NTRD Program Disclaimers

1. Disclaimer of Endorsement:

The posting herein of progress reports and final reports provided to TCEQ by its NTRD Grant Agreement recipients does not necessarily constitute or imply an endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by TCEQ or the State of Texas. The views and opinions expressed in said reports do not necessarily state or reflect those of TCEQ or the State of Texas, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

2. Disclaimer of Liability:

The posting herein of progress reports and final reports provided to TCEQ by its NTRD Grant Agreement recipients does not constitute by TCEQ or the State of Texas the making of any warranty, express or implied, including the warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose, and such entities do not assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information,apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represent that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
New Technology Research & Development (NTRD) Program
Monthly Project Status Report

Title: FEEDLOT BIOMASS: A REBURN FUEL FOR "MAXIMUM NO_X" REDUCTION IN COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS

Contract Number: TCEQ Grant # 582-5-65591 0015

Grantee: Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Texas A&M University

Date Submitted: July 10, 2006

Report for the Monthly period:
Starting Date: June 1, 2006 **Ending Date:** June 30, 2006

Section I. Accomplishments (*Please provide a bulleted list of project accomplishments as well as a description of their importance to the project.)*

The overall objectives of the project are i) to develop a retrofit technology of using processed low-ash feedlot biomass (FB) as reburn fuel for potential reduction of the NOx in coal-fired power plants by 80-90% and ii) determine the possible capture of Hg for low rank coals, reduction of CO_2 and other benefits of using animal wastes (alternately known as feedlot biomass, FB) as fuels.

In this report, the task lists are summarized and the progress/accomplishments for each task are reported. Tasks are indicated in bold letters

Task 1: Fuel Characteristics of lignite, sub-bituminous coal, raw manure (RM), and partially composted manure (PC)

2.1. Task Statement: The PERFORMING PARTY will analyze the fuel characteristics of raw manure (RM), and partially composted manure (PC).

2.1.1 The following four groups of FB will be selected: HA-RM (high-ash raw manure from Conventional lots), LA-RM (low-ash raw manure), HA-PC (high-ash PC), and LA-PC (low-ash PC). The LA-RM includes those collected from ash paved feedlots (25% ash) near Amarillo, TX and dairy farms (15-20% ash) located near Waco, TX. The conventional soil surface HA-FB will be obtained from the feed yards near Amarillo, Texas, while the LA-FB will be obtained from the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station (USDA-ARS Experimental Feedyard at Bushland, TX. Partially composted Dairy Biomass (DB) will be obtained from Dairy farms around Waco, TX. All fuel including FB and DB will be dried and ground, and shipped from Amarillo to TAMU facility at College Station, TX and DOE Pilot Facility at Pittsburgh, PA; Wyoming and Lignite coal will be ground and shipped to TAMU and DOE Pilot Facility, Pittsburgh.

<u>Progress To date:</u>

1. All the necessary fuels HA-RM, LA-RM, HA-PC, LA-PC, Wyoming Subbituminous coal, and Texas Lignite coal have been collected, dried and ground. They have been shipped to TAMU facility at College Station, TX.
2. Met with Pilot Scale Facility Vendor I: The unit is rated at 1,000,000 BTU/hr (293 kW) which 10 times the TAMU burner capacity. This will facility will require approximately 1000 lb of coal per day (with 10 hrs of operation per day). For 5 days of test and 2 weeks of test duration total coal required will be approximately 10,000 lb (5 short tons) and 2000 lb of FB (90:10 blends on heat

basis) for cofiring applications. For reburn applications with a maximum of 30 % heat input with coal as reburn fuel, total coal fuel sample mass should be 3500 lb (1.75 short tons); for reburn with FB alone the required amount jumps to 6000 lb (3 tons); Since coal will be fired only for base line studies, the required amount could be reduced to about 1 short ton for coal but FB should still be about 3 tons. Once vendor is finalized, the amount of fuel samples will be finalized...

2.1.1.1 All samples will be tested for moisture and ash content by the PERFORMING PARTY at the TAES/ARS Research and Production Laboratory at Bushland, Texas. Ultimate analyses including the heating values will be performed on all fuel samples. Ash analyses will also be performed on all the four types of FB fuels (including elements like Na, Fe, K, P, S and others) in order to interpret whether any variation in these elements amongst all the four types affect the pyrolysis, reburning, and fouling processes.

Progress To date:

An Excel based software has been developed which requires input from the proximate (Ash, FC, VM) and ultimate (C, H, N, O, S, and Cl) analyses and gross or higher heating value of fuels in order to estimate the energy conversion potential of fuels into various forms (digestion, combustion, H2 production etc)

2.1.1.2. Fundamental pyrolysis and ignition studies will be performed by the PERFORMING PARTY on all the four types of FB to generate data on kinetics of pyrolysis because of its relevance to reburn mechanism. Pyrolysis and ignition behavior studies will be performed for HA-RM, LA-RM, HA-PC, LA-PC and Coal: FB blends using Thermo Gravimetric Analyses (TGA).

Progress to date

Task 1 is 100% complete and a report has been submitted to TCEQ

2.1.2. Schedule: The PERFORMING PARTY shall complete this task within 13 months of the signed Notice to Proceed Date or May 1, 2006 as issued by TCEQ.

2.1.3. Deliverables: The PERFORMING PARTY shall submit a detailed written report to the TCEQ upon completion of this task, to include but not limited to a summary of the analyst of the fuel characteristics of raw manure and partially composted manure.

Task 2: Small Scale Reburn Experiments for NOx reduction

2.2. Task Statement: The PERFORMING PARTY will perform small scale reburn studies with fuels listed in Task 1 as reburn fuels except DB, RM and their blends. The conventional TAMU co-fired boiler burner facility will be used for the studies.

2.2.1 The PERFORMING PARTY shall modify the facility for reburn experiments. These modifications include 1) allow two different reburn injection schemes to enable better mixing with NOx laden streams; 2) Install a single-pass water tube heat exchanger just before the water quench system to cool the gases and study the fouling behavior; and 3) Install an air assisted injector system for injection of Hg Acetate solution to simulate Hg emission on the primary burn zone. For the following experiments, the NOx from the main burner will be reduced to 100-400 ppm. Gas temperatures in the reburn zone, and species concentration at exhaust will be measured. Process variables will include co-fired heat input, and reburn zone stoichiometric ratio (SR). Texas Lignite Coal will be used as the baseline main fuel. Parameters to be monitored as key performance indicators include emissions of NOx, SO_2, CO, and CO_2 and ash analyses (loss-on-ignition). The TGA analyses of FB determined from Task 1 will be used in interpreting the test data. Tests will be performed with fan type injectors to spread the FB throughout the cross

section and at an upward angle in order to improve mixing and provide more residence time for NOx reduction. The mixing time scale will be determined by measuring the O_2% when air is injected in the main burner while N_2 is injected through the reburn nozzle.

2.2.1.1. The PERFORMING PARTY will investigate the effect of reburn zone equivalence-ratio for Texas Lignite, LA-PC, and blends of Texas lignite and LA-PC.

2.2.1.2. The PERFORMING PARTY will use N_2 and air mixture in the reburn nozzle in order to simulate the exhaust gas recirculation (EGR) for injection of reburn fuel.

2.2.1.3. The PERFORMING PARTY will study the fouling potential, associated with FB as reburn fuel. During the combustion experiments, the PERFORMING PARTY will measure the water inlet temperature and exit temperature to determine the degree of ash deposition. The ash will be scraped off and sent for analyses.

Progress to date

1. Heat exchanger tubes were added to the furnace and fouling experiments are expected to start in May. Data generated were not meaningful due to location of Thermocouples inside the heat exchanger.
2. Some delays occurred due to the fracture of the natural gas burner.

2.2.1.4. The PERFORMING PARTY will conduct experiments for Hg Capture. Trace amounts of Hg acetate solution will be injected to simulate the Hg vapor in flue gases. The FB will be injected through reburn ports. Hg capture will be studied with and without the presence of heat exchangers. An Automatic Mercury Analyzer will be used for measurements of Hg (Hg0, Hg+2) emissions.

2.2.2. Schedule: The PERFORMING PARTY shall complete this task within eleven sixteen months of the signed Notice to Proceed Date (or 8/1/06) as issued by TCEQ

2.2.3. Deliverables: The PERFORMING PARTY shall submit a detailed written report to the TCEQ upon completion of this task, to include but not limited to a summary of the test results from the reburn studies. These results include the monitored emissions of NOx, SO_2, CO, and CO_2 and ash analyses as well as the results from the Mercury Analyzer.

Progress to date

Almost all experiments have been performed except the Hg aspects of measurements due to equipment problems.

In June, it had been proposed to perform fouling experiments with a small scale 30 kW (100,000 BTU/h) boiler burner using coal: biomass blends. So far, all planned experiments have been performed with the pure Texas Lignite coal, pure LAPC, 90:10 TX-Lig: LAPC blend and 70:30 TX-Lig: LAPC blend. NOx reduction experiments have been also performed with the fouling study simultaneously. The final report is been written and the NOx and fouling aspects of task will be submitted before August 01, 2006.

Mercury Aspects of Task:

Progress: For the Hg measurement, the unexpected problem with new Dukon Hg analyzer slowed down the experiments in June. It has been sent to the factory for repair and was delivered about 2 weeks back (19th Jun, 2006). Conducted experiments with 100% TX lignite coal, 100% WY sub-bituminous coal and 90-10 blend of TX lignite and LA-PC FB. Good data was obtained with elemental mercury, but had some problems with the wet chemistry method to read total mercury.

The methodology is being improved. The graduate students will perform several cases for the TCEQ project in July. The Hg results if obtained before July 31st will be incorporated with NOx and Fouling report. If equipment problems persist, an extension may be sought for Hg aspects of the task and a separate final report will be submitted later.

Task 2 is 80% completed.

Task 3: Pilot scale test at the 500,000 BTU/hr DOE-NETL facilities to verify the small-scale test data on NOx reduction and Hg capture and obtain optimum conditions.

2.3. Task Statement: The pilot plant at the Combustion and Environmental Research Facility (CERF) will bused for testing LA-RM and LA-PC fuels and measuring the NOx emissions. The PERFORMING PARTY will also obtain the optimum operating conditions and appropriate injector configuration.

2.3.1. Schedule: The PERFORMING PARTY shall complete this task within nine months 19 months from NTP (or 11/1/06) of the signed Notice to Proceed Date as issued by TCEQ.

2.3.2. Deliverables: The PERFORMING PARTY shall submit a detailed written report to the TCEQ upon completion of this task, to include but not limited to a summary of the pilot scale test and results of the NOx emissions.

Progress to date

1. As informed earlier the Vendor for pilot scale has been changed from DOE to other facilities. John and Kalyan visited with General Electric Vendor in June 29 and 30, 2006 and discussed the pilot scale tests. At GE, we had a real good technical visit with Dr. Vitali Lissianski, an engineering research leader, and Pete Maley, pilot plant engineer/ operator, at GE Energy in Santa Ana. There is no doubt they can conduct the pilot plant tests while TEES specifies test conditions for combustion or reburn protocols. The GE Energy's is 1 million BTU/hr (300 kW) vs. 0.3 MW for lab-scale pilot plant in TAMU/MENG Dept. The GE Energy group has experience with several types of Biomass including sewage sludge/biosolids and limited with DB with UC-Davis.
2. We had received e-mail from Lissianski that his administration had waived off NDA interest. So Sweeten, I and Lissianski were circumspect in presentations, careful to stick to published or open literature material.
3. Annamalai outlined an ambitious test schedule. GE said fine they could do this technically but chop it way back to have any hope of completing before TCEQ grant expires including final report Dec. 31. Second, Lissianski saw nothing in presentations that is compelling enough for an NDA. Apparently, that is long drawn out process with GE Energy and would likely cause delays and uncertainty.

Task 4: Reburn modeling to predict NOx capture by biomass fuels.

2.4. Task Statement: The PERFORMING PARTY will create a model for characterizing reburn performance with coal, FB and coal: FB blends in predicting NOx and as well as Hg control performance. This task will be conducted primarily using zero Dimensional reburn code with characteristic mixing time scale concept. The simplified model will provide directions for improvement of NOx capture and assist in developing the test matrix.

2.4.1. Schedule: The PERFORMING PARTY shall complete this task within 16 months (or 8/1/06) of the signed Notice to Proceed Date as issued by TCEQ.

2.4.2. Deliverables: The PERFORMING PARTY shall submit a detailed written report to the TCEQ upon completion of this task, to include but not limited to a summary of the modeling.

Progress to date

NOx

In the last month, the validity of some data from assumed from literature, for the fuel bound nitrogen release, has been heavily questioned. This has required review of literature to find new, reliable data, and more accurate ways to describe the nitrogen pyrolysis. Once the new data have been found it has been necessary to re run all the simulations to check out which ones of the new data guarantee the best accuracy.

Hg

No progress have been made on the mercury modeling as all the effort has been put on correcting the code for the NOx modeling

Task 4 is 80% complete.

Task 5: Perform the economics of the use of FB as reburn fuel in coal fired power plants and cost of NOx reduction compared to other technologies.

2.5. Task Statement: The PERFORMING PARTY will conduct an economic analysis for all four biomass fuels listed in Task 1.

2.5.1.1. The following will be calculated: 1) required coal and reburn fuel firing rate, 2) the ash production, 3) the dollar and CO_2 savings in using feedlot biomass, and 4) maximum radius of economical use of feedlot biomass.

<u>Progress to date</u>

1. The Computations were completed for coal and reburn fuel firing rates, CO2 savings, and ash production.
2. The fueling rates of raw high-ash feedlot biomass (HAFB-Raw), partially composted high-ash FB (HAFB-PC), raw low-ash FB (LAFB-Raw), and partially composted low-ash FB (LAFB-PC) were compared.
3. The moisture and ash percentages of LAFB-Raw and LAFB-PC were found to be very similar, and hence there is virtually no difference in fueling rate. Moreover, HAFB-PC fueling rates are only slightly different to those of HAFB-Raw. Hence, it may be deduced that choosing between a high-ash fuel and a low-ash fuel has more of an effect on reburn fueling rates than the choice between utilizing raw or partially composted FB.
4. Carbon dioxide (CO2) savings depend on the percentage of the total required heat release the reburn fuel meets. Only CO2 released from non-renewable sources, such as coal, is counted because it adds to the net CO2 loading on the environment. Therefore, less coal firing rates due to energy release from biomass means greater savings on CO2 emissions.
5. Ash production increases with HAFB, however, lower heat values of high-ash biomass fuels require higher coal firing rates for equal biomass fueling to meet heat rate requirements. Therefore, there may be a tradeoff between CO2 savings and ash production when deciding between firing HAFB and LAFB.
6. More detailed calculations and analysis will be included in the Task 5 report.
7. The following will be calculated: i) required coal and reburn fuel firing rate, ii) the ash production, iii) the dollar and CO2 savings in using feedlot biomass, and iv) maximum radius of economical use of feedlot biomass.

Estimated 99% complete

2.5.1.2. The PERFORMING PARTY will conduct an analysis of the benefits and limitations of using Selective Non Catalytic Reduction and Catalytic Reduction for NOx reductions.

<u>Progress to date</u>

1. For nominal base case values, it was found that retrofitting a low-ash, FB reburn system in a coal plant that currently uses SCR for NOx reduction would have a NPV of $11.8 million and a simple payback of 2 years and 4 months.
2. Sensitivity analysis of the NPV of such a retrofit project indicate that increased percent NOx reduction from the biomass, increased CO2 penalties, increased coal cost, lower distances between plant and feedlot, and lower biomass transportation costs are all favorable to the value of a FB reburn system retrofit on a coal-firing unit that currently uses SCR for NOx reduction.
3. When looking at the specific NOx reduction cost, it was found that for equal operation times, SCR is more cost effective at $5.80/lb NOx to that of low-ash FB reburning at $6.74/lb NOx. Selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR) seems to be the poorest option with a specific NOx reduction cost of $14.26. However, SNCR requires the lowest investment cost, which may make it favorable to smaller plants (<200 MW).
4. Additional research was conducted on current Texas coal-fired plants in order to produce real world economic comparisons for NO_x reduction.
5. This information will be used to approximate NO_x and dollar savings for some actual coal-fired units in Texas.
6. Conduct an analysis of the benefits and limitations of using Selective Non Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) and Catalytic Reduction (SCR) for NOx reductions

More detailed calculations and analyses will be included in the Task 5 report.

Estimated 90% complete

2.5.2. Schedule: The PERFORMING PARTY shall complete this task within Twelve months 16 months (or 8/1/06) to reflect changes in deadlines for tasks 2 and 4.of the signed Notice to Proceed Date as issued by TCEQ.

2.5.3. Deliverables: The PERFORMING PARTY shall submit a detailed written report to the TCEQ upon completion of this task, to include but not limited to a summary of the economic analysis including the benefit analysis of using Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction and Catalytic Reduction for NOx reductions.

Progress to date

1. A request for extending Task 5 deadline to Aug. 1, 2006 had been informally approved.
2. Task 5 is 90% complete

Task 6: Reporting

2.6. Task statement: The PERFORMING PARTY will prepare and submit monthly detailed progress reports on the status of this project and a comprehensive final report while ensuring compliance with all TCEQ program requirements.

2.6.1. The PERFORMING PARTY will coordinate all project resources to ensure compliance with NTRD program requirements while providing deliverables on-schedule and on-budget.

2.6.2. The PERFORMING PARTY will generate monthly progress reports and a final report summarizing all aspects of the project based on data from the task completion reports, including the final emissions testing report.

2.6.3. Schedule: The PERFORMING PARTY shall submit monthly reports to TCEQ by no later than 10 days after the end of each month. The PERFORMING PARTY shall submit the final report to complete this task within 21 months from NTP (or 12/31/06) of the signed Notice to Proceed Date as issued by TCEQ.

2.6.4. Deliverables: The PERFORMING PARTY shall submit monthly progress reports with associated billing statements and a final project summary report.

Indicate which part of the Grant Activities as defined in the grant agreement, the above accomplishments are related to:

Current status and progress on all tasks are reported

Section II: Problems/Solutions

Problem(s) Identified (*Please report anticipated or unanticipated problem(s) encountered and its effect on the progress of the project)*	**Task 1:** None **Task 2:** Problems with newly acquired Mercury equipment are causing delays. The new Hg equipment had display problems. Repaired unit arrived in middle of June 2006. **Task 3:** None **Task 4:** None **Task 5:** None
Proposed Solution(s) *(Please report any possible solution(s) to the problem(s) that were considered/encountered)*	**Tasks 2** Keep working to obtain needed equipment repairs. One of the problems seems to originate from the sampling line. Efforts will be made to prevent condensation. **Task 3:** **Task 4:** **Task 5:**

Action(s) Conducted and Results *(Please describe the action(s) taken to resolve the problem(s) and its effect)*	**Tasks 2** **Task 3:** **Task 4:** **Task 5:**

Section III. **Goals and Issues for Succeeding Period**: (*Please provide a brief description of the goal(s) you hope to realize in the coming period and identify any notable challenges that can be foreseen)*

Next Month's Goals

Task 1: Task is complete

Task 2: Reliable analysis procedure for wet chemistry setup to be drawn. Once it is ready, looking to continue with the experiments, to estimate the mercury levels (total, elemental and oxidized) in flue gases by firing coal with feed lot bio-mass at reburn zone, at 90:10, 80:20 and 70:30 ratios and at different equivalence ratios. Complete the final report.

Task 3: Contact pilot facilities to set up a time when experiments can be conducted and present plan of experiments

Task 4: Complete all mercury calculations with the code. Complete the NOx reduction report.

Task 5: Complete report for Task 5.

Date: 5/10/06

Authorized Project Representative's Signature

NOTE: Please attach any additional information that you feel should be a part of your report or that may be required to meet the deliverable requirements for tasks completed during this reporting period.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AB: Agricultural Biomass
AC: Activated Carbon
ACI: activated carbon injection
APCD: Air Pollution Control Devices
APH: Air Pre-heater
AW: Agricultural Wastes
ARS: Agricultural Research Station
ATP: Texas Advanced Technology Program
AWDF: Animal Waste Derived Biomass Fuels
CAFO: Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations
CAIR: Clean air Interstate Rule
CAMR: Clean Air Mercury Rule
CB: Cattle biomass
CO_2: Carbon Dioxide
DAF: Dry Ash Free

DB: Dairy Biomass
DOE: Department of Energy
DSC: Differential Scanning Calorimeter
EER: Energy and Environmental research Corp.
EGR: Exhaust Gas Recirculation
EPA: Environmental Protection Agency
ESP: electrostatic Precipitator
FB: Feedlot biomass (Cattle manure or Cattle Biomass CB)
FC: Fixed Carbon
FGD: flue gas Desulfurizer
FR: Feed Ration
GRA: Graduate Research Assistant
HA-FB-Raw: High Ash Feedlot Biomass Raw form
HA-FB-PC: High Ash Feedlot Biomass Partially Composted
HAHP: high ash/High Phosphorus feedlot biomass
HP: High Phosphorus
HHV: Higher Heating Value
HV: Heating value
LA-FB-Raw: Low Ash Feedlot Biomass
LA-FB-PC: Low Ash Feedlot Biomass Partially Composted
LALP: Low ash/Low Phosphorus feedlot biomass
LAHP: Low ash/High Phosphorus feedlot biomass
LOI: Loss on ignition or % carbon in bottom and fly ash
LP: Low Phosphorus
MAF: Moisture Ash Free, Dry Ash Free
mmBTU: million BTU
MMF: Mineral Matter Free
NETL: National Energy Technology Lab.
N2: Nitrogen
NOx: Oxides of Nitrogen
O2: Oxygen
PAC: powdered activated carbon
PCD: particulate control devices
PM: particulate matter
RM; Raw Manure
S: Sulfur
SCR: Selective catalytic reduction
SR: Stoichiometric ratio, AF/ AF_{stoich}
TAMU: Texas A&M University
TAES: Texas Agricultural Extension Service
TGA: Thermo-Gravimetric Analysis
TMPA: Texas Municipal Power Agency
TXU: Texas Utilities
USDA: US Dept of Agriculture
VM: Volatile matter