It was found that the amount of water evaporated is not sensitive to the inlet water temperature, so the inlet water temperature is assumed to be 120°F. The correlation coefficient for the linear regression was greater than 99%.

$$\Delta h(T) = 7.3660 T_F + 17,593.7 \quad (2.11)$$

The saturation pressure of water versus temperature is shown in Figure 2-6 (11). Because of the curvature of the data and the sensitivity of Equation (2.10) to the saturation pressure, this data

was fitted to a piecewise line between 125 and 185°F, (2.12). The correlation coefficient was greater than 99% for each segment.

$$P_{\text{sat}}(T_F) = A_{\text{sat}} T_F + B_{\text{sat}} \quad (2.12)$$

where

$$A_{\text{sat}} = 59.5475 \times 10^{-3}, B_{\text{sat}} = -5.5087 \text{ for } 125 < T_F < 135,$$

$$A_{\text{sat}} = 74.4615 \times 10^{-3}, B_{\text{sat}} = -7.5238 \text{ for } 135 < T_F < 145$$


$$A_{\text{sat}} = 92.2619 \times 10^{-3}, B_{\text{sat}} = -10.1068 \text{ for } 145 < T_F < 155$$

$$A_{\text{sat}} = 113.333 \times 10^{-3}, B_{\text{sat}} = -13.3749 \text{ for } 155 < T_F < 165$$

$$A_{\text{sat}} = 138.0782 \times 10^{-3}, B_{\text{sat}} = -17.4604 \text{ for } 165 < T_F < 175$$

$$A_{\text{sat}} = 166.8782 \times 10^{-3}, B_{\text{sat}} = -22.5032 \text{ for } 175 < T_F < 185$$

**Figure 2-6:** Saturation Pressure of Water versus Temperature



Substituting Equations (2.11) and (2.12) into Equations (2.9) and (2.10) and solving for evaporated water yields Equation (2.13). Once the evaporated water is known, the exit temperature can be found by substituting  $P_{\text{sat}}$  from Equation (2.12) into Equation (2.10) and solving for the exit temperature, (2.14).

$$\dot{W}_{\text{evp}} = \frac{-b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} \quad (2.13)$$

where

$$a = 7.366 (-B_{\text{sat}} + 1) + 17,593.7A_{\text{sat}}$$

$$b = \left( \text{Cp}'_{\text{in,avg}}(T_{\text{in}}, T_{\text{guess}}) (-A_{\text{sat}}T_{\text{in}} - B_{\text{sat}} + 1) - 7.366B_{\text{sat}} + 17,593.7A_{\text{sat}} \right) \sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_{\text{in},j} + 7.366\dot{m}_{\text{in,H}_2\text{O}}$$

$$c = \left( \dot{m}_{\text{fg1,H}_2\text{O}} + (-A_{\text{sat}}T_{\text{in}} - B_{\text{sat}}) \sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_{\text{fg1},j} \right) \text{Cp}'_{\text{fg1,avg}}(T_{\text{in}}, T_{\text{guess}}) \sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_{\text{fg1},j}$$

$$T_{\text{exit}} = \frac{\dot{W}_{\text{evp}} + \dot{m}_{\text{in,H}_2\text{O}}}{A_{\text{sat}} \left( \dot{W}_{\text{evp}} + \sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_{\text{in},j} \right)} - \frac{B_{\text{sat}}}{A_{\text{sat}}} \quad (2.14)$$

Since a single linear equation for the saturation pressure does not represent the data, the solution of the quadratic equation for the evaporated water depends on the slope and intercept of

Equation (2.12), that are functions of the exit temperature. To eliminate this cyclic dependency, the procedure shown below is used. It has been found that the temperature converges to within a degree and the evaporated water to within one percent on step five.

1. Determine  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp},1}$  from (2.13) assuming an exit temperature of 155°F
2. Determine  $T_{\text{exit},1}$  from (2.14) with  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp},1}$
3. Determine  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp},2}$  with  $T_{\text{exit},1}$
4. Determine  $T_{\text{exit}}$  with  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp},1}$
5. Determine  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp}}$  from (2.13) times (1 - Byp) with  $T_{\text{exit}}$

**Figure 2-7: Evaporated Water versus Temperature**










Figure 2-7 shows evaporated water based on Equations (2.9), (2.10) and the iterative procedure shown above for an Illinois #6 coal, an inlet temperature of 314°F and gauge pressure of 4" of water. The graph indicates that the iterative solution is very accurate.

### 2.5.3 Flue Gas Composition and Reheat

The composition of the flue gas changes in the scrubber. The two most significant changes are the reduction in the sulfur dioxide content and the increase in the moisture content. The sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide are removed from the flue gas by a complex set of chemical reactions. These chemical reactions have been greatly simplified in the IECM and are shown below.



Using these chemical reactions the composition of the flue gas exiting the scrubber can be determined from a molar balance and is shown below. It is assumed that the oxygen needed to oxidize the calcium sulfite to calcium sulfate is taken from the flue gas. In practice this oxygen may be supplied by blowing air through the sludge outside the scrubber vessel. It is assumed that the water needed to hydrate the scrubber sludge comes directly from the makeup slurry and does not reduce the moisture content of the flue gas. The symbol Ox represents the fraction of calcium sulfite oxidized to calcium sulfate.

$$\dot{m}_{\text{exit},j} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \dot{m}_{\text{in},j} \quad \text{for } j = \text{N}_2, \text{CO}, \text{NO}, \text{NO}_2$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{exit},\text{O}_2} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{O}_2} + (0.5(1 - \text{Ox}) \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{SO}_3} - 0.5 \text{Ox} \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{SO}_2}) \eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{std}}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{exit},\text{H}_2\text{O}} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \dot{W}_{\text{evp}}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{exit},\text{CO}_2} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{CO}_2} + \{\dot{m}_{\text{rem},\text{S}} \text{ if reagent} = \text{CaCO}_3\}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{exit},\text{SO}_2} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{SO}_2} - \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{SO}_2} \eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{std}}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{exit},\text{SO}_3} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{SO}_3} - \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{SO}_3} \eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{std}}$$

The flue gas exiting the scrubber contains water droplets that the demister has not removed. These droplets evaporate either in the reheater or after the flue gas is remixed with the bypassed flue gas. These droplets are assumed to be a fraction,  $W_{\text{demis}}$ , of the evaporated water:

$$\dot{m}_{\text{stack},j} = \dot{m}_{\text{exit},j} + \text{Byp} \dot{m}_{\text{in},j} \quad \text{for all } j \text{ except } \text{H}_2\text{O}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{stack},\text{H}_2\text{O}} = \dot{m}_{\text{exit},\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \text{Byp} \dot{m}_{\text{in},\text{H}_2\text{O}} + W_{\text{demis}} \dot{W}_{\text{evp}}$$

The flue gas exiting the scrubber is either remixed with the bypass flue gas or it passes through a reheater. Therefore, the flue gas temperature entering the stack is either the average temperature of the bypass flue gas and the flue gas exiting the scrubber or the exit temperature of the reheater. The exit temperature of the reheater is an input parameter,  $T_{\text{stack,input}}$ . The energy needed to raise the flue gas temperature to  $T_{\text{stack}}$  is the sum of the sensible energy of the flue gas and the energy needed to evaporate the water droplets and raise their temperature to  $T_{\text{stack}}$ .

If no bypass then

$$T_{\text{stack}} = T_{\text{stack,input}}$$


---

$$E_{\text{wetfgd}} = W_{\text{demis}} \dot{W}_{\text{evp}} (7.366T_{\text{stack}} + 17593.7) + \sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{in},j} (h_j(T_{\text{stack}}) - h_j(T_{\text{exit}}))$$

else

$$T_{\text{stack}} = \text{Byp} T_{\text{in}} + (1 - \text{Byp}) T_{\text{exit}}$$

$$E_{\text{wetfgd}} = 0$$

#### 2.5.4 Waste Stream Composition

A major environmental flow stream emanating from a wet FGD system is the stream of wet solids. Two model options affect the mass flow rate of wet solids. The user specifies either a forced oxidation FGD system producing a gypsum waste or a natural oxidation FGD system that produces a wet sludge. The basic chemistry for these two options is shown in Equation (2.15). The difference in the composition and mass flow rates of FGD waste depends on the extent of oxidation of calcium sulfite to sulfate,  $Ox$  and the extent of dewatering of the final product,  $W_{\text{sludge}}$ . Other constituents of the FGD solids stream include unreacted reagent (that depends on the molar stoichiometry), inert materials introduced with the reagent (as dictated by the level of reagent purity) and flyash that has been removed by the scrubber (that depends on the particulate removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{TSP}}$ ). The mass flow rates of the component are shown below.

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sludge},j} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \eta_{\text{TSP}} \dot{M}_{\text{in},j} \text{ for } j = \text{Ash, CaSO}_4$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sludge,CaO}} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \eta_{\text{TSP}} \dot{M}_{\text{in,CaO}} + \left\{ \frac{56.08 (\sigma - 1) \dot{m}_{\text{rem,S}}}{2000} \text{ if reagent} = \text{CaO} \right\}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sludge,CaCO}_3} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \eta_{\text{TSP}} \dot{M}_{\text{in,CaCO}_3} + \left\{ \frac{100.09 (\sigma - 1) \dot{m}_{\text{rem,S}}}{2000} \text{ if reagent} = \text{CaCO}_3 \right\}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sludge,CaSO}_3 \cdot 0.5\text{H}_2\text{O}} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \eta_{\text{TSP}} \dot{M}_{\text{in,CaSO}_3 \cdot 0.5\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \frac{129.14 (1 - Ox) \dot{m}_{\text{rem,S}}}{2000}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sludge,CaSO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \eta_{\text{TSP}} \dot{M}_{\text{in,CaSO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \frac{172.17 Ox \dot{m}_{\text{rem,S}}}{2000}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sludge,Misc}} = (1 - \text{Byp}) \eta_{\text{TSP}} \dot{M}_{\text{in,Misc}} + (1 - R_{\text{purity}} - W_{\text{reag}}) \dot{M}_{\text{reag}}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sludge,H}_2\text{O}} = \left( \frac{1}{W_{\text{sludge}}} - 1 \right) \sum_{j=1}^8 \dot{M}_{\text{sludge},j} \text{ for all } j \text{ except } \text{H}_2\text{O}$$

### 2.5.5 Economics Algorithm

The economic algorithm for the wet scrubber has remained unchanged except two items. The first is that the single indirect charge factor originally employed for capital cost estimates has been split into its component categories following the nomenclature used by the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), author of the basic FGD cost model. The second change is in the direct capital cost for reagent handling. If lime is used as the reagent, the direct capital cost of reagent handling is the same as the algorithm used for a spray dryer (1). If limestone is used, the algorithm remains unchanged. The direct capital cost of reagent handling is shown below.

If Reagent =  $\text{CaCO}_3$

$$\text{DC}_{\text{reag}} = \left( \text{If } \dot{M}_{\text{reag}} < 18 \text{ Then } 0.1323 \dot{M}_{\text{reag}} + 2.859 \text{ else } 0.07288 \dot{M}_{\text{reag}} + 5.393 \right) \frac{C_{\text{idx}}}{C_{\text{idx},1981}}$$


else

$$\text{DC}_{\text{reag}} = \left( \text{If } \dot{M}_{\text{reag}} < 2 \text{ Then } 0.2997 \dot{M}_{\text{reag}} + 1.546 \text{ else } 0.1986 \dot{M}_{\text{reag}} + 2.042 \right) \frac{C_{\text{idx}}}{C_{\text{idx},1981}}$$

## 2.6 Spray Dryer Performance

This section describes improvements to the lime spray dryer performance model relative to the previous report (1). The areas that were modified are the reagent composition, water evaporation in the spray dryer, flue gas composition exiting spray dryer, energy needed for reheat and characterization of the scrubber waste. A schematic diagram of the spray dryer is shown in Figure 2-8. The diagram shows a configuration with bypass and a reheater. These options are mutually exclusive, since it is not likely that a spray dryer would be built with both. If there is a bypass, the reheater is not used. Conversely, if there is no bypass, the reheater is used to raise the flue gas temperature to a specified value.

**Figure 2-8:** Schematic Diagram of the Spray Dryer FGD Model



### 2.6.1 Reagent and SO<sub>2</sub> Efficiency

The SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency is a key parameter governing the performance of the spray dryer system. The removal efficiency can either be specified or it can be calculated to meet a desired SO<sub>2</sub> emission standard. The SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2}$ , based on the emission standard is the same as Equation (2.8) shown in Section 2.5.

The spray dryer system has an option to allow bypassing of some flue gas around the scrubber. This option may lower the cost of the spray dryer system if the efficiency calculated by Equation (2.16) is not very high. When the bypass option is chosen the amount of bypass is based on either the spray dryer operating at its maximum efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{max}}$ , or the flue gas temperature entering the stack. No bypass will be used if the amount of bypass is less than the minimum bypass specified by the user,  $\text{Byp}_{\text{min}}$ . If the user wants the bypass to be based on the maximum efficiency of the spray dryer then Equation (2.16) is used.

$$\text{if } \left( 1 - \frac{\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{std}}}{\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{max}}} \right) \text{ Byp}_{\text{min}} \text{ then} \quad (2.16)$$

$$\text{Byp} = 1 - \frac{\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{std}}}{\eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{max}}}; \quad \eta_{\text{SO}_2} = \eta_{\text{SO}_2, \text{max}}$$

else

$$\text{By}p = 0.0 ; \quad \eta_{\text{SO}_2} = \eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{std}}$$

The user may desire to have the bypass based on a desired stack temperature,  $T_{\text{stack,input}}$ . With this option, a bypass is only allowed if the bypass is greater than the minimum,  $\text{By}p_{\text{min}}$ , and less than the amount determined by Equation (2.16). The induced draft fan is after the fabric filter, (that is after the gases remix) and raises the temperature of the flue gas by a user specified amount,  $T_{\text{idfan}}$ . The flue gas exiting the spray dryer and the flue gas bypassed around the spray dryer are assumed to have the same specific heat; therefore, Equation (2.17) is used if the user wants the bypass to be based on the  $T_{\text{stack,input}}$ . The inlet temperature,  $T_{\text{in}}$ , equals the temperature exiting the air preheater,  $T_{\text{fgapho}}$ , while the exit temperature,  $T_{\text{exit}}$ , is determined in the next section.

$$\text{if } \text{By}p_{\text{min}} \leq \frac{T_{\text{stack,input}} - T_{\text{idfan}} - T_{\text{sd,exit}}}{T_{\text{fgapho}} - T_{\text{sd,exit}}} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{std}}}{\eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{max}}}\right) \text{ then} \quad (2.17)$$

$$\text{By}p = \frac{T_{\text{stack,input}} - T_{\text{idfan}} - T_{\text{sd,exit}}}{T_{\text{fgapho}} - T_{\text{sd,exit}}}; \quad \eta_{\text{SO}_2} = \frac{\eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{std}}}{1 - \text{By}p}$$

else

$$\text{By}p = 0.0 ; \quad \eta_{\text{SO}_2} = \eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{std}}$$

The flue gas that is not bypassed and the moles of sulfur removed by the scrubber are determined by

$$\dot{m}_{\text{sd,in},j} = (1 - \text{By}p) \dot{m}_{\text{fgapho},j}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{rem},\text{S}} = \eta_{\text{SO}_2} (\dot{m}_{\text{sd,in},\text{SO}_2} + \dot{m}_{\text{sd,in},\text{SO}_3})$$

The reagent for the spray dryer is lime. The reagent purity,  $R_{\text{purity}}$  and moisture content,  $W_{\text{reag}}$ , must be specified. Any remaining material is considered inert. The molar stoichiometry,  $\sigma$ , (moles of calcium required per mole of sulfur into the system) is a function of the  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency and the approach to saturation temperature (1). With the molar stoichiometry, the mass flow rate of reagent can be determined.

$$\sigma_{\text{sd}} = \exp(3.322 \eta_{\text{SO}_2} + 0.025 \Delta T_{\text{sat}} - 2.900) \quad (2.18)$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{reag}} = \frac{56.08 (\dot{m}_{\text{sd,in},\text{SO}_2} + \dot{m}_{\text{sd,in},\text{SO}_3}) \sigma_{\text{sd}}}{2000 R_{\text{purity}}} \quad (2.19)$$



### 2.6.2 Water Balance




Makeup water to the spray dryer system is required principally to offset evaporative losses in the scrubber. The mass of water evaporated in the spray dryer system is determined by an energy balance assuming adiabatic conditions and neglecting the solid mass flow rates in the system. With these assumptions, the sensible energy released by the flue gas entering the scrubber has to equal the energy needed to evaporate the water evaporated and raise it to the exit temperature. This is identical with the wet scrubber, except that the flue gas exiting the spray dryer is not saturated. The user specifies an approach to saturation temperature,  $\Delta T_{\text{sat}}$ , which is a measure of how close the flue gas is to being saturated. The procedure for the spray dryer is identical with the algorithm shown in Section 2.5, except steps 4 and 5<sup>9</sup>. Once the saturation temperature,  $T_{\text{sat}}$ , of the flue gas is determined, the approach to saturation temperature is added to find the exit temperature. The evaporated water is determined with Equation (2.20), shown below, as follows:

1. Determine  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp},1}$  from (2.13) assuming an exit temperature of 155°F
2. Determine  $T_{\text{sat},1}$  from (2.14) with  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp},1}$
3. Determine  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp},2}$  with  $T_{\text{exit},1}$
4. Determine  $T_{\text{sat}}$  with  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp},1}$ , then  $T_{\text{exit}} = T_{\text{sat}} + \Delta T_{\text{sat}}$ .
5. Determine  $\dot{W}_{\text{evp}}$  from (2.20)<sup>10</sup>

$$\dot{W}_{\text{evp}} = \frac{(1 - \text{Byp}) \sum_{j=1}^9 m_{\text{sd},\text{in},j} (h_j(T_{\text{fgapho}}) - h_j(T_{\text{sd},\text{exit}}))}{7.366 T_{\text{sd},\text{exit}} + 17,593.7} \quad (2.20)$$

### 2.6.3 Flue Gas Composition and Reheat

The composition of the flue gas changes in the spray dryer. The two most significant changes are the reduction in the sulfur dioxide content and the increase in the moisture content. The sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide are removed from the flue gas by a complex set of chemical reactions. These chemical reactions have been greatly simplified in the IECM and are shown below:



Using these chemical reactions the composition of the flue gas exiting the scrubber can be determined from a molar balance and is shown below. It is assumed that the oxygen needed to oxidize the calcium sulfite to calcium sulfate is taken from the flue gas. In practice this oxygen may be supplied by blowing air through the sludge outside the scrubber vessel. It is assumed that the water needed to hydrate the scrubber sludge comes directly from the makeup slurry and does not reduce the moisture content of the flue gas. The symbol Ox represents the fraction of calcium sulfite oxidized to calcium sulfate.

<sup>9</sup> An additional assumption is needed for the spray dryer which is that the enthalpy of the water in the flue gas is approximately equal to the enthalpy of saturated steam at the same temperature.

<sup>10</sup> Bypassing flue gas around the scrubber does not change the exit temperature, but it does change the amount of water evaporated. For these reasons, the bypass variable is excluded from the derivation of the flue gas exit temperature. Once the exit temperature is determined, the amount of evaporated water can be determined for the spray dryer with bypass.

$$\dot{m}_{sd,exit,j} = \dot{m}_{sd,in,j} \quad \text{for } j = N_2, CO_2, CO, NO, NO_2$$

$$\dot{m}_{sd,exit,O_2} = \dot{m}_{sd,in,O_2} + (0.5(1 - Ox) \dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_3} - 0.5 Ox \dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_2}) \eta_{SO_2}$$

$$\dot{m}_{sd,exit,H_2O} = \dot{m}_{sd,in,H_2O} + \dot{W}_{evp}$$

$$\dot{m}_{sd,exit,SO_2} = \dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_2} - \dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_3} \eta_{SO_2}$$

$$\dot{m}_{sd,exit,SO_3} = \dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_3} - \dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_3} \eta_{SO_2}$$

After the spray dryer there are two options depending if a bypass is used. The first is that the flue gas is remixed with the bypassed flue gas before going into the fabric filter. After the fabric filter the flue gas temperature is raised by the induced draft fan before entering the stack. The second is that the flue gas passes through the fabric filter and induced draft fan before going into the reheater. After exiting the reheater the flue gas enters the stack. For either case, the flue gas composition and temperature do not change in the fabric filter. The equations governing the flue gas temperature and composition for the bypass case are shown below.

$$\dot{m}_{ff,in,j} = \dot{m}_{sd,exit,j} + Byp \dot{m}_{fgapho,j} \quad (2.22)$$

$$T_{ff,in} = Byp T_{fgapho} + (1 - Byp) T_{sd,exit} \quad (2.23)$$

$$\dot{m}_{stack,in,j} = \dot{m}_{ff,in,j} \quad (2.24)$$

$$T_{stack} = T_{ff,in} + \Delta T_{idfan} \quad (2.25)$$

$$E_{dryfgd} = 0 \quad (2.26)$$

The equations governing the flue gas temperature and composition for the reheater case are shown below. The exit temperature of the reheater is an input parameter,  $T_{stack,input}$ . The energy needed to raise the flue gas temperature to  $T_{stack}$  is the sensible energy of the flue gas.

$$\dot{m}_{stack,in,j} = \dot{m}_{ff,in,j} \dot{m}_{stack,j} = \dot{m}_{rh,in,j} = \dot{m}_{ff,in,j} = \dot{m}_{sd,exit,j} \quad (2.27)$$

$$T_{ff,in} = T_{sd,exit} \quad (2.28)$$

$$T_{rh,in} = T_{ff,in} + \Delta T_{idfan} \quad (2.29)$$

$$T_{stack} = T_{stack,input} \quad (2.30)$$

$$E_{\text{dryfgd}} = \sum_{j=1}^9 \dot{m}_{\text{rh,in},j} (h_j(T_{\text{stack}}) - h_j(T_{\text{rh,in}})) \quad (2.31)$$

#### 2.6.4 Waste Stream Composition

A major environmental flow stream emanating from a spray dryer system is the stream of dry waste solids. The basic chemistry for the creation of these solids is shown in Equation (2.21). The difference in the composition and mass flow rates of spray dryer waste depends on the extent of oxidation of calcium sulfite to sulfate, Ox. Other constituents of the spray dryer solids stream include unreacted reagent (that depends on the molar stoichiometry), inert materials introduced with the reagent (as dictated by the level of reagent purity) and flyash. The total mass flow rate of the solids created in the spray dryer and the flyash entering the spray dryer is shown below.

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sd,total},j} = \dot{M}_{\text{sd,in},j} \text{ for } j = \text{Ash, CaCO}_3, \text{CaSO}_4$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sd,total,CaO}} = \dot{M}_{\text{sd,in,CaO}} + \left\{ \frac{56.08 [\sigma (\dot{m}_{\text{sd,in,SO}_2} + \dot{m}_{\text{sd,in,SO}_3}) - \dot{m}_{\text{rem,S}}]}{2000} \right\}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sd,total,CaSO}_3 \cdot 0.5\text{H}_2\text{O}} = \dot{M}_{\text{sd,in,CaSO}_3 \cdot 0.5\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \frac{129.14 (1 - \text{Ox}) \dot{m}_{\text{rem,S}}}{2000}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sd,total,CaSO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}} = \dot{M}_{\text{sd,in,CaSO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \frac{172.17 \text{Ox} \dot{m}_{\text{rem,S}}}{2000}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sd,total,Misc}} = \dot{M}_{\text{sd,in,Misc}} + (1 - R_{\text{purity}} - W_{\text{reag}}) \dot{M}_{\text{reag}}$$

The total solids in the spray dryer either exit with the flue gas or drop out the bottom of the spray dryer. The removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{TSP}}$ , of the solids is an input parameter, that specifies what fraction of the total solids exit out the bottom. The solids that exit with the flue gas remix with the flyash bypassed around the spray dryer (if present) before entering the fabric filter. After the fabric filter removes most of the solids, the solids from the spray dryer and fabric filter are remixed before being disposed.

$$\dot{M}_{\text{sd,bottom},j} = \eta_{\text{TSP}} \dot{M}_{\text{sd,total},j}$$

$$\dot{M}_{sd,exit,j} = (1 - \eta_{TSP}) \dot{M}_{sd,total,j}$$

$$\dot{M}_{ff,in,j} = Byp \dot{M}_{fgapho,j} + \dot{M}_{sd,exit,j}$$

### 2.6.5 Economics Algorithm

The economic algorithm for the spray dryer has remained unchanged except one item. The single indirect charge factor for capital cost has been split into different categories of indirect charges following the nomenclature of the TVA.

## 2.7 Power Plant Economics

This section describes the economics of the base (original) power plant. Subsequent sections then describe how the pollution control equipment affects the economics of the base plant. The following section will describe how the economics changes when pollution control equipment is added. For purposes of cost estimate and internal consistency, the IECM effectively considers the power plant and pollution control equipment to be separate entities. The base power plant essentially consumes fuel and produces electricity and flue gas, while the pollution control equipment consumes some electricity and removes the pollutants from the flue gas.

### 2.7.1 Base Plant Costs

The base power plant uses electricity and steam for running pulverizers, steam cycle pumps, flue gas fans, cooling system and miscellaneous other equipment. These components represent internal utility (auxiliary power) consumption that reduces the amount of electricity that the power plant can sell to customers (including the pollution control equipment). The auxiliary power consumption reduces the electricity available for sale and increases the heat rate.

$$MW_{bp} = MW_g (1 - x_p - x_{sp} - x_f - x_c - x_{misc})$$

$$HR_{bp} = \frac{HR_{cycle}}{1 - x_p - x_{sp} - x_f - x_c - x_{misc}}$$

The capital and operating cost of a power plant is based on the algorithms presented in Molberg (11). The direct and total capital costs are estimated as follows:

$$TDC_{bp} = 600 \left( \frac{MW_{bp}}{1,000,000} \right)^{0.85} \frac{HW_{idx}}{HW_{idx,1988}}$$


---

$$TCC_{bp} = TDC_{bp} (1 + ICF)$$

The operating cost is divided into two categories: fuel cost and non-fuel cost. The non-fuel expenses include labor, maintenance, overhead, taxes, etc... The fuel cost depends on the fuel consumption and cost of fuel, while the non-fuel cost is proportional to the size of the power plant.

$$AC_{fuel} = 8766 \times 10^{-6} C_f m_{fuel} P_{fuel}$$

$$AC_{non} = 8766 \times 10^{-6} C_f 4.35 MW_{bp} \frac{C_{idx}}{C_{idx,1988}}$$

$$AC_{bp} = AC_{fuel} + AC_{non}$$

The total revenue requirement excluding any income from “selling” electricity to the pollution control equipment can be calculated by annualizing the total capital cost and levelizing the total operating and maintenance costs. The model does not explicitly charge the power plant for its own utility consumption. The main reason is that any charge to the power plant is collected by the power plant, so the net effect is zero. The price of electricity,  $E_{cost}$ , charged to the pollution control equipment can be set to any value by the model user (as is typically done in most economic analyses). However, the default is to use the marginal electricity cost based on the total revenue requirement of the base plant without utilities:

$$TRR_{w/o\ util, bp} = TCC_{bp} FCF + AC_{bp} VCLF \quad (2.32)$$

$$E_{cost} = \frac{TRR_{w/o\ util, bp} \times 10^6}{8766 C_f MW_{bp}} \quad (2.33)$$

where 8766 is the average number of hours in a year (including leap years).

### 2.7.2 Pollution Control Equipment Energy Penalties

This section gives a brief overview of the economics of pollution control equipment and describes in detail how the pollution control equipment affects the economics of the base power plant. This section assumes that the pollution control equipment is a consumer of energy. The next section describes the effects when pollution control equipment *contributes* energy (e.g. from exothermic chemical reactions). How the capital and operating costs of specific pollution control equipment are determined is described in other chapters and is not covered in this section. Once the total capital and operating costs are determined for a specific pollution control equipment the total revenue requirement can be calculated.

$$\text{TRR}_{\text{w/o util,pce,j}} = \text{TCC}_{\text{pce,j}} \text{FCF} + \text{AC}_{\text{pce,j}} \text{VCLF}$$

However, this does not reflect the cost of electricity and steam consumption charged to the pollution control equipment by the power plant. The utility cost is the equivalent electricity consumption times the cost of electricity. Given the utility cost, the total revenue requirement can be determined. This total revenue requirement can be expressed in mills per kilowatt hour by divided it by the net electric capacity of the power plant.

$$\text{AC}_{\text{util,pce,j}} = 8766 C_f \text{MW}_{\text{bp}} x_{\text{pce,j}} E_{\text{cost}}$$

$$\text{TRR}_{\text{pce,j}} = \text{TRR}_{\text{w/o util,pce,j}} + \text{AC}_{\text{util,pce,j}}$$

$$E_{\text{pce,j}} = \frac{\text{TRR}_{\text{pce,j}} \times 10^6}{8766 C_f \text{MW}_{\text{net}}}$$

The electricity consumption of the pollution control equipment reduces the amount of electricity available for sale to external customers. Therefore, the net electric capacity is the gross capacity minus the internal consumption, including all pollution control equipment:

$$\text{MW}_{\text{net}} = \text{MW}_{\text{g}} \left( 1 - x_p - x_{\text{sp}} - x_f - x_c - x_{\text{misc}} - \sum_{j=1}^n x_{\text{pce,j}} \right)$$

Since the pollution control equipment “pays” the base power plant for electricity consumption, these charges are income for the base power plant. The pollution control equipment utility costs appear as negative charges (i.e. income) in the base power plant utility cost. This procedure is a bookkeeping operation to change pollution control equipment for utility use:

$$\text{AC}_{\text{util,bp}} = - \sum_{j=1}^n \text{AC}_{\text{util,pce,j}}$$

The total revenue requirement including utility cost for the power plant can be calculated as the sum of the total revenue requirement without utilities plus the utility cost for the base power plant. The total revenue requirement can be divided by the net capacity to determine the cost of electricity including utility costs of the base power plant,  $E_{\text{bp}}$ . This cost of electricity,  $E_{\text{bp}}$ , will equal the price of electricity charged to the pollution control equipment,  $E_{\text{cost}}$ , if the price charged to the pollution control equipment is equal to the value determined by Equation (2.33).

$$\text{TRR}_{\text{bp}} = \text{TRR}_{\text{w/o util,bp}} + \text{AC}_{\text{util,bp}} \tag{2.34}$$

$$E_{bp} = \frac{TRR_{bp} \times 10^6}{8766 C_f MW_{net}} \quad (2.35)$$

### 2.7.3 Pollution Control Equipment Energy Credits

This section describes the changes in economics when pollution control equipment contributes energy that can be converted to electricity (as is true of an exothermic process that increases the potential heat input to the boiler). There are a variety of ways to treat this case. For the IECM, the pollution control equipment is assumed to sell the energy back to the power plant, that converts the additional energy into electricity for sale. Therefore, the revenue generated from the sale of energy to the power plant shows up as a credit in the operating costs for the pollution control equipment and a debit in the fuel cost of the power plant.

The power plant is considered to have two choices for treating this energy. Either it can reduce the amount of purchased fuel while the gross amount of electricity remains constant or it can “build” additional equipment to convert this energy into additional electricity (i.e., increase the gross plant size). The first choice requires an iterative solution since the energy generated by the pollution control equipment is a function of the fuel consumption of the power plant.<sup>11</sup> Because of the complexities of the IECM, it is not possible to solve this iterative problem explicitly.

Instead, the IECM assumes the power plant builds additional equipment to convert the additional energy into electricity. Since the IECM models new power plants, the additional equipment is “built” simultaneously with the base power plant, yet is accounted separately in the economics. This approach allows a simpler solution. Or, the user simply can neglect the change in size since it is generally small and does not change the economics substantially. The additional equipment has capital and non-fuel operating costs, that are charged to the base power plant.

The equivalent electric capacity of this energy is needed to determine the charges and debits for energy generated by pollution control equipment. If the additional energy is in the form of heat captured by the air preheater, it is treated the same as the energy from coal. The additional energy is divided by the original heat rate. If the additional energy is in the form of steam, it is treated the same as energy in the steam cycle, so the additional energy is divided by the original heat rate times the boiler efficiency. With the equivalent electric capacity, the electric capacity of the power plant with and without pollution control equipment also can be determined.

$$MW_{credit} = \frac{Q_{aph, \Delta}}{HR_{orig}} + \frac{Q_{steam}}{\eta_{boiler} HR_{orig}}$$

---

<sup>11</sup> The energy generated by the pollution control equipment is based on the fuel flow rate into the power plant and the characteristics of the specific pollution control equipment. So reducing the fuel flow rate into the power plant, changes the energy generated by the pollution control equipment, which changes the fuel flow rate. To accurately solve this problem requires an interactive solution, since it is not possible to *a priori* determine the appropriate fuel flow rate and energy from the pollution control equipment to produce a specific amount of electricity.

$$MW_{bp,new} = MW_g(1 - x_p - x_{sp} - x_f - x_c - x_{misc}) + MW_{credit}$$

$$MW_{net} = MW_g \left( 1 - x_p - x_{sp} - x_f - x_c - x_{misc} - \sum_{j=1}^n x_{pce,j} \right) + MW_{credit}$$

Multiplying the electric capacity by the heat rate and dividing by the higher heating value of the fuel gives the equivalent fuel consumption. The equivalent fuel consumption is multiplied by the cost of fuel to determine the revenue from the sale of the energy to the power plant. This revenue is credited to the operating cost of the pollution control equipment that generated the energy.

$$m_{fuel,credit} = \frac{MW_{credit} HR_{bp}}{2Hh_v}$$

$$AC_{fuel,credit} = 8766 \times 10^{-6} C_f m_{fuel,credit} P_{fuel}$$

$$AC_{pce,j} = AC_{w/o credit,pce,j} + AC_{fuel,credit}$$

Several base plant economic variables must be modified to account for the energy credit. The direct capital cost for the additional equipment is estimated to be proportional to the direct capital cost of the original power plant. Therefore, the direct capital cost is determined by

$$TDC_{bp} = 600 \left( 1 + \frac{MW_{credit}}{MW_{bp}} \right) \left( \frac{MW_{bp}}{1,000,000} \right)^{0.85} \frac{HW_{idx}}{HW_{idx,1988}}$$

The non-fuel operating and maintenance costs are estimated to be proportional to the non-fuel operating and maintenance cost of the original power plant. The total operating cost for the base plant is

$$AC_{non} = 8766 \times 10^{-6} C_f 4.35 (MW_{bp} + MW_{credit}) \frac{C_{idx}}{C_{idx,1988}}$$

$$AC_{bp} = AC_{fuel} + AC_{non} + AC_{fuel,credit}$$



The equations for the total revenue requirement, (2.34) and (2.32) and the cost of electricity of the base power plant, (2.35), do not change, but the equation for the default price of electricity charged to pollution control equipment, (2.33), does change:

$$E_{\text{cost}} = \frac{\text{TRR}_{\text{w/o util, bp}} \times 10^6}{8766 C_f \text{MW}_{\text{bp, new}}}$$

#### 2.7.4 Total Pollution Control Cost

The total capital, operating, utility and revenue requirements for pollution control excluding coal cleaning can be determined by summing the values the pollution control equipment:

$$\text{TCC}_{\text{total, pce}} = \sum_{j=1}^n \text{TCC}_{\text{pce, j}} ; \text{AC}_{\text{total, pce}} = \sum_{j=1}^n \text{AC}_{\text{pce, j}}$$

$$\text{TRR}_{\text{w/o util, total, pce}} = \sum_{j=1}^n \text{TRR}_{\text{w/o util, pce, j}} ; \text{AC}_{\text{util, total, pce}} = \sum_{j=1}^n \text{AC}_{\text{util, pce, j}}$$

$$\text{TRR}_{\text{total, pce}} = \sum_{j=1}^n \text{TRR}_{\text{pce, j}} ; E_{\text{total, pce}} = \sum_{j=1}^n E_{\text{pce, j}}$$

The total capital, operating, utility and revenue requirements of the power plant are the sum of the base power plant and the total pollution control equipment.

$$\text{TCC}_{\text{total}} = \text{TCC}_{\text{bp}} + \text{TCC}_{\text{total, pce}}$$

$$\text{AC}_{\text{total}} = \text{AC}_{\text{bp}} + \text{AC}_{\text{total, pce}}$$

$$\text{TRR}_{\text{w/o util, total}} = \text{TCC}_{\text{w/o util, bp}} + \text{TCC}_{\text{w/o util, total, pce}}$$

$$\text{AC}_{\text{util, total}} = \text{AC}_{\text{util, bp}} + \text{AC}_{\text{util, total, pce}}$$

$$\text{TRR}_{\text{total}} = \text{TCC}_{\text{bp}} + \text{TCC}_{\text{total, pce}}$$

$$\text{EC}_{\text{total}} = \text{EC}_{\text{bp}} + \text{EC}_{\text{total, pce}}$$

The total cost for pollution control including coal cleaning has to be determined by examining two identical power plant. One power plant uses cleaned coal, while the other does not. The total pollution control costs are calculated by subtracting the base plant costs for the plant that is not using cleaned coal from the total plant costs for the plant that is using cleaned coal. This procedure is necessary since the coal cleaning plant is assumed to be separate from the power plant. The capital and operating costs of the coal cleaning plant are added to the cost of raw coal, so delivered cost of coal to the power plant increases.

$$\text{TCC}_{\text{total, pce}} = \text{TCC}_{\text{total}} - \text{TCC}_{\text{bp, w/o cc}}$$

$$\text{AC}_{\text{total, pce}} = \text{AC}_{\text{total}} - \text{AC}_{\text{bp, w/o cc}}$$

$$TRR_{w/o \text{ util, total, pce}} = TCC_{w/o \text{ util, total}} - TCC_{w/o \text{ util, bp, w/o cc}}$$

$$AC_{\text{util, total, pce}} = AC_{\text{util, total}} - AC_{\text{util, bp, w/o cc}}$$

$$TRR_{\text{total, pce}} = TCC_{\text{total}} - TCC_{\text{bp, w/o cc}}$$

$$EC_{\text{total, pce}} = EC_{\text{total}} - EC_{\text{bp, w/o cc}}$$

## 2.8 Key Financial Parameters

### 2.8.1 Fixed Charge Factor

The fixed charge factor is used to convert the future carrying charges of the plant investment into a uniform series of payments over the plant life. It is calculated based on the revenue requirement methodology presented in the EPRI Technical Assessment Guide (12, 13).

Revenue requirements consist of two main components, carrying charges (fixed charges) and expenses (operating costs). Carrying charges are related to the capital investment and are incurred despite how the plant is used. They consist of return on investment, book depreciation, income taxes, local property taxes and insurance. Expenses are related to the operation and maintenance of the plant and generally used within one year and generally consist of fuel, operating and maintenance costs.

Book depreciation is the annual charge to repay the original investment. A straight line method is used in the IECM and it is assumed that the salvage value is equal to the cost of retiring the plant. The current tax laws allow for an investment tax credit. This credit is an immediate reduction in the income taxes for the year that the plant goes into services. The investment tax credit is normalized as opposed to “flow through” (these terms are explained later). Therefore, the book depreciation calculation is

$$D_b = \frac{1 - itc}{B_1}$$

Money to cover the total capital investment comes from the sale of bonds (known as debt financing) and the sale of common and preferred stock (equity financing). The ratio of debt financing to equity financing is generally around 50%. The return on debt and equity is the money a utility must pay to its investors for using their money. The weighted average of the return on debt and equity is often called the “return on investment”, “cost of money” or the “weighted cost of capital”. This return is based on the undepreciated investment or the remaining balance on the initial investment, that will be defined later in Equation (2.42). The annual rate of return on debt and equity is related to the inflation rate. The IECM assumes that the real rate of return or the return in the absence of inflation remains constant. Therefore, the rates of return are input parameters expressed in constant dollars and the nominal or current rates of returns are calculated with Equations (2.36), (2.37), (2.38). The weighted cost equity is shown in Equation (2.39), while the weighted cost of capital is shown in Equation (2.40).

$$B = (1 + e_i) (1 + B_r) - 1 \tag{2.36}$$

$$CS = (1 + e_i) (1 + CS_r) - 1 \quad (2.37)$$

$$PS = (1 + e_i) (1 + PS_r) - 1 \quad (2.38)$$

$$E = \frac{PS PS_f + CS(1 - PS_f - D_f)}{1 - D_f} \quad (2.39)$$

$$C = B D_f + E (1 - D_f) \quad (2.40)$$

Income taxes are based on company profit within a given year. The profit is equal to the total revenue minus all the deductible expenditures. Income taxes consist of state and federal taxes, with state taxes being deductible for federal tax purposes. Therefore, the effective total tax rate is.

$$t = t_s + (1 - t_s) t_f$$

**Table 2-4:** Federal Tax Depreciation Schedule

Year	Depreciation %	Year	Depreciation%
1	7.5	16	4.4
2	6.9	17	4.4
3	6.4	18	4.4
4	5.9	19	4.4
5	5.5	20	4.4
6	5.1	21	0
7	4.7	22	0
8	4.5	23	0
9	4.5	24	0
10	4.5	25	0
11	4.5	26	0
12	4.5	26	0
13	4.5	28	0
14	4.5	29	0
15	4.5	30	0

Federal tax laws also allow for an accelerated cost recovery or depreciation. This accelerated depreciation schedule,  $D_{s,n}$  used for tax purposes is a 200% declining balance method over 15 years and is shown below. It allows for a shorter recovery time and a greater deduction in the early years that the straight line depreciation schedule.

Deferred income tax is the difference between income tax actually paid and the income tax that would have been paid if a straight line tax recovery schedule had been used, Equation (2.41). There are two methods of handling deferred taxes: “flow through” and “normalization”. The flow through method pass the tax deferrals immediately to the rate payers or to the stockholders. The normalized method, which the IECM uses, accumulates the deferred taxes in a reserve account to pay for new investment items. The utility collects revenue as if a straight line recovery schedule was used. The utility then has use of the funds until the tax obligation has to be paid in the later

years of the booklife. The deferred income taxes and the investment tax credit are called tax preferences.

$$t_{d,n} = (D_{s,n} - 1/B_1) t \text{ for } n = 1, B_1 \quad (2.41)$$

As mentioned earlier, the return on investment was based on the remaining balance. The remaining balance per year is the initial investment minus the book depreciation, deferred income tax per year and investment tax credit in the first year, Equation (2.42). The returns on debt and equity per year are shown in Equation (2.43) and (2.44). The taxes paid per year are shown in Equation (2.45). The year by year carrying charges is just the sum of the book depreciation, deferred taxes, return on debt, return on equity, income taxes paid and the advalorem tax, Equation (2.46).

$$RB_n = RB_{n-1} - D_b - t_{d,n-1} \quad (2.42)$$

$$RD_n = RB_n D_f B \quad (2.43)$$

$$RE_n = RB_n (1 - D_f) E \quad (2.44)$$

$$t_{p,n} = \frac{t}{1 - t} (D_b - D_{s,n} + t_{d,n} + RE_n) \quad (2.45)$$

$$CC_n = D_b + t_{d,n} + RD_n + RE_n + t_{p,n} + a \text{ for } n = 1, B_1 \quad (2.46)$$

$$RB_1 = 1 - itc$$

The discount rate used for present value calculations is related to the weighted cost of capital. The most common method used in the utility industry is a “before tax discount rate” that is equal to the weighted cost of capital. Some industries use an “after tax discount rate” that is equal to the weighted cost of capital less the tax rate times the return on debt. The IECM uses a “before tax discount rate”, Equation (2.47). The present value factor of a future expense in a given year is given by Equation (2.48). It is assumed for present value calculations that all expenses are paid at the end of year. The annuity factor shown in Equation (2.49), calculates the present value of a uniform series of payments in the future, while the reciprocal of the annuity factor calculates an equivalent uniform annual amount for a single payment.

$$dis = C \quad (2.47)$$

$$PV_n = (1 + dis)^n \quad (2.48)$$

$$A_n = \frac{1 - PV_n}{dis} \quad (2.49)$$

The present value of future carrying charges is the sum of carrying charges times the present value factor, Equation (2.50). The levelized carrying charge converts the actual carrying charges that vary from year to year into a uniform payment for the tax life of the plant. The levelized carrying charge per year is just the cumulative present value of the carrying charge divided by

---

the annuity, Equation (2.51). The levelized carrying charge for the last year of the book life is the fixed charge factor, Equation (2.52).

$$CC_{pv,n} = \sum_{m=1}^n CC_m PV_m \quad (2.50)$$

$$CC_{l,n} = \frac{CC_{pv,n}}{A_n} \quad (2.51)$$

$$FCF = CC_{l,B_1} \quad (2.52)$$

### 2.8.2 Levelization Factor

The levelization algorithm is used to convert a series of future payments that have a uniform escalation rate into a uniform series of payments over the same period. The IECM assumes that the real escalation rate for expenses is constant, so the apparent escalation rate is calculated from Equation (2.53). The levelization factor is calculated with Equation (2.54). The total revenue requirement is calculated in Equation (2.55).

$$e_f = (1 + e_r) (1 + e_i) - 1 \quad (2.53)$$

$$L_n = \frac{k (1 - k^n)}{A_{B_1}(1 - k)}$$

where  $k = \frac{1 + e_f}{1 + dis}$  (2.54)

$$TRR = TCC FCF + TVC L_{B_1} \quad (2.55)$$

### 2.8.3 Year-by-Year Revenue Requirement Analysis

A year-by-year revenue requirement analysis is also available in the IECM. This method has the advantage of showing the revenue requirement in current dollars over the entire tax life. The total revenue requirement in a future year is the sum of the carrying charges and the operating expenses.

$$TCC_n = TCC CC$$

$$TVC_n = TVC (1 + e_f)^n$$

$$TRR_n = TCC_n + TVC_n$$

### 2.8.4 Accumulated Funds Used During Construction

The accumulated funds used during construction, AFUDC, or interest during construction is determined from the total plant cost, TPC. It is assumed that the equipment begins service at the beginning of January and that the construction takes place during the preceding years. Also the IECM determines the total plant cost in the same year dollars that the equipment begins services. The actual cashed expended for construction is assumed to be spent uniformly at the middle of

each year during construction. Therefore, the total cash expended, TCE, in mixed year dollars, is found by de-escalating the total plant cost back in time.

$$TCE = \frac{TPC}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{(1+i)^{j-0.5}}$$

After the money is spent, interest charges are accumulated as part of the AFUDC at a discount rate, dis. The discount rate is determined from Equation (2.47). Therefore, the total plant investment, TPI, is

$$TPI = \frac{TPC}{N} \sum_{j=i}^N \frac{(1+dis)^{j-0.5}}{(1+i)^{j-0.5}} = \frac{TPC}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \frac{1+dis}{1+i} \right)^{j-0.5}$$

The AFUDC is the difference between the total plant investment and the total cash expended.

$$AFUDC = TPI - TCE$$

## 2.9 Conventional Coal Cleaning

### 2.9.1 Introduction

This section describes the changes to the conventional coal cleaning model. A detailed description of the conventional coal cleaning model is contained in Reference (1). Figures 2-9 - 2-11 show the schematic diagrams for coal cleaning plants of levels 2, 3 and 4. The subscript “i” in this section refers to the coarse, medium or fine streams of the coal cleaning plant.

### 2.9.2 Level 4 Plant Cost

After reviewing the economics for a level four plant, several cost coefficients were modified to more accurately represent level four plants that use hydrocyclones. These changes are minor and do not change the cost of cleaning a given coal significantly. The new cost coefficients were modified for the direct capital cost, chemicals, electricity and water are:

$$DCC_4 = 45,700$$

$$c_4 = 0.065$$

$$e_4 = 0.158$$

$$w_4 = 0.0041$$

### 2.9.3 Moisture Content of Cleaned Coal

Another improvement to the coal cleaning model is that it now more accurately calculates the moisture content of the cleaned and refuse coal. Previously the model did not explicitly calculate the moisture content of the cleaned or refuse coal and it did not adjust the final quality of the coal to account for the thermal drier. These assumptions made the model less sensitive to the effects of the different moisture content associated with different size wash streams.

The revised model assumes that the total moisture content of the raw coal is composed of two components: the inherent moisture and the surface moisture. The inherent moisture is assumed to

remained constant even if the coal is washed or thermally dried. The surface moisture of the coal changes if it is washed or thermally dried. The model requires that the surface moisture associated with each wash stream be entered as an input parameter. The value should be typical of the surface moisture associated with the wash size stream after it has been through mechanical dewatering. In other words, as the wash stream size decreases the surface moisture should increase. For example, 28x0 mesh coal would have a surface moisture of approximately 20%, while 1.375"x0.25" would have a value of approximately 4%.

The total moisture content of each wash stream is equal to the inherent moisture content of the raw coal plus the surface moisture of either the wash stream (if the stream was washed) or the raw coal Equation.

If  $Y_i < 1$  then

$$m'_i = m'_{iROM} + ms'_i$$

else

$$m'_i = m'_{iROM} + ms'_{iROM}$$

To calculate the average properties of the coal entering the thermal drier, the fraction of coal to be thermally dried needs to be determined. Equation (2.56) calculates the weight fraction of the coal exiting the washing equipment, while Equation (2.57) calculates the fraction of coal to be thermally dried. The input parameter,  $\delta_i$ , is used to determine which streams should be thermally dried. It is set to 1 if the stream is to be thermally dried; otherwise, it is 0. This allows any combination of wash streams to be sent to the thermal drier.

$$fs_{c,i} = \frac{fs_{ROM,i} Y_i}{Y_p} \quad (2.56)$$

$$fs_d = \sum_{i=1}^3 fs_{c,i} \delta_i \quad (2.57)$$

The surface moisture associated with a wash stream,  $ms'_i$ , is an input parameter. Equations (2.58) and (2.59) show the equations for the average moisture content and higher heating value of the coal entering the thermal drier.

$$m'_{in} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{m'_i fs_{c,i} \delta_i}{(1 - m'_i)}}{\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{fs_{c,i} \delta_i}{(1 - m'_i)}} \quad (2.58)$$

$$HHV_d = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 HHV_i fs_{c,i} \delta_i}{fs_d} \quad (2.59)$$

The moisture content of the refuse streams is equal to the inherent moisture content of the raw coal plus surface moisture associated with the washed streams. Therefore, the average moisture content of the refuse coal is estimated with the equation below.

$$m'_{\text{ref}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{(m'_{\text{ROM}} + m s'_i)(1 - Y_i) f s_{\text{ROM},i}}{(1 - m'_{\text{ROM}} - m s'_i)}}{\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{(1 - Y_i) f s_{\text{ROM},i}}{(1 - m'_{\text{ROM}} - m s'_i)}}$$

With the moisture content and higher heating value of the coal entering the thermal drier determined, it is possible to calculate the performance of the thermal drier. Since the model explicitly calculates the moisture content of the coal entering the thermal drier,  $m'_{\text{in}}$ , it is possible for that coal to be drier than the specified moisture content of the coal exiting the thermal drier,  $m'_{\text{out}}$ . Thus, the thermal drier is used only if the coal entering the drier has a moisture content above a certain level. If the thermal drier is not used the thermal drier yield is set to 100 percent and the fraction of coal dried and water evaporated are set to zero. If it is used the fraction of coal dried is calculated with Equation (2.57) and the other parameters are calculated as follows.

$$m'_{\text{out}} = m'_{\text{ROM}} + m s'_{\text{out}}$$

If  $m'_{\text{in}} < m'_{\text{out}}$  then

$$w' = 0.0$$

$$E_d = 0.0$$

$$\text{LHV} = 0.0$$

$$Y_d = 1.0$$

$$Y_{o_d} = 1.0$$

(2.60)

$$w'_e = 0.0$$

$$f s_d = 0.0$$

$$\delta_t = 0$$

else

$$w' = \frac{m'_{\text{in}} - m'_{\text{out}}}{(1 - m'_{\text{in}})(1 - m'_{\text{out}})}$$

$$E_d = \frac{1020 m'}{\eta_d}$$

$$\text{LHV} = 0.96 \text{ HHV}_d - \frac{1020 m'_{\text{out}}}{(1 - m'_{\text{out}})}$$



$$Y_d = 1 - \frac{E_d}{LHV}$$

$$Y_{O_d} = (1 - f_{S_d}) + f_{S_d} Y_d \quad (2.61)$$

$$w'_e = \frac{w' m_o f_{S_d}}{Y_{O_d}}$$

The ratio of the coal exiting the washing equipment to the coal leaving the plant is defined by Equation (2.60) or (2.61). This parameter is needed to calculate the amount of coal leaving the wash streams based on the out capacity of the plant.

The thermal drier does not change the quality of the coals. It does change the weight fraction of coal in each stream. Therefore, the mass yield and weight fraction of each stream must be adjusted to account for the losses of water and coal in thermal drier. At this point it is more appropriate to describe the drier yield by individual stream though the streams to be dried are combined before entering the thermal drier and the yield is the same across both streams.

If  $\delta_i = 1$  then

$$Y_{d,i} = Y_d$$

else

$$Y_{d,i} = 1$$

With the thermal drier yield described as above, the weight fraction and mass yield of each stream can be calculated as follows:

$$f_{S_{o,i}} = \frac{f_{S_{c,i}} \delta_i}{Y_{O_d}}$$

$$Y_{t,i} = Y_i Y_{d,i}$$

Figure 2-9: Schematic Diagram of a Level 2 Conventional Coal Cleaning Plant




Figure 2-10: Schematic Diagram of a Level 3 Conventional Coal Cleaning Plant





Figure 2-11: Schematic Diagram of a Level 4 Conventional Coal Cleaning Plant



With the new weight fraction data it is possible to calculate the quality of the coal leaving the coal cleaning plant. The moisture content of the final product depends on whether any stream was thermally dried. From this, the higher heating value, ash and sulfur content on a wet basis can be calculated with the equations shown below.

If  $\delta_i = 1$  then

$$m'_{o,i} = m'_{out}$$

else

$$m'_{o,i} = m'_{in,i}$$

$$m'_o = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{m'_{o,i} f_{s_{o,i}}}{1 - m'_{o,i}}}{\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{f_{s_{o,i}}}{1 - m'_{o,i}}}$$

$$HHV_o = \sum_{i=1}^3 (1 - m'_{o,i})^3 HHV_{o,i} f_{s_{o,i}}$$

$$A_o = \sum_{i=1}^3 (1 - m'_{o,i})^3 A_{o,i} f_{s_{o,i}}$$

$$S_o = \sum_{i=1}^3 (1 - m'_{o,i})^3 S_{o,i} f_{s_{o,i}}$$

The quality of the final product after the thermal drier may differ slightly from the target quality specified because the optimization algorithm is based on dry coal properties. The difference should not be very large since the thermal drier usually has a mass yield well above 98%. Also note, that if all the streams are picked to be thermally dried, the model will only attempt to dry coal if the moisture content exceeds a specified value.

### 3 COPPER OXIDE PROCESS MODEL

#### 3.1 Nomenclature

a	Slope of linear approximation of enthalpy function (Btu/lb•mole •R)
A	reactor cross-sectional area, m <sup>2</sup>
b	Intercept of linear approximation of enthalpy function (Btu/lb•mole •R)
C <sub>o</sub>	initial CuO content, kg CuO/kg Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>
C <sub>pavg</sub>	Heat capacity (Btu•R)
D	fluidized bed (expanded) density, kg Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> /m <sup>3</sup>
E	activation energy, KJ/gmole
F	sorbent feed rate, kg Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> /hr
F <sub>f</sub>	frequency factor, 1/hr
G	molar volume of gas at reaction temperature, m <sup>3</sup> /kgmole
h <sub>i</sub>	Enthalpy of i (Btu/lb•mole •R)
k	reaction rate constant, 1/hr
M	molecular weight of CuO, kg/kgmole
m <sub>j</sub>	mass flow rate of j, lb/hr
M <sub>j</sub>	Molar flow rate of j, lb•mole/hr
MW <sub>j</sub>	molecular weight of j, lb/lb•mole
p	fractional partial pressure of SO <sub>2</sub> at absorber outlet
p <sub>o</sub>	fractional partial pressure of SO <sub>2</sub> at absorber inlet
Q <sub>reac</sub>	Total energy released or absorbed by reaction (Btu/hr)
Q <sub>total</sub>	Total energy entering device including Q <sub>reac</sub> (Btu/hr)
r	Molar ratio of sulfur dioxide entering absorber to available copper
R	universal gas constant, 0.008314 KJ/(gmole-K)
R <sub>c</sub>	ratio of the molecular weights of Cu and CuO
T	absolute reaction temperature, K
V <sub>o</sub>	inlet flue gas volumetric flow rate, m <sup>3</sup> /hr
x <sub>Cu</sub>	weight fraction of available copper in sorbent (kg Cu/kg fresh sorbent)
Z	expanded bed depth, m.
η <sub>r</sub>	regeneration efficiency, fraction

#### Subcategories

Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Alumina substrate
Cu	Copper
CuO	Copper Oxide
CuSO <sub>4</sub>	Copper sulfate
s	Sorbent
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide


#### 3.2 Introduction

This chapter describes improvements to the copper oxide process model relative to the original formulation (1). The areas that were modified are the sulfation reaction algorithm in the absorber the enthalpy functions used to calculate the temperatures of various streams and the energy captured by the air preheater. The sulfation reaction algorithm is described below in Section 3.3. The new enthalpy functions and the heats of reactions are described in Section 2.2, while the changes in the copper oxide model caused by the new enthalpy functions are described

---

in Section 3.4. The algorithms that determined the energy captured by the air preheater are described in Section 2.4. A schematic diagram of the copper oxide process is shown in Figure 3-1.

**Figure 3-1:** Schematic Diagram of the Copper Oxide Process





### 3.3 Sulfation Reaction Algorithm

The revised model for the copper oxide process determines the copper-to-sulfur ratio using a sulfation reaction algorithm developed by PETC (14) instead of an equation based on the regression analysis of experimental data. The new algorithm accounts for available copper oxide initially resident in the fluidized bed, the molar ratio of sulfur oxides to inlet available copper and incomplete regeneration of the sorbent. The derivation is given below.

The sorbent flow rate is a key parameter that affects the mass and energy balances, sizing and cost of most components of the copper oxide process. The sorbent entering the fluidized bed absorber includes regenerated copper oxide and unregenerated copper sulfate. The required flow rate of copper oxide, also referred to as available copper, is determined based on the copper-to-sulfur (Cu/S) molar ratio required to meet the emission control requirement and the amount of sulfur oxides in the flue gas. This rate is given by.

$$m_{\text{CuO}} = \frac{\text{MW}_{\text{CuO}}}{r} M_{\text{SO}_2} \quad (3.1)$$

The amount of unregenerated copper sulfate entering the absorber is given by

$$m_{\text{CuSO}_4} = \left[ \text{MW}_{\text{CuSO}_4} \left( \frac{\eta_s}{\eta_r} \right) (1 - \eta_r) \right] M_{\text{SO}_2}$$

The total sorbent mass flow rate, including copper oxide, copper sulfate and the alumina substrate, is given by

$$m_s = \left( \frac{\text{MW}_{\text{CuO}}}{X_{\text{Cu}}} \right) (M_{\text{CuO}} + M_{\text{CuSO}_4} (1 + 1.260 X_{\text{Cu}}))$$

The available Cu/S molar ratio,  $1/r$ , required to achieve a specified  $\text{SO}_2$  reduction requirement is estimated based on a first-order sulfation reaction kinetics model developed by PETC (14). The fractional partial pressure of  $\text{SO}_2$  exiting the absorber can be estimated by

$$p = \frac{\left( 1 - \frac{p_o V_o M}{G F C_o} \right) p_o}{\exp \left[ \frac{k D A G Z C_o}{M V_o} \left( 1 - \frac{p_o V_o M}{G F C_o} \right) \right] - \frac{p_o V_o M}{G F C_o}} \quad (3.2)$$

The terms on the right-hand side of the model may be redefined as follows

$$r = \frac{p_o V_o M}{G F C_o} = \frac{\text{Inlet SO}_2, \text{kgmole/hr}}{\text{Inlet CuO, kgmole/hr}} \quad (3.3)$$

$$B = k \left( \frac{k D A G Z C_o}{M V_o} \right) = k \left( \frac{\text{kgmole CuO in fluidized bed}}{\text{kgmole/hr flue gas flow rate}} \right) \quad (3.4)$$

Equation (3.3) is the inverse of the available copper-to-sulfur molar ratio. Equation (3.4) is the ratio of the copper oxide resident in the bed to the incoming flue gas molar flowrate, multiplied by the reaction rate constant. Equation (3.2) may be rewritten in terms of Equations (3.3) and (3.4) and the SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency as follows

$$\eta_{\text{SO}_2} = \frac{p_o - p}{p_o} = \frac{\exp[B(1-r)] - 1}{\exp[B(1-r)] - r} \quad (3.5)$$

This is a convenient formulation if we wish to calculate the removal efficiency when regeneration efficiency is 100 percent and B and r are known. However, more typically, we desire to calculate the value of r required to meet a specified removal efficiency, for arbitrary regeneration efficiencies.

The PETC algorithm accounts for two main effects: (1) the amount of available copper oxide initially resident in the fluidized bed per unit molar gas flow, B, and (2) the molar ratio of sulfur oxides to inlet available copper, r. However, the PETC algorithm neglects the regeneration efficiency of the sorbent. When regeneration of the sorbent is complete, the available copper content, C<sub>o</sub>, will be the same as the sorbent copper loading. However, in the more likely case where regeneration is incomplete, the available copper will be less than the sorbent copper loading. Since incomplete regeneration reduces the amount of available copper entering the absorber compared to fresh sorbent, by that reducing the sulfur absorption efficiency, the PETC model was modified explicitly to include the effect of regeneration efficiency on the Cu/S ratio requirement. Thus, an expression for C<sub>o</sub> was developed that includes regeneration efficiency as a parameter.

The mass flow of the alumina substrate is given by the difference between the total sorbent mass flow rate and the mass flow rates of copper oxide and copper sulfate in the sorbent.

$$m_{\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3} = \left\{ \frac{\text{MW}_{\text{Cu}}}{x_{\text{Cu}}} \left[ \frac{1}{r} + \left( \frac{\eta_{\text{SO}_2}}{\eta_r} \right) (1 - \eta_r) (1 + 1.260 x_{\text{Cu}}) \right] - \frac{\text{MW}_{\text{CuO}}}{r} - M_{\text{CuSO}_4} \left( \frac{\eta_{\text{SO}_2}}{\eta_r} \right) (1 - \eta_r) \right\} M_{\text{SO}_2} \quad (3.6)$$

The mass ratio of the available copper (copper oxide) to the alumina oxide substrate, C<sub>o</sub>, is then given by the ratio of Equations (3.1) and (3.6). After expanding and then collecting terms and approximating the ratio of the molecular weights of copper sulfate to copper oxide to be 2, rather than 2.006, the following expression results.

$$C_o = \frac{x_{\text{Cu}}}{(\text{R}_c - x_{\text{Cu}}) \left[ 1 + r \left( \frac{\eta_{\text{SO}_2}}{\eta_r} \right) (1 - \eta_r) \right]} \quad (3.7)$$

In the limit where the regeneration efficiency is 100 percent, Equation (3.7) reduces to

$$C_o = \frac{x_{\text{Cu}}}{(\text{R}_c - x_{\text{Cu}})}$$


---

However, when regeneration is less than complete, the weight ratio of actual copper oxide to alumina substrate is shown to depend on the sulfur-to-available-copper molar ratio,  $r$ , the sulfur dioxide removal efficiency and the weight percent copper in fresh sorbent.

Substituting Equation (3.7) into (3.4) and then substituting the resulting equation into (3.5) we obtain the following expression.

$$\eta_s = \frac{\exp\left\{\alpha \left[ \frac{1-r}{1+r \left( \frac{\eta_{SO_2}}{\eta_r} \right) (1-\eta_r)} \right]\right\} - 1}{\exp\left\{\alpha \left[ \frac{1-r}{1+r \left( \frac{\eta_{SO_2}}{\eta_r} \right) (1-\eta_r)} \right]\right\} - r} \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{k D A G Z}{M V_o} \left( \frac{x_{Cu}}{R_c - x_{Cu}} \right) \quad (3.9)$$

In most applications, we wish to solve Equation (3.8) for  $r$  as a function of  $\eta_s$ . However, an interactive numerical technique is required to obtain the solution. Newton's method is very effective and convergences within four iterations.

The rate constant used in Equation (3.9) is estimated as follows

$$k = Ff \exp\left(-\frac{E}{R T}\right)$$


The equation above is the reaction rate constant as a function of frequency factor, activation energy and temperature. The activation energy of a UOP copper oxide sorbent is reported to be 20.1 KJ/gmole (15).

PETC report three values of the frequency factor as a function of the sorbent copper loading in terms of the percent copper in fresh sorbent (14). An equation for the frequency factor was developed using regression analysis. The three data points show a non-linear relationship between frequency factor and sorbent copper loading. The following equation was found to provide good agreement with the data.

$$Ff = 94,400 10^{-6.18x_{Cu}} \quad R^2 = 0.998$$

In the above equation, the sorbent copper loading is the weight fraction of copper as copper oxide in the sorbent, to maintain consistency with the model.

Figure 3-2 shows model predictions for the copper-to-sulfur molar ratio based on experimental data by PETC (14). The model is a function of eight variables, each of that is subject to measurement error. Thus, scatter in the plotted data is expected. The scatter in the predicted Cu/S ratio can be represented statistically by a standard error, which is an indicator of the variance in the observed Cu/S ratio that is not explained by the analytical model.

**Figure 3-2:** Comparison of Experimental and Predicted Copper-to-Sulfur Ratio

### 3.4 Enthalpy Functions

In the original copper oxide model described in Reference (1), the enthalpy functions were approximated with linear equations. In the current copper oxide model, the enthalpy functions are approximated with polynomial equations, which are described in Section 2.2. This change increases the accuracy of the energy balances in the model. However, it modifies the equations used to determine the energy difference of a stream between two temperatures, the heat capacity of a stream and the temperature of a stream exiting a device. Any energy difference between two known temperatures in the current model is found by using the new enthalpy functions. Any heat capacity in the current model is found using the form (3.16). The change in the algorithm to determine the temperature of a stream exiting a device is described below.

Since the enthalpy functions were linear, the temperature of a stream exiting a device could be determined explicitly. For example, Figure 3-3 shows two streams with known temperatures entering a device and undergoing an exothermic reaction. The energy balance of the device is shown in Equation (3.10). If the enthalpy functions are of the form shown in Equation (3.11), then Equation (3.10) can be solved for the exit temperature as shown in Equation (3.12).

$$M_1 h_1(T_1) + M_2 h_2(T_2) + Q_{\text{reac}} = M_3 h_3(T_3) \quad (3.10)$$

$$h(T) = a T + b \quad (3.11)$$

$$T_3 = \frac{M_1 [a_1 T_1 + b_1] + M_2 [a_2 T_2 + b_2] + Q_{\text{reac}}}{M_3 a_3} - \frac{b_3}{a_3} \quad (3.12)$$

In the current copper oxide model, the enthalpy functions are of the form shown in Equation (3.13)<sup>12</sup>. Because of the form of the enthalpy functions, Equation (3.10) cannot be solved for the exit temperature explicitly. Instead a two step iteration replaces the equations in the original copper oxide model which determined temperatures from an energy balance. In the first step, an initial estimate of the temperature is made using Equation (3.14)<sup>13</sup>. For the second step, the exit temperature is determined with Equation (3.15). In Equation (3.15), the inlet stream that has the greatest effect on the exit temperature is used for  $T_1$ . This two step iteration is very accurate for a variety of cases studies.

$$h(T_R) = AT_R + \frac{Be^{-3}T_R^2}{3.6} - \frac{3.24Ce^5}{T_R} + \frac{De^{-6}T_R^3}{9.72} - 1.8H_{298.15} \quad (3.13)$$

$$T_{\text{guess}} = \frac{M_1 h_1(T_1) T_1 + M_2 h_2(T_2) T_2}{M_1 h_1(T_1) + M_2 h_2(T_2)} \left( 1 + \frac{Q_{\text{reac}}}{Q_{\text{total}}} \right) \quad (3.14)$$


$$T_3 = \frac{Q_{\text{total}} - M_3 h_3(T_1)}{C_{p3,\text{avg}}} + T_1 \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$Q_{\text{total}} = M_1 h_1(T_1) + M_2 h_2(T_2) + Q_{\text{reac}}$$

$$C_{p3,\text{avg}} = \frac{M_3 [h_3(T_{\text{guess}}) - h_3(T_1)]}{T_{\text{guess}} - T_1} \quad (3.16)$$

**Figure 3-3:** Typical Device in Copper Oxide Process



<sup>12</sup> The constants A, B, C, D, and  $H_{298.15}$  are given in Table 2.3.

<sup>13</sup> In the current copper oxide model, the temperature of the flue gas exiting the absorber is determined with Equation (3.14), since the correction determined by Equation (3.15) is insignificant.

## 4 NOXSO PROCESS MODEL

### 4.1 Nomenclature

#### English Letter Symbols

$A_k$	area of device, k (ft <sup>2</sup> )
$C_{\text{catagorie}}$	capital charges associated with startup (\$)
$C_{\text{idx}}$	chemical engineering cost index
$C_o$	molar gas concentration of SO <sub>2</sub> in the flue gas entering the adsorber (lb•mole/ft <sup>3</sup> )
CF	capacity factor of power plant (fraction)
$DCC_k$	capital cost for device, k (M\$)
$e^{\#}$	notation for specifying power of 10.
$E_{j,k}$	energy flow rate of specie, j, at device, k (lb•mole/hr)
$EC_k$	electricity consumption of the device, k (kW)
$f_{\text{makeup}}$	attrition rate of sorbent (fraction)
$f_{j,\text{wet air}}$	amount of specie, j, in ambient moist air (fraction)
$f_{p,j,k}$	quantity of specie, j, produced in device, k (fraction)
$F_{\text{oil}}$	constant used to estimate amount of sulfur from oil (fraction)
FOC	fixed operating cost (\$/yr)
$G_k$	gas flow rate for device, k (ft <sup>3</sup> /min)
$j,\text{temperature}$	molar enthalpy of specie, j, at specified temperature (Btu/lb•mole)
H	fluidized bed height in adsorber (ft)
HHV <sub>j</sub>	higher heating value of specie, j, (Btu/lb)
HR	heat rate of power plant (kW-Hr/MBtu)
i	inflation rate (fraction)
$K_a$	apparent rate constant (atm <sup>-1</sup> sec <sup>-1</sup> )
$LMTD_k$	log mean temperature difference of device, k (°F)
$m_j$	mass flow of specie, j, (lbs/hr or tons/hr)
$M'_{j,k}$	molar flow rate of specie, j, for device, k (lb•mole/hr)
$M'_j$	Pound mole per pound of coal entering furnace of species, j. (lb•mole/lb coal)
$MW_g$	gross electrical capacity of power plant (MW)
$N_t$	initial loading of the active Na on sorbent (lb•mole/lb)
NOP	number of operating adsorbers
NRD	number of spare adsorbers
$OC_{\text{catagorie}}$	annual operating cost (\$/yr)
$Q_k$	heat load across heat exchanger device, k (Btu/hr)
p	interest rate (fraction)
$P_k$	pressure of the device, k (" water or atm)
$RT_k$	residence time of sorbent in device, k (hours)
R	Ratio of SO <sub>2</sub> removal efficiency to NO <sub>x</sub> removal efficiency (fraction)
$T_{s,j,k}$	temperature of specie, j, for the device, k (°F)
TCC	total capital cost (\$)
TPC	total plant cost (\$)
TPI	total plant investment (\$)
TDC	total direct cost (\$)
TVC	total operating and maintenance cost, sum of FOC and VOC (\$/yr)
$U_k$	universal heat transfer coefficient for device, k (Btu/hr-ft <sup>2</sup> °F)
$UC_j$	unit cost of specie, j, (\$/unit)
$U_{tj}$	utilization constant for specie, j, in regenerator (fraction)

---

V	superficial velocity of flue gas through adsorber (ft/sec)
VOC	variable operating cost (\$/yr)
$W_{Na}$	weight fraction of sodium to sorbent (fraction)
X	mean value of the fractional conversion of the sorbent in the entire adsorber (fraction)
y	molar fraction of SO <sub>2</sub> in the flue gas (fraction)

### Greek Letter Symbols

$\delta_{NO_x}$	fraction of NO <sub>x</sub> returned to boiler that is destroyed (fraction)
$\bullet H_k$	heat of reaction in device, k (Btu/hr)
$\eta_{j,k}$	efficiency of device, k (fraction)
$\lambda$	molar stoichiometry of SO <sub>2</sub> to active sorbent
$\rho_{sorb}$	bulk density of sorbent (lbs/ft <sup>3</sup> )

### Subscripts

1	specifies the first part or half a device, k
guess	used to indicate the guess of a value in the interpolating algorithms
i	stands for inlet
j,k	used in sums to specify equipment or species.
o	stands for outlet
std	emission standard for either SO <sub>x</sub> or NO <sub>x</sub>

### Species:

acid	sulfuric acid
air	air
ash	ash
c	combustion air for gas burner not including air needed to maintain maximum temperature
CD	carbon dioxide
CM	carbon monoxide
CS	carbon oxide sulfide, COS
ex	excess air for the gas burner needed to maintain temperature
H	hydrogen, H <sub>2</sub>
HS	hydrogen sulfide, H <sub>2</sub> S
M	methane, CH <sub>4</sub>
makeup	makeup sorbent
N	nitrogen, N <sub>2</sub>
NO	nitrogen oxide, NO
ND	nitrogen dioxide, NO <sub>2</sub>
O	oxygen, O <sub>2</sub>
st	steam
sorb	sorbent
S	sulfur, S <sub>2</sub>
SC	sulfur compounds, includes COS, H <sub>2</sub> S, S <sub>2</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> and SO <sub>3</sub>
SD	sulfur dioxide, SO <sub>2</sub>
SOX	sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide
ST	sulfur trioxide, SO <sub>3</sub>
W	water, H <sub>2</sub> O

### Equipment:

aph	air preheater
AD	adsorber
AH	air heater for sorbent heater

AP	acid plant
B	boiler of power plant
GB	gas burner
R	regenerator
R&S	regenerator and steam treatment vessel
SC	sorbent cooler
SH	sorbent heater
STV	steam treatment vessel

#### Categories for capital and operating cost:

acid	acid plant
admin	support and administration labor
credit	income from sale of sulfuric acid
eng	engineering and home office fees
gf	general facilities
inv	inventory capital
maint-labor	maintenance labor
maint-matl	maintenance material
makeup	makeup catalyst due to attrition loss
marketing	marketing and shipping charges for selling sulfuric acid
misc	royalty and land charges
oper	operating labor
proc	process contingency
proj	project contingency
startup	startup charges for one month
work	working capital

## 4.2 Introduction

This chapter describes improvements to the NOXSO process model originally developed by Barrett (1). Most of these changes have been reported in previous reports to PETC. (16, 17). Other minor improvements change how sulfur from the air heater is handled and modify Equations (4.1), (4.2), (4.3), (4.7) and (4.8). Another improvement couples the SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiencies in the absorber by an input parameter, R. This change modifies Equations (4.4) and (4.5).

The basic NOXSO model is based on designs by NOXSO Corporation (18-21) and Stearns-Rogers (22). The design of the process has changed over time to incorporate other potential improvements. The current process design for this model is based on a study for EPRI (22), with one modification suggested by NOXSO Corp (23), i.e., using methane as the reducing gas instead of synthesis gas produced from a Texaco Coal Gasification System.

The NOXSO process is intended to remove over 90 percent of the SO<sub>x</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from the flue gas of a coal-fired power plant. The pollutants are adsorbed onto a sodium coated alumina sorbent in a fluidized bed reactor. The sorbent is regenerated producing various sulfur compounds and NO<sub>x</sub>. The NO<sub>x</sub> and some SO<sub>x</sub> are returned to the boiler, while the remaining sulfur compounds are sent either to a sulfuric acid or Claus plant. The NO<sub>x</sub> returned to the boiler is expected to decompose partially into nitrogen leading to a steady-state NO<sub>x</sub> concentration.

A proposed process diagram is shown in Figure 4-1. There are four major mass flows in the NOXSO process: (1) the sorbent recirculation stream, (2) the regenerator off-gas sent to the acid



plant, (3) the sorbent heater gas stream containing  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_x$  returned to the boiler and (4) the combustion/flue gas stream. This process diagram differs from the one used for the initial model developed by Barrett (1) in the following ways:

- oil is used instead of coal in the sorbent heater
- the cyclone in front of the adsorber has been removed
- methane is used for the reducing gas
- the adsorber by-pass option has been removed


Figure 4-1 is best understood by examining each major mass flow separately. The first mass flow is the sorbent stream. The sorbent entering the adsorber contains some residual sulfur compounds. The sorbent removes  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_x$  from the flue gas while raising the temperature of the flue gas. When inside the sorbent heater, it releases all the  $\text{NO}_x$  and about 8 to 10 percent of the  $\text{SO}_x$  in the sorbent. The sorbent then enters the regenerator where methane (or another reducing gas) is used to remove additional  $\text{SO}_x$  in the sorbent. After the regenerator, the sorbent enters the steam treatment vessel where steam is used to removed most of the remaining sulfur compounds. Finally, the sorbent is cooled and makeup sorbent is added before it is returned to the adsorber.

The second major mass stream is the off gas from the regenerator. This gas stream is critical to the cost and performance of the acid plant, since its composition can drastically affect the cost of the sulfur recovery system. Its composition depends on the type and quantity of reducing gas used and the design of the regenerator and steam treatment vessels. In communications with NOXSO Corporation they have suggested that these two vessels be replaced with a single vessel.

The third major stream is the air stream used to heat and cool the sorbent and to return the  $\text{NO}_x$  (and some  $\text{SO}_x$ ) to the boiler. Recent tests have indicated that approximately 65% of the  $\text{NO}_x$  returned to the boiler is decomposed (24). This air stream also contains a significant amount of oxygen, so it is used to reduce the amount of combustion air entering the air preheater. This gas stream enters the sorbent cooler where it is heated by cooling the sorbent to approximately 210 °F. Then it enters the sorbent heater where it picks up the  $\text{NO}_x$  and some  $\text{SO}_x$ . After leaving the sorbent heater it mixes with combustion air and enters the boiler.

The last mass flow is the combustion/flue gas stream. The inlet air passes through the air preheater and picks up the gas stream exiting the sorbent heater. This gas stream contains  $\text{NO}_x$ ,  $\text{SO}_x$  and the products of combustion from the air heater, plus air used to heat and cool the sorbent. The inlet gas entering the air preheater is reduced in proportion to the amount of oxygen entering this stream. The  $\text{SO}_x$  comes from the sorbent heater and the combustion of #6 fuel oil. This combined gas stream enters the boiler where some  $\text{NO}_x$  decomposes. After the boiler it passes through the air preheater, where it picks up additional air leaking across air preheater. After the air preheater, the flue gas is cooled by adding water. It then enters the adsorber, where most of the  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_x$  are removed by the sorbent. The cleaned flue gas picks up the attrition particles of the sorbent and enters the fabric filter. Here, particulate matter is removed before the gas is vented to the atmosphere.

**Figure 4-1:** NOXSO Process Diagram



The adsorption and regeneration chemistry of  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_x$  are explained in detailed in many reports cited earlier, so only a brief summary will be given here.  $\text{SO}_x$  is adsorbed onto both the sodium and alumina substrate and is dependent on several parameters:

- Sorbent flow rate
- Available sodium on sorbent
- Oxygen content of flue gas
- $\text{NO}_x$  concentration
- Steam concentration
- Degree of dehydration on the sorbent surface
- Temperature of sorbent

The adsorption of  $\text{NO}_x$  is dependent on the temperatures and flow rates of sorbent,  $\text{SO}_x$ , steam, oxygen and the type of reducing gas used. It has been found that increasing the temperature decreases  $\text{NO}_x$  removal, while using methane for regeneration of  $\text{SO}_2$  improves the  $\text{NO}_x$  removal efficiency.

The regeneration of  $\text{SO}_x$  is a multi-step process. The first step is to heat the sorbent to approximately 1000°F, where approximately 8 - 10% of the sulfur compounds and all the  $\text{NO}_x$  are released. The next step is to treat the sorbent with a reducing gas that releases COS,  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ ,  $\text{S}_2$  and  $\text{SO}_2$ . These gases are sent to the acid plant. Finally the sorbent is treated with steam to convert as many sulfites to  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  as possible.  $\text{NO}_x$  is regenerated by heating the sorbent to 1000°F.

### 4.3 Performance Model

The primary purpose of the process performance model is to characterize the major flow rates defined in the previous section and to predict the  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_x$  removal efficiencies in the adsorber. The NOXSO process recycles some  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_2$  removed by the adsorber. This requires the adsorber to have a removal efficiency higher than the efficiency required by the emission standards. The recycled  $\text{SO}_2$  comes from the sorbent heater and the acid plant, while another source of  $\text{SO}_2$  is the air heater. The  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiencies are also linked. For all the NOXSO designs proposed, the adsorber temperature has remained approximately the same, 250°F. At this temperature the  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiencies are the same. Therefore, our current model assumes a bed temperature of 250°F and that the ratio of the  $\text{NO}_x$  removal efficiency to  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency is given by a constant input parameter, R. The following procedure is then used to determine the sorbent flow rate:


- The required  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2}$ , in the adsorber needed to meet the emission standard is determined. It includes the effects of recycled  $\text{SO}_2$  and  $\text{SO}_2$  from the air heater.
- The required  $\text{NO}_x$  removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{NO}_x}$ , in the adsorber needed to meet the emission standard is determined. It includes the effects of recycled  $\text{NO}_x$  and the  $\text{NO}_x$  'destroyed' in the boiler.
- If R is less than or equal to 1, the actual  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2,A}$ , is the maximum of either  $\eta_{\text{NO}_x} / R$  or  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2}$ .
- If R is greater than 1, the actual  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2,A}$ , is the maximum of either  $\eta_{\text{NO}_x}$  or  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2} * R$ .
- The actual  $\text{NO}_x$  removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{NO}_x,A}$ , is  $\eta_{\text{SO}_2,A} * R$ .

Figure 4-2 shows a simplified diagram of the flow of sulfur compounds through the NOXSO process. It should be noted that the steam treatment vessel and the regenerator have been lumped together. The sulfur dioxide from the oil burned in the air heater is dependent on the sorbent flow rate, which depends on the sulfur removal efficiency in the adsorber. Since this is an iterative problem, the approach taken is to increase the removal of the sulfur dioxide in the absorber by a constant. This constant is called the oil factor and usually is about 1% of the sulfur from the coal. Because the  $\text{SO}_2$  emission standard remains the same, all the sulfur from the oil must exit the process as acid. The performance of the NOXSO process is not very sensitive to the value of the

oil factor, so it is not necessary to estimate this value precisely. The following efficiencies are either known or assumed:

- $\text{SO}_x$  emission standard and removal efficiency,  $\eta_{\text{std}}$
- fraction of sulfur retained in bottom ash,  $\eta_{\text{ash}}$
- fraction of sulfur compounds not released in the sorbent heater,  $\eta_{\text{SH}}$
- fraction of sulfur compounds regenerated in the regenerator,  $\eta_{\text{R}}$
- fraction of sulfur compounds regenerated in the steam treatment vessel,  $\eta_{\text{STV}}$
- fraction of sulfur compounds converted to sulfuric acid in acid plant,  $\eta_{\text{AP}}$

**Figure 4-2:** Simplified Diagram of Mass Flows for Sulfur Compounds



The objective is to derive the actual  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency in the adsorber knowing the  $\text{SO}_x$  in the flue gas from the coal, the removal efficiency required by the emission standard and the efficiencies of the sorbent heater, regenerator and the acid plant. It is assumed that none of the  $\text{SO}_2$  returned to the boiler from the sorbent heater is retained in the bottom ash. These mass conservation equations (Equations 4.1) are needed to calculate the apparent and actual  $\text{SO}_x$  removal efficiencies in the adsorber:

$$M_6 = M_8 - M_{11} \qquad M_{12} = \frac{M_{14}}{\eta_{\text{AP}}} \qquad (4.1)$$

$$M_8 = \frac{M_{10}}{\eta_{SH}}$$

$$M_{14} = (\eta_{std} + F_{oil}) M_3$$

$$M_{11} = (1 - \eta_{R\&S}) M_{10}$$

$$M_5 = M_6 + M_7$$

$$M_{10} = \frac{M_{12}}{\eta_{R\&S}}$$

$$M_7 = (1 - \eta_{std}) M_3$$

where  $\eta_{R\&S} = \eta_R + (1 - \eta_R) \eta_{STV}$

The apparent removal efficiency is the  $SO_x$  removed by the adsorber,  $M_6$ , divided by the  $SO_x$  from the coal,  $M_3$ . Substituting for  $M_6$  and simplifying yields Equations 4.2 which determines the apparent removal efficiency based on known values:

$$\eta_{app} = \frac{M_6}{M_3} = \frac{M_8 - M_{11}}{M_3} = \frac{\frac{M_{10}}{\eta_{SH}} - M_{10} (1 - \eta_{R\&S})}{M_3} = \frac{M_{10} (\eta_{R\&S} - 1 + \eta_{SH}^{-1})}{M_3} \quad (4.2)$$

$$\eta_{app} = \frac{M_{12} (\eta_{R\&S} - 1 + \eta_{SH}^{-1})}{M_3 \eta_{R\&S}} = \frac{M_{14} (\eta_{R\&S} - 1 + \eta_{SH}^{-1})}{M_3 \eta_{R\&S} \eta_{AP}} = \frac{M_3 (\eta_{std} + F_{oil}) (\eta_{R\&S} - 1 + \eta_{SH}^{-1})}{M_3 \eta_{R\&S} \eta_{AP}}$$

$$\eta_{app} = \frac{(\eta_{std} + F_{oil}) (\eta_{R\&S} - 1 + \eta_{SH}^{-1})}{\eta_{R\&S} \eta_{AP}}$$

The actual  $SO_2$  removal efficiency in the adsorber is the  $SO_x$  removed,  $M_6$ , divided by the  $SO_x$  entering the adsorber,  $M_5$ . Substituting  $\eta_{app} M_3$  for  $M_6$  and simplifying, yields the actual removal efficiency.

$$\eta_{SOX} = \frac{M_6}{M_5} = \frac{\eta_{app} M_3}{M_6 + M_7} = \frac{\eta_{app} M_3}{\eta_{app} M_3 + (1 - \eta_{std}) M_3} = \frac{\eta_{app}}{\eta_{app} + 1 - \eta_{std}} \quad (4.3)$$


The next step is to determine the  $NO_x$  removal efficiency required by the emission standard (including the effects of recycling  $NO_x$  to the boiler). Figure 4-3 shows a simplified  $NO_x$  flow diagram. The following parameters are known: the  $NO_x$  produced originally,  $M_{16}$ , the emission constraint,  $M_{18}$ , and the fraction of  $NO_x$  “destroyed” in the boiler,  $\delta_{NOX}$ . The actual  $NO_x$  removal efficiency is the  $NO_x$  removed,  $M_{19}$ , divided by the  $NO_x$  entering the adsorber,  $M_{17}$ . Substituting for  $M_4$  and  $M_2$  and simplifying yields:

$$\eta_{\text{NOX}} = \frac{M'_{19}}{M'_{17}} = \frac{M'_{19}}{M'_{16} + (1 - \delta_{\text{NOX}}) M'_{19}} = \frac{\frac{\eta_{\text{NOX}} M'_{18}}{1 - \eta_{\text{NOX}}}}{M'_{16} + \frac{(1 - \delta_{\text{NOX}}) \eta_{\text{NOX}} M'_{18}}{1 - \eta_{\text{NOX}}}} \quad (4.4)$$

Solving the above equation for  $\eta_{\text{NOX}}$  yields

$$\eta_{\text{NOX}} = \frac{M'_{16} - M'_{18}}{M'_{16} - (1 - \delta_{\text{NOX}}) M'_{18}} \quad (4.5)$$

**Figure 4-3:** Simplified Diagram of Mass Flows for  $\text{NO}_x$



NOXSO has reported that the actual  $\text{NO}_x$  removal efficiency is related to the  $\text{SO}_x$  removal efficiency. However, a steady state relationship between  $\eta_{\text{NOX}}$  and the  $\text{SO}_x$  removal efficiency could not be determined from the available data, so this relationship is modeled as an input parameter,  $R$ , which is the ratio of  $\text{NO}_x$  removal efficiency to the actual  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency. Since the actual  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency equals  $R$  times the actual  $\text{NO}_x$  removal efficiency, the actual  $\text{SO}_x$  removal efficiency is chosen so that both the  $\text{SO}_2$  and  $\text{NO}_x$  emission constraints are satisfied. the actual  $\text{NO}_x$  removal efficiency is  $R$  times the actual  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency.

if  $R > 1$  then

$$\eta_{\text{SOX,A}} = \text{maximum}(\eta_{\text{NOX}}, R \eta_{\text{SOX}})$$

else

$$\eta_{\text{SOX,A}} = \text{maximum}(\eta_{\text{NOX}} / R, \eta_{\text{SOX}})$$

$$\eta_{\text{NOX,A}} = R \eta_{\text{SOX,A}} \quad (4.6)$$

With  $\text{NO}_x$  removal efficiency determine, the amount of  $\text{NO}_x$  removed by the adsorber and the  $\text{NO}_x$  entering the adsorber can be determined with the following equations:

$$M_{17} = M_{16} + (1 - \delta_{\text{NOX}}) M_{19} = M_{16} + (1 - \delta_{\text{NOX}}) \eta_{\text{NOX,A}} M_{17} \quad (4.7)$$

$$M_{17} = \frac{M_{16}}{1 - (1 - \delta_{\text{NOX}}) \eta_{\text{NOX,A}}} \quad (4.8)$$

$$M_{19} = \eta_{\text{NOX,A}} M_{17}$$

With the actual  $\text{SO}_x$  removal efficiency in the adsorber known, it is possible to determine the  $\text{SO}_x$  removed by the adsorber and the  $\text{SO}_x$  remaining in the flue gas. Equations 4.6, 4.7 and 4.9 are easily derived from Figure 4-2. The derivation of Equation 4.8 is quite involved and is not presented here. The ratio of sulfur exiting the absorber to the sulfur removed by the absorber is

$$c = \frac{M_6}{M_8} = 1 - (1 - \eta_{\text{R\&S}}) \eta_{\text{SH}} \quad (4.9)$$

$$M_7 = M_5 (1 - \eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{A}})$$

$$M_6 = \frac{M_3 \eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{A}} c (1 + F_{\text{oil}})}{c - \eta_{\text{SO}_2,\text{A}} (1 - \eta_{\text{SH}} + (1 - \eta_{\text{AP}}) \eta_{\text{R\&S}} \eta_{\text{SH}})}$$

$$M_8 = \frac{M_6}{c}$$

The sorbent flow rate is determined by an algorithm developed by NOXSO (24). The numerator in Equation 4.10 is the  $\text{SO}_x$  removed by the adsorber,  $M_6$ .  $\lambda$  is the stoichiometric ratio of sulfur removed to available sodium and is assumed to be unity (23). The parameter  $X$  can be determined by existing algorithms (24).

$$m_{\text{sorb}} = \frac{A_A V C_o (y_i - y_o)}{\lambda N_t X} = \frac{M_6}{\lambda N_t X} \quad (4.10)$$

$$X = \frac{\ln\left(\frac{y_o}{y_i}\right) V}{k_a P H} + 1 = \frac{\ln(1 - \eta_{\text{SOX,A}}) V}{k_a P H} + 1$$

$H$ ,  $K_a$ ,  $P$  and  $\lambda$  are input parameters.  $K_a$  is currently set to 3.7 according to (24), while  $P$  is assumed to be 1 atmosphere.  $N_t$  is the loading of active sorbent material to the weight of sorbent. This can be determined by the following equation:

$$N_t = \frac{w_{\text{Na}}}{23 \eta_{\text{R\&S}}}$$

Once the sorbent flow rate is known, the makeup sorbent rate and the energy required to pump the sorbent can be determined. The makeup sorbent rate is assumed to be a fraction of the

sorbent rate and is an input parameter. Energy to pump the sorbent is assumed to be proportional to the energy estimated in the EPRI report (22):

$$m_{\text{makeup}} = f_{\text{makeup}} m_{\text{sorb}}$$

$$EC_{\text{sorb}} = 1795 \text{ kW} / 1.3486e^6 \text{ lb/hr} * m_{\text{sorb}} = 1.32e^{-3} m_{\text{sorb}}$$

The energy required to raise the sorbent temperature to 1110°F from the exit temperature of the adsorber is simply the difference in enthalpy times the sorbent flow rate. This determines the amount of air needed by the sorbent heater. It is assumed that the air temperature drops from 1280°F to 610°F in the sorbent heater.

$$E_{\text{sorb,SH}} = (h_{\text{sorb}}(1110) - h_{\text{sorb}}(250)) m_{\text{sorb}}$$

$$M_{\text{air,SH}} = \frac{E_{\text{sorb,SH}}}{\hat{h}_{\text{air}}(1,280) - \hat{h}_{\text{air}}(610)}$$

Once the flow rate of the air is determined, the amount of energy needed to heat the air to 1280°F is equal to the energy flow rate of air at 1280°F minus the heat given up in the sorbent cooler minus the energy flow rate of air at 100°F, which is the temperature of the air after the compressor. The sorbent flow rate at the sorbent cooler is approximately 7% less than when it left the adsorber; it is also assumed to drop from 970°F to 210°F.

The energy required to heat the air determines the oil requirement for the air heater. The efficiency of the air heater is an input parameter. The electricity consumption of the compressor is determined by the flow rate of air and the pressure increase, which is assumed to be 84" of water.

$$E_{\text{air,AH}} = \left[ (\hat{h}_{\text{air}}(1280) - \hat{h}_{\text{air}}(100)) \right] M_{\text{air,SH}} - 0.93 \left[ (\hat{h}_{\text{sorb}}(970) - \hat{h}_{\text{sorb}}(210)) \right] m_{\text{sorb}}$$

$$EC_{\text{air,SH}} = \left( \frac{1,545 M_{\text{air,SH}}}{0.75 * 60 * 44,240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2} * 84}{14.687} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (80 + 460)$$

Once the energy requirement to heat the air is known, this determines the oil requirement for the air heater. The efficiency of the air heater is an input parameter and 18% excess air is assumed. With the oil consumption known, the amount of combustion air for the air heater can be determined. The oil is assumed to be a heavy fuel oil, with a higher heating value of 18,400 Btu/lb and the following composition: 87.87% carbon, 10.33% hydrogen, 1.16% sulfur, 0.14% nitrogen and 0.50% oxygen (8). The actual composition is not extremely critical, yet the components are in place in case another fuel, such as coal, is used.

$$m_{\text{oil}} = \frac{E_{\text{air,SH}}}{\text{HHV}_{\text{oil}} \eta_{\text{AH}}}$$



$$m_{\text{air,AH}} = \frac{\left( \frac{0.8787}{12} + \frac{0.1033}{4} + \frac{0.0116}{32} - \frac{0.005}{32} \right) 1.18 m_{\text{oil}}}{f_{\text{O, wet air}}}$$

The amount of steam and methane used in the regenerator and steam treatment vessels can be calculated once the sulfur flow rate exiting the sorbent heater is found. The methane requirement for the regenerator is assumed to be proportional to the sulfur dioxide entering the regenerator. According to NOXSO, approximately 3690 SCFM of methane are needed for 575 lb-moles per hour of sulfur dioxide (25). Also 3.34 moles of steam are needed for each mole of sulfur dioxide entering the steam treatment vessel. The constant converting SCFM to lb-moles/hr is 0.1585 assuming at standard temperature of 58°F.

$$M_{\text{SC,R,i}} = M_{\text{SC,A,o}} \eta_{\text{SH}}$$

$$M_{\text{M,R,i}} = 3690 / 575 * 0.1585 M_{\text{SC,R,i}}$$

$$M_{\text{W,STV,i}} = 3.34 (1 - \eta_{\text{STV}}) M_{\text{SC,R,i}}$$

The utilization of methane and steam and the fractions of SO<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S and S<sub>2</sub> produced in the regenerator are input parameters. It is assumed that there is sufficient oxygen to convert all the carbon in the methane to CO<sub>2</sub>, that no COS is formed and that all only H<sub>2</sub>S and steam are produced in the steam treatment vessels. The moisture content of the regenerator gas is assumed to be the steam not used in the steam treatment vessel plus the hydrogen released when methane is converted to carbon dioxide minus the hydrogen used to form hydrogen sulfide. This gas is sent to either a sulfuric acid plant or an elemental sulfur (Claus) plant.

$$M_{\text{M,R,o}} = (1 - \eta_{\text{R}}) M_{\text{M,R,i}}$$

$$M_{\text{SD,R,o}} = f_{\text{PSD,R}} \eta_{\text{R}} M_{\text{SD,R,i}}$$

$$M_{\text{HS,R,o}} = (f_{\text{PHS,R}} \eta_{\text{R}} + (1 - \eta_{\text{R}}) \eta_{\text{STV}}) M_{\text{SD,R,i}}$$

$$M_{\text{S,R,o}} = (1 - f_{\text{PSD,R}} - f_{\text{PHS,R}}) \eta_{\text{R}} M_{\text{SD,R,i}} / 2$$

$$M_{\text{M,R,o}} = (1 - U_{\text{tM}}) M_{\text{M,R,i}}$$

$$M_{\text{CD,R,o}} = U_{\text{tM}} M_{\text{M,R,i}}$$

$$M_{\text{W,R,o}} = (1 - U_{\text{tW}}) M_{\text{W,STV,i}} + 2M_{\text{CD,R,o}} - f_{\text{PHS,R}} \eta_{\text{R}} M_{\text{SD,R,i}}$$

The next step is to determine the composition of the gas returned to the boiler. This gas stream consists of three other streams. The first is the air used to heat and cool the sorbent, M<sub>air,SH</sub>. The second is the NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>x</sub> picked up by this stream in the sorbent heater. Finally, there is the flue gas from the air heater. The off gas from the acid plant is returned to the flue gas upstream of the adsorber. Since it is a small stream and to simplify the calculations, it is treated as SO<sub>2</sub> returned to the boiler. It is assumed that only SO<sub>2</sub> is returned to the boiler from the sorbent heater, acid plant and air heater. The composition of NO<sub>x</sub> returned to the boiler is assumed to be in the same proportions as that generated in the boiler. The temperature of this gas stream is estimated to be 620°F (22).

$$M_{N,B,i} = f_{N,wet\ air} M_{air,SH} + 0.0014 / 28 M_{oil}$$

$$M_{O,B,i} = f_{O,wet\ air} (M_{air,SH} + 0.18 / 1.18 M_{air,AH})$$

$$M_{W,B,i} = f_{W,wet\ air} (M_{air,SH} + M_{air,AH}) + 0.1033 / 2 M_{oil}$$

$$M_{CD,B,i} = 0.8787 / 12 M_{oil}$$

$$M_{SD,B,i} = [(1 - \eta_{SH}) + (1 - \eta_{AP})\eta_{SH}\eta_{R\&S}] M_{SD,A,o} + 0.0116 / 32 M_{oil}$$

$$M_{NO,B,i} = fp_{NO,B} M_{NOX,A,o}$$

$$M_{ND,B,i} = (1 - fp_{NO,B}) M_{NOX,A,o}$$

Now the inlet combustion air and the composition of the flue gas exiting the boiler can be determined. The oxygen being returned to the boiler reduces the combustion air entering the air preheater. Since the nitrogen and moisture are based on the oxygen content, the only variable which needs to be modified is the oxygen required. See Chapter 2 for more details on how the variables,  $M_{B,i}$ , are determined. Once these parameters are known, the composition of the flue gas exiting the boiler can be determined:

$$M_{O,AP,i} = M_{O,required} - M_{O,B,i}$$

$$M_{CD,B,o} = M_{C,coal} + M_{CD,B,i}$$

$$M_{W,B,o} = M_{W,coal} + M_{W,AP,i} + 0.5 M_{H,coal} + M_{W,B,i}$$

$$M_{SD,B,o} = fp_{SD,B} \eta_{ash} M_{S,coal} + M_{SD,B,i}$$

$$M_{ST,B,o} = (1 - fp_{SD,B}) \eta_{ash} M_{S,coal}$$

$$M_{ND,orig} = \frac{NO_{x,ef} m_{coal}}{46 + \frac{30fp_{NO,B}}{1 - fp_{NO,B}}}$$

$$M_{NO,orig} = \frac{fp_{NO,B} M_{ND,orig}}{1 - fp_{NO,B}}$$

$$M_{ND,B,o} = M_{ND,orig} + (1 - \delta_{NOX}) M_{ND,B,i}$$

$$M_{NO,B,o} = M_{NO,orig} + (1 - \delta_{NOX}) M_{NO,B,i}$$

$$M_{N,B,o} = 0.5 M_{N,coal} + M_{N,AP,i} - 0.5 (M_{NO,orig} + M_{ND,orig}) + M_{N,B,i} + 0.5 M_{NOX,A,o}$$

$$M_{O,B,o} = M_{O,AP,i} + 0.5 M_{O,coal} - M_{C,coal} - 0.25 M_{H,coal} - fp_{SD,B} \eta_{ash} M_{S,coal} - 1.5 M_{ST,B,o} - 0.5 M_{NO,orig} - M_{ND,orig} + M_{O,B,i} + \delta_{NOX} (M_{ND,B,i} + 0.5 M_{NO,B,i})$$

With the flue gas flow rate and combustion air determined, the air preheater model can be used to determine the flue gas temperature leaving the air preheater,  $T_{fg,AP,o}$  and the temperature of the combustion exiting the air preheater,  $T_{air,AP,o}$ . Now the amount of water added to cool the

flue gas to 210°F and the volumetric flow rate into the adsorber can be determined. The water needed to cool the flue gas is the energy loss of the flue gas between the exit temperature of the air preheater and 210°F divided by 20,204 (the energy needed to raise a mole of water from 60°F to 212°F saturated steam). Now the gas flow rate into and exiting the adsorber can be determined:

$$M_{W,fg,added} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^8 (\hat{h}_i(T_{fg,AP,o}) - \hat{h}_i(210))M_{i,fg}}{20,204}$$

$$G_{A,i} = \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^8 M_{i,fg} + M_{W,fg,added} \right) 1,545 * (210 + 460)}{14.687 * 144 * 60}$$

$$G_{A,o} = G_{A,i} \frac{250 + 460}{210 + 460}$$

With the volumetric flow rate determined, the number of operating train and the size of each adsorber can be determined. Each adsorber in EPRI report handled 450,000 acfm (22). The algorithm to determine the number of redundant trains is retained from Reference (1). The electricity consumption is required to overcome the pressure drop, in the adsorber (22" water) and to power the blower for the air heater. This blower is assumed to have a 4" water pressure drop.

$$NOP = \text{round}\left(\frac{G_{A,i}}{450,000}\right)$$

$$NRD = 1 + \text{if}\left(\frac{NOP}{4} - 1\right) > 1 \text{ then round}\left(\frac{NOP}{4} - 0.5\right) - 1 \text{ else } 0$$

$$A_A = \frac{G_{A,i}}{60 NOP V}$$

$$EC_{FG} = 1.38e^{-4} * 22 G_{A,o}$$

$$EC_{AH} = \frac{1,545 (80 + 460) M_{AH}}{14.687 * 144 * 60} * 4 * 1.38e^{-4}$$

The NOXSO process consumes low pressure steam in the steam treatment vessel, while the acid plant may produce steam. Therefore, the net steam consumption or credit is the difference between the steam consumed by NOXSO and that generated by the acid plant. The temperature of the steam from the acid plant is set to 665°F, the temperature of the steam required for the NOXSO process. Then, 15,940 Btu is the energy required to raise a mole of saturated water at 226°F to saturated steam at 338°F minus the value from the enthalpy algorithms at 338°F. The boiler is assumed to be 88% efficient. Therefore, the total power consumption of the NOXSO and acid plant is the sum of the requirements for the pressure drop in the flue gas, transport of the sorbent, compressor for the sorbent cooler, blower for the air heater, the acid plant and (if required) the steam consumption:

$$EC_{\text{steam}} = (M_{\text{W,STV}} - M_{\text{steam,AP}}) \frac{\hat{h}_{\text{W}}(665\text{F}) + 15,940}{0.88 * \text{HR}}$$

$$EC_{\text{total}} = EC_{\text{fg}} + EC_{\text{air,SC}} + EC_{\text{AH}} + EC_{\text{sorb}} + EC_{\text{AP}} + \text{if } EC_{\text{steam}} > 0$$

The energy is added to the power plant from the steam generated by the acid plant and the air recycled to the boiler. The electrical equivalent for the steam is straight forward. The energy credit for the air recycled to the boiler is more complicated, since it also reduces the amount of inlet combustion air and changes the performance of the air preheater. The energy credit for the recycled air is the energy flow rate of the recycled air plus inlet combustion air at the new air preheater exit temperature minus the energy flow rate of the original combustion air at 515°F. The original combustion air is the air required for the coal consumed.

$$EC_{\text{recycled}} = (M_{\text{recycled}} (620) + M_{\text{comb,air}}(T_{\text{AP,o}}) - M_{\text{comb,air}}(515)) / \text{HR}$$

$$\text{if } EC_{\text{steam}} < 0 \text{ then } EC_{\text{steam}} = -EC_{\text{steam}} \text{ else } 0$$

$$EC_{\text{total}} = EC_{\text{recycled}} + EC_{\text{steam}}$$

#### 4.4 Economic Model

The current economics model for the NOXSO process is based primarily on the recent case study by EPRI (22). The major difference is that methane is used for the regeneration step rather than a synthesis gas produced on-site.

The capital costs are scaled to five key parameters: flue gas flow rate, sorbent flow rate, makeup flow rate, area of the adsorbers and oil consumption. The values of these parameters for the EPRI base case plant (1000MW, 4% S coal) are: 3.6e<sup>6</sup> acfm, 1.36e<sup>6</sup> lb/hr, 880 lb/hr, 2542 ft<sup>2</sup> and 7200 lb/hr. The area of the adsorber, 2545 ft<sup>2</sup>, is estimated from the gas flow rate into the adsorber, the number of operating trains and the gas velocity through the adsorber. The capital cost for a larger air preheater, if that option is chosen, is also included as a part of the capital cost for the NOXSO process.

##### 4.4.1 Capital Costs

The EPRI report lists plant components by section with delivered equipment costs itemized. The report also gives the total cost of each plant area. The cost of the components can be summed and divided into the total cost to determine a multiplier for each area. The total equipment cost, total process capital and the appropriate multiplier are given in Table 4-1. Note that the design plant size is two 500 MW units. The regeneration system, area 40, contains a Texaco Coal Gasification System for producing regeneration gas. This item has been removed from the total listed in area 40 of Table 4-1. It was assumed to have a multiplier of one, since it is a delivered system. The sulfuric acid plant, particulate removal and waste disposal areas are not listed since they have been explicitly modeled elsewhere in the IEC model.

The capital cost coefficients for each major parameters are estimated by adding all the component costs associated with each parameter, then divide through by the base value of the parameter (from the EPRI report) raised to the 0.7 power. The makeup rates of sorbent and oil

consumption are used to scale the reagent feed system. Since the Texaco Coal Gasification System is not used, liquid oxygen storage is not needed. Miscellaneous process equipment is included in the coefficient for oil. Therefore, the total capital cost for area 10 is:

$$DCC_{10} = \frac{1,651,777}{880^{0.7}} m_{\text{makeup}}^{0.7} + \frac{965,006}{7200^{0.7}} m_{\text{oil}}^{0.7} = 14,350 m_{\text{makeup}}^{0.7} + 1.925 m_{\text{oil}}^{0.7} \quad (4.11)$$

**Table 4-1:** Area Cost Multipliers for NOXSO Process

Area	Description	Equipment Costs	Total Cost	Multiplier
10	Reagent Feed System	12.76	5.57	2.29
20	SO <sub>2</sub> Removal System	7.52	2.52	2.99
30	Flue Gas Handling System	27.00	13.65	1.98
40	Sorbent Regeneration System	15.66	9.99	1.57 <sup>a</sup>
70	General Support Equipment	0.30	0.17	1.77

<sup>a</sup> Does not include the Texaco Coal Gasification System.

The capital cost for the flue gas equipment is broken into two components. The first component is area 30, with a slight modification to the capital cost for the I.D. fans. Since the adsorber does not cause the entire pressure drop across the I.D. fans, it is only charged for its portion of the pressure drop, 22" water. Since the I.D. fans are sized for 30" of water, the NOXSO process is charged for 73% of the I.D. fans and dampers. The capital cost for the duct work associated with the multicyclones and ESP are not included. The second component is the adsorber, which is in the SO<sub>2</sub> removal system in the EPRI report. However, its cost is related to the flue gas flow rate, so it is included with the flue gas handling system. Thus:

$$DCC_{30} = \frac{20,599,176}{3,600,000^{0.7}} G_{A,i}^{0.7} + \frac{5,292,001}{10 * 2,542^{0.7}} (NOP + NRD) A_A^{0.7} \quad (4.12)$$

$$DCC_{30} = 530 G_{A,i}^{0.7} + 2,188 (NOP + NRD) A_A^{0.7}$$

The capital cost associated with the sorbent flow rate includes part of area 20 and most of area 40. The Texaco Coal Gasification System, regenerative gas burner and the acid plant compressor are not included. The regenerative gas burner and acid plant compressor are part of the acid plant model. The equipment from area 20 is the regenerated sorbent transfer hopper and the pneumatic conveying system. The capital cost associated with general support equipment is taken as a fraction of the previous capital cost areas. The results are:

$$DCC_{40} = \frac{15,132,844}{1,358,600^{0.7}} m_{\text{sorb}}^{0.7} = 770 m_{\text{sorb}}^{0.7} \quad (4.13)$$

$$DCC_{70} = \frac{296,121}{43,640,804}(DCC_{10} + DCC_{30} + DCC_{40})$$

$$DCC_{70} = 0.007(DCC_{10} + DCC_{30} + DCC_{40})$$

The total direct capital cost is the sum of Equations 4.11 through 4.14, plus the cost of a larger air preheater (if needed). The indirect capital charges include general facilities, engineering fees, project and project contingencies. These are assumed to be 10%, 12.5%, 21.2% and 13.4% respectively, of the total direct capital cost. The total plant cost is the sum of the following items, plus the total capital cost of the acid plant.

$$DCC_{total} = DCC_{10} + DCC_{30} + DCC_{40} + DCC_{70} + DCC_{APH}$$

$$DCC_{gf} = 0.10DCC_{total}$$

$$DCC_{eng} = 0.125DCC_{total}$$

$$DCC_{proj} = 0.212DCC_{total}$$

$$DCC_{proc} = 0.134DCC_{total}$$

$$TPC = DCC_{total} + DCC_{gf} + DCC_{eng} + DCC_{proj} + DCC_{proc} + TCC_{acid}$$

The cost of interest during construction is a function of the interest and inflation rates and is taken as a fraction of the total plant cost. The project is assumed to take three years to complete, with an equal amount of money spent each year. All funds are expended in the middle of each year. The interest rate is a function of the debt/equity ratio and is calculated according to EPRI guidelines (12). The startup charges are estimated to be one month of the fixed and variable operating costs plus 2% of the total plant inventory cost. The royalty charges are assumed to be 0.5% of the total direct capital cost. The land costs are scaled to the size of the gross size of the plant. In sum:

$$TPI = \left( \left( \frac{1+i}{1+p} \right)^{0.5} + \left( \frac{1+i}{1+p} \right)^{1.5} + \left( \frac{1+i}{1+p} \right)^{2.5} \right) \frac{TPC}{3}$$

$$C_{startup} = (FOC + VOC) / 12 + 0.02TPI$$

$$C_{misc} = 0.005DCC_{total} + 4.97e^{-5}MW_g$$

Working capital is estimated as 60 days of consumption at full capacity for the makeup sorbent, methane and oil. The sorbent cost is \$2.5 / lb, the cost of oil is expressed in \$ per Btu, while 0.378 converts lb-moles/hr to MSCF.

$$C_{work} = (2.5m_{makeup} + 0.378UC_M M_{M,R,i} + UC_{oil}HHV_{oil}m_{oil})24 * 60$$

The inventory capital cost of the sorbent is estimated from the mass of sorbent in the process equipment. The settled bed height is estimated to be one-half the expanded bed height. The amount of sorbent in the adsorber is estimated from the area of the adsorber, settled bed height and density. The amount of sorbent in the rest of the system is estimated from the residence

times of equipment and the mass flow rate of sorbent. The total capital cost is the sum of the total plant inventory, startup charges, working capital, inventory cost, land and royalty fees:

$$C_{inv} = \left( \frac{H}{2} A_A \rho_{sorb} + \frac{m_{sorb}}{NOP} (RT_R + RT_{SH} + RT_{SC}) \right) (NOP + NRD) * 2.5$$

$$TCC = TPI + C_{startup} + C_{work} + C_{inv} + C_{misc}$$

#### 4.4.2 Operating and Maintenance Costs

Annual operating charges consist of fixed and variables charges. The fixed charges consist of the operating, maintenance, administrative labor and the maintenance materials. It is estimated that 5.2 workers per hour at \$19.70/hr are needed for operating labor. Maintenance labor and materials and administration labor charges are estimated using the EPRI guidelines (12). Maintenance cost is 4.8% of the total plant cost excluding the total capital cost for the acid plant. Labor accounts for 40%, while materials account for 60% of the total maintenance cost. Administrative and support labor is estimated to be 30% of the operating and maintenance labor. The variable charges include the costs for makeup sorbent, methane, oil and miscellaneous charges. The result is:

$$OC_{oper} = 5.2 * 19.7 * 8766$$

$$OC_{maint-labor} = 0.40 * 0.048 (TPC - TCC_{acid})$$

$$OC_{maint-matl} = 0.60 * 0.048 (TPC - TCC_{acid})$$

$$OC_{admin} = 0.30(OC_{oper} + OC_{maint-labor})$$

$$FOC = OC_{oper} + OC_{maint-labor} + OC_{maint-matl} + OC_{admin}$$

$$OC_{sorb} = 2.5 * 8,766 CF m_{makeup}$$

$$OC_M = 0.378 * 8,766 CF UC_M M_{M,R,i}$$

$$OC_{oil} = 8,766 CF HHV_{oil} UC_{oil} m_{oil}$$

$$OC_{misc} = 0.019DCC_{total}$$

$$VOC = OC_{sorb} + OC_M + OC_{oil} + OC_{misc}$$

The NOXSO process typically produces an energy credit. In the IEC model, energy credits are account for by increasing the output of the power plant while keeping coal consumption the same. The capital and operating costs, including the additional energy cost, of the increased size are charged to the basic power plant, while the NOXSO process is given a credit for the energy it supplies to the power plant. This is equivalent to if the NOXSO process decreases the amount of coal burned in the boiler. Since the energy credit and the cost of the NOXSO are dependent on the coal consumption, it becomes an iterative problem.

$$TCC_{BP,incre} = \frac{ECr_{total}}{MWg*1000} TCC_{BP}$$

$$TVC_{BP,incre} = \frac{ECr_{total}}{MWg*1000} TVC_{BP}$$

$$OCr_{coal} = 8766 \text{ CF } UC_{coal} \frac{ECr_{total} \text{ HR}}{2000 \text{ HHV}_{coal}}$$

The total capital and operating cost of the power plant are increased by  $TCC_{BP,incr} + TVC_{BP,incr}$ . The total variable cost of the NOXSO process is the sum of the fixed and variable operating costs minus the credits for coal and the sale of sulfuric acid. Utility consumption is charged separately. The result is:

$$TVC = FOC + VOC - OCr_{coal} - OCr_{credit,acid}$$

$$Util = 8766 \text{ CF } UC_{elec} EC_{total}$$

**Table 4-2:** Properties of Illinois No. 6 Coal Used for Case Studies (As-Fired Basis)

Coal Property	Run-of-Mine Coal	Washed Coal <sup>a</sup>
Btu/lb	10,190	10,330
% Sulfur	4.4	3.1
% Carbon	57.0	57.7
% Hydrogen	3.7	4.0
% Oxygen	7.2	8.4
% Nitrogen	1.1	1.1
% Moisture	12.3	17.5
\$/ton (at mine) <sup>b</sup>	28.10	32.70
\$/ton (transport) <sup>b</sup>	5.90	5.90

<sup>a</sup> Model results for a 30% reduction on lbs/MBtu basis using conventional coal cleaning (Level 3 plant design).

<sup>b</sup> 1985 dollars, assuming a midwestern plant and mine location.

#### 4.5 Deterministic Analysis for the NOXSO Process

This section presents a deterministic analysis of the NOXSO process and compares it to a conventional plant design with wet flue gas desulfurization (FGD) and selective catalytic reduction (SCR) and to the advanced copper oxide process design. The NOXSO process diagram is shown in Figure 4-1. This case study assumed a new 522 MW power plant burning an Illinois #6 coal. The properties of this coal are shown in Table 4-2, while key input assumptions for the NOXSO process are shown in Table 4-3. The financial assumptions and emission standards are shown in Table 4-4. Current federal New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for SO<sub>2</sub> and



particulates are assumed to apply. The assumed NO<sub>x</sub> emission constraint, however, is more stringent than the current NSPS and requires an emission reduction of 85 to 90 percent below current U.S. requirements. This represents current NO<sub>x</sub> control requirements in Japan, West Germany and California.

**Table 4-3: NOXSO Performance and Economic Assumptions**

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value
Air Preheater Enlargement	no	Regenerator Utilization of:	
Bed Height (in)	36	Methane (%)	90
Bed Pressure Drop (in water)	22	Steam (%)	30
Bed Temperature (°F)	250	Residence Time of Sorbent in:	
Flue Gas Bed Velocity (ft/s)	2.95	Cooler (min)	18
Gas Burner for Regenerator Gas	yes	Heater (min)	28
K <sub>a</sub> , Rate Constant (atm <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )	3.7	Regenerator (min)	35
Methane Cost (\$/MSCF)	4.50	Sodium Loading (% of weight)	3.8
NO <sub>x</sub> "destruction" efficiency (%)	65	Sorbent Characteristics:	
Oil Cost (\$/MBtu)	4.50	Attrition Rate (% of sorbent flow)	0.07
Oil Sulfur Correction Factor	0.6	Cost (\$/lb)	2.57
Regenerator Gas Sulfur Composition:		Density (lbs/ft <sup>3</sup> )	30
H <sub>2</sub> S (% of S regenerated)	30	Sorbent Regeneration Efficiency by:	
S <sub>2</sub> (% of S regenerated)	5	Methane (%)	81.4
SO <sub>2</sub> (% of S regenerated)	65	Steam (%)	90.7
		Overall Calc. (%)	98.3

#### 4.5.1 Cost Results

Table 4-5 shows the calculated capital and levelized total revenue requirement for the assumptions shown in Tables 4-2 to 4-4. The assumptions for the wet FGD and Copper Oxide process are shown in Reference (26). As shown, the NOXSO process has the lowest capital and revenue requirements for the unwashed coal. The revenue requirement is 8% and 15% lower than the conventional and Copper Oxide designs, respectively. For the washed coal, its capital cost is still 13% less than the Copper Oxide process, while the total revenue requirement is 5% higher.

Table 4-6 shows the cost breakdown for the capital and operating cost for the NOXSO process. For the unwashed coal, the direct capital cost is divided somewhat equally between the equipment associated with the sorbent, flue gas and acid plant. Most of the indirect costs, including startup costs, working and inventory capital are attributed to the sorbent flow rate. Approximately 40% of the total variable cost, excluding sulfuric acid sales and coal energy credits, is for sorbent makeup, while oil and gas consumption account for 25% and 18%, respectively. The fixed operating costs (12%), acid plant variable cost (4%) and miscellaneous cost (1%) account for the rest.

**Table 4-4:** Financial and Emission Assumptions for Case Studies

Model Parameter	Nominal Value
<u>Emission Constraints</u>	
Nitrogen Oxides	0.08 lbs/MBtu
Sulfur Dioxide	90% Removal
Particulates	0.03 lbs/MBtu
<u>Power Plant Parameters</u>	
Gross Capacity	522 MW
Gross Heat Rate	9500 Btu/kWh
Capacity Factor	65%
Excess Air (boiler / total)	20% / 39%
Ash to Flue Gas	80%
Sulfur to Flue Gas	97.5%
Preheater Inlet Temperature	700 °F
Preheater Outlet Temperature	300 °F
<u>Financial Parameters</u>	
Inflation Rate	0%
Debt Fraction / Real Return	50% / 4.6%
Common Stock Fraction / Real Return	35% / 8.7%
Preferred Stock Fraction / Real Return	15% / 5.2%
Federal Tax Rate	36.7%
State Tax Rate	2.0%
Ad Valorem Rate	2.0%
Investment Tax Credit	0%
Book Life	30 years
Real Escalation Rates	0%
Real Discount Rate (calc)	6.13%
Fixed Charge Factor (calc)	10.34%
Levelization Factors	1.000

**Table 4-5:** Summary of Total Pollution Control Costs  
 (4.4%S Illinois No. 6 Coal)  
 All Costs in Constant 1985 Dollars

Process Configuration	No Coal Cleaning		Washed Coal <sup>a</sup>	
	Capital (\$/net kW)	Level Rev Req (mills/kWh)	Capital (\$/net kW)	Level Rev Req (mills/kWh)
<u>Conventional Plant Design</u>				
Coal Cleaning	-	-	(6) <sup>b</sup>	1.9
SCR System	69	3.7	70	3.7
Cold-Side ESP	43	0.9	40	0.8
Wet FGD System	197	9.0	192	8.3
Solid Waste Disposal	56	2.0	43	1.6
Total	365	15.6	339	16.3
<u>Copper Oxide Design</u>				
Coal Cleaning	-	-	(3) <sup>b</sup>	1.9
Copper Oxide Process	244	14.4	180	8.5
Fabric Filter	62	1.4	62	1.4
Solid Waste Disposal	25	1.1	21	1.0
Total	332	16.9	260	12.8
<u>NOXSO Design</u>				
Coal Cleaning	-	-	(4) <sup>b</sup>	1.9
NOXSO Process	178	11.9	149	9.2
Fabric Filter	60	1.4	59	1.4
Solid Waste Disposal	25	1.1	21	0.9
Total	263	14.4	225	13.4

<sup>a</sup> 30% sulfur reduction on lbs/MBtu basis.

<sup>b</sup> These costs (or credits) result from changes in the base plant cost.

**Table 4-6:** Breakdown of Costs for NOXSO Process

Component	Capital Cost (85 M\$)
Feed Equipment	1.8
Flue Gas Equipment	15.6
Sorbent Equipment	15.4
General Support Equipment	0.2
Acid Plant	<u>18.0</u>
Total Direct Capital	51.0
General Facilities	3.3
Engineering Fees	4.1
Project Contingency	7.0
Process Contingency	<u>4.4</u>
Total Plant Cost	69.9
AFUDC	<u>6.6</u>
Total Plant Investment	76.5
Royalties	0.2
Startup Costs	4.3
Working Capital	7.1
Initial Catalyst Cost	<u>7.2</u>
Total Capital Cost	95.2

Component	Operating and Maintenance Cost (85 M\$/yr)
Fixed Operating	4.0
Methane	6.0
Oil	8.6
Makeup Sorbent	13.6
Miscellaneous	0.6
Acid Plant O&M	1.5
Sulfuric Acid Sales	-8.3
Coal Credit	<u>-2.5</u>
Total Variable Cost	23.4

**Table 4-7: NOXSO Performance Parameters**

Parameter	Unwashed Coal	Washed Coal
Concentration of Pollutants entering Absorber (ppm)		
NO <sub>x</sub>	806	811
SO <sub>2</sub>	3300	2350
Energy Consumption (-) or Production (+)		
Acid Plant		
Electricity (MW)	-2.0	-1.4
Steam (10 <sup>6</sup> Btu/hr)	+84.4	+59.0
NOXSO Process		
Electricity (MW)	-12.1	-10
Methane Consumption (10 <sup>6</sup> Btu/hr)	-234	-164
Oil Consumption (10 <sup>6</sup> Btu/hr)	-334	-230
Recycled Gas to Boiler (10 <sup>6</sup> Btu/hr)	+172	+132
Steam (10 <sup>6</sup> Btu/hr)	-7.9	-5.5
Total Electricity Consumption (MW)	-14.2	-11.4
Coal Credit (tons/hr) <sup>a</sup>	12.7	9.3
Flue Gas Flow Rate (10 <sup>6</sup> acfm)	1.78	1.74
Makeup Sorbent Flow Rate (lbs/hr)	929	641
Molar Stoichiometry (Na/S removed)	3.31	3.27
Net Capacity (MW)	533	529
Number of Operating Trains	4	4
Required Removal Efficiency of Absorber		
NO <sub>x</sub>	92.8	92.7
SO <sub>2</sub>	91.1	87.0
Actual (larger value of SO <sub>2</sub> and NO <sub>x</sub> ) <sup>b</sup>	92.8	92.7
Sorbent Flow Rate (10 <sup>6</sup> lbs/hr)	1.33	0.92

<sup>1a</sup> This value is the sum of the steam requirements of the NOXSO process and acid plant divided by the boiler efficiency (88%), plus the energy sent to the boiler in the recycled gas. This net energy requirement is divided by the higher heating value of the coal and converted to tons/hr.

<sup>1b</sup> The SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency are assumed to be equal, so the larger of these two values is used to determine the molar stoichiometry.

Sulfuric acid sales reduce the total variable cost by 24%, while the coal energy credit reduces the cost by 7%. For the washed coal the same general trends appear. On the other hand, the capital cost associated with the flue gas remains constant, while the direct capital costs associated with the sorbent and acid plant decrease by approximately 20%. The variable operating cost and sales of sulfuric acid decrease by 30%. The sulfuric acid plant capital cost is 37 \$/kW, while producing 8.3 M\$/yr from selling sulfuric acid and 0.9 M\$/yr as a coal credit from steam

production. The variable and utility cost is 2.1 M\$/yr. This translates into a savings of 1.7 mills/kWh for the NOXSO process or a profit of 31 \$/ton for the sulfuric acid generated. For the washed coal, the capital cost is 30 \$/kW and the sulfuric acid sales are 5.8 M\$/yr. The net result is a savings of 1.1 mills/kWh or 28 \$/ton.

#### 4.5.2 NO<sub>x</sub> Removal Efficiency

Originally, NOXSO believed that the NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency was a function of the SO<sub>2</sub> concentration and the bed temperature (20). In Reference (1), it was estimated that at a bed temperature of 248°F the NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiencies would be equal. However, in the process developmental unit test at the Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center (PETC), the experimental data did not show any clear correlation between NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency and bed temperature (27). However, there was clear evidence that the NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency was depended on the regeneration gas. Methane was found to improve the NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency compared to hydrogen. Four experimental tests were conducted using methane at a bed temperature of approximately 245°F. The SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations were held at approximately 2300 and 630 ppm, respectively. Three test were conducted at an 18 inch bed height, the other was at 42 inches. For three of the tests with removal efficiencies were greater than 84%, the SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiencies were within  $\pm 2$ . For the other test, the removal efficiencies were much lower (SO<sub>2</sub> equalled 69%, while NO<sub>x</sub> equalled 78%). For the reasons shown above the SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiencies are assumed to be equalled.

In Reference (27), NOXSO also showed that the NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency was correlated to the ratio of SO<sub>2</sub> to NO<sub>x</sub> by a factor of 0.80. However, all the data came from experiments which used hydrogen as a regeneration gas and it is not clear if the same trend would hold if methane is used as a regeneration gas. NOXSO also showed a significant transient effect of increasing the ratio of SO<sub>2</sub> to NO<sub>x</sub> from 3.1 to 4.1. The steady-state effect was small, approximately 3.5 removal points. Since this is a steady-state model, the transient change is not useful. Yet, it could be very useful to a power plant operator. These test were also conducted using hydrogen, so the steady-state effect may not be applicable using methane—especially if removal efficiencies of 90% or greater are required.

#### 4.5.3 Effects of Stoichiometry

Table 4-7 gives a breakdown of the important performance parameters for the washed and unwashed coals. For both cases the required NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency, (92.8%) is higher than the SO<sub>2</sub> efficiency, (91.1%). This is caused by the inefficient destruction of NO<sub>x</sub> which is recycled to the boiler. Since the NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> efficiencies are assumed to be equal, the molar stoichiometry is determined by the NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency. As shown, the sorbent flow rate decreases by 30% for the washed coal. However, if the molar stoichiometry was driven by the SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency, its value for the unwashed and washed coals would be 2.8 and 2.2 respectively, instead of 3.3. These stoichiometries would produce sorbent flow rates of  $1.1 \times 10^6$  lbs/hr and  $0.57 \times 10^6$  lbs/hr, respectively. The NOXSO process capital cost would decrease from 178 to 166 \$/kW for the unwashed coal and from 149 to 129 \$/kW for the washed and the total NOXSO process revenue requirement would fall to 10.4 mills/kWh and 6.8 mills/kWh, respectively. Thus, if the NO<sub>x</sub> “destruction” efficiency was improved substantially or the NO<sub>x</sub>


emission constraint was relaxed, the cost of the NOXSO process would decrease more substantially with coal cleaning.

Figure 4-4 shows the SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency versus molar stoichiometry for three different bed heights with the flue gas velocity and rate constant, K<sub>a</sub>, held constant at 2.95 ft/s and 3.7 respectively. The molar stoichiometry is the moles of sodium required to remove one mole of SO<sub>2</sub>. This value is equal to the inverse of the average conversion factor of sodium, X, times the effective molar ratio of sodium to sulfur removed. According to NOXSO (23, 28), the effective molar ratio of sodium to sulfur removed is one. Therefore, the equation shown below is the molar stoichiometry of sodium to sulfur removed.

$$msr = \frac{1}{\frac{\ln(1 - \eta)V}{K_a H} + 1}$$

- where H = Bed height (inches)
- K<sub>a</sub> = Reaction rate constant (atm<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>)
- msr = molar stoichiometry (Na to S removed)
- V = Flue gas velocity (inches s<sup>-1</sup>)
- η = SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency (fraction)

**Figure 4-4:** Sulfur Removal Efficiency versus Molar Stoichiometry



For a fixed value of K<sub>a</sub>, increasing the bed height or decreases the flue gas velocity will decrease the molar stoichiometric ratio. While this equation is very useful for understanding and predicting the performance of the absorber, it is only an approximation. A limitation of this equation is that the molar stoichiometry goes to infinity if the following conditions occur.

$$\eta = 1 - e^{-\frac{KaH}{V}}$$

For  $Ka = 3.7 \text{ atm}^{-1}\text{sec}^{-1}$ ,  $H = 36 \text{ in}$  and  $V = 2.95 \text{ ft/s}$ , the molar stoichiometry goes to infinity at  $\eta = 97.7\%$ . At 18 and 42 inches and the same values of  $Ka$  and  $V$ , the asymptotic values are 84.8% and 98.8%, respectively. It is important to know this asymptotic value since the molar stoichiometry increase rapidly as this value is approached. For the 36 inch bed height, the molar stoichiometry increases rapidly for values above 90% removal, since it is approaching its asymptotic value. For the unwashed coal, the molar stoichiometry is 3.31. If the bed height was increased to 42 inches, the molar stoichiometry would decrease by 25%. It was not possible to determine if this would be economical since pressure drop data does not exist for the 42 inch bed height.

#### 4.5.4 Process Energy Requirements

The NOXSO process consumes and produces large quantities of energy as shown in Table 4-7. About half the energy from the fuel oil consumption is recovered by recycling the heater gas to the boiler. Also, 35% of the energy from the methane and steam consumed in the regenerator is converted to steam in the acid plant. Approximately 50% of the electricity consumption for the NOXSO process is used to overcome the pressure drop across the absorber. The sorbent cooler compressor and the pneumatic conveying blowers consume about 35% and 13%, respectively. The acid plant consumes some additional electricity (2MW), while producing steam which can be used to regenerate the sorbent in the steam treatment vessel or sent to the steam cycle to produce electricity.

#### 4.6 Sensitivity Analysis for the NOXSO Process

Beginning with the results shown above, a sensitivity analysis was performed to determine the effects of important parameters affecting the NOXSO process. The process parameters which were varied are the molar stoichiometry, sorbent attrition rate, regenerator efficiency,  $\text{NO}_x$  “destruction” efficiency, sorbent cost, methane cost, oil cost and sulfuric acid cost. System effects of coal cleaning, air preheater size and the use of a gas burner for the acid plant inlet gas also were examined. Since pressure drop data are not available for different bed height and flue gas velocities, these parameters were held constant.

##### 4.6.1 Combustion of Acid Plant Gases

The default assumption for the NOXSO process is to use a gas burner for the regenerator, since it appeared in the EPRI report (22). However, it was not clear if it was needed since it was never mentioned in previous reports by NOXSO. Using a gas burner for the regenerator gas is useful if there are sufficient combustible gases in the gas stream entering the acid plant. This is because:

- the energy in the combustible gases is released before the boiler and superheater so it can be captured and turned into steam



- any hydrogen or gases containing hydrogen are oxidized to water before the dryers so there is less moisture in the converter
- the gas flow rate entering the converter is lower, so the capital and power costs are lower for the converter and any downstream equipment

The disadvantages are additional capital and power costs for the gas burner equipment and a larger gas flow through the boiler, superheater and gas humidification and cooling tower. This often increases the cost of these components, so the overall economics depends on the composition of the gas. Table 4-8 summarizes the important performance and cost changes of a gas burner. If a gas burner is not used, the acid plant capital cost doubles and the acid plant uses more than three times more electricity while producing no steam. The total revenue requirement for the NOXSO process increases by 1.8 mills/kWh and the net capacity of the power plant decreases 15 MW. Thus, the advantages of using a gas burner for the gas entering the acid plant are substantial. If the washed coal is used, the magnitude of the effects is smaller, but it is still advantages to use a gas burner. Another feature of a gas burner is that it minimizes the effects of varying gas composition on the acid plant.

**Table 4-8:** Effects of Gas Burner for Sulfuric Acid Plant with the Unwashed Coal

Parameter	With Gas Burner	No Gas Burner
<b>Acid Plant</b>		
Capital Cost (\$/kW)	37	72
Total Variable Cost (M\$/yr)	1.52	1.63
Utility Cost (M\$/yr)	0.43	1.43
Levelized Rev. Requirement (mills/kWh)	-1.72	-0.46
Acid Profit (\$/ton of acid)	31	8
Electricity Consumption (kW)	2030	6770
Steam Production (kW)	0	10,020
<b>Total Process</b>		
Capital Cost (\$/kW)	263	305
Levelized Rev. Requirement (mills/kWh)	14.4	16.1
Net Capacity (MW)	533	519

#### 4.6.2 Air Preheater Effects

The NOXSO process recycles NO<sub>x</sub> to the boiler via the gas stream used to heat the sorbent. This stream contains about 18% oxygen, which reduces by 37% the required combustion air entering the air preheater. Since the combustion air stream entering the air preheater is smaller, the air preheater cannot transfer as much heat, resulting in an exit temperature of the flue gas higher than the nominal value of 300°F. This results in an energy penalty for the NOXSO process. Building a larger air preheater would reduce the energy penalty. Yet, it is not possible to eliminate the energy penalty since the combustion air stream is much smaller. Table 4-9 summarizes the important performance and cost changes of building a larger air preheater, which

raises the temperature of the combustion air to 660°F. Increasing the air preheater size increases the energy credit by 19 MBtu/hr or 1 ton/hr of coal. The larger air preheater costs 8.4 \$/kW, while increasing the coal credit by 0.2 M\$/yr. The effect on the total process including the cost of the fabric filter is to increase the total revenue requirement by 0.3 mills/kWh. For the washed coal the energy credit increases by 54 MBtu/hr or 2.5 tons/hr of coal. The capital cost increases to 12 \$/kW, while the total revenue requirement still increases by 0.3 mills/kWh. This value is within the error of the model, so it is uncertain whether a larger air preheater is economical.

**Table 4-9:** Effects of the Air Preheater for the Unwashed Coal

Parameter	w/o NOXSO	Original Size	Larger Size
Flue Gas Flow Rate (acfm)			
Inlet Temperature (°F)	700	700	700
Exit Temperature (°F)	300	382	370
Combustion Air (10 <sup>3</sup> acfm)	1041	655	655
Inlet Temperature (°F)	80	80	80
Exit Temperature (°F)	515	634	660
Energy Flow Flow Rate (10 <sup>6</sup> Btu/hr)			
Across Air Preheater	497	400	419
From Recycled Air	0	269	269
Total to Boiler	497	669	688
Coal Energy Credit (tons/hr) <sup>a</sup>	0	8.4	9.4
NOXSO Process			
Additional Capital Cost (\$/kW)	--	0	8.4
Coal Credit (M\$/yr)	--	1.63	1.82
Total Process			
Capital Cost (\$/kW)	--	263	271
Levelized Rev. Requ. (mills/kWh)	--	14.4	14.5
Net Capacity (MW)	--	533	535

<sup>a</sup> This is the difference between the total energy flow to the boiler minus the energy flow to the boiler without the NOXSO process divided by the higher heating value of the coal and converted to tons/hr

Air preheaters of different sizes also were examined. This resulted in the same conclusion: the cost change was within the error of the model. Other options for capturing more energy from the flue gas, such as a second economizer after the air preheater, were not explored. However, if the flue gas temperature could be reduced to 300°F, an additional coal credit of 6.6 tons/hr could be achieved. This would save an additional 1.3 M\$/yr.

#### 4.6.3 Other Process Parameters

The next sensitivity test was to multiply the nominal values (shown in Table 4-3) of the molar stoichiometry, attrition rate, sorbent cost, methane cost, oil cost and acid price by 0.5, 0.75, 1, 1.5 and 2. Each parameter was varied individually while all other parameters were held


constant. Figure 4-5 and 4-6 show the effects on the total capital and levelized revenue requirement of these parameters for the unwashed coal. Also plotted are the effects of a larger air preheater and not using a burner to show how they compare to variations in other parameters.


Apparently the most important parameter is the molar stoichiometry, since the both the capital and total revenue requirement change drastically with minor changes in the stoichiometry. The capital cost and revenue requirement increase by 13% and 32%, respectively, for a 50% increase in the molar stoichiometry. There are several reasons for this:

- The sorbent flow rate is directly proportional to the molar stoichiometry. Higher sorbent flow increases the electricity used for sorbent transportation and the size of the equipment, except the absorber and acid plant.
- The gas quantity returned to the boiler is also proportional to the sorbent flow rate. This stream increases the flue gas flow rate entering the absorber and the fabric filter. The capital cost for the absorber increases slightly. Doubling the molar stoichiometry increases the capital cost of the fabric filter by 7%.
- Most of the indirect costs, working capital, startup costs and inventory capital are proportional to either the total process capital, which is proportional to the sorbent flow rate or to the sorbent flow rate directly.
- Most of the variable costs are proportional to the sorbent flow rate either directly or indirectly. The only exceptions are the variable cost for methane and sulfuric acid sales. The oil cost increases since the heat required for the sorbent heater is proportional to the sorbent flow rate. Most of the fixed operating cost are related to the total process capital.

The next most important parameters are the sorbent cost and the attrition rate. These two are closely related, since they effect the makeup sorbent cost, working capital and startup cost in the same manner. The only difference is that the sorbent cost affects the inventory capital while the attrition rate does not. This difference is shown most distinctly in Figure 4-5.

**Figure 4-5:** Capital Cost Sensitivity Analysis for Unwashed Coal



**Figure 4-6: Total Revenue Requirement Sensitivity Analysis**

Of the remaining parameters, the price of methane, fuel oil and sulfuric acid, the total revenue requirement is most sensitive to the price of oil and least sensitive to the price of methane. A 50% increase in the price of oil increases the total revenue requirement by 10%, while the same increase in methane cost, results in a 7% increase. These two parameters also affect the capital cost since they affect the startup and working capital. The price of sulfuric acid has no effect on the capital cost, while having a significant effect on the total revenue requirement. A 50% increase in the price of sulfuric acid decreases the total revenue requirement by 8.5%.

#### 4.6.4 NO<sub>x</sub> Reduction Efficiency

Figure 4-7 shows the capital and revenue requirements for different values of the NO<sub>x</sub> being destroyed in the boiler. The NO<sub>x</sub> “destruction” efficiency determines the NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency required in the adsorber to meet the emission standard. As this value decreases the removal efficiency increases since there is a more NO<sub>x</sub> entering the adsorber. Between destruction efficiencies of 50% and 80%, the NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency in the adsorber is higher than the required SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency, so any change in this parameter changes the molar stoichiometry, which has a significant effect on the overall cost. Above a NO<sub>x</sub> “destruction” efficiency of 80% the SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency is greater, so the molar stoichiometry is not affected. For the washed coal, the NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency is always greater so the cost always decreases with improvements in the destruction efficiency.

#### 4.6.5 Sorbent Regenerator Efficiency

Figure 4-8 shows the capital and revenue requirements versus the overall regeneration efficiency. The overall regeneration efficiency is a function of the efficiencies of both the regenerator and the steam treatment vessel:

$$\eta_{R\&S} = \eta_R + (1 - \eta_R)\eta_{STV}$$

where

- $\eta_R$  the efficiency of removing sulfur from the sorbent with methane in the
- $\eta_{STV}$  the efficiency of removing sulfur from the sorbent with steam in the steam treatment vessel
- $\eta_{R\&S}$  the overall regeneration efficiency of both vessels

To analyze the sensitivity of the NOXSO process to the overall regeneration efficiency,  $\eta_R$  and  $\eta_{STV}$  were given the following values: 55%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 95%. This produced the overall efficiencies of 79.75%, 84%, 91%, 96%, 99% and 99.75% shown plotted in Figure 4-8. The nominal value is 98.27%, which was estimated from an EPRI report (22). The utilization of methane and steam was assumed to remain constant at their nominal values of 90% and 30%, respectively. The efficiency of the regenerator using methane was not set to 50%, because this would have created a gas composition which the acid plant was not designed to handle.<sup>14</sup> As shown, the capital and revenue requirement cannot be improved significantly, since the nominal value for the regeneration efficiency is high. However, if the regeneration efficiency drops to 91%, then the capital and revenue requirement increase by 2.7% and 6.7%, respectively.

#### 4.7 Conclusion

From this analysis it is obvious that the most significant parameter affecting the design and cost of the NOXSO process is the sorbent flow rate needed to achieve a given removal efficiency. Therefore, the relationship between  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiencies, the molar stoichiometry and regeneration process should be studied further, since they affect the sorbent flow rate directly and have a high degree of uncertainty. Data on  $\text{NO}_x$  removal and destruction in the boiler is the most critical, since it is the most uncertain of any of the parameters. More experimental data is needed to confirm the analytical model for  $\text{SO}_2$  removal efficiency. However, the results of the performance model are consistent with previous studies.



Experiments using a continuous regenerator should be performed since only batch test have been performed. These experiments should be designed to develop a performance curve relating methane and steam consumption to regeneration efficiency and predict the regenerated gas composition. If a performance curve existed, the IEC model could be used to optimize the NOXSO process, since the tradeoffs between the sorbent flow rate, oil consumption, methane consumption and acid plant are modeled explicitly.

The analysis of the air preheater showed that an additional that an energy credit worth 1.3 M\$/yr can be achieved if the temperature in the flue gas is reduced to 300°F. Other options for capturing this energy should be explored. A second economizer after the air preheater may be economical.



#### Figure 4-7: Effect of $\text{NO}_x$ Destruction Efficiency in Boiler

---

<sup>14</sup> The inlet sulfur dioxide concentration was too low for this design, so the capital and operating cost would not be valid.



**Figure 4-8: Effect of Overall Regenerator Efficiency**





## 5 ELECTRON BEAM PROCESS MODEL

### 5.1 Nomenclature

#### English Symbols

Byp	Bypass (fraction)
$C_j$	Concentration of j in flue gas (ppm)
D	Electron beam dosage (Mrads)
ES	Emission standard (lb/million Btu into furnace)
Hhv	Higher heating value of fuel (Btu/lb)
$\dot{m}_{\#,j}$	Molar flow rate of component j at point # (lb•mole/hr)
$M_{\#,j}$	Mass flow rate of component j at point # (tons/hr)
$R_{\text{purity}}$	Purity of reagent (fraction)
$T_{\#}$	Temperature at point # (°R)

#### Greek Symbols

$\Delta T$	Temperature difference (°F)
$\eta$	Efficiency (fraction)
$\sigma$	Molar stoichiometry (fraction)

#### Subcategories for Combustion Air and Flue Gas Components

CO	Carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
H <sub>2</sub> O	Moisture
N <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen
NO	Nitrogen oxide
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen dioxide
O <sub>2</sub>	Oxygen
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide
SO <sub>3</sub>	Sulfur trioxide

#### Subcategories for Solid Stream Components

Ash	Ash
CaO	Lime
CaCO <sub>3</sub>	Limestone
CaSO <sub>3</sub> •.5H <sub>2</sub> O	Hydrated calcium sulfite
CaSO <sub>4</sub>	Calcium Sulfate
CaSO <sub>4</sub> •2H <sub>2</sub> O	Hydrated calcium sulfate
H <sub>2</sub> O	Water or Moisture
Misc	Miscellaneous

#### General Subcategories


eb	Electron beam chamber
exit	Exiting device
fgapho	Exiting air preheater on flue gas side
fuel	Fuel stream
in	Entering device
NO <sub>x</sub>	Nitrogen oxide
sat	Saturation

sd	spray dryer
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide
std	Based on emission standard

## 5.2 Introduction

This section describes several improvements to the electron beam (E-beam) process model, developed previously (1). The areas which were updated are the electron beam dose, flue gas composition and solids composition exiting the electron beam chamber. A schematic diagram of the electron beam process is shown in Figure 5-1. In the configuration, a spray dryer is employed upstream of the electron beam chamber to remove SO<sub>2</sub>, to add moisture and lime to the flue gas and to lower the flue gas temperature.<sup>15</sup> A fabric filter is downstream to collect the flyash and solids which form in the electron beam chamber. The electron beam process model uses a modified spray dryer model. The modifications to the spray dryer model are described in Section 5.3, while the original spray dryer model is described in Section 2.6.

**Figure 5-1:** Schematic Diagram of Electron Beam Process



## 5.3 Spray Dryer Model Modifications

Because the spray dryer used with the electron beam process does not have a reheater, equations (2.24), (2.25) and (2.27) through (2.31) are not used. For the electron beam process,

<sup>15</sup> This is the configuration initially of interest to DOE/PETC. More recently, an E-beam process using ammonia injection without a spray dryer was tested at the pilot plant level. While the IECM can be modified to simulate the latter configuration, the current model code retains the original design developed by Research-Cottrell.

the flue gas exiting the spray dryer enters the electron beam process instead of a fabric filter. The result of modifying equations (2.22) and (2.23) are shown below:

$$\dot{m}_{eb,in,j} = \dot{m}_{sd,exit,j} + Byp \dot{m}_{fgapho,j}$$

$$T_{eb,in} = Byp T_{fgapho} + (1 - Byp) T_{sd,exit}$$

In the original spray dryer model, the reagent and molar stoichiometry was determined using Equations (2.18) and (2.19). For the electron beam model, they are determined with the equations below. The molar stoichiometry of the E-beam,  $\sigma_{eb}$ , is an input parameter and is the molar ratio of lime to sulfur dioxide plus one-half the  $NO_x$  entering the spray dryer.

$$\dot{M}_{reag} = \frac{56.08 (\dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_2} + \dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_3} + 0.5\dot{m}_{sd,in,NO} + 0.5\dot{m}_{sd,in,NO_2}) \sigma_{eb}}{2000 R_{purity}}$$

$$\sigma_{sd} = \frac{2000 \dot{M}_{reag} R_{purity}}{56.08 (\dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_2} + \dot{m}_{sd,in,SO_3})}$$

In the spray dryer model, the amount of bypass and  $SO_2$  removal was determined using Equations (2.16) and (2.16). For the electron beam model, the amount of bypass is an input parameter and the  $SO_2$  removal is determined by solving Equation (2.18) for  $\eta_{SO_2}$ .

$$\eta_{SO_2} = \frac{\ln \sigma_{sd} - 0.025\Delta T_{sat} + 2.9}{3.322}$$

#### 5.4 Electron Beam Dose

The sulfur dioxide and  $NO_x$  removal efficiencies required for the ebeam process to meet their respective emission standards are determined by

$$\eta_{SO_2, std} = 1 - \frac{2000 ES_{SO_2} \dot{M}_{fuel} Hh\nu_{fuel}}{64.06 * 1,000,000 (\dot{m}_{eb,in,SO_2} + \dot{m}_{eb,in,SO_3})} \quad (5.1)$$

$$\eta_{NO_x, std} = 1 - \frac{2000 ES_{NO_x} \dot{M}_{fuel} Hh\nu_{fuel}}{46.01 * 1,000,000 (\dot{m}_{eb,in,NO} + \dot{m}_{eb,in,NO_2})} \quad (5.2)$$

Helfritch and Feldman determined an algorithm for predicting the outlet concentration of  $SO_2$  and  $NO_x$  versus the dose of electron directed into the flue gas (29). Their algorithm is based on the rates of reactions of the principal chemical reactions and experimental data and is shown below.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>16</sup> In Reference (29), there is a typographical error for Equation 5.3. The constant "2.5" is typed as "0.25."

$$\frac{C_{SO_2}}{C_{SO_2,in}} = \exp\left\{\frac{-2.5 D}{1 + 0.0058 C_{SO_2,in}}\right\} \quad (5.3)$$

$$\frac{C_{NO_x}}{C_{NO_x,in}} = \exp\left\{\frac{-0.12 D (1 + 0.058 C_{SO_2,in})}{1 + 0.0058 C_{SO_2,in}}\right\} \quad (5.4)$$

Typically when the IECM is used, the emission constraints are specified and the pollution control equipment has to meet these constraints. Therefore, Equations (5.3) and (5.4) are solved for the electron beam dose and the ratios of the outlet to inlet concentrations are replaced by one minus the removal efficiencies specified in Equations (5.1) and (5.2).

$$D_{SO_2} = \frac{(1 + 0.0058 C_{SO_2,in}) * \ln(1 - \eta_{SO_2, std})}{-2.5} \quad (5.5)$$

$$D_{NO_x} = \frac{(1 + 0.0058 C_{SO_2,in}) * \ln(1 - \eta_{NO_x, std})}{-0.12 (1 + 0.058 C_{SO_2,in})} \quad (5.6)$$

where

$$C_{SO_2,in} = \frac{1,000,000 (m_{eb,in,SO_2} + m_{eb,in,SO_3})}{\sum_{j=1} m_{eb,in,j}}$$

Since the electron beam process has to meet both the  $NO_x$  and  $SO_2$  emission constraints, the larger dose determined by Equations (5.5) and (5.6) is used and the actual  $NO_x$  and  $SO_2$  removal efficiencies are determined by the equations below. Thus,


if  $D_{SO_2} \cdot D_{NO_x}$  then  $D = D_{SO_2}$  else  $D = D_{NO_x}$

$$\eta_{SO_2} = 1 - \exp\left\{\frac{-2.5 D}{1 + 0.0058 C_{SO_2,in}}\right\}$$

$$\eta_{NO_x} = 1 - \exp\left\{\frac{-0.12 D (1 + 0.058 C_{SO_2,in})}{1 + 0.0058 C_{SO_2,in}}\right\}$$

## 5.5 Flue Gas Composition

The composition of the flue gas changes in the electron beam chamber. The two most significant changes are the reduction in the sulfur dioxide content and nitrogen oxide content. The sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide are removed from the flue gas by a complex set of chemical reactions (29). These chemical reactions have been greatly simplified in the IECM and are shown below.



Using these chemical reactions the composition of the flue gas exiting the electron beam chamber can be determined from a molar balance as shown below. The symbol, Ox, represents the fraction of calcium nitrite oxidized to calcium nitrate.

$$\dot{m}_{\text{eb,exit},j} = \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},j} \quad \text{for } j = \text{N}_2, \text{CO}_2, \text{CO}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{eb,exit},\text{O}_2} = \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{O}_2} - \{0.5 \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{SO}_2} \eta_{\text{SO}_2} +$$

$$[(0.5 \text{Ox} + 0.25) \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{NO}} + (0.5 \text{Ox} - 0.25) \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{NO}_2}] \eta_{\text{NO}_x}\}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{eb,exit},\text{H}_2\text{O}} = \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{H}_2\text{O}} - \{2 [\dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{SO}_2} + \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{SO}_3}] \eta_{\text{SO}_2} +$$

$$(1 - \text{Ox}) [\dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{NO}} + \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{NO}_2}] \eta_{\text{NO}_x}\}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{eb,exit},\text{SO}_2} = \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{SO}_2} - \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{SO}_2} \eta_{\text{SO}_2}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{eb,exit},\text{SO}_3} = \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{SO}_3} - \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{SO}_3} \eta_{\text{SO}_2}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{eb,exit},\text{NO}} = \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{NO}} - \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{NO}} \eta_{\text{NO}_x}$$

$$\dot{m}_{\text{eb,exit},\text{NO}_2} = \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{NO}_2} - \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in},\text{NO}_2} \eta_{\text{NO}_x}$$

## 5.6 Waste Composition

A major environmental flow stream emanating from the electron beam system is the stream of dry waste solids. The basic chemistry for the creation of these solids is shown in Equation (5.7). The difference in the composition and mass flow rates of electron beam waste depends on the extent of oxidation of calcium nitrite to calcium nitrate, Ox. Other constituents of the electron

beam solids stream include unreacted reagent (which depends on the molar stoichiometry), inert materials introduced with the reagent (as dictated by the level of reagent purity) and the solid waste from the spray dryer system. The total mass flow rate of the solids exiting the electron beam is shown below.

$$\dot{M}_{\text{eb,exit},j} = \dot{M}_{\text{eb,in},j} \text{ for } j = \text{Ash, CaCO}_3, \text{CaSO}_4, \text{CaSO}_3 \cdot 0.5\text{H}_2\text{O}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{eb,exit,CaO}} = \dot{M}_{\text{eb,in,CaO}} - \frac{56.08}{2000} \{[\dot{m}_{\text{eb,in,SO}_2} + \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in,SO}_3}] \eta_{\text{SO}_2} +$$

$$0.5 [\dot{m}_{\text{eb,in,NO}} + \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in,NO}_2}] \eta_{\text{NO}_x}\}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{eb,CaSO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}} = \dot{M}_{\text{eb,in,CaSO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \frac{172.17 (\dot{m}_{\text{eb,in,SO}_2} + \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in,SO}_3}) \eta_{\text{SO}_2}}{2000}$$

$$\dot{M}_{\text{eb,exit,Misc}} = \dot{M}_{\text{eb,in,Misc}} + \frac{[150.1 (1-\text{Ox}) + 164.09 \text{Ox}] 0.5 (\dot{m}_{\text{eb,in,NO}} + \dot{m}_{\text{eb,in,NO}_2}) \eta_{\text{NO}_x}}{2000}$$

## 5.7 Economics Algorithm

The economic algorithm for the electron beam process has remained unchanged except one item. The single indirect charge factor for capital cost has been split into different categories of indirect charges following the nomenclature of the TVA (see baseline plant section).

## 6 SULFURIC ACID PLANT MODEL

### 6.1 Nomenclature

#### English Letter Symbols

$A_k$	area of device, k (ft <sup>2</sup> )
$C_{\text{categoric}}$	capital charges associated with startup (\$)
$C_{\text{idx}}$	chemical engineering cost index
$C_o$	molar gas concentration of SO <sub>2</sub> in the flue gas entering the adsorber (lb•mole/ft <sup>3</sup> )
CF	capacity factor of power plant (fraction)
$DCC_k$	capital cost for device, k (M\$)
$e^{\#}$	notation for specifying power of 10.
$E_{j,k}$	energy flow rate of specie, j, at device, k (lb•mole/hr)
$EC_k$	electricity consumption of the device, k (kW)
$f_{\text{makeup}}$	attrition rate of sorbent (fraction)
$f_{j,\text{wet air}}$	amount of specie, j, in ambient moist air (fraction)
$f_{p,j,k}$	quantity of specie, j, produced in device, k (fraction)
$F_{\text{oil}}$	constant used to estimate amount of sulfur from oil (fraction)
FOC	fixed operating cost (\$/yr)
$G_k$	gas flow rate for device, k (ft <sup>3</sup> /min)
$j,\text{temperature}$	molar enthalpy of specie, j, at specified temperature (Btu/lb•mole)
H	fluidized bed height in adsorber (ft)
HHV <sub>j</sub>	higher heating value of specie, j, (Btu/lb)
HR	heat rate of power plant (kW-Hr/MBtu)
i	inflation rate (fraction)
$K_a$	apparent rate constant (atm <sup>-1</sup> sec <sup>-1</sup> )
$LMTD_k$	log mean temperature difference of device, k (°F)
$m_j$	mass flow of specie, j, (lbs/hr or tons/hr)
$M_{j,k}$	molar flow rate of specie, j, for device, k (lb•mole/hr)
$MW_g$	gross electrical capacity of power plant (MW)
$N_t$	initial loading of the active Na on sorbent (lb•mole/lb)
NOP	number of operating adsorbers
NRD	number of spare adsorbers
$OC_{\text{categoric}}$	annual operating cost (\$/yr)
$Q_k$	heat load across heat exchanger device, k (Btu/hr)
p	interest rate (fraction)
$P_k$	pressure of the device, k (" water or atm)
$RT_k$	residence time of sorbent in device, k (hours)
$T_{s,j,k}$	temperature of specie, j, for the device, k (°F)
TCC	total capital cost (\$)
TPC	total plant cost (\$)
TPI	total plant investment (\$)
TDC	total direct cost (\$)
TVC	total operating and maintenance cost, sum of FOC and VOC (\$/yr)
$U_k$	universal heat transfer coefficient for device, k (Btu/hr-ft <sup>2</sup> •°F)
$UC_j$	unit cost of specie, j, (\$/unit)
$U_{tj}$	utilization constant for specie, j, in regenerator (fraction)
V	superficial velocity of flue gas through adsorber (ft/sec)
VOC	variable operating cost (\$/yr)

$W_{Na}$	weight fraction of sodium to sorbent (fraction)
$X$	mean value of the fractional conversion of the sorbent in the entire adsorber (fraction)
$y$	molar fraction of $SO_2$ in the flue gas (fraction)

### Greek Letter Symbols

$\delta_{NO_x}$	fraction of $NO_x$ returned to boiler which is destroyed (fraction)
$\cdot H_k$	heat of reaction in device, k (Btu/hr)
$\eta_{j,k}$	efficiency of device, k (fraction)
$\lambda$	molar stoichiometry of $SO_2$ to active sorbent
$\rho_{sorb}$	bulk density of sorbent (lbs/ft <sup>3</sup> )

### Subscripts

1	specifies the first part or half a device, k
guess	used to indicate the guess of a value in the interpolating algorithms
i	stands for inlet
j,k	used in sums to specify equipment or species.
o	stands for outlet
std	emission standard for either $SO_x$ or $NO_x$

### Species:

acid	sulfuric acid
air	air
ash	ash
c	combustion air for gas burner not including air needed to maintain maximum temperature
CD	carbon dioxide
CM	carbon monoxide
CS	carbon oxide sulfide, COS
ex	excess air for the gas burner needed to maintain temperature
H	hydrogen, $H_2$
HS	hydrogen sulfide, $H_2S$
M	methane, $CH_4$
makeup	makeup sorbent
N	nitrogen, $N_2$
NO	nitrogen oxide, NO
ND	nitrogen dioxide, $NO_2$
O	oxygen, $O_2$
st	steam
sorb	sorbent
S	sulfur, $S_2$
SC	sulfur compounds, includes COS, $H_2S$ , $S_2$ , $SO_2$ and $SO_3$
SD	sulfur dioxide, $SO_2$
SOX	sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide
ST	sulfur trioxide, $SO_3$
W	water, $H_2O$

### Equipment:

aph	air preheater
AD	adsorber
AH	air heater for sorbent heater
AP	acid plant
b	boiler in acid plant

---



B	boiler of power plant
BF	dilution air blower and filter
CS	catalytic converter contact section
D	drying tower
ES	effluent strippers
GB	gas burner
GC	gas humidification and cooling tower
HP	heat recovery preheater
IC	inlet compressor
MC	main compressor
PA	product acid
R	regenerator
R&S	regenerator and steam treatment vessel
s	superheater
SC	sorbent cooler
SH	sorbent heater
SS	strong acid handling system
STV	steam treatment vessel
T	interpass and final towers and associated equipment
WA	weak acid system


#### Categories for capital and operating cost:

acid	acid plant
admin	support and administration labor
credit	income from sale of sulfuric acid
eng	engineering and home office fees
gf	general facilities
inv	inventory capital
maint-labor	maintenance labor
maint-matl	maintenance material
makeup	makeup catalyst due to attrition loss
marketing	marketing and shipping charges for selling sulfuric acid
misc	royalty and land charges
oper	operating labor
proc	process contingency
proj	project contingency
startup	startup charges for one month
work	working capital

## 6.2 Introduction

This chapter describes a sulfuric acid plant model developed by Frey (30). This model has been incorporated into the IECM to more carefully analyze the economics of processes producing a sulfuric acid byproduct. The original IECM models of the NOXSO and copper oxide processes treated the acid plant as a simple system, based on earlier studies for DOE/PETC. The new acid plant performance and economic models were developed based on an interpass absorption (2/1) contact acid plant design by Monsanto for SMC (31, 32). Subsequent information from Monsanto (33, 34) and other studies (22) also were used for this model.



Figure 6-1: Schematic Diagram of Sulfuric Acid Plant



The Monsanto design has a conversion efficiency of 99.5% and is based on a regenerator off-gas composition specified by SMC, which consisted of CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>O and SO<sub>2</sub>. The current design, shown in Figure 6-1, was modified to fit off-gases with different compositions, temperatures and pressures. Presently it can handle these additional gases: CO, COS, H<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S, N<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub>. The only major changes are an additional inlet gas compressor and gas burner. The inlet gas compressor is only used if the inlet off gas is below 97" of water, while the gas

burner is used to burn combustible compounds in the inlet gas. The inlet gas compressor and gas burner are shown in Figure 6-2.

**Figure 6-2:** Schematic Diagrams of Inlet Compressor and Gas Burner



To understand this model, it is important to understand the characteristics of contact acid plants, overall strategy, assumptions and algorithms used for this model and how it interacts with the rest of the IECM. Contact acid plants have high initial capital cost and low operating cost, excluding utilities. Therefore, it is more important to estimate the capital cost than the operating cost. The most expensive and critical component is the converter.

Another important point is that acid plants can either be net energy producers or consumers depending on the composition of the inlet gas. So the amount of energy consumed and produced have to be accurately estimated. Acid plants are very reliable and maintenance requirements are small.

Generally an acid plant only has to be shut down once a year for a week, to maintain the catalyst in the converter. The attrition rate per year is approximately 2% for the entire converter, if the gas does not contain any dust, arsenic, chlorine and fluorine. Dust clogs the catalyst, while the other chemicals react with the catalyst and reduce its reactivity. The actual attrition rate per bed varies. The first stage or bed has the highest rate, the second stage has the second highest and the last stage has the lowest.

Before proceeding with a detailed description of the acid plant chemical processes, an overview is given below. It is assumed the reader will refer to Figures 6-1 and 6-2 for information to understand where the output of one piece of equipment is the input to another.

The principal steps of the process are:

- Oxidizing combustible gases other than  $\text{SO}_2$ , if economical
- Gas purification, cooling and drying
- Conversion of  $\text{SO}_2$  to  $\text{SO}_3$
- Conversion of  $\text{SO}_3$  to sulfuric acid

A contact sulfuric acid plant is based on the chemical reaction of  $\text{SO}_3$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  forming sulfuric acid. This reaction takes place in the final and interpass towers. The  $\text{SO}_3$  in the gas reacts with the water in the 98.5% sulfuric acid that is circulated through these towers. A strong acid is used to help prevent acid mist from forming.

Acid mist is formed if the  $\text{SO}_3$  is brought in contact with free water vapor. This acid mist can cause corrosion problems downstream unless it is removed. Some mist is always created, so mist eliminators are used downstream of the towers, although these are somewhat expensive and have a significant pressure drop. To prevent moisture from entering the converter, drying towers are used upstream. Moisture is also formed from any hydrogen compounds entering the converter, since they burn in the first stage.

The  $\text{SO}_3$  is generated in the converter by oxidizing  $\text{SO}_2$  in the presence of a catalyst. The oxidation of  $\text{SO}_2$  is highly temperature dependent, the rate of reaction increases with increasing temperature. Yet, the conversion efficiency decreases with increasing temperature. Because of this, a three pass converter design is used to achieve a 99.5% conversion efficiency. The first stage oxidizes 70% of the  $\text{SO}_2$  operating at a temperature of 1158°F; the second stage converts an additional 25% at 918°F; the final stage converts all but the last 0.5% of the  $\text{SO}_2$  at 877°F. The catalyst has a maximum operating temperature of 1158°F, which is maintained by adding dilution air upstream of the converter. Since the oxidation of  $\text{SO}_2$  is exothermic, the maximum concentration of  $\text{SO}_2$  in the gas stream to the converter is approximately 11% if the gas stream does not contain any combustible gases. Any combustible gases in the inlet gas react with oxygen in the first stage and cause additional heat to be released in the first stage of the converter, so additional dilution air is required to ensure that the catalyst does not get too hot.

---

This significantly increases the capital and operating costs. The amount of dilution air is determined by an energy balance on the first stage of the converter.

The gas must be cooled for the second and third stages. This is accomplished by five heat exchanges which either cool or heat the gas after it leaves the first stage. After the second stage, the gas passes through the interpass tower and mist eliminator which cools the gas and converts the SO<sub>3</sub> into sulfuric acid. The gas has to be heated for the third stage, so it passes through the heat recovery preheater and two heat exchangers.

The gas stream, 6, into the converter (see Figure 6.1) must be dry and have a maximum SO<sub>2</sub> concentration of approximately 11%. The gas is prepared by a series of heat exchangers and drying towers, upstream of the converter. The inlet gas stream, 1, is cooled from 824°F to 609°F by the heat recovery preheater, while the gas stream, 25, from the interpass tower is heated from 180°F to 256°F. If the heat recovery preheater cools the inlet gas below 506°F, the boiler or superheater is not used. This occurs when substantial combustible gases enter the converter. The combustible gases increase the dilution air requirement, which increases the size of stream 25 relative to stream 1.

A gas burner can be used to burn any combustible gases before it enters the converter and is usually placed upstream of the heat recovery preheater. It is assumed that the natural gas to fire these burners is just used to ignite and maintain combustion and does not add any significant energy to the gas stream. Therefore, the energy and molar balances ignore any effects of the natural gas. These burners generally have a maximum temperature of 2000°F, so additional air over stoichiometric may be needed to maintain this temperature. Using a gas burner increases the temperature and flow rate of the gases into the heat recovery preheater, superheater, boiler and gas humidification and cooling tower. The overall effect is to increase the cost of the superheater, boiler, gas humidification and cooling tower, weak acid and effluent stripper components. However, the dilution air, inlet and exit converter flow rates are lower and additional energy is recovered by the superheater and boiler. This reduces the cost for the heat recovery preheater, dilution blower, drying tower and converter. These trade-offs make it difficult to determine *a priori* whether it is more profitable to use the gas burner, so the user must specify its use.

The boiler and superheater are primarily used to generate high quality steam, which can be used elsewhere in the power plant or to generate electricity. The gas humidification and cooling tower drops the temperature to 169°F, while reducing the moisture content by 30%. This is done by circulating a weak acid through the gas.

Finally the dilution air is added to the inlet gas stream and this combined stream is sent to the drying tower, which removes the remaining moisture by circulating a 93% acid through the gas. The dilution air is determined by an energy balance on the first stage of the converter.

### 6.3 Performance Model

The sulfuric acid plant model developed is meant to respond to several factors that affect sulfuric acid plant cost. These include the volume flow rate, moisture content, temperature, pressure, combustible gases and SO<sub>2</sub> content of the inlet gas stream. To achieve this, mass and energy balances are performed on key components to determine critical mass and heat loads. These mass and heat loads are used to estimate the capital cost and operating cost.

To perform energy balances, enthalpy data over a large temperature range (77 - 3000°F) are needed for the 11 chemicals listed in the Introduction. These data are obtained by integrating the polynomial correlations for specific heat with respect to temperature obtain from Barin and Knacke (5) and Barin, Knacke and Kubaschewski (6). These polynomial equations are functions in this model, as explained earlier in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2). When the temperature of a gas flow needs to be estimated, an initial estimate is made which is used to interpolate or extrapolate to the final estimated temperature. This procedure reduces the error to less than 5% and is also a non-iterative technique. Some assumptions for this model are (1) that the inlet gas is free of dust, arsenic, chlorine and fluorine, (2) the inlet pressure entering the heat recovery preheater is 95 - 97" inches of water and (3) the temperatures exiting the gas humidification and cooling tower and the drying tower are 169°F and 120°F respectively. The temperatures in the converter and exiting the heat exchangers surrounding it are the same as those estimated in the Monsanto design for SMC (31). The pressure drops for all the equipment remains the same. The gases are assumed to be ideal and all energy transfers are assumed to be adiabatic. The atmosphere is assumed to have a pressure of 14.687 psi, a temperature of 80°F, contain 21% oxygen, 79% nitrogen on a dry basis and 0.018 lbs moisture per pound of dry air. Although these values appear as constants in this report, they are variables in the model.

The first step is to calculate the characteristics of the inlet gas before and after the inlet compressor. The inlet compressor is used if the pressure exiting the regenerator is less than 95" of water. The gas flow rates are based on the ideal gas law, while the energy consumed by the compressor is depended on the pressure difference. If the pressure difference is greater than 50" of water, a compressor is used with an efficiency of 75% (35). Otherwise, a blower is used with an efficiency of 85% (36). The main difference between a blower and a compressor is that a blowers' pressure drop is low enough to assume incompressible flow. The temperature, inlet and exit gas flow rate and energy consumed by the inlet compressor are shown below.

$$T_{IC,o} = (T_{R,o} + 460) \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2*97}}{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}P_{R,o}} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 460$$

$$G_{IC,i} = \frac{1545 M_{R,o} (T_{R,o} + 460)}{60*144 (14.687 + 3.612e^{-2} P_{R,o})}$$

$$G_{IC,o} = \frac{1545 M_{R,o} (T_{IC,o} + 460)}{60*144(14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*97)}$$

if  $P_{R,o} < 47$  then

$$EC_{IC} = \left( \frac{1545M_{R,o}}{0.75*60*44,240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2*97}}{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}P_{R,o}} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (T_{R,o} + 460)$$

else  $EC_{IC} = 1.38e^{-4}G_{IC,i}(97 - P_{R,o})$

The next step is to determine if the gas burner is used and affects the gas flow rate. The model assumes that the pressure drop across the gas burner is negligible. The gas burner is assumed to be fired by natural gas. It is assumed that only enough natural gas is used to maintain and ignite the combustible gases in the inlet stream. Therefore, the energy and mass balances ignore the effects of it. The gas burner has a maximum operating temperature of 2000°F and completely oxidize all the combustible gases. To prevent the gas burner from operating above 2000°F, additional air is added above the stoichiometric requirement to oxidize the combustible gases. To solve for the additional air requirement, the gas burner is assumed to be divided into two parts, shown in Figure 6-2. The first part burns the gases with 5% excess air. If the total energy flow rate into the first part of the gas burner is greater than the energy flow rate of the exhaust gases at 2000°F, then additional air is added. If it isn't, then the exit temperature of the gas burner is estimated by interpolating between the inlet temperature and 2000°F. The oxygen needed for combustion is

$$M_{O,c,1} = 2M_{M,R,o} + 0.5M_{H,R,o} + 0.5M_{CM,R,o} + 1.5M_{CS,R,o} + 1.5M_{HS,R,o} + 2M_{S,R,o}$$

The additional air needed for 5% excess air is

$$\text{if } 1.05M_{O,c,1} > M_{O,R,o} \text{ then}$$

$$M_{O,c} = 1.05M_{O,c,1} - M_{O,R,o}$$

$$\text{else } M_{O,c} = 0$$

$$M_{N,c} = 3.76M_{O,c}$$

$$M_{W,c} = 1.611 * 0.018(M_{O,c} + M_{N,c})$$

Since combustion air has to be raised to 97° of water, its temperature into the gas burner is

$$T_c = (80 + 460) \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2*97}}{14.687} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 460$$

The next step is to determine the exhaust gases exiting the first part of the gas burner and the energy produced. It is assumed that all the methane, hydrogen, carbon monoxide, hydrogen sulfide, sulfur and COS are oxidized.

$$M_{j,GB,1} = 0$$

$$M_{SD,GB,1} = M_{SD,R,o} + M_{CS,R,o} + M_{HS,R,o} + 2M_{S,R,o}$$

$$M_{W,GB,1} = M_{W,R,o} + M_{W,c} + 2M_{M,R,o} + M_{H,R,o} + M_{HS,R,o}$$

$$M_{CD,GB,1} = M_{CD,R,o} + M_{M,R,o} + M_{CM,R,o} + M_{CS,R,o}$$

$$M_{N,GB,1} = M_{N,R,o} + M_{W,c}$$

$$\text{if } M_{O,R,o} > 1.05M_{O,c,1} \text{ then}$$

$$M_{O,GB,1} = M_{O,R,o} - M_{O,c,1}$$

$$\text{else } M_{O,GB,1} = 0.05M_{O,c,1}$$

where  $j = \text{CM,CS,H,HS,M,S}$

$$\bullet H_{GB} = 345,200M_M + 104,000M_H + 121,700M_{CM} + 255,400M_S + \\ 222,900M_{HS} + 236,000M_{CS}$$

Now an energy balance is performed on the first part of the gas burner to see if more air is needed to cool the gas burner. Two estimates are made for the exit temperature: one is made at the maximum allowable temperature of 2000°F, the other is made at the inlet temperature. If the total energy entering the gas burner is greater the energy flow rate of the exhaust gases at 2000°F, then additional air is needed to cool the gas. If the temperature is less than 2000°F, then no additional air is added and the exit temperature is estimated by a linear interpolation between the inlet temperature and 2000°F. Finally, the total molar and volumetric flow rates of the combustion air are calculated, with the energy consumed by the gas burner combustion air compressor.

$$E_{GB,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(T_{GB,i})M_{GB,i}$$

$$E_c = \hat{h}_O(T_c)M_{O,c} + \hat{h}_N(T_c)M_{N,c} + \hat{h}_{W,c}(T_c)M_{w,c}$$

$$E_{GB,total} = E_{BG,i} + E_c + \Delta H_{GB}$$

$$E_{GB,max} = \sum_{j=1}^5 \hat{h}_j(2000)M_{j,1}$$

$$E_{GB,min} = \sum_{j=1}^5 \hat{h}_j(T_{GB,i})M_{j,1}$$

where  $k = \text{CD,CM,CS,H,HS,M,N,O,S,SD,W}$  and  $j = \text{CD,N,O,SD,W}$

if  $E_{GB,total} > E_{GB,max}$  then

$$M_{O,ex} = \frac{E_{GB,total} - E_{GB,max}}{15,180 - \hat{h}_O(T_c) + 3.76(14,440 - \hat{h}_N(T_c)) + 1.611*0.018*(17,920 - \hat{h}_W(T_c))}$$

$$T_{GB,o} = 2000$$



$$\text{else } M_{O,ex} = 0$$

$$T_{GB,o} = \frac{2000 - T_{GB,i}}{E_{-} - E_{-}} (E_{GB,total} - E_{GB,min}) + T_{GB,i}$$

$$M_{N,ex} = 3.76M_{O,ex}$$

$$M_{W,ex} = 1.611 * 0.018 * 4.76M_{O,ex}$$

$$M_{c,total} = M_{O,c} + M_{N,c} + M_{W,c} + M_{O,ex} + M_{N,ex} + M_{W,ex}$$

$$G_{c,total} = \frac{1545M_{c,total} (80 + 460)}{60 * 14.687 * 144}$$

$$EC_{GBC} = \left( \frac{1545M_{c,total}}{0.75 * 60 * 44,240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2} * 97}{14.687} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (80 + 460)$$

The next step is to determine the composition and temperature of the gas steam entering the heat recovery preheater. It should be noted that the composition of the gas stream between the gas burner and the first stage of the converter is the same, except the moisture content. This allows the use of the same variable names for the composition of the gas stream between the gas burner and converter, which saves space and increases execution speed. The composition of the gas stream entering the heat recovery preheater depends on whether the gas burner is used. If it isn't used, the composition and temperature are the same as those exiting the regenerator.

If a gas burner is not used then

$$M_{k,HP,i} = M_{k,R,o}$$

$$T_{HP,i} = T_{R,o}$$

else

$$M_{j,HP,i} = 0$$

$$M_{SD,HP,i} = M_{SD,GB,1}$$

$$M_{CD,HP,i} = M_{CD,GB,1}$$

$$M_{W,HP,i} = M_{W,GB,1} + M_{W,ex}$$

$$M_{N,HP,i} = M_{N,GB,1} + M_{N,ex}$$

$$M_{O,HP,i} = M_{O,GB,1} + M_{O,ex}$$

$$T_{HP,i} = T_{GB,o}$$

$$M_{HP,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} M_{k,HP,i}$$

$$G_{HP,i} = \frac{1545M_{HP,i}(T_{HP,i} + 460)}{60*144*(14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*97)}$$

where k = CD,CM,CS,H,HS,M,N,O,S,SD,W and j = CM,CS,H,HS,M,S

So far the algorithms have followed the gas stream into the acid plant and it seems logical to model the heat recovery preheater next. However, the heat load on the preheater is determined by the gas flow exiting the second stage of the converter, M25, which hasn't been determined and this gas flow is depended on the gas flow entering the converter. This cyclic problem is eliminated by the assumptions made at the beginning of this section and noting that the composition of the gas entering the converter can be predicted by the composition exiting the gas burner. Another important assumption is dividing the first stage of the converter into two parts. The first part burns the combustible gases and converts 70% of the SO<sub>2</sub> to SO<sub>3</sub>. The second part adds dilution air to lower the temperature to 1158°F. This is the same procedure used for the gas burner. Another important points are:

- The combustible gases entering the converter are the same as those exiting the gas burner. Therefore, the energy released in the first stage of the converter can be determined.
- The oxygen requirement for complete conversion of SO<sub>2</sub> to SO<sub>3</sub> and the oxidation of the other combustible gases can be calculated.
- The gas entering the first stage of the converter is assumed to be 997°F and free of moisture, since the drying tower removes all moisture.

The oxygen consumed in the first stage is calculated, with the oxygen needed for oxidation all the combustible gases and converting all the SO<sub>2</sub> to SO<sub>3</sub> is calculated below. This ensures that enough oxygen is available to convert the SO<sub>2</sub> to SO<sub>3</sub>. Once these values are known the composition of the gas exiting the converter, not including additional dilution air needed to maintain 1158°F, can be determined:

$$M_{O,CS,1} = 2M_{M,PH,i} + 0.5M_{CM,PH,i} + 0.5M_{H,PH,i} + 0.35M_{SD,PH,i} + 1.85M_{CS,PH,i} + 1.85M_{HS,PH,i} + 2.7M_{S,PH,i}$$

$$M_{O,CS,all} = 2M_{M,PH,i} + 0.5M_{CM,PH,i} + 0.5M_{H,PH,i} + 0.5M_{SD,PH,i} + 2M_{CS,PH,i} + 2M_{HS,PH,i} + 3M_{S,PH,i}$$

$$\text{if } M_{O,CS,all} > M_{O,PH,i} \text{ then } M_{O,CS,c} = M_{O,CS,all} - M_{O,PH,i}$$

$$\text{else } M_{O,CS,c} = 0$$

$$M_{N,CS,c} = 3.76M_{O,CS,c}$$

$$M_{W,CS,c} = 1.611*0.018(M_{O,CS,c} + M_{O,CS,c})$$

$$\text{if } M_{O,CS,all} > M_{O,PH,i} \text{ then } M_{O,CS,1,o} = M_{O,CS,all} - M_{O,CS,1}$$

$$\text{else } M_{O,CS,1,o} = M_{O,PH,i} - M_{O,CS,1}$$

$$M_{N,CS,1,o} = M_{N,PH,i} + M_{N,CS,c}$$

$$M_{CD,CS,1,o} = M_{CD,PH,i} + M_{M,PH,i} + M_{CM,PH,i} + M_{CS,PH,i}$$

$$M_{W,CS,1,o} = M_{H,PH,i} + 2M_{M,PH,i} + M_{HS,PH,i}$$

$$M_{ST,CS,1,o} = 0.7(M_{SD,PH,i} + 2M_{S,PH,i} + M_{HS,PH,i} + M_{CS,PH,i})$$

$$M_{SD,CS,1,o} = 0.3(M_{SD,PH,i} + 2M_{S,PH,i} + M_{HS,PH,i} + M_{CS,PH,i})$$

$$\bullet H_{CS,1} = 42,570 * 0.7 M_{SD,PH,i} + 345,200 M_{M,PH,i} + 104,000 M_{H,PH,i} +$$

$$121,700 M_{CM,PH,i} + 315,000 M_{S,PH,i} + 261,500 M_{HS,PH,i} + 265,800 M_{CS,PH,i}$$

With this information an energy balance can be performed on the second part of the first stage to determine the additional amount of dry air needed to cool the catalyst to 1158°F. Then the total molar flow rate of moist dilution air can be calculated. The energy flow rate into the second part of the first stage is the energy flow of the species entering the heat recovery preheater at 779°F, except the moisture, plus the energy flow from the combustion air at 779°F, plus the energy released in the first part. The energy flow out of the second part of the first stage is the sum of the product gases at 1158°F. The constants in Equation 6.69 are the enthalpies of oxygen and nitrogen at 779°F. The constant 2864.2 in Equation 3.51 is the enthalpy difference for dry air between 1158°F and 779°F.

$$E_{CS,1} = \sum_{k=1}^{10} \hat{h}_j(779) M_{k,PH,i} + 5,235.7 M_{O,CS,c} + 5,028.4 M_{N,CS,c} + \Delta H_{CS,1} \quad (6.1)$$




$$E_{CS,1,max} = \sum_{j=1}^6 \hat{h}_j(1158) M_{j,CS,1,o}$$

$$M_{air,CS,ex} = \frac{E_{CS,1} - E_{CS,1,max}}{2,864.2} \quad (6.2)$$

$$M_{BF} = (1 + 1.611 * 0.018) M_{air,CS,ex} + M_{O,CS,c} + M_{N,CS,c} + M_{W,CS,c}$$

where  $k = CD, CM, CS, H, HS, M, N, O, S, SD$  and  $j = CD, N, O, SD, ST, W$

Figure 6-3: Inlet Gas Cooling Heat Exchangers



Now the molar flow rates for the gas streams entering and exiting the drying tower and gas streams, 23 & 25 can be determined. The gas stream entering the drying tower is the same as the gas stream entering the heat recovery preheater minus the moisture removed in the gas humidification and cooling tower plus the moist dilution air. This includes all the moisture added with the dilution air, since the dilution air compressor is upstream of the drying tower. The gas streams, 23 & 25, are a bit more complicated to figure out. Stream 23 is after the second stage of the converter, which converts an additional 83% of the SO<sub>2</sub> exiting the first stage to SO<sub>3</sub>, which consumes oxygen. Therefore, gas stream 23 is the sum of M<sub>k,CS,1,o</sub>, the air added for temperature control, M<sub>air,CS,ex</sub>, minus the oxygen consumed in the second stage. After the second stage it passes through the interpass tower, which removes all the moisture and converts all the SO<sub>3</sub> to sulfuric acid. Note that the variables M<sub>N,CS,1,o</sub>, M<sub>O,CS,1,o</sub> and M<sub>CD,CS,1,o</sub> do not include the dry air needed to cool the catalyst to 1158•F.

$$M_{D,i} = M_{PH,i} + M_{BF} - 0.3M_{W,PH,i}$$

$$M_{D,o} = M_{D,i} - 0.7M_{W,PH,i} - 1.611*0.018M_{air,CS,ex} - M_{W,CS,c}$$

$$M_{23} = \sum_{k=1}^6 M_{k,CS,1,o} + M_{air,CS,ex} - 0.5*0.83M_{SD,CS,1,o}$$

$$M_{CD,25} = M_{CD,CS,1,o}$$

$$M_{N,25} = M_{N,CS,1,o} + 0.79M_{air,CS,ex}$$

$$M_{O,25} = M_{O,CS,1,o} + 0.21M_{air,CS,ex} - 0.5*0.83*M_{SD,CS,1,o}$$

$$M_{SD,25} = 0.17M_{SD,CS,1,o}$$

$$M_{25} = \sum_{j=1}^4 M_{j,25}$$

where k = CD,N,O,SD,ST,W and j = CD,N,O,SD

With this information, it is possible to model the heat recovery preheater, superheater and boiler. Schematic diagrams for the heat recovery preheater, boiler and superheater are shown in Figure 6-3. The factor which will most directly affect the cost of heat exchangers are the required heat transfer surface area. This is calculated based on knowledge of the heat transfer load, the heat transfer coefficient U and the log mean temperature difference (LMTD) for the heat exchanger. The heat transfer coefficients for the heat recovery preheater, superheater and boiler are 4.5, 6 and 15 respectively, which are taken from the Monsanto design.

The heat load in the heat recovery preheater is energy needed to raise the gas stream, 25, from 180•F to 256•F. The exit temperature of the heat recovery preheater is estimated by making a guess of the exit temperature based on the ratio of the heat load to the energy entering heat recovery preheater. This algorithm is used instead of a constant since it provides a reasonable estimate of the exit temperature. This temperature estimate is used to estimate the energy flow rate exiting the heat recovery preheater. The energy estimate is used to calculate the exit

temperature. The exit temperature is used to calculate the log mean temperature difference, which is used to determine the area of the heat recovery preheater.

$$Q_{HP} = \sum_{j=1}^4 (\hat{h}_j(256) - \hat{h}_j(180)) M_{j,25}$$

$$E_{HP,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(T_{HP,i}) M_k$$

$$T_{guess} = T_{HP,i} \left( 1 - \frac{Q_{HP}}{E_{HP,i}} \right)$$

$$E_{guess} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(T_{guess}) M_k$$

where  $j = CD, N, O, SD$  and  $k = CD, CM, CS, H, HS, M, N, O, S, SD, W$

$$T_{HP,o} = -Q_{HP} \frac{T_{HP,i} - T_{guess}}{E_{HP,i} - E_{guess}} + T_{HP,i}$$

$$LMTD_{HP} = \frac{(T_{HP,i} - 256) - (T_{HP,o} - 180)}{\ln \left( \frac{T_{HP,i} - 256}{T_{HP,o} - 180} \right)}$$

$$A_{HP} = \frac{Q_{HP}}{4.5 LMTD_{HP}}$$

The calculations for the boiler and superheater are similar, except that first the amount of water that can be heated to steam must be determined and then the calculations for the LMTD and heat transfer areas of the boiler and superheater can be made. To parallel the design work performed by Monsanto, the off-gas temperature leaving the boiler is specified as 506°F, unless the exit temperature of the heat recovery preheater is less. If this occurs, the superheater and boiler are not used, no steam is generated and the temperature of the gas entering the gas humidification and cooling tower is the exit temperature of the heat recovery preheater.<sup>17</sup>

The water mass flow rate required for conversion to steam is calculated by determining how much energy is available in the hot regenerator off-gas to heat water from 226°F to superheated steam at a specified temperature and 100 psia. The constant 17,929 is the energy needed to raise a mole of saturated water at 226 to 338°F, while 2134.8 is the enthalpy of saturated steam at

<sup>17</sup> Instead of testing the exit temperature of the heat recovery preheater to see if it is greater than 506, the energy flow of the gas stream exiting the heat recovery preheater is compared against the energy flow of the gas stream at 506. This method is used since the exit temperature is just an interpolated estimate, while the energy flow exiting the preheater can be determined more accurately by subtracting the heat load from the energy entering the preheater.

338°F. The temperature of the superheated steam is a user specified value, since this steam can be used by some FGD processes, which require steam at different temperatures.

$$E_{HP,o} = E_{HP,i} - Q_{HP}$$

$$E_{506} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(506)M_k$$

if  $E_{HP,o} > E_{506}$  then

$$E_{GC,i} = E_{506}$$

$$T_{GC,i} = 506$$

else

$$E_{GC,i} = E_{HP,o}$$

$$T_{GC,i} = T_{HP,o}$$

$$M_{st} = \frac{E_{HP,o} - E_{GC,i}}{\hat{h}_W(T_{\text{specified}}) - 2134.8 + 17,929}$$

Now the boiler and superheater energy loads can be determined and after an energy balance calculation, the boiler inlet temperature can be determined. The inlet temperature of the boiler can be estimated similarly to the exit temperature of the heat recovery preheater. From this, the LMTD for both the superheater and the boiler can be calculated. Finally, the required heat transfer areas for both heat exchangers are calculated from knowledge of the heat transfer coefficient, heat load and LMTD.

$$Q_b = 17,929M_{st}$$

$$Q_s = (\hat{h}_W(T_{\text{specified}}) - 2134.8)M_{st}$$

$$T_{\text{guess}} = T_{HP,i} \left( 1 - \frac{Q_{HP}}{E_{HP,i}} \right)$$

$$E_{\text{guess}} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(T_{\text{guess}})M_k$$

$$T_{bi,i} = -Q_s \frac{T_{HP,o} - T_{\text{guess}}}{E_{HP,o} - E_{\text{guess}}} + T_{HP,o}$$

The log mean temperature differences for the boiler and superheater are based on the inlet and outlet temperatures of the two heat exchangers. The required heat transfer surface area for

each is calculated based on the heat load, the log mean temperature difference and the universal heat transfer coefficient. The values for the heat transfer coefficients are adopted from the Monsanto estimate.

$$\text{LMTD}_s = \frac{(T_{\text{HP,o}} - T_{\text{specified}}) - (T_{\text{b,i}} - 338)}{\ln\left(\frac{T_{\text{HP,o}} - T_{\text{specified}}}{T_{\text{b,i}} - 338}\right)}$$

$$\text{LMTD}_b = \frac{(T_{\text{b,i}} - 338) - (506 - 226)}{\ln\left(\frac{T_{\text{b,i}} - 338}{506 - 226}\right)}$$

$$A_s = \frac{Q_s}{6\text{LMTD}_s}$$

$$A_b = \frac{Q_b}{15\text{LMTD}_b}$$

The off-gas enters the cooling and humidification tower at a temperature of 506°F and leaves at 169°F. It is assumed that about 30 percent of the water vapor is removed based on the Monsanto design. Cooling is effected by the circulation of a weak acid stream through the cooling tower. The mass flow of this stream is calculated by an energy balance. The constant 324.6 is amount of energy needed to raise the temperature of the weak acid from 163°F to 181°F. The constants 840.6 and 17,813 are the enthalpy and heat of vaporization at 181°F.

$$E_{\text{GC,o}} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(169)M_k - 0.3\hat{h}_w(169)M_{\text{W,HP,i}}$$

$$M_{\text{WA}} = \frac{E_{\text{GC,i}} - E_{\text{GC,o}} + 0.3(\hat{h}_w(T_{\text{GC,i}}) - 840.6 + 17,813)}{324.6}$$

The electricity usage for the main and dilution compressors and also the pumps used for the strong, weak and product acid pumps can be determined. The pressure drops across the main and dilution compressors are 116" and 67" of water respectively.

$$\text{EC}_{\text{BF}} = \left(\frac{1545M_{\text{BF}}}{0.75*60*44240}\right) \left(\frac{1.4}{1.4-1}\right) \left[ \left(\frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*67}{14.687}\right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (80 + 460)$$

$$\text{EC}_{\text{MC}} = \left(\frac{1545M_{\text{D,o}}}{0.75*60*44240}\right) \left(\frac{1.4}{1.4-1}\right) \left[ \left(\frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*167}{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*51}\right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (120 + 460)$$

The total acid produced can be determined with the energy consumption of the pumps. The pressure drops for the strong, weak and product acid pumps are 80 feet of water, 120 psi and 80 psi respectively. The efficiencies for the strong and weak acid pumps are 80%, while the product



pump is much smaller and has an efficiency of 70%. The specific gravity for sulfuric acid greater than 95% is 1.83, while the specific gravity for weak acid is assumed to be 1. The specific gravity for the product acid at 93% concentration, is estimated to be 1.77, which equals  $1.83 \cdot 0.93 + 1 \cdot 0.07$ . The energy needed for the weak acid pump is based on the molar flow rate of weak acid. The strong acid system which supplies acid to the drying, interpass and final towers has three pumps. Therefore, the energy usage is based on scaling the total flow rate for these pumps on the sulfuric acid produced. In the Monsanto design, 3501 gallons per minute of strong acid is pumped against a head of 80 feet of water for 17.3 tons per hour of acid produced.

$$m_{\text{acid}} = 0.995 (M_{\text{SD,R,o}} + M_{\text{CS,R,o}} + M_{\text{HS,R,o}} + 2M_{\text{S,R,o}}) * 98 \text{ lbm/lb}\cdot\text{mole}$$

/ 2000 tons/lbm

$$EC_{\text{WA}} = \frac{120 \frac{\text{lbf}}{\text{in}^2} * 18 \frac{\text{lbm}}{\text{lbmole}} * 144 \frac{\text{in}^2}{\text{ft}^2} M_{\text{WA}}}{44,240 \frac{\text{ft}\cdot\text{lbf}/\text{min}}{\text{kW}} * 7.4805 \frac{\text{gal}}{\text{ft}^3} * 60 \frac{\text{min}}{\text{hr}} * 8.33 \frac{\text{lbm}}{\text{gal}} * 0.80}$$

which simplifies to

$$EC_{\text{WA}} = \frac{120 \frac{\text{lbf}}{\text{in}^2} M_{\text{WA}}}{63,813 \frac{\text{lbmole}/\text{hr} * \text{lbf}/\text{in}^2}{\text{kW}} * 0.80}$$

$$EC_{\text{SS}} = \frac{\left( \frac{3501 \frac{\text{gal}}{\text{min}}}{17.3 \frac{\text{tons}}{\text{hr}}} \right) 80 \text{ ft} * 61.2 \frac{\text{lbm}}{\text{ft}^3} * 32.174 \frac{\text{ft}}{\text{sec}^2} * 1.83 m_{\text{acid}}}{7.4805 \frac{\text{gal}}{\text{ft}^3} * 32.174 \frac{\text{lbm}\cdot\text{ft}}{\text{lbf}\cdot\text{sec}^2} * 44,240 \frac{\text{ft}\cdot\text{lbf}/\text{min}}{\text{kW}} * 0.80}$$

which simplifies to

$$EC_{\text{SS}} = \frac{202.4 \frac{\text{gal}/\text{min}}{\text{tons}/\text{hr}} * 80 \text{ ft} m_{\text{acid}}}{2955 \frac{\text{gal}/\text{min} * \text{ft}}{\text{kW}} * 0.80}$$

$$EC_{\text{PA}} = \frac{2000 \frac{\text{lbm}}{\text{ton}} * 144 \frac{\text{in}^2}{\text{ft}^2} * 80 \frac{\text{lbf}}{\text{in}^2} m_{\text{acid}}}{60 \frac{\text{min}}{\text{hr}} * 8.33 \frac{\text{lbm}}{\text{gal}} * 7.4805 \frac{\text{gal}}{\text{ft}^3} * 44,240 \frac{\text{ft}\cdot\text{lbf}/\text{min}}{\text{kW}} * 1.77 * 0.70}$$

which simplifies to

$$EC_{\text{PA}} = \frac{80 \frac{\text{lbf}}{\text{in}^2} m_{\text{acid}}}{1017 \frac{\text{tons}/\text{hr} \text{ lbf}/\text{in}^2}{\text{kW}} * 0.70}$$

The total energy consumed is the sum of the inlet, gas burner, dilution air and main compressor plus the weak, strong and product acid pumps. The equivalent electric power of the

steam produced is calculated by assuming an 88% efficient boiler and the heat rate specified by the main power plant.

$$EC_{\text{total}} = EC_{\text{IC}} + EC_{\text{GB}} + EC_{\text{BF}} + EC_{\text{MC}} + EC_{\text{WA}} + EC_{\text{SS}} + EC_{\text{PA}}$$

$$EC_{\text{st}} = \frac{E_{\text{PH,o}} - E_{\text{GC,i}}}{0.88\text{HR}}$$

## 6.4 Economic Model

The cost estimate for the sulfuric acid plant is based on physical parameters that affect the cost of the equipment in the plant. An experimental scaling factor of 0.6 is assumed and all the capital costs are in mid-83 dollars, except the inlet compressor and gas burner which are mid-82 dollars. All costs may later be adjusted to a current basis using appropriate cost-escalators included in the IEC model.

### 6.4.1 Capital Cost

The cost of the inlet compressor depends on the pressure drop and the inlet gas flow rate. The cost is pro-rated by pressure drop since the capital cost of blowers and compressors increase with increasing pressure. The cost estimates come from the NOXSO chapter in the EPRI Economic Evaluation of FGD Systems (22). For both estimates, it is assumed that there are two operating and one spare. The algorithm is:

if  $P_{\text{R,o}} < 47''$  of water

$$DCC_{\text{IC}} = \$1.04e^6 \left( \frac{G_{\text{R,o}}}{35,000\text{ft}^3/\text{min}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{\text{idx}}}{314}$$

else if  $47 \leq P_{\text{R,o}} < 95$

$$DCC_{\text{IC}} = \$5.64e^6 \left( \frac{G_{\text{R,o}}}{1.80e^6 \text{ft}^3/\text{min}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{\text{idx}}}{314}$$

The capital gas of the gas burner is also taken from reference (22). It is assumed that there are two operating and one spare and that the cost includes the cost of the combustion air compressor.

$$DCC_{\text{GB}} = \$7.07e^5 \left( \frac{G_{\text{IC,o}}}{68,000 \text{ft}^3/\text{min}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{\text{idx}}}{314}$$

The heat recovery preheater cost is scaled to the Monsanto cost estimate of \$29,000 for a heat exchanger with an area of 1100 square feet. The cost of the boiler is based on an estimated cost of \$53,000 for a heat exchanger with 350 square feet of heat exchange area. The cost of the superheater is scaled from the estimate of \$80,000 for a heat exchanger with an area of 50 square feet.

$$DCC_{HP} = \$29,000 \left( \frac{A_{HP}}{1,100\text{ft}^2} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_b = \$53,000 \left( \frac{A_b}{350\text{ft}^2} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_s = \$80,000 \left( \frac{A_s}{50\text{ft}^2} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

The gas humidification and cooling tower cost estimate is based on the Monsanto estimate of \$367,000 for a gas stream of 1063 lb•mole/hr. The cost of the tower is scaled to the off-gas flow  $M_{GC,i}$  entering the sulfuric acid plant.

$$DCC_{GC} = \$367,000 \left( \frac{M_{GC}}{1,063 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

The weak acid system is associated with the gas humidification and cooling tower. The cost of this system is proportional to the flow rate of weak acid,  $M_{WA}$ , required to achieve the necessary cooling in the tower.

$$DCC_{WA} = \$39,000 \left( \frac{M_{WA}}{19,250 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

The drying tower is sized to accommodate the inlet gas stream consisting of the regenerator off-gas and dilution air,  $M_{D,i}$ . Monsanto estimated a cost of \$636,000 for a tower that handles 5325 lb•mole/hr of gas.

$$DCC_D = \$636,000 \left( \frac{M_{D,i}}{5,325 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

The blower and filter are required to pump and clean the dilution air mass flow,  $M_{BF}$  and are sized accordingly. Monsanto estimated the cost of these components based on a dilution air inlet flow of 4407 lb•mole/hr.

$$DCC_{BF} = \$518,000 \left( \frac{M_{BF}}{4,407 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

The contact section of the sulfuric acid plant includes the inter-pass heat exchangers and the catalytic converter. The total cost of this part of the system was estimated by Monsanto to be \$2,681,000. The cost of this part of the plant is scaled to the gas flow exiting the drying tower.

$$DCC_{CS} = \$2,681,000 \left( \frac{M_{D,o}}{4,854 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

The cost for the interpass and final towers and their associated equipment was estimated to be \$988,000. This cost is scaled to the gas stream  $M_{23}$ .

$$DCC_T = \$988,000 \left( \frac{M_{23}}{4,685 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

The strong acid system is proportional in size to the amount of sulfur in the off-gas stream. The cost of the effluent stripper is assumed to be proportional to the off-gas flow rate.

$$DCC_{SA} = \$739,000 \left( \frac{M_{SD,HP,i} + M_{CS,HP,i} + M_{HS,HP,i} + 2M_{S,HP,i}}{354 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_{ES} = \$70,000 \left( \frac{M_{GC,i}}{1,063 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

The total direct cost of the sulfuric acid plant is the sum of the individual equipment direct capital costs. The indirect capital cost, not including AFUDC, is estimated to be 27.5%, 41.9% and 8.1% of the total direct cost for the labor and general field cost, home office cost and contingency respectively.

$$DCC_{total} = \sum_{k=1}^{13} DCC_k$$

$$TCC_{acid} = (1 + 0.275 + 0.419 + 0.081) DCC_{total} = 1.776 DCC_{total}$$

#### 6.4.2 Operating and Maintenance Costs

The non-utility operating costs of an acid plant consist of the operating, maintenance and administration labor, plus maintenance material, catalyst makeup, marketing and shipping cost. The labor costs and makeup requirements are estimated from letters with Monsanto (33, 34). The maintenance personnel are assumed to only work 1/3 of the total number of hours in a year. It is assumed that 2 operators are always working around the clock. Acid plants of this size require 2 operators per shift, with 2 full time maintenance people. The administration and support labor cost is estimated to be 30% of the operating and maintenance labor cost.

$$OC_{oper} = 2 \text{ persons} * 19.70 \text{ \$/hr} * 8766 \text{ hrs/yr} * C_{idx}/325.3$$

$$OC_{maint-labor} = 2 \text{ persons} * 19.70 \text{ \$/hr} * 8766 \text{ hrs/yr} / 3 * C_{idx}/325.3$$

$$OC_{admin} = 0.30 * (OC_{oper} + OC_{maint-labor})$$

The maintenance material cost is estimated as a fraction of the direct capital cost. The fraction is 0.9%. The makeup of the catalyst is approximately 2% per year and the converter requires approximately \$35.2 per lb•mole/hr of gas flow (1985\$) (34). The marketing and shipping cost are estimated to be 10% of the sulfuric acid credit (12). Sulfuric acid is assumed to sell for \$50/ton (1985\$). (12).

$$OC_{maint-matl} = 0.009 * DCC_{total}$$

$$OC_{\text{makeup}} = 0.02 * 35.2 \text{ 85\$/lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr} * M_6 * C_{\text{id}x}/325.3$$

$$OC_{\text{credit}} = 50 \text{ 85\$/ton} * CF * 8766 * m_{\text{acid}} * C_{\text{id}x}/325.3$$

$$OC_{\text{marketing}} = 0.1 * OC_{\text{credit}}$$

$$OC_{\text{total}} = OC_{\text{oper}} + OC_{\text{maint-labor}} + OC_{\text{admin}} + OC_{\text{main-mater}} + OC_{\text{makeup}} \\ + OC_{\text{marketing}} - OC_{\text{credit}}$$

## 6.5 Numerical Example

This section contains a numerical example of the sulfuric acid plant model presented in the previous sections. The input parameters and their values necessary to run the model are given in Table 6-1. The model will be illustrated by using a gas stream with a large quantity of combustible gases, which requires the use of the gas burner. The gas stream is not from any particular report or FGD process. The composition consists of the species with which this model has been designed for except nitrogen and oxygen.<sup>18</sup> The pressure exiting the regenerator in the FGD process is 28" of water. Therefore, the inlet compressor is required to raise the pressure to 97" of water.

Since the pressure of the regenerator off-gas is less than 97" of water, the inlet compressor is needed. Equations 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 are used to calculate the temperature exiting the inlet compressor, gas flow rate in actual cubic feet per minute and electricity consumption of the compressor.

$$T_{\text{IC},o} = (T_{\text{R},o} + 460) \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2*97}}{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}P_{\text{R},o}} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 460 \quad (6.3)$$

$$T_{\text{IC},i} = (550 + 460) \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612d^{-2*97}}{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2*28}} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 460$$

$$T_{\text{IC},i} = 958.5\text{°F}$$

$$G_{\text{IC},i} = \frac{1545 M_{\text{R},o} (T_{\text{R},o} + 460)}{60*144 (14.687 + 3.612e^{-2} P_{\text{R},o})} \quad (6.4)$$

$$G_{\text{IC},i} = \frac{1545*1,568*(550 + 460)}{60*144(14.687 + 3.612e^{-2*28})}$$

$$G_{\text{IC},i} = 24,290 \text{ acfm}$$

<sup>18</sup> There are two reasons for not including oxygen and nitrogen in the gas stream for the numerical example. Since there are products of incomplete oxidation in this particular gas stream, it is not likely to contain oxygen. Nitrogen could have been added to the gas; however, any nitrogen available would probably have been added with air to completely oxidize the gas in the regenerator.

$$G_{IC,o} = \frac{1545 M_{R,o} (T_{IC,o} + 460)}{60*144(14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*97)} \quad (6.5)$$

**Table 6-1:** Input Parameters for Sulfuric Acid Plant Numerical Example

Input Parameter	Sample Value	Input Parameter	Sample Value
$T_{R,o}$	900°F	$M_{M,R,o}$	10 lb•mole/hr
$P_{R,o}$	28" of water	$M_{N,R,o}$	0 lb•mole/hr
$T_{specified}$	550°F	$M_{O,R,o}$	0 lb•mole/hr
$M_{CD,R,o}$	500 lb•mole/hr	$M_{S,R,o}$	41 lb•mole/hr
$M_{CO,R,o}$	50 lb•mole/hr	$M_{SD,R,o}$	200 lb•mole/hr
$M_{COS,R,o}$	17 lb•mole/hr	$M_{W,R,o}$	500 lb•mole/hr
$M_{H,R,o}$	100 lb•mole/hr	$M_{R,o}$	1,568 lb•mole/hr
$M_{HS,R,o}$	150 lb•mole/hr		

$$G_{IC,o} = \frac{1,545*1,568*(958.54 + 460)}{60*144*(14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*97)}$$

$$G_{IC,o} = 21,865 \text{ acfm}$$

if  $P_{R,o} < 47$  then

$$EC_{IC} = \left( \frac{1545M_{R,o}}{0.75*60*44,240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*97}{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}P_{R,o}} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (T_{R,o} + 460) \quad (6.6)$$

$$\text{else } EC_{IC} = 1.38e^{-4}G_{IC,i}(97 - P_{R,o})$$

Since 28" is less than 97"

$$EC_{IC} = \left( \frac{1,545*1,568}{0.75*60*44,240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*97}{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*28} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (T_{R,o} + 460)$$

$$EC_{IC} = 249.3 \text{ kW}$$

The gas burner is used since the inlet gas contains many combustible gases. The algorithm of the gas burner divides it into two parts, see Figure 6-3. The first part determines the amount of energy released by burning the combustible gases. This is used to determine the total energy flow exiting the first part of the gas burner and the composition of the outlet gas. The air needed for combustion and its temperature are calculated first.

$$M_{O,c,1} = 2M_{M,R,o} + 0.5M_{H,R,o} + 0.5M_{CM,R,o} + 1.5M_{CS,R,o} + 1.5M_{HS,R,o} + 2M_{S,R,o}$$

$$M_{O,c,1} = 2*10 + 0.5*100 + 0.5*50 + 1.5*17 + 1.5*150 + 2*41 = 427.5 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

since  $1.05*427.5 > 0$

$$M_{O,c} = 1.05*427.5 - 0 = 448.9 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{N,c} = 3.76M_{O,c} = 3.76*448.88 = 1,688 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{W,c} = 1.611*0.018(448.88 + 1,687.77) = 61.96 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$T_c = (80 + 460) \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2*97}}{14.687} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 460$$

$$T_c = 114.1 \cdot F$$

Now the exhaust gas from the first part and the energy released are calculated.

$$M_{CO,GB,1} = M_{COS,GB,1} = M_{H,GB,1} = M_{HS,GB,1} = M_{M,GB,1} = M_{S,GB,1} = 0$$

$$M_{SD,GB,1} = M_{SD,R,o} + M_{CS,R,o} + M_{HS,R,o} + 2M_{S,R,o}$$

$$M_{SD,GB,1} = 200 + 17 + 150 + 2*41 = 449 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{W,GB,1} = M_{W,R,o} + M_{W,c} + 2M_{M,R,o} + M_{H,R,o} + M_{HS,R,o}$$

$$M_{W,GB,1} = 500 + 61.96 + 2*10 + 100 + 150 = 832.0 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{CD,GB,1} = M_{CD,R,o} + M_{M,R,o} + M_{CM,R,o} + M_{CS,R,o}$$

$$M_{CD,GB,1} = 500 + 10 + 50 + 17 = 577 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{N,GB,1} = M_{N,R,o} + M_{W,c}$$

$$M_{N,GB,1} = 0 + 1,688 = 1,688 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

since  $0 > 1.05*427.5$  is false

$$M_{O,GB,1} = 0.05M_{O,c,1} = 0.05*417.5 = 21.38$$

$$\bullet H_{GB} = 345,200M_M + 104,000M_H + 121,700M_{CM} + 255,400M_S + 222,900M_{HS} + 236,000M_{CS}$$

$$\bullet H_{GB} = 345,200*10 + 104,000*100 + 121,700*50 + 255,400*41 + 222,900*150 + 236,000*17$$

$$\bullet H_{GB} = 67.86e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

The total energy exiting the first part of the gas burner is calculated next, with the energy flow rates of the exhaust gases at two estimated temperatures 2000•F and 958.54•F. Then the energy flow exiting the first part is compared to the energy flow rate of the exhaust gas, if it is greater than additional air is needed to cool the gas burner. Then the total volumetric flow rate of

the combustion gas is calculated with the electricity consumed by the compressor for the combustion air.

$$E_{GB,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(T_{GB,i})M_{GB,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(958.54)M_{GB,i}$$

$$E_{GB,i} = 9,567*500 + 6,414*50 + 10.34e^3*17 + 6,166*100 + 7,950*150 + \\ 10,33e^3*10 + 6,359*0 + 7.426*41 + 9,833*200 + 7,576*500$$

$$E_{GB,i} = 13.25e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$E_c = \hat{h}_O(T_c)M_{O,c} + \hat{h}_N(T_c)M_{N,c} + \hat{h}_{W,c}(T_c)M_{w,c}$$

$$E_c = 261.3*448.9 + 258.6*1,688 + 298.2*61.96 = 572.2e^3 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$E_{GB,total} = E_{BG,i} + E_c + \Delta H_{GB}$$

$$E_{GB,total} = 13.25e^6 + 572.2e^3 + 67.86e^6 = 81.68e^6$$

$$E_{GB,max} = \sum_{j=1}^5 \hat{h}_j(2000)M_{j,1}$$

$$E_{GB,max} = 22.78e^3*577 + 14.44e^3*1,688 + 15.18e^3*21.38 + 23.36e^3*449 + \\ 17.92e^3*832.0$$

$$E_{GB,max} = 63.24e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$E_{GB,min} = \sum_{j=1}^5 \hat{h}_j(T_{GB,i})M_{j,1}$$

$$E_{GB,min} = 9,569*577 + 6,359*1,688 + 6,640*21.38 + 9,833*449 + 7,576*832.0$$

$$E_{GB,min} = 27.11e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$



if  $E_{GB,total} > E_{GB,max}$  then

$$M_{O,ex} = \frac{E_{GB,total} - E_{GB,max}}{15,180 - \hat{h}_O(T_c) + 3.76(14,440 - \hat{h}_N(T_c)) + 1.611*0.018*(17,920 - \hat{h}_W(T_c))}$$

$$T_{GB,o} = 2000$$

else  $M_{O,ex} = 0$

$$T_{GB,o} = \frac{2000 - T_{GB,i}}{E_{GB,max} - E_{GB,min}} (E_{GB,total} - E_{GB,min}) + T_{GB,i}$$

since  $81.68e^6 > 63.24e^6$

$$M_{O,ex} = \frac{81.68e^6 - 63.24e^6}{(15,180 - 261.3) + 3.76(14,440 - 258.6) + 1.611*0.018*4.76(17,920 - 298.2)}$$

$$M_{O,ex} = 260.9 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$T_{GB,o} = 2000\text{°F}$$

$$M_{N,ex} = 3.76M_{O,ex} = 3.76*260.9 = 981.1 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{W,ex} = 1.611*0.018*4.76M_{O,ex} = 1.611*0.018*4.76*260.9 = 36.02 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{c,total} = M_{O,c} + M_{N,c} + M_{W,c} + M_{O,ex} + M_{N,ex} + M_{W,ex}$$

$$M_{c,total} = 448.9 + 1,688 + 61.96 + 260.9 + 981.1 + 36.02 = 3,477 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$G_{c,total} = \frac{1,545M_{c,total}(80 + 460)}{60*14.687*144} = \frac{1,545*3,477*(80 + 460)}{60*14.687*144} = 22,860 \text{ acfm}$$

$$EC_{GB} = \left( \frac{1545M_{c,total}}{0.75*60*44,240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687+3.612e^{-2}*97}{14.687} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (80 + 460)$$

$$EC_{GB} = \left( \frac{1,545*3,477}{0.75*60*44,240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*97}{14.687} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (80 + 460)$$

$$EC_{GB} = 321.8 \text{ kW}$$

Since the gas burner is used, the actual exhaust gas and volumetric gas flow rate needs to be calculated. It is important to note that the molar flow rate has tripled, while the volumetric flow

rate has increased almost five times. Since the gas burner is upstream of the superheater and boiler, the energy released in the gas burner can be partially recovered by the superheater and boiler.

$$M_{CO,HP,i} = M_{COS,HP,i} = M_{H,HP,i} = M_{HS,HP,i} = M_{M,HP,i} = M_{S,HP,i} = 0 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{SD,HP,i} = M_{SD,GB,1} = 449 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{CD,HP,i} = M_{CD,GB,1} = 577 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{N,HP,i} = M_{N,GB,1} + M_{N,ex} = 1,688 + 981.1 = 2669 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{O,HP,i} = M_{O,GB,1} + M_{O,ex} = 21.38 + 260.9 = 282.3 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{W,HP,i} = M_{W,GB,1} + M_{W,ex} = 832.0 + 36.02 = 868.0 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$T_{HP,i} = T_{GB,o} = 2000\text{°F}$$

$$M_{HP,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} M_{k,HP,i} = 577 + 2,669 + 282.3 + 449 + 868.0 = 4,845 \text{ lbmole/hr}$$

$$G_{HP,i} = \frac{1,545 M_{HP,i} (T_{HP,i} + 460)}{60 \cdot 144 \cdot (14.687 + 3.612e^{-2} \cdot 97)} = \frac{1,545 \cdot 4,845 \cdot (2,000 + 460)}{60 \cdot 144 \cdot (14.687 + 3.612e^{-2} \cdot 97)}$$

$$G_{HP,i} = 117.2e^3 \text{ acfm}$$

The next step is to calculate the oxygen needed for the converter and the energy released in the first stage of the converter. The first stage of the catalytic converter is divided into two parts to solve for dilution air. The first part burns any combustibles and converts above 70% of the SO<sub>2</sub> to SO<sub>3</sub>.

$$M_{O,CS,1} = 2M_{M,PH,i} + 0.5M_{CM,PH,i} + 0.5M_{H,PH,i} + 0.35M_{SD,PH,i} + 1.85M_{CS,PH,i} + 1.85M_{HS,PH,i} + 2.7M_{S,PH,i} \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{O,CS,1} = 2 \cdot 0 + 0.5 \cdot 0 + 0.5 \cdot 0 + 0.35 \cdot 449 + 1.85 \cdot 0 + 1.85 \cdot 0 + 2.7 \cdot 0 = 157.2$$

$$M_{O,CS,all} = 2M_{M,PH,i} + 0.5M_{CM,PH,i} + 0.5M_{H,PH,i} + 0.5M_{SD,PH,i} + 2M_{CS,PH,i} + 2M_{HS,PH,i} + 3M_{S,PH,i}$$

$$M_{O,CS,all} = 20 + 0.5 \cdot 0 + 0.5 \cdot 0 + 0.5 \cdot 449 + 2 \cdot 0 + 2 \cdot 0 + 3 \cdot 0 = 224.5 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$\text{if } M_{O,CS,all} > M_{O,PH,i} \text{ then } M_{O,CS,c} = M_{O,CS,all} - M_{O,PH,i}$$

$$\text{else } M_{O,CS,c} = 0$$

since 224.5 is not greater than 282.3 then

$$M_{O,CS,c} = 0 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{N,CS,c} = 3.76M_{O,CS,c} = 3.76 \cdot 0 = 0 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{W,CS,c} = 1.611*0.018(M_{O,CS,c} + M_{O,CS,c}) = 1.611*0.018(0 + 0) = 0 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$\text{if } M_{O,CS,all} > M_{O,PH,i} \text{ then } M_{O,CS,1,o} = M_{O,CS,all} - M_{O,CS,1}$$

$$\text{else } M_{O,CS,1,o} = M_{O,PH,i} - M_{O,CS,1}$$

since 224.5 is not greater than 282.3 then

$$M_{O,CS,1,o} = M_{O,PH,i} - M_{O,CS,1} = 282.3 - 157.2 = 125.2 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{N,CS,1,o} = M_{N,PH,i} + M_{N,CS,c} = 2,669 + 0 = 2,669 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{CD,CS,1,o} = M_{CD,PH,i} + M_{M,PH,i} + M_{CM,PH,i} + M_{CS,PH,i}$$

$$M_{CD,CS,1,o} = 577 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 577 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{W,CS,1,o} = M_{H,PH,i} + 2M_{M,PH,i} + M_{HS,PH,i} = 0 + 0 + 2*0 = 0 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{ST,CS,1,o} = 0.7(M_{SD,PH,i} + 2M_{S,PH,i} + M_{HS,PH,i} + M_{CS,PH,i})$$

$$M_{ST,CS,1,o} = 0.7(449 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0) = 314.3$$

$$M_{SD,CS,1,o} = 0.3(M_{SD,PH,i} + 2M_{S,PH,i} + M_{HS,PH,i} + M_{CS,PH,i})$$

$$M_{SD,CS,1,o} = 0.3(449 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0) = 134.7$$

$$\bullet H_{CS,1} = 42,570*0.7M_{SD,PH,i} + 345,200M_{M,PH,i} + 104,000M_{H,PH,i} +$$

$$121,700M_{CM,PH,i} + 315,000M_{S,PH,i} + 261,500M_{HS,PH,i} + 265,800M_{CS,PH,i}$$

$$\bullet H_{CS,1} = 42,570*0.7*449 + 345,200*0 + 104,000*0 + 121,700*0 + 315,000*0$$

$$+ 261,500*0 + 265,800*0 = 13.38e^6$$

An energy balance can be made to determine the amount of air needed for cooling the first stage of the converter. Once this value is known, the total amount of moist dilution air can be determined with the molar flow rates exiting the drying tower ( $M_6$ ), second stage ( $M_{23}$ ) and entering the heat recovery preheater ( $M_{25}$ ).

$$E_{CS,1} = \sum_{k=1}^{10} \hat{h}_j (779) M_{k,PH,i} + 5,235.7 M_{O,CS,c} + 5,028.4 M_{N,CS,c} + \Delta H_{CS,1}$$

$$E_{CS,1} = 7,456*577 + 5,068*0 + 8,082*0 + 4,888*0 + 6,202*0 + 7,779*0 +$$

$$5,028*2,669 + 5,236*282.3 + 5,869*0 + 7,680*449 + 5,236*0 + 5,028*0 +$$

$$13.38e^6$$

$$E_{CS,1} = 36.03e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$E_{CS,1,max} = \sum_{j=1}^6 \hat{h}_j (1158) M_{j,CS,1,o}$$

$$E_{CS,max} = 11,980*577 + 7,859*2,669 + 8,226*125.2 + 12,290*134.7 + 16,970*314.3 + 9,439*0$$

$$E_{CS,max} = 35.91e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

where  $k = \text{CD,CM,CS,H,HS,M,N,O,S,SD}$  and  $j = \text{CD,N,O,SD,ST,W}$

$$M_{air,CS,ex} = \frac{E_{CS,1} - E_{CS,1,max}}{2,864.2} = \frac{36.03e^6 - 35.91e^6}{2,864.2} = 42.53 \text{ lbmole/hr}$$

$$M_{BF} = (1 + 1.611*0.018)M_{air,CS,ex} + M_{O,CS,c} + M_{N,CS,c} + M_{W,CS,c}$$

$$M_{BF} = (1 + 1.611*0.018)42.53 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 43.76 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{D,i} = M_{PH,i} + M_{BF} - 0.3M_{W,PH,i} = 4845 + 43.76 - 0.3*868.0 = 4,629 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{D,o} = M_{D,i} - 0.7M_{W,PH,i} - 1.611*0.018M_{air,CS,ex} - M_{W,CS,c}$$

$$M_{D,o} = 4,629 - 0.7*868.0 - 1.611*0.018*43.76 - 0 = 4,020 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{23} = \sum_{k=1}^6 M_{k,CS,1,o} + M_{air,CS,ex} - 0.5*0.83M_{SD,CS,1,o}$$

$$M_{23} = 577 + 2,669 + 125.2 + 134.7 + 314.3 + 0 + 42.53 - 0.5*0.83*134.7$$

$$M_{23} = 3,807 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{CD,25} = M_{CD,CS,1,o} = 577 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{N,25} = M_{N,CS,1,o} + 0.79M_{air,CS,ex} = 2,669 + 0.79*42.53 = 2,702 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{O,25} = M_{O,CS,1,o} + 0.21M_{air,CS,ex} - 0.5*0.83*M_{SD,CS,1,o}$$

$$M_{O,25} = 125.2 + 0.21*42.53 - 0.5*0.83*134.7$$

$$M_{O,25} = 78.19 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{SD,25} = 0.17M_{SD,CS,1,o} = 0.17*134.7 = 22.90 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$M_{25} = \sum_{j=1}^4 M_{j,25} = 577 + 270 + 78.18 + 22.90 = 3,381 \text{ lbmole/hr}$$

where  $k = \text{CD,N,O,SD,ST,W}$  and  $j = \text{CD,N,O,SD}$

The heat load on the heat recovery preheater can be determined now. The initial guess for the exit temperature is estimated by the ratio of the heat load to the inlet energy flow rate. This algorithm is used because it makes a very good initial guess for a wide range of inlet temperatures, compositions and heat loads. Note that in Equations 6.7 and 6.8, the molar flow rates of the combustible gases are zero and weren't shown in the calculation.

$$Q_{HP} = \sum_{j=1}^4 (\hat{h}_j(256) - \hat{h}_j(180)) M_{j,25}$$

$$Q_{HP} = (1,715 - 961.0) * 577 + (1,256 - 720.3) * 2,702 + (1,285 - 732.3) * 78.19 + (1,802 - 1,017) * 22.29$$

$$Q_{HP} = 1.943e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$E_{HP,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(T_{HP,i}) M_k = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(2000) M_k \quad (6.7)$$

$$E_{HP,i} = 22.78e^3 * 577 + 14.44e^3 * 2,669 + 15.18e^3 * 282.3 + 23.36e^3 * 449 + 17.92e^3 * 868.0$$

$$E_{HP,i} = 82.01e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$T_{guess} = T_{HP,i} \left( 1 - \frac{Q_{HP}}{E_{HP,i}} \right) = 2,000 \left( 1 - \frac{1.943e^6}{82.01e^6} \right) = 1,953^\circ\text{F}$$

$$E_{guess} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(T_{guess}) M_k = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(1,953) M_k \quad (6.8)$$

$$E_{guess} = 22.15e^3 * 577 + 14.06e^3 * 2,669 + 14.78e^3 * 282.3 + 22.70e^3 * 449 + 17.42e^3 * 868.0$$

$$E_{guess} = 79.79e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

where  $j = \text{CD,N,O,SD}$  and  $k = \text{CD,CM,CS,H,HS,M,N,O,S,SD,W}$

$$T_{HP,o} = -Q_{HP} \frac{T_{HP,i} - T_{guess}}{E_{HP,i} - E_{guess}} + T_{HP,i} = -1.943e^6 \frac{2,000 - 1,953}{82.01e^6 - 79.79e^6} + 2,000 = 1,959^\circ\text{F}$$

$$LMTD_{HP} = \frac{(T_{HP,i} - 256) - (T_{HP,o} - 180)}{\ln \left( \frac{T_{HP,i} - 256}{T_{HP,o} - 180} \right)} = \frac{(2,000 - 256) - (1,959 - 180)}{\ln \left( \frac{1,959 - 256}{2,000 - 180} \right)} = 1,761^\circ\text{F}$$

$$A_{HP} = \frac{Q_{HP}}{4.5 LMTD_{HP}} = \frac{1.943e^6}{4.5 * 1,761} = 245.1 \text{ ft}^2$$

The amount of steam generated with the heat and area of the boiler and superheater, are determined similarly to the heat recovery preheater. The energy flow rate exiting the heat

recovery preheater is compared to the energy flow at 506°F to determine if any steam can be generated.

$$E_{HP,o} = E_{HP,i} - Q_{HP} = 82.01e^6 - 1.943e^6 = 80.07 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$E_{506} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(506)M_k$$

$$E_{506} = 4,366*577 + 3,040*2,669 + 3,143*282.3 + 4,527*449 + 3,556*868.0$$

$$E_{506} = 16.64e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

and  $k = \text{CD,CM,CS,H,HS,M,N,O,S,SD,W}$

if  $E_{HP,o} > E_{506}$  then

$$E_{GC,i} = E_{506}$$

$$T_{GC,i} = 506$$

since  $80.07e^6$  is greater than  $16.64e^6$

$$E_{GC,i} = 16.64e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$T_{GC,i} = 506^\circ\text{F}$$

$$M_{st} = \frac{E_{HP,o} - E_{GC,i}}{\hat{h}_W(T_{\text{specified}}) - 2,134.8 + 17,929} = \frac{80.07e^6 - 16.64e^6}{3,934 - 2,134.8 + 17,929}$$

$$M_{st} = 3215 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

Now the boiler and superheater heat loads and also the log mean temperature differences and areas can be determined. It should be noted that the model is not smart enough to determine whether the exit temperature of the heat recovery preheater is lower than the specified temperature of the steam. If this occurs, a warning will be generated by the model when the model tries to evaluate the log mean temperature difference for the superheater. At this point the user should check the exit temperature of the heat recovery preheater and set the temperature of the steam accordingly.

$$Q_b = 17,929M_{st} = 17,929*3,215 = 57.65e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$Q_s = [\hat{h}_W(T_{\text{specified}}) - 2134.8]M_{st} = (3,934 - 2,134.8)*3,215 = 5,786e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$T_{\text{guess}} = T_{HP,o} \left( 1 - \frac{Q_s}{E_{HP,o}} \right) = 1,959 \left( 1 - \frac{5.768e^6}{80.07e^6} \right) = 1,817^\circ\text{F}$$

$$E_{\text{guess}} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(T_{\text{guess}})M_k = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(1,817)M_k$$

$$E_{\text{guess}} = 20.35e^3 * 577 + 12.98e^3 * 2,669 + 13.63e^3 * 282.3 + 20.86e^3 * 449 + 15.99e^3 * 868.0$$

$$E_{\text{guess}} = 73.49e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$T_{\text{bi},i} = -Q_s \frac{T_{\text{HP},o} - T_{\text{guess}}}{E_{\text{HP},o} - E_{\text{guess}}} + T_{\text{HP},o} = -5.786e^6 \frac{1,959 - 1,817}{80.07e^6 - 73.49e^6} + 1,959 = 1,834^\circ\text{F}$$

$$\text{LMTD}_s = \frac{(T_{\text{HP},o} - T_{\text{specified}}) - (T_{\text{b},i} - 338)}{\ln\left(\frac{T_{\text{HP},o} - 338}{T_{\text{b},i} - 338}\right)} = \frac{(1,959 - 550) - (1,834 - 338)}{\ln\left(\frac{1,959 - 550}{1,834 - 338}\right)} = 1,452^\circ\text{F}$$

$$\text{LMTD}_b = \frac{(T_{\text{b},i} - 338) - (506 - 226)}{\ln\left(\frac{T_{\text{b},i} - 338}{506 - 226}\right)} = \frac{(1,834 - 338) - (506 - 226)}{\ln\left(\frac{1,834 - 338}{506 - 226}\right)} = 725.8^\circ\text{F}$$

$$A_s = \frac{Q_s}{6\text{LMTD}_s} = \frac{5.786e^6}{6 * 1,452} = 664 \text{ ft}^2$$

$$A_b = \frac{Q_b}{15\text{LMTD}_b} = \frac{57.65e^6}{15 * 725.8} = 5,295 \text{ ft}^2$$

The weak acid needed for the gas humidification and cooling tower and also the electricity consumption of the compressors and pumps can be calculated now.

$$E_{\text{GC},o} = \sum_{k=1}^{11} \hat{h}_k(169)M_k - 0.3\hat{h}_w(169)M_{\text{W,HP},i}$$

$$E_{\text{GC},o} = 854.7 * 577 + 643.1 * 2,669 + 653.2 * 282.3 + 905.2 * 449 + 742.9 * 868.0 - 0.3 * 742.9 * 868.0$$

$$E_{\text{GC},o} = 3.252e^6 \text{ Btu/hr}$$

$$M_{\text{WA}} = \frac{E_{\text{GC},i} - E_{\text{GC},o} + 0.3(\hat{h}_w(T_{\text{GC},i}) - 840.6 + 17,813)M_{\text{W,HP},i}}{324.6}$$

$$M_{WA} = \frac{16.64e^6 - 3.252e^6 + 0.3(3,556 - 840.6 + 17,813)868.0}{324.6}$$

$$M_{WA} = 57,710 \text{ lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr}$$

$$EC_{BF} = \left( \frac{1545M_{BF}}{0.75*60*44240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*67}{14.687} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (80 + 460)$$

$$EC_{BF} = \left( \frac{1,545*43.76}{0.75*60*44,240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*67}{14.687} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (80 + 460)$$

$$EC_{BF} = 2.862 \text{ kW}$$

$$EC_{MC} = \left( \frac{1545M_{D,o}}{0.75*60*44240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*167}{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*51} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (120 + 460) ($$

$$EC_{MC} = \left( \frac{1,545*4,020}{0.75*60*44,240} \right) \left( \frac{1.4}{1.4-1} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*167}{14.687 + 3.612e^{-2}*51} \right)^{\frac{1.4-1}{1.4}} - 1 \right] (120 + 460)$$

$$EC_{MC} = 422.7 \text{ kW}$$

$$m_{acid} = 0.995(M_{SD,R,o} + M_{CS,R,o} + M_{HS,R,o} + 2M_{S,R,o}) 98 \text{ lbm/lb}\cdot\text{mole}$$

$$/2000 \text{ tons/lbm}$$

$$m_{acid} = 0.995(200 + 17 + 50 + 41) * 98/2000 = 21.89 \text{ tons/hr}$$

$$EC_{WA} = \frac{120 \frac{\text{lbf}}{\text{in}^2} M_{WA}}{63,813 \frac{\text{lbmole/hr} * \text{lbf/in}^2}{\text{kW}} * 0.80}$$

$$EC_{WA} = \frac{120 * 57,710}{63,813 * 0.8} = 135.7 \text{ kW}$$

$$EC_{SS} = \frac{202.4 \frac{\text{ga, om}}{\text{tons/hr}} * 80 \text{ ft } m_{acid}}{2955 \frac{\text{gal/min} * \text{ft}}{\text{kW}} * 0.80}$$

$$EC_{SS} = \frac{202.4 * 21.89 * 80}{2,955 * 0.8} = 149.9 \text{ kW}$$



$$EC_{PA} = \frac{80 \frac{\text{lb}_f \cdot \text{m}}{\text{in}^2} \text{acid}}{1017 \frac{\text{tons/hr lb}_f/\text{in}^2}{\text{kW}} * 0.70}$$

$$EC_{PA} = \frac{21.89 * 80}{1,017 * 0.7} = 2.46$$

$$EC_{\text{total}} = EC_{IC} + EC_{GB} + EC_{BF} + EC_{MC} + EC_{WA} + EC_{SS} + EC_{PA}$$

$$EC_{\text{total}} = 249.3 + 321.8 + 2.862 + 422.7 + 135.7 + 149.9 + 2.46 = 1,285 \text{ kW}$$

$$EC_{st} = \frac{E_{PH,o} - E_{GC,i}}{0.88HR}$$

$$EC_{st} = \frac{E_{PH,o} - E_{GC,i}}{0.88HR} = \frac{80.07e^6 - 16.64e^6}{0.88 * 9500} = 7,587 \text{ kW}$$

The direct capital cost of the power plant is calculated next.

if  $P_{R,o} > 47$  then

$$DCC_{IC} = \$1.04e^6 \left( \frac{G_{R,o}}{35,000 \text{ ft}^3/\text{min}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{314}$$

else if  $47 \leq P_{R,o} < 95$

$$DCC_{IC} = \$5.64e^6 \left( \frac{G_{R,o}}{1.80e^6 \text{ ft}^3/\text{min}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{314}$$

since  $P_{R,o} > 47$

$$DCC_{IC} = \$1.04e^6 \left( \frac{G_{R,o}}{35,000 \text{ ft}^3/\text{min}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{314} = \$1.04e^6 \left( \frac{24,290}{35,000} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{314} = \$843.0e^3$$

$$DCC_{GB} = \$7.07e^5 \left( \frac{G_{IC,o}}{68,000 \text{ ft}^3/\text{min}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{314} = \$7.07e^5 \left( \frac{21,870}{68,000} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{314} = \$361.2e^3$$

$$DCC_{HP} = \$29,000 \left( \frac{A_{HP}}{1,100 \text{ ft}^2} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$29,000 \left( \frac{245.1}{1,100} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9} = \$11.78e^3$$

$$DCC_b = \$53,000 \left( \frac{A_b}{350 \text{ ft}^2} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$53,000 \left( \frac{5,295}{350} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9} = \$270.5e^6$$

$$DCC_s = \$80,000 \left( \frac{A_s}{50 \text{ft}^2} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$80,000 \left( \frac{664.0}{50} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9} = \$377.6e^3$$

$$DCC_{GC} = \$367,000 \left( \frac{M_{GC}}{1,063 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$367,000 \left( \frac{4,845}{1,063} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_{GC} = \$911.9e^3$$

$$DCC_{WA} = \$39,000 \left( \frac{M_{WA}}{19,250 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$39,000 \left( \frac{57,710}{19,250} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_{WA} = \$75.36e^3$$

$$DCC_D = \$636,000 \left( \frac{M_{D,i}}{5,325 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$636,000 \left( \frac{4,629}{5,325} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_D = \$586.7e^3$$

$$DCC_{BF} = \$518,000 \left( \frac{M_{BF}}{4407 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$518,000 \left( \frac{43.76}{4407} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_{BF} = \$32.55e^3$$

$$DCC_{CS} = \$2,681,000 \left( \frac{M_{D,o}}{4854 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$2,681,000 \left( \frac{4020}{4854} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_{CS} = \$2.394e^6$$

$$DCC_T = \$988,000 \left( \frac{M_{23}}{4685 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$988,000 \left( \frac{3807}{4685} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_T = \$872.3e^3$$

$$DCC_{SA} = \$739,000 \left( \frac{M_{SD,HP,i} + M_{CS,HP,i} + M_{HS,HP,i} + 2M_{S,HP,i}}{354 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_{SA} = \$739,000 \left( \frac{449 + 0 + 0 + 0}{354} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9} = \$852.3e^3$$

$$DCC_{ES} = \$70,000 \left( \frac{M_{GC,i}}{1,063 \text{ lbmole/hr}} \right)^{0.6} \frac{C_{idx}}{316.9} = \$70,000 \left( \frac{4,845}{1,063} \right)^{0.6} \frac{316.9}{316.9}$$

$$DCC_{ES} = \$173.9e^3$$

$$DCC_{total} = \sum_{k=1}^{13} DCC_k = \$843.0e^3 + \$361.2e^3 + \$11.78e^3 + \$270.5e^3 + \$377.6e^3 + \\ \$911.9e^3 + \$75.36e^3 + \$584.7e^3 + \$32.55e^3 + \$2,394e^3 + \$872.3e^3 + \\ \$852.3e^3 + \$173.9e^3$$

$$DCC_{total} = \$7.761e^6$$

$$TCC_{acid} = (1 + 0.275 + 0.419 + 0.081)DCC_{total} = 1.776DCC_{total}$$

$$TCC_{acid} = 1.776 * \$7.761e^3 = \$13.784e^3$$

Now the operating costs are calculated.

$$OC_{oper} = 2 \text{ persons} * 19.70 \text{ \$/hr} * 8766 \text{ hrs/yr} * C_{idx}/325.3$$

$$OC_{oper} = 2 * 19.70 * 8766 * 316.9 / 325.3 = \$336.5e^3/\text{yr}$$

$$OC_{maint-labor} = 2 \text{ persons} * 19.70 \text{ \$/hr} * 8766 \text{ hrs/yr} / 3 * C_{idx}/325.3$$

$$OC_{maint-labor} = 2 * 19.70 * 8766 / 3 * 316.9 / 325.3 = \$112.3e^3/\text{yr}$$

$$OC_{admin} = 0.30(OC_{oper} + OC_{maint-labor})$$

$$OC_{admin} = 0.30(336.5e^3 + 112.3e^3) = \$134.6e^3/\text{yr}$$

$$OC_{maint-mater} = 0.009DCC_{total} = 0.009 * 7.761e^6 = 69.85e^3/\text{yr}$$

$$OC_{makeup} = 0.02 * 35.2 \text{ 85\$/lb}\cdot\text{mole/hr} * M_6 * C_{idx}/325.3$$

$$OC_{makeup} = 0.02 * 35.2 * 4,020 * 316.9 / 325.3 = \$2,757/\text{yr}$$

$$OC_{credit} = 50 \text{ 85\$/ton} * CF * 8766 * m_{acid} * C_{idx}/325$$

$$OC_{credit} = 50 * .65 * 8766 * 21.89 * 316.9 / 325.3 = \$6,076e^3/\text{yr}$$

$$OC_{marketing} = 0.1 * OC_{credit} = 0.1 * 6,076e^3 = \$607.6e^3/\text{yr}$$

$$OC_{total} = OC_{oper} + OC_{maint-labor} + OC_{admin} + OC_{main-mater} + OC_{makeup}$$

$$+ OC_{marketing} - OC_{credit}$$

$$OC_{total} = \$336.5e^3 + \$112.2e^3 + \$134.6e^3 + \$69.85e^3 + \$2,757 + \$607.6e^3 - \$6,076e^3$$

$$OC_{total} = 1,264e^3 - \$6,076e^3 = -\$4,812e^3$$

## 7 CLAUS PLANT MODEL

### 7.1 Nomenclature

AC	Annual cost (M\$/yr)
$C_{idx}$	Chemical Engineering Plant cost index for current year
$C_{idx,\#}$	Chemical Engineering Plant cost index for year #
$C_f$	Capacity factor (fraction)
DC	Direct capital cost (M\$)
EC	Electric power consumption (kW)
ICF	Indirect charge factor (fraction)
$\dot{m}_{\#,j}$	Molar flow rate of component j at point # (lb•mole/hr)
$M_{\#,j}$	Mass flow rate of component j at point # (tons/hr)
P	Price (\$/ton)
TDC	Direct capital cost (M\$)
TCC	Total capital cost (M\$/yr)
$\eta$	Efficiency (fraction)

### Subcategories for Inlet Gas Components

CH <sub>4</sub>	Methane
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
COS	
H <sub>2</sub>	Hydrogen
H <sub>2</sub> O	Moisture
H <sub>2</sub> S	Hydrogen Sulfide
S <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide

### General Subcategories

added	Added to inlet gas stream
claus	Claus reduction system
credit	Credit
in	Entering Claus plant
pret	Inlet gas pretreatment system
S	sulfur


### 7.2 Introduction

This chapter describes a Claus sulfur plant model originally developed by Frey (30). The purpose of the Claus sulfur plant is to convert the off-gas from the regenerators in the copper oxide and NOXSO processes into elemental sulfur (as an alternative to sulfuric acid recovery). The original IECM treated the sulfur recovery system in a somewhat simple fashion, consistent with available studies then. The more detailed Claus sulfur plant performance and economic models now developed were based on a design by Allied Chemical Corporation documented by Ratafia-Brown (32). The performance and cost information for this design was developed by Allied Chemical for a specified gas composition, temperature, pressure and flow rate. The Allied Chemical design had a conversion efficiency of 95% and was based on an inlet gas composition which consisted of CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>O and SO<sub>2</sub>. The current model has been modified to

---


accommodate additional inlet gases: COS, H<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S and S<sub>2</sub>. These additional gases change the process methane requirement. A schematic diagram of the Claus sulfur plant is shown in Figure 7-1.

**Figure 7-1:** Schematic Diagram of Claus Sulfur Plant




### 7.3 Performance Model


A standard Claus plant usually processes a gas stream containing hydrogen sulfide, a portion of which is combusted to form sulfur dioxide. The hydrogen sulfide and sulfur dioxide are converted to elemental sulfur via the Claus reaction.



However, if the inlet gas does not contain hydrogen sulfide a portion of the  $\text{SO}_2$  in the inlet gas must be reduced with natural gas to produce the required quantity of hydrogen sulfide. This is accomplished via the following reaction:





Thus, some elemental sulfur is obtained via the reducing reaction, while the remainder is obtained via the Claus reaction. The overall reaction is:



Thus, the required molar flow rate of methane is one-half the molar flow rate of sulfur dioxide in the inlet gas. Since the inlet gas may contain  $\text{COS}$ ,  $\text{H}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ , the methane requirement is modified to account for the effects of these chemical compounds. Any  $\text{H}_2$  is assumed to react with  $\text{SO}_2$  to produce  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  as shown in Equation (7.1). The  $\text{COS}$  content of the inlet gas is very small and it is assumed that sufficient water is available to convert  $\text{COS}$  into  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  as shown in Equation (7.2).



The methane requirement is based on a molar balance and the requirement that 2 moles of hydrogen sulfide are needed for each mole of sulfur dioxide entering the Claus reactor. The derivation of the methane requirement is shown below. In Equation (7.3), the a, b, c, d, e and f are the number of moles of  $\text{SO}_2$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$ ,  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ ,  $\text{COS}$  and  $\text{H}_2$  and x represents the additional methane that must be added to the inlet gas.



want the molar ratio of  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  to  $\text{SO}_2$  equal 2.

$$\frac{\text{H}_2\text{S}}{\text{SO}_2} = \frac{c + b + x + d + e/3}{a - 1.5(b+x) - 3/e} = 2$$

solving for x yields

$$x = 0.5a - b - 0.25c - 0.25d - 0.25e$$

or expressing the methane requirement with the symbols list in Figure 7-1.

$$\dot{m}_{\text{added,CH}_4} = 0.5\dot{m}_{\text{in,SO}_2} - \dot{m}_{\text{in,CH}_4} - 0.25\dot{m}_{\text{in,H}_2\text{S}} - 0.25\dot{m}_{\text{in,COS}} - 0.25\dot{m}_{\text{in,H}_2}$$

The Allied Chemical sulfur recovery plant design includes a reduction stage using two packed-bed, cyclic heat exchangers and a catalyst packed reactor. The gas stream then flows through a two-stage Claus plant, where sulfur is recovered for byproduct sale. Allied recommended that the inlet gas have a very low water content prior to treatment in the sulfur

recovery plant. Therefore, gas cooling and water removal prior to the sulfur recovery plant is assumed in the design reported by Ratafia-Brown. This pretreatment system removes 91.2% of the moisture in the inlet gas.

Most of the electricity is consumed in an inlet gas compressor and air blowers. The electric power consumption is assumed to be proportional to the inlet molar flow rate. The constant of proportionality for the electric power consumption is determined by dividing the power consumption, 0.104 kW, by the inlet gas molar flow rate, 1063 mole/hr, reported in Reference (32). The electricity consumption is determined with

$$EC = \frac{0.104}{1,063} \sum_{j=1}^8 \dot{m}_{in,j}$$

The amount of sulfur recovered by the process is estimated based on the total inlet sulfur compounds and the sulfur recovery efficiency of the byproduct plant. This efficiency is approximately 95 percent, so the total mass flow rate of byproduct sulfur is

$$\dot{M}_S = (\dot{m}_{in,SO_2} + \dot{m}_{in,H_2S} + \dot{m}_{in,COS} + 2\dot{m}_{in,S_2}) \eta_S \frac{32.06}{2000}$$

#### 7.4 Economic Model

The cost of the sulfur recovery system is estimated based on the direct cost of the sulfur plant gas pretreatment equipment and the Allied Chemical SO<sub>2</sub> Reduction and Claus plant system. The cost of the pretreatment section is based on an “exponential scaling rule” with the inlet gas flow rate as the predictive parameter. The cost of Claus plants has been shown to scale with mass flow rates using an exponent of approximately 0.7 in other studies. In Reference (32), the direct capital cost of pretreatment was reported to be \$903,000 in 1984 and the total inlet flow rate was 1,063 moles/hr. The direct capital cost of pretreatment is determined with

$$DC_{pret} = 0.903 \left( \sum_{j=1}^8 \frac{\dot{m}_{in,j}}{1,063} \right)^{0.7} \frac{C_{idx,\#}}{C_{idx,1984}}$$

The cost of the Allied Chemical SO<sub>2</sub> Reduction and Claus plant system is scaled to the inlet flow of gas to the reduction unit of the plant after gas treating. In Reference (32), the direct capital cost of the reduction system was reported to be \$9,500,000 in 1984 and the inlet flow rate was 637 moles/hr. The direct capital cost of the reduction system is determined with

$$DC_{claus} = 9.53 \left( \sum_{j=1}^8 \frac{\dot{m}_{in,j} - 0.918\dot{m}_{in,H_2O}}{637} \right)^{0.7} \frac{C_{idx,\#}}{C_{idx,1984}}$$

The total direct cost is the sum of the above direct costs discussed. The total capital cost is the sum of the total direct cost and the indirect costs. The indirect costs include general facilities,

engineering and home office fees and project and process contingency and are expressed as a fraction of the total direct cost.

$$\text{TDC} = \text{DC} + \text{DC}$$

$$\text{TCC} = \text{TDC} (1 + \text{ICF})$$

The annual costs of the sulfur recovery plant include methane and power consumption and sulfur by-product credit. The annual costs for methane and power consumption are accounted for in either the copper oxide or NOXSO process. The credit from the sale of the by-product sulfur is:

$$\text{ACS}_{\text{credit}} = 8766 \times 10^{-6} C_f P_S \dot{M}_S$$

The model does not include costs for catalyst replacement. A typical annual replacement cost is only a few thousand dollars, negligible compared to the annual totals. However, the initial catalyst charge is included in the capital costs.

---



## 8 FROTH FLOTATION PROCESS MODEL

### 8.1 Nomenclature

A	= Ash content coal (fraction)
AC	= Annual operating cost (78\$/dry ton of clean coal)
$c_k$	= Chemical cost for $k^{\text{th}}$ level plant (78\$/dry ton of cleaned coal)
CS	= Concentration of solids (fraction)
DC	= Direct capital cost (78\$)
DCC	= Cost coefficient for cleaning equipment (78\$/dry ton of raw coal)
$e_k$	= Electricity cost for $k^{\text{th}}$ level plant (78\$/dry ton of cleaned coal)
$E_d$	= Energy needed for thermal drier (Btu/lb of dry coal)
f	= Weight fraction of coal (fraction)
HHV	= Average higher heating value of coal (Btu/lb)
$K_{\text{specie}}$	= Rate constant of specie ( $\text{min}^{-1}$ )
$l_k$	= Labor cost for $k^{\text{th}}$ level plant (78\$/dry ton of cleaned coal)
LHV	= Lower heating value of coal (Btu/lb)
$m'$	= Total moisture content of coal (fraction)
$m_i'$	= Inherent moisture content of coal (fraction)
$m_s'$	= Surface moisture content of coal (fraction)
m	= Dry mass flow rate of coal (tons/hr)
MIBC	= MIBC consumption of froth flotation circuit (lb/raw dry ton)
O	= #2 fuel oil consumption of froth flotation circuit (lb/raw dry ton)
$r_{\text{specie}}$	= Recovery of species (fraction)
$R_{\text{specie}}$	= Ultimate recovery constant of species (fraction)
S	= Sulfur content of coal (fraction)
T	= Residence time of flotation vessels (minutes)
v	= Volume of flotation cells ( $\text{ft}^3$ )
$V_{\text{ef}}$	= Effective volume of flotation equipment (fraction)
$w'$	= Weight of water evaporated in thermal drier per pound of dry coal processed (fraction)
$w'_e$	= Weight of water evaporated in thermal drier (tons/hr)
$w_k$	= Water cost for $k^{\text{th}}$ level plant (78\$/dry ton of cleaned coal)
$Y_d$	= Mass yield of the thermal drier (fraction)
$Y_p$	= Mass yield of coal cleaning plant excluding the thermal drier yield (fraction)
$Y_t$	= Mass yield of the entire coal cleaning plant (fraction)
$Y_{od}$	= Ratio of coal mass exiting wash streams to coal mass exiting plant (fraction)

### Greek Letter Symbols

$\varepsilon$	= Efficiency of thermal drier (fraction)
$\delta_i$	= Equals 0 if wash stream i is not thermally dried and 1 if it is thermally dried.
$\rho_c$	= density of coal ( $\text{lb}/\text{ft}^3$ )
$\rho_w$	= density of water ( $\text{lb}/\text{ft}^3$ )

### Subscripts:

c	= clean coal exiting wash streams
d	= thermal drier
i	= (1) coarse, (2) medium or (3) fine streams
in	= entering thermal drier
j	= oil or MIBC

k	= level of plant (2,3,4 or 5)
l	= clean, thermal, raw, refuse, sample
o	= clean coal exiting plant
out	= exiting thermal drier
ref	= refuse coal
ROM	= raw coal

**species:**

a	= ash
afc	= ash-free coal
s	= sulfur content

**8.2 Introduction**

This chapter describes the addition of a conventional froth flotation circuit into the coal cleaning module of the IECM. The purpose of this modification is to include froth flotation as an option to clean the fine coal stream. The original model (1) has three beneficiation levels (2, 3 and 4) in which different streams are washed by specific gravity equipment. Level 2 washes only the coarse stream. Level 3 washes the coarse and medium streams. Level 4 washes the coarse, medium and fine streams. The new modification adds a fifth level, which uses specific gravity equipment to wash the coarse and medium streams and froth flotation equipment for the fine stream. The specific size fractions in each stream are specified by the model user. As before, the model optimizes the yield of each circuit To achieve a target coal quality for the cleaned coal product.


**8.3 Process Description**

This section only briefly describes froth flotation of coal. For a more detailed descriptions of the froth flotation process see References (37-41). Most coal cleaning processes use the difference between the specific gravity of coal, ash and pyrite to separate the coal from the ash and pyrite (40). Froth flotation, however, uses the difference between the adhesion of small air bubbles to coal, ash and pyrite to achieve separation. Usually small air bubbles are passed through a fine coal slurry stream. Air attaches itself to coal and floats to the surface, where it is removed. Since the air does not attach itself to the ash it remains in the slurry and is carried off. Particles which stick to air bubbles are called hydrophobic, while those which are easily wetted are called hydrophilic.

Coal is inherently hydrophobic, but the degree of floatability depends on several parameters, including particle size, pulp density, coal rank, extent of oxidation, quantity and type of chemicals used, slurry pH, aeration and agitation, retention time. Three theories which broadly try to predict the floatability of coal are the carbon-hydrogen ratio theory, the carbon content theory and the surface-components theory. All three theories have advantages and disadvantages in predicting the floatability of coal. Yet, none of the theories predicts the quality and yield of coal for a specific set of flotation parameters. Although they are not applicable for this model, they can be used to estimate the performance of a new coal from existing floatability data.

---

Figure 8-1: Coal Cleaning Plant with Froth Flotation of Fine Stream



Usually chemicals, called frothers, are added to the coal slurry to prolong the life of the air bubbles, which enhances the stability of the froth. MIBC (methyl isobutyl carbinol) is a common frother used for coal froth flotation. Collectors increase the adhesion of air to coal and are needed for highly oxidized or lower rank coals. A common collector used for froth flotation of coal is fuel oil. Other chemicals can be added which perform a variety of functions. The most common are depressing agents, activating agents, pH regulators, dispersing agents and protective colloids.

Figure 8-1 shows the a process diagram for a conventional coal cleaning plant with froth flotation for the fine size stream. Although it is widely used, the process is not understood as well as specific gravity based beneficiation. Because less is known about froth flotation, it is difficult to predict full scale performance from laboratory batch data. Although there are algorithms for scaling up laboratory data (42), they have not been implemented in this model until they can be further evaluated. It is also generally accepted that flotation washability data cannot be predicted from specific gravity washability data (43, 44).

#### 8.4 Froth Flotation Performance Model

A complete description of the conventional coal cleaning model is found in Reference (1). This report only discusses the improvements that have been added. The model uses a Lagrange multiplier technique to maximize the yield (mass or energy) for a given coal and plant configuration. The algorithm needs discrete data points of the yield and coal quality at different specific gravities for three wash streams (coarse, medium, fine). For froth flotation of the finesize stream, the user can specify washability data in one of three different ways:

- Actual yield and quality data at different residence times
- Rate and ultimate recovery constants for ash-free yield, ash and sulfur content
- Mass yield and coal quality of the cleaned coal for the flotation circuit

For all three options the following information is also needed:

- The quantity of MIBC and #2 fuel oil,
- Inlet slurry concentration
- Effective volume of the cells

For option one, the froth flotation data is substituted for the conventional fine stream data and the model optimizes the yield for all three streams as usual. Data in this form can be found in Reference 9. But, this is batch data and has not been scaled to full size. The only difference is that the residence time is determined instead of a specific gravity for the fine stream. The only restriction currently is that the number of coal quality data points for froth flotation must equal the number of specific gravity data points.

For the second option, the rate and ultimate recovery constants are used in the Klimpel model (Equation 8.1) to predict the recovery of ash-free coal, ash and sulfur at different residences times (42, 43):

$$r_i = R_i \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{K_i T} (1 - e^{-K_i T}) \right] \quad (8.1)$$

The total mass yield is equal to the sum of the ash-free coal and ash recovered (Equation 8.2). The ash content of the cleaned coal is equal to the recovery of ash times the raw coal ash content divided by the mass yield (Equation 8.3). The sulfur content of the cleaned coal is determined similarly (Equation 8.4). The higher heating value is estimated by Equation 8.5.

$$Y_{p,3} = (1 - A_{ROM}) r_{afc} + A_{ROM} r_a \quad (8.2)$$

$$A_{o,3} = \frac{A_{ROM} r_a}{Y_{p,3}} \quad (8.3)$$

$$S_{o,3} = \frac{S_{ROM} r_s}{Y_{p,3}} \quad (8.4)$$

$$HHV_{o,3} = HHV_{ROM} \left( \frac{1 - A_{o,3}}{1 - A_{ROM}} \right) \quad (8.5)$$

The coal yield and quality in the froth circuit at different residence intervals can be determined with Equations 8.2 - 8.5. The residence times intervals are determined by specifying a maximum residence time and dividing by the number of specific gravity data points.<sup>19</sup> This data is then substituted into the fine size washability data and the model proceeds as usual.

For the third option, the yield and quality of the froth flotation circuit is specified at a given residence time. This data is passed into the optimization algorithm, where the model optimizes the mass yields of the coarse and medium streams to achieve the overall target coal quality.

For all three options, once the residence time is determined the total volume of the cells can be determined from Equation 8.6:

$$v = m_{ROM} f_{ROM,3} T \frac{2000 \text{ lb/ton}}{60 \text{ min/hr}} \left[ \frac{1}{r_c} + \left( \frac{1}{CS} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{r_w} \right] \frac{1}{V_{ef}} \quad (8.6)$$

The densities of water and coal are assumed to be 84 and 62 lb/ft<sup>3</sup>, respectively. The effective volume,  $V_{ef}$ , is used to account for the volume occupied by the air-ingestion equipment and air bubbles.

## 8.5 Process Economics

The general coal cleaning plant economic model is based on several studies (45-50) and is described in Reference (1). All cost are computed in 1978 dollars then escalated to a current year using a plant cost index. The same method is used to estimate the cost of the new level five plant with froth flotation. The capital cost is divided into five different sections: (1) raw coal handling,

<sup>19</sup> This will be changed to the maximum number of data points possible in the next version of the model.

(2) cleaning equipment, (3) thermal drying, (4) refuse handling and (5) coal sampling system. The direct capital cost of each section other than the coal sampling system is related to its characteristic mass flow and is assumed to have an economy of scale of 0.7 for plant sizes in the range of 500 to 2000 clean tons per hour (tph) (46). Only the cost of the cleaning equipment section is assumed to vary with different levels of coal cleaning. The capital cost related to clean coal handling (which includes the cost of conveyors, storage and loading equipment) is included in the raw coal handling cost since the cleaning plant is assumed to be at the mine site. It is assumed that the cost of the coal sampling system does not vary with plant capacity.

The economics of froth flotation depend on the residence time, chemical usage and process yield. The direct capital for the cleaning equipment for a level 5 plant is estimated by Equation 8.7:

$$DC_{\text{clean}} = DCC_5 m_{\text{ROM}}^{0.7} + 6780 v^{0.4} \quad (8.7)$$

$$\text{where } DCC_5 = 43,700$$

The first term of Equation 8.7 is the capital cost of the cleaning equipment excluding the flotation cells. The second term is the capital cost of the flotation cells. The value for the first term was obtained from Reference (46). It represents the average cost of cleaning equipment excluding the flotation cells scaled to the raw coal mass flow rate. The direct capital cost for the froth flotation equipment is scaled to the total volume of the vessels (46, 47). An exponential scaling factor of 0.4 is used as the best fit to available data (46, 47).

The indirect and annualized capital costs are calculated as shown in Reference (1). The operating and maintenance costs of a level five plant are calculated similarly to the other levels. The cost factors for labor, maintenance, refuse and taxes are the same as a level four plant (46). The cost factor for chemicals (excluding oil and MIBC), electricity and water are, respectively, 0.064, 0.15 and 0.0015 in 1978\$/ton of raw coal (45). The amounts of MIBC and #2 fuel oil used are input parameters in the model. Therefore, the cost per ton of cleaned coal is estimated by the following equations:

$$AC_{\text{oil}} = \frac{0.072 O f_{\text{ROM},3}}{Y_t}$$

$$AC_{\text{MIBC}} = \frac{0.60 \text{ MIBC } f_{\text{ROM},3}}{Y_t}$$

## 9 SELECTIVE AGGLOMERATION PROCESS MODEL

### 9.1 Nomenclature

#### English Symbols

$A_{\text{clean}}$	Ash content of the clean coal going to thermal drier (fraction)
$A_r$	Ash content of the raw coal input (fraction)
$A_{\text{ref}}$	Ash content of the refuse coal (fraction)
$AC_{\text{elect}}$	Annual cost of electricity ( \$ / dry ton of cleaned coal)
$AC_{\text{labor}}$	Annual cost of labor ( \$ / dry ton of cleaned coal)
$AC_{\text{agg}}$	Annual cost of agglomerant ( \$ / dry ton of cleaned coal)
$AC_{\text{maint}}$	Annual cost of maintenance ( \$ / dry ton of cleaned coal)
$AC_{\text{payovh}}$	Annual cost of payroll overheads ( \$ / dry ton of cleaned coal)
$AC_{\text{plovh}}$	Annual cost of plant overheads ( \$ / dry ton of cleaned coal)
$AC_{\text{tax}}$	Annual cost of taxes, insurance, etc ( \$ / dry ton of cleaned coal)
$AC_{\text{waste}}$	Annual cost of waste disposal ( \$ / dry ton of cleaned coal)
$AC_{\text{water}}$	Annual cost of water ( \$ / dry ton of cleaned coal)
$c$	Cost of agglomerant used (\$/lb agglomerant)
$C_{\text{idx}}$	Chemical engineering cost index
$C_{\text{idx, 1984}}$	Chemical engineering cost index for 1984 for current year
$C_{\text{sol}}$	Degree of agglomerant solubility in water (fraction)
$C_{\text{capital}}$	Total capital cost (\$ /dry ton of cleaned coal)
$C_{\text{operating}}$	Total operating cost (\$ /dry ton of cleaned coal)
$C_r$	Cost of raw coal (\$ /dry ton of raw coal)
$C_{\text{ref}}$	Cost of refuse coal (\$ /dry ton of cleaned coal)
$C_{\text{total}}$	Total cost of clean coal (\$ /dry ton of cleaned coal)
CRF	Capital Recovery factor (dimensionless)
$d$	Real discount rate for capital cost (fraction)
DC	Direct capital cost (\$)
$DC_{\text{agequip}}$	Direct capital cost of the selective agglomeration plant equipment (\$)
$DC_{\text{aggreg}}$	Direct capital cost of agglomerant recovery equipment (\$)
$DC_r$	Direct capital cost of the refuse handling (\$)
$DC_{\text{ref}}$	Direct capital cost of the refuse handling (\$)
$DC_{\text{thermal}}$	Direct capital cost of thermal drying system (\$)
$e$	Cost of electricity (\$/dry ton of raw coal)
$E_{\text{drier}}$	Energy needed for thermal drier (Btu)
$h$	Annual operating hours of coal cleaning plant (hrs/yr)
$HHV_r$	Higher heating value of raw coal (Btu/lb dry coal)
$HHV_{\text{clean}}$	Higher heating value of raw coal (Btu/lb dry coal)
$i$	Nominal interest rate (fraction)
$l$	Labor cost (\$/hr)
LHV	Lower heating value of cleaned coal (Btu/lb dry coal)
$m_{\text{dry}}$	Dry mass flow rate of clean coal entering the thermal drier (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{evapwater}}$	Mass flow rate of water evaporated in thermal drier (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{evapwater}}$	Weight of water evaporated in thermal drier per pound of clean coal (fraction)
$m_{\text{inmois}}$	Moisture content of clean coal entering thermal drier (fraction)
$m_{\text{aggclean}}$	Mass flow rate of agglomerant entering the evaporator system (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{agglosttoatmtot}}$	Mass flow rate of total agglomerant lost to the atmosphere (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{agglosttowater}}$	Mass flow rate of agglomerant lost to water (tons/hr)

$m_{\text{agglsttosolid}}$	Mass flow rate of agglomerant lost to solid(tons/hr)
$m_{\text{aggnew}}$	Mass flow rate of new agglomerant (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{aggrec}}$	Mass flow rate of recovered agglomerant (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{aggtotal}}$	Mass flow rate of recovered agglomerant mixed with raw coal (tons/hr)
$m_o$	Dry mass flow rate of clean coal leaving the plant (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{outmois}}$	Moisture content of clean coal leaving thermal drier (fraction)
$m_r$	Dry mass flow rate of raw coal input (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{ref}}$	Dry mass flow rate of refused coal (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{steam}}$	Total mass flow rate of steam required for stripping system (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{water}}$	Total mass flow rate of cooling water required for stripping system (tons/hr)
$m_t$	Cost of maintenance (fraction)
$n$	Life of coal cleaning plant (years)
$p$	Inflation rate (fraction)
$PS_{\text{clean}}$	Pyritic sulfur in the clean coal removed from the raw input (%)
$r$	Cost of refuse coal disposal (\$/wet ton)
$R$	Ratio of dry mass agglomerant to dry mass of raw coal (dimensionless)
$s$	Cost of steam (\$/1000 tons)
$t$	Annual rate of taxes and insurance costs for plant (fraction)
$TCC$	Total capital cost (\$)
$TDC$	Total direct capital cost
$w$	Cost of water (\$/1000 tons)
$W$	Water loss in the process (tons/hr)
$W_c$	Working capital (\$/dry of clean coal)
$Y_{\text{clean}}$	Mass yield of clean coal going to the thermal drier (fraction)
$Y_{\text{drier}}$	Thermal drier mass yield (fraction)
$Y_{\text{total}}$	Mass yield of entire coal cleaning plant (fraction)

### Greek letter symbols

$\epsilon$	Efficiency of thermal drier (fraction)
------------	--

## 9.2 Introduction

This chapter presents new performance and economic models simulating the operation of a coal beneficiation plant using the selective agglomeration process. The primary function of this model is to estimate the cost and ability of the process to remove the pyritic sulfur and ash to help meet power plant emission standards. This section presents a brief overview of the selective agglomeration process, a description of the economic algorithms and an assessment of this process' ability to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions of coal fired power plants. Performance models are based on bench-scale tests on a one ton per hour (tph) Proof-of-Concept (POC) unit performed by Bechtel for the U.S Department of Energy, Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center under Contract No. DE-AC-22-84PC79867 (51). An assessment of capital investment and operating costs for a selective agglomeration process with plant size of 300 tph proposed by Burns and Roe Services Corporation is adopted in developing the economic model (52).


In selective coalescence (also known as selective agglomeration), an agglomerating liquid such as chlorofluorocarbons (e.g., Freon 113) or hydrocarbons (e.g., n-pentane and n-heptane) is contacted with an agitated, aqueous suspension of the feed coal. The coal particles agglomerate into a large floc in the non-aqueous phase. The mineral matter particles which remain dispersed in the aqueous phase are then separated by screening the flocs.



### 9.3 Process Description

A conceptual flow scheme for a selective agglomeration process is shown in Figure 9-1. This design is adopted from the Bechtel 1tph proof of concept selective agglomeration process and forms the basis for the economic model discussed below. The coal feed capacity of this design is 300 tons per hour. The process comprises three steps: raw coal particle size reduction near 15 microns, agglomeration and separation of the product coal from mineral matter which remains dispersed in the aqueous phase and recovery of the agglomerating agent for recycling in the process.

**Figure 9-1:** Schematic Diagram of Selective Agglomeration Process



#### 9.3.1 Grinding Operation

The first step includes the grinding operation where the feed is ground to an extremely fine size to render most of the coal and the impurities (and pyritic minerals) into discrete particles. Unlike heavy liquid cyclones, the selective agglomeration process can treat coal-water slurries. Therefore, pre-drying of the coal is not necessary. In grinding the raw coal particles to 15 microns, a stirred ball mill also can be used.

Grinding is an important step since, depending on the method of grinding, the surface properties of pyrites will change. This will have very important implications on the sulfur removal potential of the process.

#### 9.3.2 Agglomeration and Separation

In the second step, slurry is intensely mixed with a hydrocarbon bridging agent (agglomerant) for example normal heptane or normal pentane. Under these conditions the agglomerant selectively wets and agglomerates the coal under high shear for 1 to 4 minutes. The coal forms

small spherical agglomerates, while the mineral matter remains dispersed in the aqueous phase and thus is rejected as tailings. The agglomerates approximately 50-100 mesh size are grown to larger sizes by adding a solution to the binder material, typically asphalt dissolved in agglomerant. Mixing is continued under less severe conditions to allow the agglomerates to grow 2-3 mm in size. The ash-laden water is then drained or screened from the agglomerates. The agglomerant is then recovered for reuse by steam stripping. The residual asphalt serves to maintain the physical stability of the agglomerates, easing their dewatering, storage and handling.

The second step process could be operated under a slight negative pressure or the process equipment could be vented to a vapor collection system.

**Table 9-1:** Properties of n-heptane and n-pentane (52)

Liquid	Boiling Point, °C	Density gm/cm <sup>3</sup>	Heat of Vaporization cal/gm	Viscosity cp
n-heptane (C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>16</sub> )	98.4	0.684	76.5	0.40
n-pentane (C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>12</sub> )	36.1	0.626	91.6	0.21

Table 9-1 compares the properties of n-heptane and n-pentane. Compared to n-heptane, n-pentane is a highly volatile liquid. It has a low boiling point (36.1C or 97F) and high vapor pressure (at 30C, 670mm Hg). n-pentane is highly flammable. The lower and upper limits of flammability for n-pentane in air are 1.40 and 7.80 percentage (by volume) respectively. The design of the plant controls excessive n-pentane losses due to vaporization.

The limit for human exposure to n-pentane contaminated air is 500 ppm (52). To avoid human exposure to n-pentane, the equipment in the system should be air tight, the piping should be leak proof.

The n-pentane based plant required a refrigeration system to provide cooling water during hot weather (ambient greater than 25C or 77F). No such refrigeration system was required for n-heptane (boiling point 98.4C) based plant (52). The only difference between n-pentane and n-heptane based plants was the absence of a refrigeration system in the n-pentane based plant.

### 9.3.3 Solvent Recovery and Refuse Thickening

The product coal-agglomerant-water mixture is fed to an evaporator, where almost all the agglomerant is evaporated. The agglomerant vapors are cooled in a heat exchanger. Vapors that

are not condensed are compressed by a compressor. The resulting liquid is circulated to the conditioning tank. The product coal may retain as little as 50 to 100 ppm of the agglomerant.

The product coal can be obtained as a somewhat dry product containing 10% moisture or as a pulp containing 40% water. This will depend on the type of evaporator used to vaporize the agglomerant.

The mineral matter-water slurry contains very small amount of agglomerant (50 to 100 ppm). This slurry is thickened in a static thickener and the clarified water is recirculated to the circuit and the refuse is sent to the refuse disposal circuit.

#### 9.4 Performance Model

The selective agglomeration process was evaluated by Bechtel for three coals. They are Pittsburgh No.8, Illinois No.6 and Upper Freeport seams. The average ROM coal characteristics for these coals are shown in Table 9-2. Using Bechtel's 1tph POC, the average clean coal performance for coal plants of 300 tph (dry) coal feed is estimated and shown in Table 9-2.

It was not possible to develop a generalized algorithm which would determine the quality and yield of the clean coal based on the experimental data. Therefore, the model uses experimental data of the cleaned coals quality (i.e. ash and sulfur content) and mass yield directly to determine the cost of the cleaned coal. The input parameters for the performance and economic models are:

- Ash, sulfur, inherent moisture and surface moisture contents of raw coal
- Higher heating value of raw coal
- Ash, sulfur, surface moisture of cleaned coal
- Mass yield of process
- Moisture content entering thermal drier
- Mass ratio of agglomerant to dry raw coal
- Solubility of agglomerant in water
- Efficiency of thermal drier
- Cost of agglomerant in dollars per ton

As noted above, the basic performance parameters characterizing the change in coal quality are determined from experimental data for a particular coal. Because data for the selective agglomeration process are currently limited, only three coals are represented here.

If the higher heating value of the clean coal is not provided then the following algorithm is used

$$\text{HHV}_{\text{clean}} = (\text{HHV})_r [1 - A_{\text{clean}}] / [1 - A_{\text{raw}}]$$

Estimates of plant operating and capital costs typically are scaled to various mass flow rates within the coal cleaning plant. Those developed below are the rate of raw coal and agglomerant into the plant, the rate of dry and wet refuse coal out of the plant, the rate of agglomerant recovered and lost from the plant, the rate steam and water required for stripping the agglomerant and the rate of water evaporated in the thermal drier. The process flow scheme with respective mass flows shown in Figure 9-2.

**Table 9-2:** Feed Coal and Clean Coal Quality(1)

Performance Parameter	Pittsburgh No.8	Illinois No.6	Upper Freeport
<b>ROM coal Quality</b>			
Ash %	39.16	15.71	57.31
Sulfur %	4.71	4.54	2.11
Pyritic sulfur %	3.39	2.46	1.93
Organic sulfur %	1.24	2.03	0.16
Sulfate sulfur, %	0.08	0.05	0.03
Heating Value (Btu/lb)	8,528	11,837	5,947
<b>Performance (ROM basis)*</b>			
% Yield	56.5	72.5	39.5
% Ash removal	93.3	81.1	94.6
% Ash reduction	92.8	77.6	94.3
% Sulfur removal	59.5	51.3	70.4
% SO <sub>2</sub> reduction	56.9	42.3	68.9
% Pyritic sulfur removal	82.3	79.1	82.6
% Pyritic sulfur reduction	79.0	78.1	75.3
% Btu Recovery	92.2	84.8	91.3

\* The calculations on a ROM basis for ash reduction, sulfur dioxide reduction, pyritic sulfur reduction are based on analytical values for ROM coal for the feed and those of clean coal agglomerates for the individual tests. The ROM basis energy (Btu) recovery is calculated as follows:

$$\text{ROM basis Btu recovery, \%} = (\text{Bench-scale test of Bechtel's 1tph POC, Btu recovery, \%}) \times \text{Btu recovery, \% for precleaning operation, i.e prior to the Bechtel's 1tph POC bench scale test}$$

The amount of agglomerant dosage needed for this process is obtained from experiments. The ratio of mass of agglomerant to the dry mass of raw coal is denoted by R, or

$$R m_r = [ m_{\text{aggnew}} + m_{\text{aggrec}} ] = m_{\text{aggtotal}}$$

R = 1 to 2 or up are recommended for Pittsburgh No.8, Illinois No.6 and Upper Freeport (52).

The amount of steam and cooling water needed in coal stripping system is calculated by

$$m_{\text{steam}} = 0.127 ( m_{\text{aggnew}} + m_{\text{aggrec}} ) = 0.127 m_{\text{aggtotal}}$$

$$m_{\text{water}} = 6.061 ( m_{\text{aggnew}} + m_{\text{aggrec}} ) = 6.061 m_{\text{aggtotal}}$$


Details of the calculation can be found later in the numerical example section.

Not all the agglomerant will be recovered. Depending on the degree of solubility of agglomerant in water, some will be lost to the water. The amount of agglomerant that is lost to the water is estimated to be

$$m_{\text{agglostto water}} = C_{\text{sol}} \times W$$

where  $W$  is the total water loss in the process.

**Figure 9-2:** Schematic Diagram of Selective Agglomeration Process with Flow Rates



Besides the loss of agglomerant to the water in the stripping system, some agglomerant is also lost to the atmosphere. To find the agglomerant that is lost to the atmosphere, we have to consider all components of the subcircuits. The formula obtained is shown below:

$$m_{\text{agglosttoatmtot}} = 3 \times 10^{-4} m_r$$

The agglomerant is also lost with the solids. To find the agglomerant lost with the clean coal and the refuse, we have assumed the following formula:

$$m_{\text{agglosttosolid}} = 5 \times 10^{-4} m_r$$

Therefore, the new or makeup agglomerant is

$$m_{\text{aggnew}} = m_{\text{agglostto water}} + m_{\text{agglosttoatmtot}} + m_{\text{agglosttosolid}}$$

Normally, it is necessary to thermally dry the fine sizes of coal-hot water slurry. It is assumed that product coal is used to fire the thermal drier, thus reducing the overall plant yield. It is also assumed that drying alters only the coal moisture content, with all the other coal properties (measured on a dry basis) remain the same. Since the moisture content of coal entering and leaving the thermal drier is specified, the weight of the water evaporated per pound of precleaned coal into the thermal drier is (1):

$$m_{\text{evapwater}}' = m_{\text{inmois}}' - m_{\text{outmois}}' / [(1 - m_{\text{inmois}}')(1 - m_{\text{outmois}})']$$

The amount of energy needed to evaporate this water is

$$E_d = 1020 m_{\text{evapwater}}' / \varepsilon$$

The lower heating value can be approximated by

$$\text{LHV} = 0.96 \text{ HHV}_{\text{clean}} - [ 1020 m_{\text{outmois}}' / ( 1 - m_{\text{outmois}}' ) ]$$

Therefore, the drier yield and total plant yield are given by

$$Y_{\text{drier}} = 1 - E_d / \text{LHV}$$

and

$$Y_{\text{total}} = Y_{\text{clean}} Y_{\text{drier}}$$

The weight of water evaporated is

$$m_{\text{evapwater}} = m_{\text{evapwater}}' [ m_{\text{dry}} / Y_{\text{drier}} ]$$

Once the drier is determined, the dry mass flow rates for the raw coal stream, refuse stream and drier stream can be calculated by the following equations:

$$m_r = m_o / Y_{\text{total}}$$

$$m_{\text{dry}} = m_o / Y_{\text{drier}}$$

$$m_{\text{ref}} = m_r - m_{\text{dry}}$$

The water loss in the coal cleaning plant is

$$W = m_{\text{dry}} [ ( 1 / ( 1 - m_{\text{outmois}}' ) ) - 1 ] + m_{\text{ref}} [ ( 1 / \text{RC} ) - 1 ]$$

## 9.5 Economic Model

The total cost in dollars per ton of dry cleaned coal can be divided into four separate cost categories.

- cost of raw coal
- cost of rejected coal
- annual operating and maintenance costs
- annualized capital costs

The cost of raw coal is an input parameter. The cost of the refuse coal is a function of the plant yield and can be calculated from

$$C_{\text{ref}} = C_r [ ( 1 / Y_{\text{total}} ) - 1 ] \quad (9.1)$$

### 9.5.1 Capital Cost

The capital cost is divided into five different sections: raw coal handling, selective agglomeration process equipment, agglomerant handling, refuse handling and thermal driers. The capital costs related to clean coal storage is included in the raw coal cost, since the coal cleaning equipment is assumed to be at the mine site. This include the cost for conveyors, storage and loading equipment. The raw coal cost also includes the cost of grinding the ROM feed coal. The direct capital cost for refuse handling includes refuse sump and explosion proof pump. The direct capital cost is determined by these equations:

---

$$DC_r = \$ 91,963 m_r^{0.7} \times C_{idx} / C_{idx,1984} \quad (9.2)$$

$$DC_{aggequip} = \$10,521 m_r^{0.7} \times C_{idx} / C_{idx,1984} \quad (9.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} DC_{aggre} &= \$ 102,005 m_r^{0.7} \times C_{idx}/C_{idx, 1984} \\ &= \$ 102,005 \times [ (m_{aggnew} + m_{aggre} ) / R ]^{0.7} \times C_{idx}/C_{idx, 1984} \\ &= \$ 102,005 R^{-0.7} (m_{aggnew} + m_{aggre})^{0.7} \times C_{idx}/C_{idx, 1984} \end{aligned} \quad (9.4)$$

$$DC_{ref} = \$19,100 m_{ref}^{0.7} \times C_{idx}/C_{idx, 1984} \quad (9.5)$$

$$DC_{coalsampling} = \$324,000 \times C_{idx}/C_{idx, 1984} \quad (9.6)$$

$$DC_{drier} = \$153, 000 m_{evapwater}^{0.7} \times C_{idx}/C_{idx, 1984} \quad (9.7)$$

The direct capital cost for the selective agglomeration subcircuit equipment covers the cost for the 18,000 gallon conditioning tank with a carbon steel agitator of 100 horsepower, explosion proof feed pump, 12,000 gallon high shear mixer with stainless steel agitator of 400 horsepower, enclosed sieve bend and a stainless steel horizontal-tube evaporator. The direct cost for agglomerant recovery subcircuit equipment consists of the costs for 12,000 and 500 gallon weathered carbon steel tanks, explosion proof pumps, adsorption tower, blower, sump and 8900 ton refrigeration system.

The total direct capital cost is found by adding Equation (9.2) through (9.7)

$$TDC = DC_r + DC_{aggequip} + DC_{aggre} + DC_{ref} + DC_{drier} + DC_{coal sampling}$$

The indirect capital and contingencies costs are estimated to be 54% of the direct capital cost. Therefore, the total capital cost, which is depreciated over the life of the plant is

$$TCC = 1.54 TDC$$

The total capital cost is annualized as follows:

$$d = [ ( 1 + i ) / ( 1 + p ) - 1 ]$$

Where  $i$  is the interest rate and  $p$  is the inflation rate. Therefore, capital recover factor is

$$CRF = d / [ 1 - ( 1 + d )^{-n} ]$$

Working capital is estimated to be 25% of the labor, maintenance, electricity, water, waste disposal and chemical(agglomerant) costs as in the conventional plant model described in Chapter 2.

$$W_c = 0.25 ( AC_{labor} + AC_{maint} + AC_{elect} + AC_{water} + AC_{waste} + AC_{agg} )$$

As in Chapter 2, the capital cost in (\$ per dry ton of cleaned coal) is

$$C_{capital} = dW_c + [ ( TCC \times CRF ) / ( m_o \times h ) ] \quad (9.8)$$

### 9.5.2 Operating and Maintenance Cost

The annual operating and maintenance costs comprise several cost elements, including labor, maintenance, raw material and waste disposal costs, also taxes, insurance and general administrative overhead. The operating and maintenance cost is broken down into the components shown in Table 9-3. The total annual cost of agglomerant in \$/ton of clean coal is then estimated to be:

$$AC_{agg} = cm_{aggnew} / m_o$$

The cost of labor is estimated to be dependent of plant size. Maintenance costs, taxes and insurance are estimated to be proportional to the total capital cost of the plant. The cost of electricity is linked to the mass flow rate of the coal entering the plant, while the cost of waste disposal is proportional to the quantity of coal rejected. The cost for water is proportional to the amount of water in the clean coal and refuse streams. Overhead costs are based on labor, maintenance and agglomerant costs. The equations for these costs are:

$$AC_{elect} = e / Y_{tot} \cdot C_{idx} / C_{idx,1980}$$

$$AC_{labor} = l / m_o \cdot C_{idx} / C_{idx,1980}$$

$$AC_{maint} = [ mt. TCC ] / [ m_o h ]$$

$$AC_{payovh} = 0.30 AC_{labor}$$

$$AC_{pltovh} = 0.26 [ AC_{labor} + AC_{maint} + AC_{agg} ]$$

$$AC_{steam} = sm_{steam} / Y_{tot} \cdot C_{idx} / C_{idx,1980}$$

$$AC_{tax} = [ t TCC ] / [ m_o h ]$$

$$AC_{waste} = [ r m_{ref} ] / m_o RC \cdot C_{idx} / C_{idx,1980}$$

$$AC_{water} = [ w 240 W ] / m_o \cdot C_{idx} / C_{idx,1980}$$

where e, l, m, r and w are taken from Table 9-3. Adding the above equations yields and converting to a base year yield

$$C_{operating} = (AC_{agg} + AC_{elect} + AC_{labor} + AC_{maint} + AC_{payovh} + AC_{pltovh} + AC_{tax} + AC_{waste} + AC_{water}) \quad (9.9)$$

The total cost for cleaned coal is found by adding Equations (9.1), (9.8), (9.9) and the raw coal cost

$$C_{total} = C_r + C_{ref} + C_{operating} + C_{capital}$$



**Table 9-3: Operating Cost Factors (1980 \$)**

Variable Cost Elements	Symbol Definition	Value
Electricity	e (\$/raw ton)	1.560
Labor	l (\$/hr)	268.000
Maintenance	mt (fraction)	0.045
Refuse Disposal	r (\$/wet ton)	1.200
Taxes	t (fraction)	0.040
Water	w (\$/1000 gallon)	0.180
Agglomerant	c (\$/lb)	0.800

## 9.6 Illustrative Example

Here we present a numerical example to illustrate the model calculations. The following assumptions are made:

Coal type	=	Illinois #6
Size	=	9.8microns <sup>20</sup>
Agglomerant	=	n-pentane
R	=	1.30
p	=	0.06
i	=	0.13
n	=	25
C <sub>idx, 1984</sub>	=	261.5
C <sub>sol</sub>	=	1%
m <sub>o</sub>	=	500 tons/hr
h	=	5500 hrs/yr

### 9.6.1 Performance Model

Clean coal characteristics:

%A <sub>clean</sub>	=	3.52
%S	=	2.46
%Y <sub>clean</sub>	=	72.5
HHV <sub>clean</sub>	=	11.837 x [1-0.0352] / [1 - 0.1571]
	=	13,549
m <sub>outmois'</sub>	=	0.05

<sup>20</sup> Please refer to Table 9-2.

Assume  $m_{\text{inmois}'}$  = 0.24 . Then, the weight of water evaporated per pound of dry into thermal coal drier:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{evapwater}'} &= [m_{\text{inmois}'} - m_{\text{outmois}'}] / [(1 - m_{\text{inmois}'}) (1 - m_{\text{outmois}'})] \\ &= 0.24 - 0.05 / [(1 - 0.24) (1 - 0.05)] \\ &= 0.26 \end{aligned}$$

The amount of energy needed to evaporate this water is

$$\begin{aligned} E_d &= 1020 m_{\text{evapwater}'} / \varepsilon \\ &= [1020 \times 0.26] / 0.55 = 482.2 \text{ Btu/lb} \end{aligned}$$

The lower heating value:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHV} &= 0.96 \text{ HHV}_{\text{clean}} - [(1020 m_{\text{outmois}'}) / (1 - m_{\text{outmois}'})] \\ &= 0.96 \times 13,549 - [(1020 \times 0.05) / (1 - 0.05)] \\ &= 12,953 \text{ Btu/lb} \end{aligned}$$

The drier yield:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\text{drier}} &= 1 - E_d / \text{LHV} \\ &= 1 - (482.2 / 12,953) \\ &= 0.963 \end{aligned}$$

The plant yield:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\text{total}} &= Y_{\text{clean}} Y_{\text{drier}} \\ &= 0.725 \times 0.963 \\ &= 0.698 \end{aligned}$$

The weight of water evaporated:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{evapwater}} &= m_o [m_{\text{evapwater}'} / Y_{\text{drier}}] \\ &= 500 \times (0.26 / 0.963) \\ &= 135.0 \text{ tons/hr} \end{aligned}$$

Dry mass flow rate of raw coal input:

$$\begin{aligned} m_r &= m_o / Y_{\text{total}} \\ &= 500 / 0.698 \\ &= 716.3 \text{ tph} \end{aligned}$$

Mass flow rate of n-pentane input (dry basis)

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{aggnew}} + m_{\text{aggreg}} &= 1.3 m_r \\ &= 1.3 \times 716.3 \\ &= 931.2 \text{ tph} \end{aligned}$$

Dry mass flow rate of cleaned coal entering the thermal drier:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{dry}} &= m_o / Y_{\text{drier}} \\ &= 500 / 0.963 \\ &= 519.2 \text{ tph} \end{aligned}$$

Dry mass flow rate of refuse coal:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{ref}} &= m_r - m_{\text{dry}} \\ &= 716.3 - 519.2 \\ &= 197.1 \text{ tph} \end{aligned}$$

Water loss in the coal cleaning plant:

$$W = m_{\text{dry}} [(1 / (1 - m_{\text{inmois}'}) - 1)] + m_{\text{ref}} [(1 / RC) - 1]$$


---

$$= 519.2 [ ( 1 / ( 1 - 0.24 ) ) - 1 ] + 197.1 [ ( 1 / 0.35 ) - 1 ]$$

$$= 530.0 \text{ tph}$$

Mass flow rate of agglomerant lost to water

$$m_{\text{aggllosttwater}} = C_{\text{sol}} \times W$$

$$= 0.01 \times 530.0$$

$$= 5.30 \text{ tph}$$

Mass flow rate of agglomerant lost to atmosphere

$$m_{\text{aggllosttoatm}} = 0.0003 \times m_r$$

$$= 0.0003 \times 716.3$$

$$= 0.21 \text{ tph}$$

Mass flow rate of agglomerant lost with refuse

$$m_{\text{aggllosttosolid}} = 0.0005 \times m_r$$

$$= 0.0005 \times 716.3$$

$$= 0.35 \text{ tph}$$

Mass flow rate of new agglomerant makeup

$$m_{\text{aggnew}} = 5.30 + 0.21 + 0.35$$

$$= 5.87 \text{ tph}$$

### 9.6.2 Economic Model

$$d = [ ( 1 + i ) / ( 1 + p ) - 1 ]$$

$$= [ ( 1 + 0.13 ) / ( 1 + 0.06 ) - 1 ]$$

$$= 0.066$$

$$\text{CRF} = 0.066 / [ 1 - ( 1 + 0.066 )^{-25} ]$$

$$= 0.083$$

Capital Cost:

$$\text{DC}_r = \$ 91,963 m_r^{0.7} \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1984} ]$$

$$= \$ 91,963 \times (716.3)^{0.7} \times [ 216.5 / 216.5 ]$$

$$= \$ 9,165,995$$

$$\text{DC}_{\text{aggequip}} = \$ 10,521 m_r^{0.7} \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1984} ]$$

$$= \$ 10,521 \times 716.3^{0.7} \times [ 216.5 / 216.5 ]$$

$$= \$ 1,048,633$$

$$\text{DC}_{\text{aggregc}} = \$ 102,005 m_r^{0.7} \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1984} ]$$

$$= \$ 102,005 \times 716.3^{0.7} \times [ 216.5 / 216.5 ]$$

$$= \$ 10,166,885$$

$$\text{DC}_{\text{ref}} = \$ 19,100 m_{\text{ref}}^{0.7} \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1984} ]$$

$$= \$ 19,100 \times 197^{0.7} \times [ 216.5 / 216.5 ]$$

$$= \$ 771,461$$

$$\text{DC}_{\text{drier}} = \$ 153,000 m_{\text{evapwater}}^{0.7} \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1984} ]$$

$$= \$ 153,000 \times 135.0^{0.7} \times [ 216.5 / 216.5 ]$$

$$= \$ 4,741,602$$

$$\text{DC}_{\text{coalsampling}} = \$ 324,000 \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1984} ]$$

$$= 324,000 \times [ 216.5 / 216.5 ] = \$ 387,230$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{TDC} &= \$9,165,995 + \$1,048,633 + \$10,166,885 + \$771,461 + \\
&\quad \$4,741,602 + \$387,230 \\
&= \$26,281,806 \\
\text{TCC} &= 1.54 \times \text{TDC} \\
&= 1.54 \times \$26,281,806 \\
&= \$40,473,982 \\
\text{Annual Cost} & \\
\text{AC}_{\text{agg}} &= [c \times [m_{\text{agglosttowater}} + m_{\text{agglosttoatmtot}} + m_{\text{agglosttosolid}}]] / m_o \\
&= (0.8 \times 5.87) / 500 \\
&= \$0.0094/\text{ton} \\
\text{AC}_{\text{elect}} &= e / Y_{\text{tot}} [C_{\text{idx}}/C_{\text{idx},1980}] \\
&= 1.56 / 0.698 [261.5/218.8] \\
&= \$2.67/\text{ton} \\
\text{AC}_{\text{labor}} &= 1 / m_o [C_{\text{idx}}/C_{\text{idx},1980}] \\
&= 268 / 500 [261.5/218.8] \\
&= \$0.65/\text{ton} \\
\text{AC}_{\text{maint}} &= [\text{mt. TCC}] / [m_o \text{ h}] \\
&= [0.045 \times \$40,473,982] / [500 \times 5500] \\
&= \$0.66/\text{ton} \\
\text{AC}_{\text{payovh}} &= 0.30 \text{ AC}_{\text{labor}} \\
&= 0.30 \times \$0.65 \\
&= \$0.20/\text{ton} \\
\text{AC}_{\text{pltovh}} &= 0.26 [ \text{AC}_{\text{labor}} + \text{AC}_{\text{maint}} + \text{AC}_{\text{agg}} ] \\
&= 0.26 ( \$0.65 + \$0.66 + \$0.0094 ) \\
&= \$0.34/\text{ton} \\
\text{AC}_{\text{tax}} &= [t \text{ TCC}] / [m_o \text{ h}] \\
&= [0.04 \times \$40,473,982] / [500 \times 5500] \\
&= \$0.59/\text{ton} \\
\text{AC}_{\text{waste}} &= [r m_{\text{ref}}] / m_o \text{ RC} \cdot C_{\text{idx}}/C_{\text{idx},1980} \\
&= [1.2 \times 197] / [500 \times 0.35] \cdot 261.5/218.8 \\
&= \$1.61/\text{ton} \\
\text{AC}_{\text{water}} &= [w \text{ 240 W}] / m_o \cdot C_{\text{idx}}/C_{\text{idx},1980} \\
&= (0.18/1000) \times 240 \times 521.7/500 \times 261.5/218.8 \\
&= \$0.055/\text{ton} \\
\text{Working Capital} & \\
W_c &= 0.25 ( \text{AC}_{\text{labor}} + \text{AC}_{\text{maint}} + \text{AC}_{\text{elect}} + \text{AC}_{\text{water}} + \text{AC}_{\text{waste}} + \text{AC}_{\text{agg}} ) \\
&= 0.25 ( \$0.65 + \$0.66 + \$2.67 + \$0.055 + \$1.61 + \$0.0094 ) \\
&= \$1.41/\text{ton} \\
\text{Cleaning Cost is then:} & \\
C_r &= \$28.60/\text{ton} \text{ (see Table 9-4)} \\
C_{\text{ref}} &= C_r [(1/Y_{\text{total}}) - 1] \\
&= \$28.60 [ (1/0.709) - 1]
\end{aligned}$$


---

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \$11.74/\text{ton} \\
C_{\text{operating}} &= (AC_{\text{agg}} + AC_{\text{elect}} + AC_{\text{labor}} + AC_{\text{maint}} + AC_{\text{payovh}} + AC_{\text{pltovh}} + \\
&\quad AC_{\text{tax}} + AC_{\text{waste}} + AC_{\text{water}}) \\
&= (\$0.0094 + \$2.67 + \$0.65 + \$0.66 + \$0.20 + \$0.34 + \$0.59 + \\
&\quad \$1.61 + \$0.055) \\
&= \$6.78/\text{ton} \\
C_{\text{capital}} &= dW_c + [ (TCC \times CRF) / (m_o \times h) ] \\
&= [0.066 \times \$1.41] + [ (\$40,473,982 \times 0.083) / (500 \times 5500) ] \\
&= \$1.31/\text{ton} \\
C_{\text{total}} &= C_r + C_{\text{ref}} + C_{\text{operating}} + C_{\text{capital}} \\
&= \$25.00 + \$10.82 + \$6.78 + \$1.31 \\
&= \$43.91/\text{ton}
\end{aligned}$$

Tables 9-4, 9-5 and 9-6 summarize the results of the case study and present similar results for two additional coals: Pittsburgh #8 and Upper Freeport. The results for these three coals also are summarized graphically in Figures 9-3 and 9-4.

**Table 9-4:** Components of Cleaning Cost (1984\$ / dry ton of clean coal)

Components	Illinois #6	Pittsburgh	Upper Freeport
Raw*	28.60	21.80	13.60
Capital	1.31	1.55	1.97
O&M	6.78	8.95	12.84
Refuse	11.74	18.27	22.16
Total	48.43	50.57	50.57

\* The raw coal price is a model input parameter. The base prices assumed were taken from the (1986) report. However, since two of the coals reported by Bechtel had extraordinarily high ash contents (see Table 9-2), the base prices were adjusted for the higher ash levels. For example, the Pittsburgh coal price is assumed to be \$32.49/ton with an ash content of 9.30%. However, at 39.16% ash the price is:

$$32.49 \frac{1 - 0.3916}{1 - 0.093} = \$21.80/\text{ton}.$$

Base prices for Illinois #6 and Lower Freeport are \$26.91/ton (20.70% ash) and \$28.29/ton (11.20% ash) respectively.


**Table 9-5:** Breakdown of Operating and Maintenance Costs ( 1984\$ / dry ton of clean coal )

Component	Illinois #6	Pittsburgh	Upper Freeport
Heavy Liquid	0.0094	0.0157	0.028
Electricity	2.67	3.43	4.11
Labor	0.65	0.65	0.65
Maintenance	0.66	0.77	0.97
Payroll Overhead	0.20	0.20	0.20
Plant Overhead	0.34	0.37	0.43
Taxes & Insurance	0.59	0.69	0.85
Waste Disposal	1.61	2.74	5.46
Water	0.055	0.08	0.14


**Table 9-6:** Breakdown of Capital Cost ( Million 1984\$ )

Component	Illinois #6	Pittsburgh	Upper Freeport
Raw Coal Processing	9.166	10.905	14.030
Sel. Agg. Cleaning Equip.	1.049	1.248	1.605
Sel. Agg. Recovery Equip.	10.167	12.104	15.562
Refuse Coal	0.771	1.266	2.051
Thermal Drier	4.741	4.741	4.741
Coal Sampling Equipment	0.387	0.387	0.387

**Figure 9-3: Components of Total Coal Cost (1984\$/dry ton of cleaned coal)**



**Figure 9-4: Breakdown of Capital Cost (Million 1984\$)**



## 9.7 Sensitivity Analysis

Tests to identify the key design and operating parameters for the selective agglomeration process were conducted by Bechtel in its 1 tph POC bench scale test(51). Among the variables examined were:

1. coal grind (to determine the minimum size of coal input that produces greater yield)
2. pulp density
3. effects of oxidation and aging
4. speed of reactors
5. agglomerant dosage (in high shear reactor)
6. asphalt dosage (in low shear reactor)

It is assumed that the key design and operating parameters identified in these tests will also be the key design and operating parameters for selective agglomeration for a 300 tph coal feed.

The results of the tests were as follows.

### 9.7.1 Coal Grind

#### *Pittsburgh No. 8*

The tests yielded clean coal with ash contents between 3.4% and 5.4%, while the sulfur dioxide emission potential per million Btu of the ROM coal was reduced by 48 to 56 percent. This means a reduction in pyritic sulfur between 67 and 77 percent. Interestingly, in all the tests more than 90% Btu recovery in the clean coal was obtained.

**Table 9.7:** Bechtel Test Results on Pittsburgh #8 Coal (51)

	Fine Grind	Coarse Grind:		
		Typical	Mean	Std. Dev.
<b>Agglomerated Clean Coal:-</b>				
Test No.	I-12-B	P-10-B	23 tests	
Grind Size (microns)	3.70	12.10	12.10	ND
% Ash	3.30	4.80	4.93	0.19
% Total Sulfur	3.48	3.61	3.78	0.11
Heating Value (Btu/lb)	14251	14014	14003	48
<b>ROM Performance:-</b>				
% Energy Recovery	92.90	92.70	92.30	0.80
% Ash Reduction	95.00	92.50	92.30	0.30
% Sulfur Reduction	58.70	56.50	54.60	1.50
% SO <sub>2</sub> Reduction	55.60	53.20	51.00	1.50
% Pyritic Sulfur Red.	77.30	73.90	70.80	2.20



Better ash reduction was obtained from finer particle size (see Table 9-7). When the particle size was reduced from 12.4 microns to 3.7 microns (50% passing), the clean coal ash was lowered from 4.8 to 3.3 percent at the same high energy recovery. The reduction in the sulfur content was less pronounced, however, due to the high organic sulfur content of this coal. Clean coal sulfur content was only reduced from 3.6% to 3.5%. The comparative results are shown in Table 9-7.

The mean values of several tests with different process conditions, all at a grind size of 12.1 microns are also shown in Table 9-7. These are compared to results obtained with reduced size feed. The small standard deviations of results at the same grind size despite variations in process conditions are taken as indications that none of the variables other than the size of the grind affected process performance to any significant degree.

*Illinois No.6*

The tests yielded clean coal with ash reductions between 78% and 84%. The ROM sulfur dioxide reduction varied between 46% and 54%. The ROM pyritic sulfur was reduced to about 90 percent.

**Table 9-8:** Bechtel Test Results on Illinois #6 Coal (51)

	Fine Grind	Coarse Grind:		
		Typical	Mean	Std. Dev.
Agglomerated Clean Coal:-				
Test No.	1-9-A	1-9-A	18 tests	
Grind Size (microns)	3.7	9.8	9.8	ND
% Ash	2.9	3.5	3.7	0.27
% Total Sulfur	2.56	2.75	2.72	0.09
Heating Value (Btu/lb)	13857	13780	13744	38
ROM Performance:-				
% Energy Recovery	84.90	84.60	84.60	0.30
% Ash Reduction	84.20	80.90	79.70	1.50
% Sulfur Reduction	59.70	56.50	56.80	1.50
% SO <sub>2</sub> Reduction	51.80	48.00	48.30	1.70
% Pyritic Sulfur Red.	95.60	88.50	89.20	3.20

The effects of grind size on performance with Illinois No. 6 coal are shown in Table 9-8. Finer grinding to 3.7 microns, from 9.8 microns (50 percent passing) resulted in improvement in the clean coal ash and sulfur contents. The mean values of 18 tests with different process conditions, all at a grind size of 9.8 microns and their standard deviation are also shown in Table

9-8. These are compared to results obtained with reduced size feed. The minimal standard deviations of results at the same grind size, despite variations in process conditions, are taken as indications that none of the variables other than the size of the grind affected process performance to any significant degree.

*Upper Freeport Coal*

The results showed that the coal could be cleaned with ROM energy recoveries between 89% and 92% and the clean coal ash could be reduced to between 9.0% and 6.1%. Very fine grinding to 2.9 microns (50 percent passing) did not improve the results. The ash reductions obtained were between 74 to 95 percent. As can be seen in Table 9-9, the Upper Freeport ROM coal's sulfur content is mostly in the pyritic form. This would indicate high sulfur reduction potential. In fact, the total SO<sub>2</sub> reductions achieved varied from 56% to as high as 72%. The ash content in the tailing was high 88.1 to 92.4%, showing a good carbon capture efficiency.

Comparative results with coarse and finely ground Upper Freeport coal are shown in Table 9-9. As with the other two coals, all tests with the coarser grind produced similar results. However, when the feed was reground to a finer size of 2.9 microns from 4.5microns (50 percent passing), an increase in the clean coal ash content occurs accompanied by a slight reduction in the sulfur content.

**Table 9-9:** Bechtel Test Results on Upper Freeport Coal (51)

	Fine Grind	Coarse Grind:		
		Typical	Mean	Std. Dev.
Agglomerated Clean Coal:-				
Test No.	F-8-A	F-6-B	12 tests	
Grind Size (microns)	2.9	4.3	4.3	ND
% Ash	8.5	7.8	8.1	0.85
% Total Sulfur	1.40	1.56	1.58	0.05
Heating Value (Btu/lb)	14106	14206	14168	143
ROM Performance:-				
% Energy Recovery	92.0	91.7	91.7	0.1
% Ash Reduction	93.8	94.3	94.1	0.7
% Sulfur Reduction	73.5	70.8	70.3	1.2
% SO <sub>2</sub> Reduction	72.0	69.1	68.6	1.3
% Pyritic Sulfur Red.	78.8	75.5	75.0	1.4

### **9.7.2 Pulp Density**

Tests were run at 10, 15, 20 and 25 percent solids by weight. At 25 percent solids, the sample slurries of the fine ground coal all became too strongly non-Newtonian under high shear to agglomerate properly. Illinois No. 6 and Pittsburgh No. 8 samples were run at 20 percent solids, where their fluid mechanical properties were marginal. The results indicated that Pittsburgh No. 8 performed marginally worse at 20 percent solids, but that Illinois No. 6 showed no significant change. No detectable change in performance was seen for any of the samples agglomerated at 10 percent as compared to 15 percent. These results led to the selection of a solids concentration of 15 percent in the nominal selective agglomeration process design.

### **9.7.3 Agglomerant Dosage**

In a high shear reactor (where the agglomerate is added to the slurry), the approximate speed is 12,000 rpm. Given an adequate quantity to sustain agglomeration, the agglomerant dosage affects only the size of the agglomerates and not the product quality or energy recovery. Agglomerant dosages (by weight percent of dry coal feed) of 25% or up are recommended for Pittsburgh No.8 and Illinois No.6 and agglomerant dosages 35% or up for Upper Freeport.

### **9.7.4 Asphalt Dosage**


In low shear reactor (where asphalt binder is added to the mixture of agglomerate and slurry), the approximate speed is 6,000 rpm. Asphalt dosage affects product size and strength. Agglomerates of adequate strength are required to avoid carbon losses during product screening. Asphalt dosages (by weight percent of dry coal feed) of 4% or up are recommended for Pittsburgh No.8, Illinois No.6 and Upper Freeport. Since the cost of adding the asphalt to the process is marginal compared to other costs, we dropped it in calculating the cost of the entire coal cleaning process.

### **9.7.5 Effects on Economics**


The cleaning cost (excluding the raw coal cost) for Illinois #6 coal for the two different grind sizes of coal input noted earlier was investigated. The results of this sensitivity analysis suggest that as 9.8 microns coal was ground to 3.7 microns, the sulfur content of cleaned coal was reduced by 5%. Still, the cleaning cost increased by \$1 per dry ton of cleaned coal (Figure 9-5).

The cleaning cost for Illinois #6 coal for the two different solids concentrations (pulp density) was also investigated. The results of this sensitivity analysis suggested that an increase of 5% solid concentration could lead to about a 0.3% increase in sulfur reduction and an additional \$0.30 increase in clean cost per dry ton of cleaned coal (Figure 9-6). The results support the selection of 15% solid concentration in the selective agglomeration process.

**Figure 9-5:** Cleaning Cost (1984\$/dry ton of cleaned coal) vs. Sulfur Reduction for Different Grind Sizes (Illinois #6 coal).



**Figure 9-6:** Cleaning Cost (1984\$/dry ton of cleaned coal) vs. Sulfur Reduction for on Different Pulp Density (Illinois #6 coal).



## 10 HEAVY LIQUID SEPARATION PROCESS MODEL

### 10.1 Nomenclature

#### English letter symbols

$A_{\text{clean}}$	Ash content of the clean coal going to cleaning circuit and eventually thermal drier (fraction)
$A_{\text{precleaned}}$	Ash content of precleaned coal (fraction)
$A_{\text{preref}}$	Ash content of the refuse coal from the precleaning subcircuit (fraction)
$A_r$	Ash content of the raw coal input (fraction)
$A_{\text{ref}}$	Ash content of the refused coal going to refuse circuit (fraction)
$AC_{\text{elect}}$	Annual cost of electricity ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$AC_{\text{labor}}$	Annual cost of labor ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$AC_{\text{liq}}$	Annual cost of heavy liquids ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$AC_{\text{maint}}$	Annual cost of maintenance ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$AC_{\text{payovh}}$	Annual cost of payroll overheads ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$AC_{\text{plovh}}$	Annual cost of plant overheads ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$AC_{\text{steam}}$	Annual cost of steam ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$AC_{\text{tax}}$	Annual cost of taxes, insurance, etc ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$AC_{\text{waste}}$	Annual cost of waste disposal ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$AC_{\text{water}}$	Annual cost of water ( \$ / dry ton of clean coal)
$c$	Cost of heavy liquid used (\$/lb heavy liquid)
$C_{\text{idx}}$	Chemical Engineering Cost Index for current year
$C_{\text{idx, 1984}}$	Chemical Engineering Cost Index for 1984
$C_{\text{sol}}$	Degree of heavy liquid solubility in water (fraction)
$C_{\text{capital}}$	Total capital cost (\$/dry ton of clean coal)
$C_{\text{operating}}$	Total operating cost (\$/dry ton of clean coal)
$C_r$	Cost of raw coal (\$/dry ton of raw coal)
$C_{\text{ref}}$	Cost of refuse coal (\$/dry ton of clean coal)
$C_{\text{total}}$	Total cost of clean coal (\$/dry ton of clean coal)
CRF	Capital Recovery factor (dimensionless)
$d$	Real discount rate for capital cost (fraction)
DC	Direct capital cost (\$)
$DC_{\text{hlcequip}}$	Direct capital cost of the heavy liquid cyclone plant equipment (\$)
$DC_{\text{liqrec}}$	Direct capital cost of heavy liquid recovery equipment (\$)
$DC_r$	Direct capital cost of the refuse handling (\$)
$DC_{\text{ref}}$	Direct capital cost of the refuse handling (\$)
$DC_{\text{coal sampling}}$	Direct capital cost of sampling the clean coal (\$)
$DC_{\text{thermal}}$	Direct capital cost of thermal drying system (\$)
$e$	Cost of electricity (\$/dry ton of raw coal)
$E_{\text{drier}}$	Energy needed for thermal drier (Btu)
$h$	Annual operating hours of coal cleaning plant (hrs/yr)
$HHV_r$	Higher heating value of raw coal (Btu/lb dry coal)
$HHV_{\text{clean}}$	Higher heating value of clean coal (Btu/lb dry coal)
$i$	Nominal interest rate (fraction)
$l$	Labor cost (\$/hr)
LHV	Lower heating value of clean coal (Btu/lb dry coal)
$m_{\text{clean}}$	Dry mass flow rate of clean coal entering the cleaning circuit (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{dry}}$	Dry mass flow rate of clean coal leaving the cleaning plant (tons/hr)

$m_{\text{evapwater}}$	Mass flow rate of water evaporated in thermal drier (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{evapwater}}'$	Weight of water evaporated in thermal drier per pound of clean coal (fraction)
$m_{\text{inmois}}'$	Moisture content of clean coal entering thermal drier (fraction)
$m_{\text{liqclean}}$	Mass flow rate of heavy liquid from the overflows of cleaner and scavenger cyclones, entering the cleaning circuit (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqeffluentref}}$	Mass flow rate of heavy liquid leaving as effluent from solid bowl centrifuge (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqfiltclean}}$	Mass flow rate of heavy liquid leaving as filtrate from the drum filter (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqlosttoatmtot}}$	Mass flow rate of total heavy liquid lost to the atmosphere (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqlosttewater}}$	Mass flow rate of heavy liquid lost to water (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqnew}}$	Mass flow rate of new heavy liquid (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqrec}}$	Mass flow rate of recovered heavy liquid (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqref}}$	Mass flow rate of heavy liquid from the overflows of cleaner and scavenger cyclones, entering the refuse coal circuit (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqstripclean}}$	Mass flow rate of heavy liquid entering the clean coal stream stripping system (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqstripref}}$	Mass flow rate of heavy liquid entering the refused coal stripping system (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqthicclean}}$	Mass flow rate of underflow heavy liquid leaving the coal thickening cyclone(tons/hr)
$m_{\text{liqthicref}}$	Mass flow rate of overflow heavy liquid leaving the refuse thickening cyclone(tons/hr)
$m_o$	Dry mass flow rate of clean coal leaving the plant (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{outmois}}'$	Moisture content of clean coal leaving thermal drier (fraction)
$m_{\text{precleaned}}$	Dry mass flow rate of precleaned coal (tons/hr)
$m_r$	Dry mass flow rate of raw coal input (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{ref}}$	Dry mass flow rate of refused coal entering the refuse circuit (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{steam}}$	Total mass flow rate of steam required for stripping system (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{steamclean}}$	Mass flow rate of steam required for clean coal stream stripping system (tons/hr)
$m_{\text{steamref}}$	Mass flow rate of steam required for refused coal stream stripping system (tons/hr)
$m_t$	Cost of maintenance (fraction)
$n$	Life of coal cleaning plant (years)
$p$	Inflation rate (fraction)
$PS_{\text{clean}}$	Pyritic sulfur in the clean coal removed from the raw input (%)
$r$	Cost of refuse coal disposal (\$/wet ton)
$R$	Ratio of dry mass heavy liquid to dry mass of clean coal from the precleaning subcircuit (dimensionless)
$t$	Annual rate of taxes and insurance costs for plant (fraction)
$TCC$	Total capital cost (\$)
$TDC$	Total direct capital cost
$w$	Cost of water (\$/1000 tons)
$W$	Water loss in the process (tons/hr)
$W_c$	Working capital (\$/dry of clean coal)
$Y_{\text{clean}}$	Mass yield of clean coal exiting from the HLR subcircuit (fraction)
$Y_{\text{drier}}$	Thermal drier mass yield (fraction)
$Y_{\text{precleaned}}$	Mass yield of clean coal from the precleaning subcircuit (fraction)
$Y_{\text{total}}$	Mass yield of entire coal cleaning plant (fraction)

### Greek letter symbols

$\varepsilon$	Efficiency of thermal drier (fraction)
---------------	--

## 10.2 Introduction

This chapter describes new performance and economic models simulating the operation of a coal beneficiation plant using the heavy liquid cyclone process. The primary function of these

models is to estimate the cost and ability of the process to remove pyritic sulfur and ash content to help meet power plant emission standards. This report presents a brief overview of heavy liquid cyclones, a description of the economic algorithms and an assessment of this process' ability to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions of coal fired power plants. Models are adopted from bench-scale test on a one ton per hour (tph) Proof-of-Concept (POC) units performed by Process Technology Institute (PTI)<sup>21</sup> (53). An assessment of capital investment and operating costs for a heavy liquid cyclone process for a plant size of 300 tph proposed by Burns and Roe Services Corporation (52) is adopted in developing the economic model.

The heavy liquid cyclone process uses the differences in specific gravity (s.g.) between the coal and liberated pyrites to achieve separation. In this process, coal (s.g. ~ 1.30) is mixed with a heavy liquid of specific gravity between 1.33 to 1.60 and passed through a cyclone. The high centrifugal forces experienced by the coal and the liberated pyrites in the heavy liquid promote separation by moving the lighter coal particles to the center and the heavier pyrites particles to the wall of the cyclone. The clean coal reports as overflow and the heavy impurities as underflow.

The process design is based on 2" to 4" diameter cyclones. Because of the small throughput capacity of these cyclones, a large number of cyclones is required. Effective distribution of the feed material to the cyclones is a challenging problem. Because of these uncertainties in the performance of cyclones, the operating cost of cyclones is a cost-sensitive area. Another cost-sensitive area is recovery of the heavy liquid.

### 10.3 Process Description

A conceptual flow scheme for an HLC process is shown in Figure 10-1 and 10-2. The HLC process comprises of two subcircuits: heavy liquid cyclone subcircuit and heavy liquid recovery subcircuit. Two other subcircuits also contributed to the HLC process discussed here. They are the precleaning subcircuit and the comminution subcircuit.

#### 10.3.1 Precleaning Subcircuit

The objective of the precleaning circuit (flowsheet not shown) was to remove the out-of-seam dilution rock that is collected during the normal course of mining operations. Because most of this rock is coarse, it is advantageous to remove the rock prior to grinding to avoid energy intensive grinding process and fine particle separation difficulties. Heavy medium cyclone circuit would be used to remove the most coarse rock and maintain high thermal recovery.

In this subcircuit, the ROM feed was crushed to 3/8" and screened at 8 mesh. The 3/8" x 8 mesh material was subjected to cleaning in the heavy medium cyclone while the -8 mesh material was saved for recombination with the precleaned +8 mesh material.

The 3/8" x 8 mesh coal was fed continuously into a sump where it was mixed with the water. A 5" kreb cyclone was used to make separation. The clean coal and refuse products were collected off the drain and rinse screens into 55 gallon barrels. These 55 gallon barrels were removed to storage alongside the -8 mesh material. The +8 mesh and the -8 mesh material were

---

<sup>21</sup> There are four other groups involved in the project: Michigan Technological University (MTU); Bateman Engineer, Inc (BE); Norton, Hambleton Engineering Inc. (NHE); and, American Electric Power (AEP).

then proportionally combined as needed to provide the feed to the grinding circuit for heavy liquid cyclone (HLC) test work.


### 10.3.2 Comminution Subcircuit

Pre-cleaned feed is crushed in an open circuit to a top size of 28 mesh in a dry roll crusher. It is then slurred and fed to an attrition mill operating in closed circuit which simplifies grinding to various topsizes typically ranging from 100-325 mesh. There is no flowsheet for this subcircuit.

### 10.3.3 Heavy Liquid Cyclone (HLC) Subcircuit

This subcircuit shown in Figure 10-1 comprises the various stages of HLC separation. It involves a 2" diameter cyclone acting as a primary stage of separation and 1" diameter cyclones acting as cleaner and scavenger stage. The cleaner stage is used for cleaning the primary cyclone or clean coal flow stream. The scavenger cyclone was used for recovering misplaced clean coal in the tailings stream from the primary cyclone.

**Figure 10-1:** Heavy Liquid Cyclone Subcircuit (HLC)



In this configuration, the overflow from the cleaner and the scavenger cyclones normally combine to constitute a clean coal product of 4% - 5% ash at 80% Btu recovery when run near optimum. A middlings stream is produced from the cleaner cyclone underflow. Ash values often occur in the 8% - 12% range with this flow stream which represents 7% - 10% of the total feed to the circuit. Final tailings are removed from the scavenger and cleaner underflows. These are generally 10% - 20% of the plant feed with ash in the 50%-60% range when run near optimum (52).

PTI also tested a three stage cyclone circuit where the scavenger was removed and used as a recleaning stage reprocessing the overflow stream from the cleaner cyclone. It was found that




marginal improvements in coal quality with the recleaner cyclone generally did not warrant the corresponding loss in Btu recovery.

### 10.3.4 Heavy Liquid Recovery Subcircuit

This subcircuit shown in Figure 10-2 comprises of two streams: the clean coal stream and the refuse stream. The original design of the clean coal stream showed a pressure filter as a mechanical deliquoring stage followed by a turbo dryer as a thermal recovery stage for stripping the heavy liquid from the surface of the coal and refuse. In the Dow Organic Heavy Liquid (OHL) process (52), the coal heavy-liquid slurry is deliquored by the hooded vacuum filter and the filter cake is washed with hot water to displace residual heavy liquid. Final heavy-liquid removal is achieved in a proprietary stripping system. The stripping system is believed to consist of a direct contact evaporator. The coal is discharged from the stripping system as a coal/hot-water slurry. The amount of moisture (water) in coal-hot water slurry is depended on the amount of steam required to remove the heavy liquid from the clean coal and the amount of water discharged with the heavy liquid in the other exit stream. The water is removed in the thermal drier.

**Figure 10-2:** Heavy Liquid Recovery Subcircuit (HLR)



In the refuse stream, the refuse is thickened in a solids bowl centrifuge and then stripped of any remaining heavy liquid in a stripping system similar to the clean coal stripping system. The heavy liquid and water are allowed to separate under quiescent conditions in decanter. The heavy liquid from the decanter is mixed with other recovered heavy liquid and recirculated to the conditioning tank.

It is recommended that when designing the HLC and HLR subcircuits, all the equipment in the circuit be vented to a collection system to minimize the heavy liquid losses. All the equipment should be air tight. The piping should be designed to prevent losses of the heavy liquid vapors. Besides the losses to the atmosphere, the heavy liquid also lost to the water. The detailed calculation of heavy liquid losses are discussed later in illustrative results.

#### 10.4 Performance Model

The algorithm for the determining the higher heating value is as follows:

$$\text{HHV}_{\text{clean}} = \text{HHV}_r [ 1 - A_{\text{clean}} / 1 - A_r ]$$

Estimates of plant operating and capital costs typically are scaled to various mass flow rates within the coal cleaning plant. Those developed below are the rate of raw coal and heavy liquid into the plant, the rate of dry and wet refuse coal out of the plant, the rate of heavy liquid recovered and lost from the plant, the rate steam and water required for stripping the heavy liquid and the rate of water evaporated in the thermal drier.

In approaching the performance models developed, we will look at one subcircuit at a time.

##### 10.4.1 Precleaning Subcircuit

The yield of the clean coal going into the Communion subcircuit is calculated as follows:

$$Y_{\text{precleaned}} = [ A_{\text{preref}} - A_r ] / [ A_{\text{preref}} - A_{\text{precleaned}} ] \quad (10.1)$$

##### 10.4.2 Communion Subcircuit

We assume the grinding process does not significantly affect the percentage yield of precleaned coal.  $Y_{\text{precleaned}}$  obtained from Equation (10.1) remains as the ground precleaned coal enters the HLC subcircuit.

##### 10.4.3 HLC Subcircuit

The amount of heavy liquid needed for this process related to the specific gravity of the coal and the specific gravity of the heavy liquid. The ratio of mass of heavy liquid to the dry mass of precleaned coal is denoted by R, or

$$m_{\text{liq}} = R m_{\text{precleaned}}$$

The value of R is determined from experiments.

The yield of the clean coal going into the HLR subcircuit is calculated as follows:

$$Y_{\text{clean}} = [ A_{\text{ref}} - A_{\text{precleaned}} ] / [ A_{\text{ref}} - A_{\text{clean}} ]$$

##### 10.4.4 HLR Subcircuit

As was mentioned earlier, we have divided this subcircuit into two streams -- the clean coal and refuse coal streams. We will look at the clean coal stream first.

###### *Clean Coal Stream*

The mass flow rate of the heavy liquid entering this stream,  $m_{\text{liqclean}}$ , is the sum of the mass flow rate of the underflow of the coal thickening cyclone,  $m_{\text{liqthicclean}}$  and the heavy liquid exiting from the drum filter (  $m_{\text{liqfiltclean}} + m_{\text{liqstripeclean}}$  ):

$$m_{liqclean} = m_{liqthicclean} + m_{liqfiltclean} + m_{liqstripclean}$$

The amount of steam needed in clean coal stripping system was

$$m_{steamclean} = 0.149 m_{liqstripclean} \quad (10.2)$$

### *Refuse Coal Stream*

The approach in developing the following equations for the refuse coal stream is similar to the one discussed in the clean coal stream. The mass flow rate of the heavy liquid entering this stream,  $m_{liqref}$ , is the sum of the mass flow rate of the overflow of the refuse thickening cyclone,  $m_{liqthicref}$  and the heavy liquid exiting from the solid bowl centrifuge ( $m_{liqeffluentref}$  and  $m_{liqstripref}$ ):

$$m_{liqref} = m_{liqthicref} + m_{liqeffluentref} + m_{liqstripref}$$

The amount of steam and cooling water needed in refuse stripping system is calculated by equations follows:

$$m_{steamref} = 0.149 m_{liqstripref} \quad (10.3)$$

Combining equations (10.2) and (10.3), the total steam consumption is therefore

$$m_{steam} = m_{steamclean} + m_{steamref} = 0.149 (m_{liqstripclean} + m_{liqstripref})$$

By tabulating the experimental data

$$m_{liqstripclean} + m_{liqstripref} = 0.436 m_{liq}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} m_{steam} &= 0.149 \times 0.436 \times m_{liq} \\ &= 65.0 \times 10^{-3} m_{liq} \end{aligned}$$

Not all the heavy liquid will be recovered. Depending on the degree of solubility of heavy liquid in water, some will be lost to the water. The amount of heavy liquid that is lost to the water is estimated to be

$$m_{liqlosttowater} = C_{sol} \times W$$

where  $W$  is the total water loss in the process

Besides the losses of the heavy liquid to the water in both stripping system, some heavy liquid is also lost to the atmosphere. To find the heavy liquid that is lost to the atmosphere, we have to consider the entire components of HLC and HLR subcircuits. The formula obtained is shown below:

$$m_{liqlosttoatmtot} = 3.5 \times 10^{-4} m_{precleaned}$$

Hence, the recovered heavy liquid (methylene chloride) from this stream is

$$(m_{liqrec}) = m_{liqclean} + m_{liqref} - m_{liqlosttowater} - m_{liqlosttoatmtot} \quad (10.4)$$

Since the sum of  $m_{liqclean} + m_{liqref}$  is also the sum of  $m_{liqnew} + m_{liqrec}$ , equation (10.4) is reduced to

$$m_{liqrec} = (m_{liqnew} + m_{liqrec}) - m_{liqlosttowater} - m_{liqlosttoatmtot}$$

or

$$m_{liqnew} = m_{liqlosttowater} + m_{liqlosttoatmtot}$$

#### 10.4.5 Thermal Drier Subcircuit

Normally, it is necessary to thermally dry the fine sizes of coal-hot water slurry. It is assumed that product coal is used to fire the thermal drier, thus reducing the overall plant yield (this subcircuit is not shown in the flowsheet). It is also assumed that drying alters only the coal moisture content, with all the other coal properties (measured on a dry basis) remain the same. Since the moisture content of coal entering and leaving the thermal drier is specified, the weight of the water evaporated per pound of precleaned coal into the thermal drier is

$$m_{evapwater}' = [m_{inmois}' - m_{outmois}'] / [(1 - m_{inmois}') (1 - m_{outmois}')]$$

The amount of energy needed to evaporate this water is

$$E_d = 1020 m_{evapwater}' / \epsilon$$

The lower heating value can be approximated by

$$LHV = 0.96 HHV_{clean} - [1020 m_{outmois}' / (1 - m_{outmois}')]$$

Therefore, the drier yield and total plant yield are given by

$$Y_{drier} = 1 - E_d / LHV$$

and

$$Y_{total} = Y_{precleaned} Y_{clean} Y_{drier}$$

The weight of water evaporated is

$$m_{evapwater} = m_{evapwater}' [m_o / Y_{drier}]$$

Once the drier is determined, the dry mass flow rates for the raw coal stream, refuse stream and drier stream can be calculated by the following equations:

$$m_r = m_o / Y_{total}$$

$$m_{precleaned} = m_o \times Y_{precleaned}$$

$$m_{dry} = m_o / Y_{drier}$$

$$m_{ref} = m_o - m_{dry}$$

The water loss in the coal cleaning plant is

$$W = m_{dry} [(1 / (1 - m_{inmois}')) - 1] + m_{ref} [(1 / RC) - 1]$$

### 10.5 Economic Model

The total cost in dollars per ton of dry clean coal can be divided into four separate cost categories.

- cost of raw coal
  - cost of rejected coal
  - annual operating and maintenance costs
  - annualized capital costs
-

The cost of raw coal is an input parameter. The cost of the refuse cost is a function of the plant yield and can be calculated from

$$C_{ref} = C_r [(1/Y_{total}) - 1] \quad (10.5)$$

### 10.5.1 Capital Cost

The capital cost is divided into five different sections: raw coal handling, heavy liquid cyclone equipment, heavy liquid handling, refuse handling and thermal driers (if needed). The capital costs related to clean coal storage is included in the raw coal cost, since the coal cleaning equipment is assumed to be at the mine site. This includes the cost for conveyors, storage and loading equipment. The raw coal cost also includes the related capital cost from the precleaning process. This includes heavy mediums cyclones, sieve bends, coal screens and coal centrifuges. The cost of handling the refuse from the precleaning process is combined with the cost of handling the refuse from the HLR subcircuit. This direct capital cost for refuse handling includes refuse sump, explosion proof pump, refuse thickening cyclone, centrifuges and refuse stripping system. The direct capital cost is determined by these equations:

$$DC_r = \$ 22, 524 m_r^{0.7} \times [C_{idx} / C_{idx,1984}] \quad (10.6)$$

$$DC_{hlcequip} = \$22, 528 m_{precleaned}^{0.7} \times [C_{idx} / C_{idx,1984}] \quad (10.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} DC_{liqrec} &= \$ 30,643 (m_{liqnew} + m_{liqrec})^{0.7} \times [C_{idx} / C_{idx,1984}] \\ &= \$ 30,643 \times (Rm_r)^{0.7} \times [C_{idx} / C_{idx,1984}] \end{aligned} \quad (10.8)$$

$$DC_{ref} = \$33, 514 m_{ref}^{0.7} \times [C_{idx} / C_{idx,1984}] \quad (10.9)$$

$$DC_{drier} = \$153, 000 m_{evapwater}^{0.7} \times [C_{idx} / C_{idx,1984}] \quad (10.10)$$

$$DC_{coalsampling} = \$324,000 \times [C_{idx} / C_{idx,1980}] \quad (10.11)$$

The direct capital cost for the HLC subcircuit equipment covers the cost for the 20,000 gallon cast iron conditioning tank, agitator of 200 horsepower, cyclone feed pump and three set of cyclones -- primary, cleaner and scavenger. Clean coal sump, pump, coal thickening cyclone, drum filter and clean coal stripping system are included in  $DC_{clean}$ .

The total direct capital cost is found by adding Equation (10.6) through (10.11)

$$TDC = DC_r + DC_{hlcequip} + DC_{liqrec} + DC_{ref} + DC_{drier} - DC_{coalsampling}$$

The indirect capital and contingencies costs are estimated to be 56% of the direct capital cost. Therefore, the total capital cost, which is depreciated over the life of the plant is

$$TCC = 1.56 TDC$$

The total capital cost is annualized as follows:

$$d = [(1 + i) / (1 + p) - 1]$$

where  $i$  is the interest rate and  $p$  is the inflation rate. Therefore, capital recover factor is

$$CRF = d / [1 - (1 + d)^{-n}]$$

Working capital is estimated to be 25% of the labor, maintenance, electricity, water, waste disposal and heavy liquid costs as in the conventional plant model described in Chapter 2.

$$W_c = 0.25 ( AC_{\text{labor}} + AC_{\text{maint}} + AC_{\text{elect}} + AC_{\text{water}} + AC_{\text{waste}} + AC_{\text{liq}} + AC_{\text{steam}})$$

As in Chapter 2, the capital cost in (\$ per dry ton of clean coal) is

$$C_{\text{capital}} = [ dW_c + [ ( TCC \times CRF ) / ( m_o \times h ) ] ] \quad (10.12)$$

### 10.5.2 Operating and Maintenance Cost

The annual operating and maintenance costs comprise several cost elements, including labor, maintenance, raw material and waste disposal costs, also taxes, insurance and general administrative overhead. The operating and maintenance cost is broken down into nine components.

- heavy liquid
- electricity
- labor
- maintenance
- payroll overhead
- taxes and insurance
- waste disposal
- water
- steam

Table 10-1 shows the cost factors for various components. The total annual cost of heavy liquid in \$/ton of clean coal is estimated to be

$$AC_{\text{liq}} = [ c \times m_{\text{liqnew}} ] / m_o$$

The cost of labor is estimated to be dependent of plant size. Maintenance costs, taxes and insurance are estimated to be proportional to the total capital cost of the plant. The cost of electricity is linked to the mass flow rate of the coal entering the plant, while the cost of waste disposal is proportional to the quantity of coal rejected. The cost for water is proportional to the amount of water in the clean coal and refuse streams. Overhead costs are based on labor, maintenance and heavy liquid costs. The equations for these costs are

$$AC_{\text{elect}} = e / Y_{\text{tot}} \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1980} ]$$

$$AC_{\text{labor}} = l / m_o \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1980} ]$$

$$AC_{\text{maint}} = [ m_t \cdot TCC ] / [ m_o \cdot h ]$$

$$AC_{\text{payovh}} = 0.30 AC_{\text{labor}}$$

$$AC_{\text{pltovh}} = 0.26 [ AC_{\text{labor}} + AC_{\text{maint}} + AC_{\text{liq}} ]$$

$$AC_{\text{tax}} = [ t \cdot TCC ] / [ m_o \cdot h ]$$

$$AC_{\text{waste}} = [ r \cdot m_{\text{ref}} ] / m_o \cdot RC \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1980} ]$$

$$AC_{\text{water}} = [ w \cdot 240 \cdot W ] / m_o \times [ C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1980} ]$$

$$AC_{\text{steam}} = s \times m_{\text{steam}} / m_o \times [C_{\text{idx}} / C_{\text{idx},1980}]$$

where e, l, m, r, s and w are taken from Table 10-1. Adding the above equations and converting to a base year yields:

$$C_{\text{operating}} = C_{\text{idx}} (AC_{\text{liq}} + AC_{\text{elect}} + AC_{\text{labor}} + AC_{\text{maint}} + AC_{\text{payovh}} + AC_{\text{pltovh}} + AC_{\text{tax}} + AC_{\text{waste}} + AC_{\text{water}} + AC_{\text{steam}}) \quad (10.13)$$

The total cost for clean coal is found by adding Equations (10.5), (10.12), (10.13) and the raw coal cost

$$C_{\text{total}} = C_{\text{raw}} + C_{\text{ref}} + C_{\text{operating}} + C_{\text{capital}}$$

**Table 10-1:** Operating Cost Factors (1980 \$)

Variable Cost Elements	Symbol Definition	Value
Electricity	e (\$/raw ton)	1.560
Labor	l (\$/hr)	268.000
Maintenance	mt (fraction)	0.045
Refuse Disposal	r (\$/wet ton)	1.200
Taxes	t (fraction)	0.040
Water	w (\$/1000 gallon)	0.180
Heavy Liquid	c (\$/lb)	0.800

## 10.6 Illustrative Results

Experimental HLC process done by PTI on Pittsburgh coal and Illinois No.6 coal is shown in Table 10-2. In this process the heavy liquid used is methylene chloride. Methylene chloride is chosen over Freon-113 (another heavy liquid considered) since the lower specific gravity of methylene chloride (s.g. 1.33) will give better product quality than the process based on Freon-113 (s.g. 1.57). The relevant properties of methylene chloride and Freon-113 are listed in Table 10-3.

**Table 10-2: HLC Feed Coal and Clean Coal Quality (53)**

Performance parameter	Pittsburgh No. 8	Illinois No.6
<b>Feed Product Quality</b>		
Ash %	40.9	25.30
Sulfur %	3.66	4.53
Pyritic sulfur %	2.83	2.24
Heating value (Btu/lb)	8260	10580.
lb SO <sub>2</sub> /10 <sup>6</sup> Btu	8.86	8.56
<b>Product Quality</b>		
Ash %	1.67	2.52
Pyritic sulfur %	0.45	0.55
Heating value (Btu/lb)	14150.	13520.
lb SO <sub>2</sub> /10 <sup>6</sup> Btu	2.37	3.72
<b>Performance</b>		
% Ash removal	94.70	82.80
% Ash reduction	89.50	81.80
% Sulfur removal	76.20	64.80
% Sulfur reduction	54.40	44.40
% Pyritic sulfur removal	90.60	81.00
% Pyritic sulfur reduction	84.10	75.40
% Btu Recovery	80.40	87.60



**Table 10-3:** Properties of Heavy Liquids

Liquid	Formula	Boiling Point, °C	Density, gm/cm <sup>3</sup>	Heat of Vapor., cal/gm	Viscosity, cp	Toxicity	Solubility in Water, gm/gm
Freon-113	CCL <sub>2</sub> F- CClF <sub>2</sub>	47.6	1.57	35.0	0.68	non-toxic	insoluble
Methylene Chloride	CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	40.0	1.33	89.0	0.45	High	0.02

PTI had also performed experiments of the HLC process without the precleaned subcircuit for the Pittsburgh coal. The product qualities found could not come close to meeting the quality requirements for clean coal products. It was found necessary to have the precleaned subcircuit. Table 10-4 shows the comparisons between the quality product coal of HLC process with and without precleaned subcircuit.

## 10.7 Sensitivity Results

The key design and operating parameters for HLC process considered were:

1. Coal Grind—minimum size that could be run without degradation in cyclone performance.
2. Solids Concentration—maximum capacity of the 2” and 1” cyclones before pulp density became a hindrance in the separation.

Analyzing PTI’s experimental result of the HLC process we found that the value of the parameters vary with coal type. It can be summarized as follows:

### 10.7.1 Illinois Coal

A much lower reduction in ash values was obtained with the 200 mesh grind than with the 100 mesh grind. However, the ash reduction did not come without a loss in thermal recovery. For example, it was possible to achieve ash reductions in excess of 80% with corresponding thermal recoveries of 72% - 74%. It is realized that ash values in clean coal product of less than 4% are not theoretically possible, even if the coal is ground below 325 mesh.


When the coal was ground to pass 325 mesh, the cyclone efficiency degraded. The ash values achieved in the clean coal product was 11% -12% at a resultant thermal recovery of 88%. Since it is theoretically possible to achieve somewhat lower ash levels at 80% recovery, this result indicates that the cyclone efficiency began deteriorating at 325 mesh. Table 10-3 shows the experimental results of grind size on product performance. The results are graphically displayed in Figures 10-3 and 10-4.

**Table 10-4:** The Effect of Precleaned Subcircuit on Pittsburgh coal(53)  
100 mesh grind size, 5% solids, inlet pressure of 15 psi

Performance Parameter	Pittsburgh No. 8	Illinois No.6
<b>Feed Product Quality</b>		
Weight %	100.00	72.50
Ash %	40.90	24.56
Sulfur %	3.66	3.52
Pyritic sulfur %	2.83	2.60
lb SO <sub>2</sub> /10 <sup>6</sup> Btu	8.86	6.44
Heating value (Btu/lb)	8260.	10937.
<b>Product Quality</b>		
Weight %	35.08	46.72
Ash %	22.03	5.33
Sulfur %	not determined	1.72
Pyritic sulfur %	not determined	0.41
lb SO <sub>2</sub> /10 <sup>6</sup> Btu	not determined	2.46
Heating value (Btu/lb)	11342	13980
% Btu Recovery	49.00	80.44
% Ash reduction	46.10	84.96
% Sulfur reduction	not determined	53.01
% Pyritic sulfur reduction	not determined	85.51
% Ash red./10 <sup>6</sup> Btu	61.42	92.43
% Sulfur red./10 <sup>6</sup> Btu	not determined	72.71
% Pyritic sulfur red./10 <sup>6</sup> Btu	not determined	91.59
% Ash removal	83.07	93.37
% Pyritic sulfur removal	not determined	91.96


The effect of solids concentration using 10, 15, 20 and 25 percent solids by weight on the heavy cyclones showed that thermal recovery is optimum at medium solids (i.e. 10% by weight). However, there also is a trade-off in that lower ash values are achieved at lower concentrations.

**Figure 10-3: Illinois #6: Grind Size vs. Grade Recovery**  
 (% Btu rec., %Ash red., %Pyritic Sulfur red.)



note: % Pyritic Sulfur reduction for 300 mesh is not Available  
 Clean coal product based on ROM coal

**Figure 10-4: Illinois #6: Effect of Solid Concentration on Performance**



note: Clean coal product based on ROM coal

A most encouraging results in this test work occurred with respect to the pyritic sulfur removal. Usually, the pyritic sulfur removals were greater than 79%. The most important aspect of these results was that they were consistent irrespective of thermal recoveries. Pyritic sulfur removals were consistently between 80-90% while Btu recoveries ranged from under 29% to over 77%. These results are encouraging in that the efficiency of the cyclone appears to remain high with respect to pyritic sulfur removal, even when ash removal may suffer. Pyritic sulfur removal always exceeded ash removal showing that the cyclone is more selective with respect to pyrites.

**Table 10-5:** Coal Quality vs. Coal Size (Illinois No. 6 Coal)(53)

Process: HLC - 15 psi

Coal type: precleaned Illinois #6 ; 5% solids

Feed Quality	Wt %	A%	S%	PS%	lb SO <sub>2</sub> /10 <sup>6</sup>	Btu	%Btu Rec
Rom Feed	100.00	25.29	4.53	2.24	8.56	10580.	100.00
Precleaned Feed	89.50	17.40	3.28	1.65	5.66	11582.	97.98

Coal size:	100 mesh	200 mesh	300 mesh
Product Quality			
Weight %	63.38	57.27	74.48
Ash %	5.43	4.14	11.97
Sulfur %	2.33	2.50	2.77
Pyritic sulfur %	0.28	0.43	not available
Heating value (Btu/lb)	13399.00	13589.	12438.
% Btu Recovery	80.27	73.56	87.57
% Ash reduction	78.52	83.64	52.66
% Sulfur reduction	48.65	44.85	38.76
% Pyritic sulfur red.	87.31	80.74	not available

note: Clean coal products based on ROM coal

### 10.7.2 Pittsburgh No. 8 Coal

During the test program, the previous 100 mesh grind tests were compared to additional tests run at 200 mesh grinds. Specifically, tests were run at smaller apex diameters in an attempt to increase thermal recoveries. Although the ash in the clean coal product remained low, hovering around 4.5% -5.5%, thermal recoveries did not dramatically improve. When the coal was ground to pass 200 mesh, slightly better thermal recoveries were achieved. However, a considerable amount of ash reported to the cyclone overflow when the apex was constricted in this manner. This can be observed in Table 10-6 and Figures 10-5 and 10-6.

**Table 10-6:** Coal Quality vs. Coal Size (Pittsburgh No. 8 Coal)(53)

Process: HLC - 15 psi


Coal type: precleaned Pittsburgh ; 5% solids

Feed Quality	Wt %	A%	S%	PS%	lb SO <sub>2</sub> /10 <sup>6</sup>	Btu	%Btu Rec
ROM Feed	100.00	40.80	3.66	2.83	9.02	8119	100.00
Precleaned Feed	72.50	24.56	3.52	2.60	6.44	10937	97.67

Coal size:	100 mesh	200 mesh
Product Quality		
Weight %	46.72	54.68
Ash %	5.33	12.78
Sulfur %	1.72	1.94
Pyritic sulfur %	0.41	0.71
Heating value (Btu/lb)	13980.	12906.
% Btu Recovery	80.44	86.93
% Ash reduction	86.96	68.73
% Sulfur reduction	53.01	46.98
% Pyritic sulfur reduction	85.51	74.98


note: Clean coal products based on ROM coal

**Figure 10-5: Pittsburgh: Grind Size vs. Grade Recovery**  
 (% Btu rec., %Ash red., %Pyritic Sulfur red.)




note: Clean coal product based on ROM coal

**Figure 10-6: Pittsburgh: Effect of Solid Concentration on Performance**



note: Clean coal product based on ROM coal

**Figure 10-7:** Grade / Recovery vs.  $A_{\text{clean}}$ 

Illinois:

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = -25.387 + 152.33 \cdot \log(A_{\text{clean}}) \quad R^2 = 0.727$$

Upper Freeport:

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = -167.11 + 243.38 \cdot \log(A_{\text{clean}}) \quad R^2 = 0.942$$

Pittsburgh:

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = -35.353 + 159.77 \cdot \log(A_{\text{clean}}) \quad R^2 = 0.927$$

A grade recovery plots of %Btu recovery vs. % ash content of clean coal shown in Figure 10-7. A similar grade recovery plot between the Btu recovery and pyritic sulfur removal is presented in Figure 10-8. Regressing both plots, relationships between Btu recovery and clean ash and Btu recovery and pyritic sulfur removal were obtained :

Illinois No. 6:

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = -25.387 + 152.33 \times \log(A_{\text{clean}})$$

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = 96.439 + 0.1337 \times \text{PS}_{\text{clean}} - 0.004 \times \text{PS}_{\text{clean}}^2$$


Pittsburgh No. 8:

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = -35.353 + 159.77 \times \log(A_{\text{clean}})$$

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = 97.119 + 0.023 \times \text{PS}_{\text{clean}} - 0.020 \times \text{PS}_{\text{clean}}^2$$

In incorporating the economic model for Illinois #6 and Pittsburgh #8 to predict the cost of cleaning the coal, the performance data of 10% solid concentration and 100 mesh grind size of the two types of coal is used. A summary of performance and costs for Illinois #6 and Pittsburgh coals to produce an output of 500 tons per hour is presented in Table 10-7, 10-8 and 10-9.

**Figure 10-8:** Grade / Recovery vs.  $PS_{\text{clean}}$



Illinois:

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = 96.439 + 0.134 * PS_{\text{clean}} - 0.004 * PS_{\text{clean}}^2 \quad R^2 = 0.650$$

Pittsburgh:

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = 97.119 + 0.023 * PS_{\text{clean}} - 0.020 * PS_{\text{clean}}^2 \quad R^2 = 0.884$$

Upper Freeport:

$$\% \text{ Btu recovery} = 116.73 - 0.682 * PS_{\text{clean}} + 0.004 * PS_{\text{clean}}^2 \quad R^2 = 0.921$$

## 10.8 Numerical Example

Type of coal	=	Illinois #6
Size	=	100 mesh (5% solids)
Heavy Liquid	=	Methylene Chloride
R	=	5.60
p	=	0.06
i	=	0.13
n	=	25
$C_{\text{sol}}$	=	2%
$m_0$	=	500 tons/hr
h	=	5500 hrs/yr

### 10.8.1 Performance Model

Clean coal characteristics:

$$\% \text{ Ash clean} = 5.43$$



$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\text{precleaned}} &= 0.895 \\
\% \text{ Btu recovery} &= -25.387 + 152.33 \times \log(A_{\text{clean}}) \\
\% \text{ Btu recovery} &= -25.387 + 152.33 \times \log 5.43 = 86.5\% \\
\% \text{ Btu recovery} &= 96.439 + 0.1337 \times PS_{\text{clean}} - 0.004 \times PS_{\text{clean}}^2 \\
\text{or} \\
0 &= 0.004 \times PS_{\text{clean}}^2 - 0.1337 \times PS_{\text{clean}} - 96.439 + 86.5 \\
0 &= 0.004 \times PS_{\text{clean}}^2 - 33.425 \times PS_{\text{clean}} - 9.939 \\
0 &= PS_{\text{clean}}^2 - 33.425 \times PS_{\text{clean}} - 2484.75 \\
PS_{\text{clean}} &= \{ (33.425) + [(33.425)^2 + (4 \times 1 \times 2484.75)]^{1.5} \} / 2 \times 1 \\
&= 69.3\% \text{ pyrites removed} \\
HHV_{\text{clean}} &= HHV_r [ 1 - A_{\text{clean}} / 1 - A_r ] \\
&= 10,580 [ 1 - 0.0543 / 1 - 0.2529 ] \\
&= 13,392 \text{ Btu}
\end{aligned}$$

The weight of water evaporated per pound of dry into thermal coal drier:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{\text{evapwater}}' &= m_{\text{inmois}}' - m_{\text{outmois}}' / [ ( 1 - m_{\text{inmois}}' ) ( 1 - m_{\text{outmois}}' ) ] \\
&= 0.28 - 0.05 / [ ( 1 - 0.28 ) ( 1 - 0.05 ) ] \\
&= 0.336
\end{aligned}$$

The amount of energy needed to evaporate this water is

$$\begin{aligned}
E_d &= 1020 m_{\text{evapwater}}' / \epsilon \\
&= [ 1020 \times 0.336 ] / 0.55 \\
&= 623.6 \text{ Btu/lb}
\end{aligned}$$

The lower heating value:

$$\begin{aligned}
LHV &= 0.96 HHV_{\text{clean}} - [ ( 1020 m_{\text{outmois}}' ) / ( 1 - m_{\text{outmois}}' ) ] \\
&= 0.96 \times 13,392 - [ ( 1020 \times 0.05 ) / ( 1 - 0.05 ) ] \\
&= 12,803.1 \text{ Btu/lb}
\end{aligned}$$

The drier yield:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\text{drier}} &= 1 - E_d / LHV \\
&= 1 - ( 623.6 / 12,803.1 ) \\
&= 0.9513
\end{aligned}$$

The plant yield:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\text{total}} &= Y_{\text{precleaned}} Y_{\text{clean}} Y_{\text{drier}} \\
&= 0.895 \times 0.634 \times 0.951 \\
&= 0.540
\end{aligned}$$

The weight of water evaporated:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{\text{evapwater}} &= m_o [ m_{\text{evapwater}}' / Y_{\text{drier}} ] \\
&= 500 \times ( 0.336 / 0.9513 ) \\
&= 176.7 \text{ tph}
\end{aligned}$$

Dry mass flow rate of raw coal input:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_r &= m_o / Y_{\text{total}} \\
&= 500 / 0.540 \\
&= 925.9 \text{ tph}
\end{aligned}$$

Dry mass flow rate of precleaned coal to HLC process:

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{\text{precleaned}} &= Y_{\text{precleaned}} \times m_r \\
 &= 0.895 \times 925.9 \\
 &= 829.3 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$

Mass flow rate of methylene chloride input (dry basis)

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{\text{liq}} &= 5.60 m_{\text{precleaned}} \\
 &= 5.60 \times 829.3 \\
 &= 4644.0 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$

Dry mass flow rate of cleaned coal entering the thermal drier:

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{\text{dry}} &= m_o / Y_{\text{drier}} \\
 &= 500 / 0.951 \\
 &= 525.6 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$

Dry mass flow rate of refuse coal:

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{\text{ref}} &= m_{\text{precleaned}} - m_{\text{dry}} \\
 &= 829.3 - 525.6 \\
 &= 401 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$

Water loss in the coal cleaning plant:

$$\begin{aligned}
 W &= m_{\text{dry}} [ ( 1 / ( 1 - m_{\text{inmois}} ) ) - 1 ] + m_{\text{ref}} [ ( 1 / RC ) - 1 ] \\
 &= 525.6 [ ( 1 / ( 1 - 0.28 ) ) - 1 ] + 401 [ ( 1 / 0.35 ) - 1 ] \\
 &= 949.1 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$

Total mass flow rate of steam for the stripping system in (tons/hr)

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{\text{steam}} &= 65.0 \times 10^{-3} \cdot m_{\text{liq}} \\
 &= 65.0 \times 10^{-3} \cdot 4644.0 \\
 &= 301.9 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$

Total mass flow rate of coolant for the stripping system in (tons/hr)

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{\text{water}} &= m_{\text{waterclean}} + m_{\text{water ref}} \\
 &= 2.37 m_{\text{liqstripclean}} + 2.37 m_{\text{liqstripref}} \\
 &= 2.37 (m_{\text{liqstripclean}} + m_{\text{liqstripref}}) \\
 &= 2.37 \times 2024.8 \\
 &= 4,798.8 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$

Mass flow rate of methylene chloride lost to water

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{\text{liqlosttowater}} &= C_{\text{sol}} \times W \\
 &= 0.02 \times 949.1 \\
 &= 18.98 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$

Mass flow rate of methylene chloride lost to atmosphere

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{\text{liqlosttoatm}} &= 0.00035 \times m_{\text{precleaned}} \\
 &= 0.00035 \times 829.3 \\
 &= 0.29 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$

Mass flow rate of new heavy liquid in tons per hour

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{\text{liqnew}} &= 18.98 + 0.29 \\
 &= 19.27 \text{ tph}
 \end{aligned}$$


---

### 10.8.2 Economic Model

Capital Cost:

$$\begin{aligned}
 DC_r &= \$ 22, 524 m_r^{0.7} \\
 &= \$ 22, 524 \times (926.575)^{0.7} \\
 &= \$2,688,202 \\
 \\ 
 DC_{hlcequip} &= \$22, 528 m_{precleaned}^{0.7} \\
 &= \$22, 528 \times 829.3^{0.7} \\
 &= \$2, 487,798 \\
 DC_{liqrec} &= \$ 30,643 R^{0.7} m_r^{0.7} \\
 &= \$ 30,643 \times 5.66^{0.7} \times 926.575^{0.7} \\
 &= \$19, 153, 152 \\
 DC_{ref} &= \$33, 514 m_{ref}^{0.7} \\
 &= \$33, 514 \times 401^{0.7} \\
 &= \$2, 225, 399 \\
 DC_{drier} &= \$153, 000 m_{evapwater}^{0.7} \\
 &= \$153, 000 \times 176.74^{0.7} \\
 &= \$153, 037 \\
 TDC &= \$2,688,202 + \$2,487,798 + \$19,153,152 + \$2,225,399 + \$153,037 \\
 &= \$41,663,840 \\
 TCC &= 1.56 \times TDC \\
 &= 1.56 \times \$41,663,840 \\
 &= \$41,663,840
 \end{aligned}$$

Annual Cost

$$\begin{aligned}
 AC_{liq} &= [ (Rc_{mprecleaned}) + [ c \times ( m_{liqnewt}) ] ] / m_o \\
 &= ( 5.60 \times 0.8 \times 829.3 + 0.8 \times 18.981 ) / 500 \\
 &= \$7.54/ton \\
 AC_{elect} &= e / Y_{tot} \\
 &= 1.56 / 0.540 \\
 &= \$2.89/ton \\
 AC_{labor} &= l / m_o \\
 &= 268 / 500 \\
 &= \$0.54/ton \\
 AC_{maint} &= [ mt. TCC ] / [ m_o h ] \\
 &= [ 0.045 \times \$41,663,840 ] / [ 500 \times 5500 ] \\
 &= \$0.68/ton \\
 AC_{payovh} &= 0.30 AC_{labor} \\
 &= 0.30 \times \$0.536 \\
 &= \$0.16/ton \\
 AC_{pltovh} &= 0.26 [ AC_{labor} + AC_{maint} + AC_{liq} ] \\
 &= 0.26 ( \$0.536 + \$0.6818 + \$7.5404 ) \\
 &= \$2.28/ton
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 AC_{\text{tax}} &= [ t \text{ TCC } ] / [ m_o \text{ h } ] \\
 &= [ 0.04 \times \$41,663,840 ] / [ 500 \times 5500 ] \\
 &= 0.61/\text{ton} \\
 AC_{\text{waste}} &= [ r m_{\text{ref}} ] / m_o \text{ RC} \\
 &= [ 1.2 \times 401 ] / [ 500 \times 0.35 ] \\
 &= \$2.75/\text{ton} \\
 AC_{\text{water}} &= [ w 240 W ] / m_o \\
 &= (0.18/1000) \times 240 \times 949.1/500 \\
 &= \$0.08/\text{ton} \\
 \text{Working Capital} \\
 W_c &= 0.25 ( AC_{\text{labor}} + AC_{\text{maint}} + AC_{\text{elect}} + AC_{\text{water}} + AC_{\text{waste}} + AC_{\text{liq}} ) \\
 &= 0.25 ( \$0.54 + \$0.82 + \$2.89 + \$0.08 + \$2.75 + \$7.54 ) \\
 &= \$3.66/\text{ton} \\
 \text{Cleaning Cost is then:} \\
 C_r &= \$25.35 \text{ (see Table 10-7)} \\
 C_{\text{ref}} &= C_r [ (1/Y_{\text{total}}) - 1 ] \\
 &= \$25.35 [ (1/0.540) - 1 ] \\
 &= \$21.60/\text{ton} \\
 C_{\text{operating}} &= C_{\text{idx}} ( AC_{\text{liq}} + AC_{\text{elect}} + AC_{\text{labor}} + AC_{\text{maint}} + AC_{\text{payovh}} + AC_{\text{pltovh}} \\
 &\quad + AC_{\text{tax}} + AC_{\text{waste}} + AC_{\text{water}} ) \\
 &= 1.193 ( \$7.54 + \$2.89 + \$0.54 + \$0.82 + \$0.16 + \$2.31 \\
 &\quad + \$0.73 + \$2.75 + \$0.082 ) \\
 &= \$21.27/\text{ton} \\
 C_{\text{capital}} &= dW_c + [ ( \text{TCC} \times \text{CRF} ) / ( m_o \times \text{h} ) ] \\
 &= [ 0.066 \times \$3.66 ] + [ ( \$50,357,033 \times 0.083 ) / ( 500 \times 5500 ) ] \\
 &= \$2.10/\text{ton} \\
 C_{\text{total}} &= C_r + C_{\text{ref}} + C_{\text{operating}} + C_{\text{capital}} \\
 &= \$25.00 + \$21.33 + \$21.27 + \$2.10 \\
 &= \$69.70/\text{ton}
 \end{aligned}$$

A summary of total cleaned coal cost components appears in Table 10-7 for both the Illinois and Pittsburgh coals. Breakdowns of O&M costs and total capital costs appear in Tables 10-8 and 10-9, respectively. Graphical comparisons of total coal cost and capital cost appear in Figures 10-9 and 10-10.

**Table 10-7:** Components of Total Coal Cost (1984\$ / dry ton of clean coal)

Components	Illinois #6	Pittsburgh
Raw*	25.35	21.17
Capital	2.10	2.69
Operating	21.27	32.65
Refuse	21.60	43.20
Total	70.32	99.71

\* See footnote to Table 9-4 for explanation of input coal prices.


**Table 10-8:** Breakdown of the Operating and Maintenance Cost ( 1984\$ / dry to of clean coal)

Components	Illinois #6	Pittsburgh
Heavy Liquids	7.54	9.94
Electricity	2.89	4.74
Labor	0.54	0.54
Maintenance	0.82	1.02
Payroll Overhead	0.16	0.16
Plant Overhead	2.31	2.99
Taxes & Insurance	0.73	0.90
Waste Disposal	2.75	6.89
Water	0.08	0.18


**Table 10-9:** Breakdown of the Capital Cost ( Million 1984\$ )

Components	Illinois #6	Pittsburgh #8
Raw Coal	2.688	3.802
HLC Equip.	2.488	3.036
HLR Equip.	19.153	23.128
Refuse Coal	2.225	4.235
Thermal Drier	5.726	5.645

**Figure 10-9: Components of Total Coal Cost**  
(1989\$ / dry ton of clean coal)



**Figure 10-10: Components of Capital Cost**



## 11 REFERENCES

1. E. S. Rubin, J. S. Salmento, J. G. Barrett, C. N. Bloyd, H. C. Frey, Modeling and Assessment of Advanced Processes for Integrated Environmental Control of Coal-Fired Power Plants, Prepared by Carnegie Mellon University for DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA (1986).
2. J. S. Salmento, S. Siegel and M. Berkenpas, Center for Energy and Environmental Studies (CEES), Technical Manual for the Integrated Environmental Control Model (IECM), Prepared by Carnegie Mellon University for DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA (1991).
3. Combustion Engineering, Inc., *Combustion: Fossil Power Systems*. J. G. Singer, Eds., (Combustion Engineering Inc., Windsor, CT, 1981).
4. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Third Edition (Research Triangle Park, NC, 1982).
5. I. Barin, O. Knacke, *Thermochemical Properties of Inorganic Substances* (Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, 1973).
6. I. Barin, O. Knacke, O. Kubaschewski, *Thermochemical Properties of Inorganic Substances: Supplement* (Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, 1977), vol. 1.
7. J. Ratafia-Brown, R. Hershey, Science Management Corporation, Modeling of the Regenerator Reactor for the Fluidized Bed Copper Oxide Flue Gas Treatment Process, Report to DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA, (1984).
8. G. H. Babcock, S. Wilcox, *Steam/Its Generation and Use* (Babcock and Wilcox Company, New York, NY, 1978).
9. F. P. Incropera, D. P. D. Witt, *Fundamentals of Heat Transfer* (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1981).
10. *ASHRAE Handbook: 1981 Fundamentals* (American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc., Atlanta, GA, 1981).
11. J. C. Molburg, E.S.Rubin, Air Pollution Control Costs for Coal-to-Electricity Systems, *Journal of the Air Pollution Control Association* , **33**, (1983).
12. Electric Power Research Institute, TAG - Technical Assessment Guide: Electricity Supply - 1986 (EPRI, Palo Alto, CA, 1986).
13. Electric Power Research Institute, TAG - Technical Assessment Guide: Fundamentals and Methods Supply-1986 (EPRI, Palo Alto, CA, 1987).
14. J. T. Yeh, C. J. Drummond, Process Simulation of the Fluidized Bed Copper Oxide Process Sulfation Reaction, AIChE 1986 Spring National Meeting (New Orleans, LA, 1986).

15. J. T. Yeh, R. J. Demski, J. P. Strakey, J. I. Joubert, PETC Fluidized-Bed Copper Oxide Process for Combined SO<sub>2</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> Removal from Flue Gas, AIChE 1984 Winter National Meeting (AIChE, Atlanta, GA, 1984).
  16. E. S. Rubin, Modeling of Integrated Environmental Control Systems for Coal-Fired Power Plants, Third Quarterly Report to Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, U.S. Department of Energy, (June, 1988).
  17. E. S. Rubin, Modeling of Integrated Environmental Control Systems for Coal-Fired Power Plants, Fourth Quarterly Report to Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, U.S. Department of Energy, (October, 1988).
  18. Science Applications, Inc., NOXSO Corporation, Appendix A: Economic Evaluation of the NOXSO Process for Control of Coal Fired Flue Gas NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>x</sub>, Report to DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA, (1983).
  19. J. L. Halsbeck, L. G. Neal, H. P. Tseng, NOXSO Corporation, Evaluation of the NOXSO Combined NO<sub>x</sub>/SO<sub>x</sub> Flue Gas Treatment Process, Report to DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA, (1983).
  20. J. L. Halsbeck, C. J. Wang, L. G. Neal, H. P. Tseng, J. D. Tucker, NOXSO Corporation, Evaluation of the NOXSO Combined NO<sub>x</sub>/SO<sub>x</sub> Flue Gas Treatment Process, Report to DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA, (1984).
  21. J. L. Halsbeck, C. J. Wang, L. G. Neal, C. P. Perng, NOXSO Corporation, Evaluation of the NOXSO Combined NO<sub>x</sub>/SO<sub>x</sub> Flue Gas Treatment Process, Report to DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA, (1985).
  22. R. Keeth, J. E. Miranda, J. B. Reisdorf, R. W. Scheck, *Economic Evaluation of FGD Systems*, EPRI, Palo Alto, CA, 1986, vol. IV.
  23. Private communication with L.G. Neal, NOXSO Corporation (1988).
  24. J. L. Halsbeck, L. G. Neal, W. T. Ma, Development Status of the NOXSO Combined NO<sub>x</sub>/SO<sub>2</sub> Flue Gas Treatment Process, Fourth Symposium on Integrated Environmental Control, EPRI, Palo Alto, CA, (1988).
  25. Private Communication with NOXSO Corporation (1988).
  26. E. S. Rubin, J. S. Salmento, H. C. Frey, Evaluating Combined SO<sub>2</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> Processes, Fourth Symposium on Integrated Environmental Controls. Co-Sponsored by EPRI/ASME/APCA, EPRI, Palo Alto, CA, (1988).
  27. J. L. Halsbeck, L. G. Neal, The NOXSO Process: Simultaneous Removal of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from Flue Gas, AIChE 1987 Spring National Meeting (Houston, TX, 1987).
  28. J. L. Halsbeck, C. J. Wang, The NOXSO Process Development: An Update, Ninth EPA-EPRI Symposium on Flue Gas Desulfurization, EPRI, Palo Alto, CA, (1985).
-



29. D. M. Helfritch, T. L. Feldman, Electron Beam Process Removal of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from Flue Gas, Proceedings of 3rd Symposium on Integrated Environmental Controls for Fossil Fuel Power Plants (Air Pollution Control Association, Pittsburgh, PA, 1986).
30. H. C. Frey, M.E. Thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University (1987).
31. J. Ratafia-Brown, R. Hershey, *Economic Evaluation of the Fluidized Bed-Copper Oxide Flue Gas Treatment Process and Integrated Sulfuric Acid Plant* (Science Management Corporation, 1983).
32. J. Ratafia-Brown, R. Hershey, *Technical and Economics Evaluation of the Fluidized Bed-Copper Oxide Flue Gas Treatment Process and Integrated Sulfur-Producing Plants*, Report to DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA, (Science Management Corporation, 1983).
33. Private Communication from S. Higgins. (St. Louis, MO, Monsanto Enviro-Chem, February 1988).
34. Private Communications from S. Higgins. (St. Louis, MO, Monsanto Enviro-Chem, April 1988).
35. C. W. Gibbs, Eds., *New Compressed Air and Gas Data* (Ingersol-Rand Co., Phillipsburg, 1971).
36. C. N. Bloyd, J. C. Molburg, E. S. Rubin, J. F. Skea, The State Level Advanced Utility Simulation Model Analytical Documentation, Chapter 5: The Pollution Control Module, US EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC, (1984).
37. K. J. Miller, A. W. Deurbrouck, Eds., *Froth Flotation to Desulfurize Coal* (Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1982).
38. D. J. Brown, in *Froth Flotation-50th Anniversary Volume* D. W. Fuerstenau, Ed. (AIME, New York, 1962) pp. 518-538.
39. F. F. Aplan, in *Flotation, A.M. Gaudin Memorial Volume* M. C. Feurstenau, Ed. (AIME, New York, 1976), vol. II, pp. 1235-1265.
40. J. W. Leonard, Eds., *Coal Preparation, 4th Edition* (The American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers, Inc. (New York, 1979).
41. J. Leja, *Surface Chemistry of Froth Flotation* (Plenum Press, New York, 1982).
42. T. J. Olson, WEMCO, Froth Flotation for Fine-Coal Cleaning (1985).
43. B. J. Arnold, A Practical View of Rate and Residence Time in Industrial Coal Froth Flotation Circuits, 5th Annual International Pittsburgh Coal Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, (1988).
44. J. A. Avallaro, A. W. Deurbrouck, Froth Flotation Washability Data of Various Appalachian Coals Using the Timed Release Analysis Technique, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, Washington, DC, (1965).

45. B. Onursal, B. Chenz, L. McCandless, Versar, Inc., Cost, Energy and Environmental Sensitivity Analysis of Coal Cleaning Technology for Industrial Boiler Applications, Report to US EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC, (1980).
  46. Bechtel Corporation, Coal Preparation and Cleaning Assessment Study, Report to Argonne National Lab, Argonne, IL, (1977).
  47. J. Buroff, Technology Assessment Report for Industrial Boilers: Coal Cleaning and Low Sulfur Coal, Report to US EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC, (Versar, Inc, 1979).
  48. Hoffman-Muntner Corporation, Engineering/Economic Analyses of Coal Preparation with SO<sub>2</sub> Cleanup Processes, Interagency Energy-Environment Research and Development Program, US DOE, Washington DC, (1978).
  49. J. C. Molburg, Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Engineering and Public Policy, Carnegie Mellon University (1982).
  50. E.C. Holt, Jr., An Engineering/Economic Analysis of the Coal-Pyrite Flotation Process , U.S. Department of Energy, Washington DC, (1981).
  51. Bechtel Corporation, Advanced Physical Fine Coal Cleaning Spherical Agglomeration, Bechtel Phase I Report to the U.S. Department of Energy, Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, Pittsburgh, PA, (August, 1988).
  52. Burns and Roe Services Corporation, in *Acid Rain Control Initiative Coal Preparation—Technical and Economic Analyses* , Report to DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA, (March, 1987).
  53. Process Technology Inc. et al., A Report on Proof of Concept Testing of the Heavy Liquid Cyclone Technology, Report to DOE/PETC, Pittsburgh, PA, (1989).
-



## **APPENDIX**

### Illustrative Case Studies

