

PENNS<sup>T</sup>ATE

---



**THE DEVELOPMENT OF COAL-BASED TECHNOLOGIES  
FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES**

**Phase III Final Report**

By

Bruce G. Miller, Sharon Falcone Miller, Sarma V. Pisupati, Chunshan Song, Ronald S. Wasco,  
Ronald T. Wincek, Xiaochun Xu, and Alan W. Scaroni

**The Energy Institute**

**The Pennsylvania State University;**

Richard Hogg, Subhash Chander, M. Thaddeus Ityokumbul,

Mark S. Klima, and Peter T. Luckie

**Department of Energy and Geo-Environmental Engineering**

**The Pennsylvania State University; and**

Adam Rose, Richard L. Gordon, Jeffrey Lazo, and A. Michael Schaal,

**Department of Energy, Environmental, and Mineral Economics**

**The Pennsylvania State University**

January 30, 2004

Work Performed Under Cooperative Agreement No. DE-FC22-92PC92162

For  
U.S. Department of Energy  
National Energy Technology Laboratory  
P.O. Box 10940  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15236

By  
The Consortium for Coal-Water Slurry Fuel Technology  
The Pennsylvania State University  
C211 Coal Utilization Laboratory  
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF COAL-BASED TECHNOLOGIES  
FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES**

**Phase III Final Report**

By

Bruce G. Miller, Sharon Falcone Miller, Sarma V. Pisupati, Chunshan Song, Ronald S. Wasco,  
Ronald T. Wincek, Xiaochun Xu, and Alan W. Scaroni

**The Energy Institute**

**The Pennsylvania State University;**

Richard Hogg, Subhash Chander, M. Thaddeus Ityokumbul,  
Mark S. Klima, and Peter T. Luckie

**Department of Energy and Geo-Environmental Engineering**

**The Pennsylvania State University; and**

Adam Rose, Richard L. Gordon, Jeffrey Lazo, and A. Michael Schaal,  
**Department of Energy, Environmental, and Mineral Economics**

**The Pennsylvania State University**

January 30, 2004

Work Performed Under Cooperative Agreement No. DE-FC22-92PC92162

For  
U.S. Department of Energy  
National Energy Technology Laboratory  
P.O. Box 10940  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15236

By  
The Consortium for Coal-Water Slurry Fuel Technology  
The Pennsylvania State University  
C211 Coal Utilization Laboratory  
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

## **DISCLAIMER**

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor the United States Department of Energy, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The third phase of a three-phase project investigating the development of coal-based technologies for U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) facilities was completed. The objectives of the project were to: decrease DOD's dependence on foreign oil and increase its use of coal; promote public and private sector deployment of technologies for utilizing coal-based fuels in oil-designed combustion equipment; and provide a continuing environment for research and development of coal-based fuel technologies for small-scale applications at a time when market conditions in the U.S. are not favorable for the introduction of coal-fired equipment in the commercial and industrial capacity ranges.

The Phase III activities were focused on evaluating deeply-cleaned coals as fuels for industrial boilers and investigating emissions control strategies for providing ultra-low emissions when firing coal-based fuels. This was addressed by performing coal beneficiation and preparation studies, and bench- to demonstration-scale emissions reduction studies. In addition, economic studies were conducted focused on determining cost and market penetration, selection of incentives, and regional economic impacts of coal-based technologies.

### **Coal Preparation/Utilization**

Research conducted under Phases I and II of this project revealed a number of specific areas where continued and/or more focused effort was required in order to develop more effective, more reliable coal processing systems. The specific objectives of the Phase III research on coal preparation were centered around focused investigations into specific coal-cleaning options and their associated ancillary operations and the integration of processing/cleaning operations for overall system optimization. As in the earlier phases of the project, emphasis was on fine-coal processing for the production of a high quality, micronized coal for dry coal and coal-water mixture (MCWM) applications.

Simulations were performed for open and closed grinding circuit configurations using grinding kinetics theory to determine an optimum grinding circuit for producing MCWMs. Data obtained from investigations from the first two phases of the project, and supplemented by additional experiments carried out in Phase III, were used to perform simulations for both conventional ball milling and stirred-media milling. These simulations clearly illustrated that

single-stage grinding in a conventional ball mill does not produce size distributions with the form required for stable coal-water mixtures. A general two-mill grinding circuit simulator, previously developed at Penn State, was used to evaluate the performance of a two-mill grinding circuit under various operating conditions to obtain design criteria for a full-scale system. Data from the simulator were used to develop a conceptual integrated grinding/cleaning circuit for preparing MCWMs.

Particle size separations were carried out using a high-speed, solid-bowl centrifuge under various operating conditions to classify -100 mesh Upper Freeport seam coal. Centrifuge performance was evaluated in terms of the size selectivity curves and corresponding performance parameters: cut size, sharpness index, and apparent bypass. The results indicated that the centrifuge was able to achieve cut sizes less than 10  $\mu\text{m}$  under nearly all conditions, with sharpness indices generally ranging from 0.45 to 0.60. In most cases, the apparent bypass was less than 0.3.

The solid-bowl centrifuge was also used for density separations using a magnetite-and-water dense medium under various operating conditions for treating -100 mesh coal. Centrifuge performance was evaluated in terms of the clean coal yield and ash content while, for selected tests, partition curves were generated. In nearly all cases, clean coal could be produced at an ash content of less than 7%. The clean coal yields varied over a wide range, with values over 80% possible in some cases.

Density separations were also conducted using a magnetic fluid as the dense medium. The separations were carried out using several laboratory separation cells designed to operate within a Franz electromagnet. The results demonstrated that separations could be made at different densities using both batch and continuous separators. Magnet pole design was found to be critical in achieving a constant medium density.

An integrated centrifugal/froth-flotation system was evaluated, with the aim of extending the size range of fine coal cleaning further. It was found that for a given clean coal yield, the integrated process was able to produce a clean coal with a lower ash content than either dense-medium cycloning or flotation alone.

Surface-based processes such as froth flotation are particularly attractive for deep cleaning of fine coal for MCWM applications because of their relative insensitivity to particle size. Laboratory-scale, batch testing of fine coal flotation, conducted in Phases I and II of the

project was extended to continuous, pilot-scale studies. A two-stage, rougher/cleaner circuit with a capacity of 8 gpm was used in these tests. The results indicated that performance in the continuous system roughly paralleled that in the batch tests, but that flotation rates and recoveries were consistently lower. The differences were attributed primarily to low mobility and stability of the froth. Continuous flotation tests were also conducted in a pilot-scale, fully instrumented flotation column. It was found that fine coal with an ash content of 9.4% could be cleaned to about 5% at 75 – 80% yield in a single stage operation under appropriate conditions of air flow rate, solids feed rate and concentration and froth-phase gas hold-up.

Continuous dry processing of fine coal using triboelectrostatic separation was also investigated as an extension of the batch testing carried out under Phases I and II of the project. A specially designed test unit was shown to separate fine coal selectively, but at lower efficiency than in the equivalent batch systems. Design modifications to improve separation efficiency were investigated. Preliminary evaluations of an integrated grinding/dry separation system provided encouraging results.

## **Emissions Reduction**

The studies of emissions from coal-fired industrial boilers, that were initiated in the first two phases of the project, were extended into Phase III and involved fundamental, pilot-scale, and full-scale demonstrations and included: 1) evaluations of NO<sub>x</sub> reduction strategies such as low-temperature selective catalytic reduction (SCR) and reburning by injecting a biomass-based product and a MCWM; 2) a pilot-scale investigation of simultaneous SO<sub>2</sub> removal/NO<sub>x</sub> reduction technology injecting a biomass-based pyrolysis product into the combustion chamber; 3) a fundamental study of formation/destruction mechanisms of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) followed by demonstration-scale testing; 4) comprehensive studies of trace elements and mercury emissions investigating the effect of coal cleaning and particulate removal devices; 5) the development of a unified methodology for simultaneously measuring trace element emissions and mercury speciation; 6) an investigation of fine particulate matter removal using ceramic filters; and 7) the development of a molecular basket to capture CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the flue gas of coal-fired boilers.

A low-temperature SCR study was initiated in Phase II with the objectives of identifying and/or developing a NO<sub>x</sub> reduction catalyst that is compatible with the typical operating

conditions and the economic constraints of industrial boilers, establishing the limitations of candidate  $\text{NO}_x$  reduction catalysts so that their implementation in pilot- and demonstration-scale tests will be straightforward, and identifying maximum allowable transients that the catalyst can be exposed to before losing effectiveness. Bench-scale testing was successfully completed in Phase II and the results were scaled up for pilot-scale testing in Phase III. Pilot-scale tests demonstrated that a low-temperature SCR catalyst can achieve greater than 20% reduction at typical utility of industrial baghouse temperatures. Further work is necessary before this concept would be commercially accepted.

A reburning study was performed to understand the mechanism by which  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions are reduced when cofiring coal with MCWM. The results confirmed the potential of MCWM as a reburn fuel for significant  $\text{NO}_x$  reduction as MCWM exhibits reductions similar to that of natural gas. Reburn effectiveness depends strongly upon the reburn zone stoichiometry, which is controlled by the reburn fuel heat input and by the air staging configuration. The results indicated that the gas phase reactions did not contribute significantly to the reduction of gas phase  $\text{NO}_x$  that was produced in the initial stages of combustion but rather it was reactions with the carbon/char that resulted in the lower  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions.

A model was developed for NO reduction through homogenous gas phase reactions when a biomass-derived product, made from biomass pyrolysis products that have been reacted with air and a lime/slurry, was used as a reburn fuel. The model was validated through thermal gravimetric analysis and pilot-scale combustion testing. The study showed that the percentage of  $\text{NO}_x$  reduction using the biomass-derived product could be predicted using the gas phase reaction model. Levels of  $\text{NO}_x$  reduction were correlated with pyrolysis gas yield.

The PAH work, initiated in Phase II, was continued into Phase III to study the effect of temperature and oxygen concentration on the formation and destruction of PAHs in a laminar-flow reactor and a full-scale industrial boiler. Trends in PAH formation and destruction were observed as a function of temperature and oxygen level in the fundamental study; although, availability of oxygen is the more dominant factor in PAH formation and destruction than temperature, which was observed in both the reactor and boiler. Only naphthalene and phenanthrene were detected in the demonstration boiler flue gas whereas the laminar-flow reactor, with decreased air-to-fuel mixing, resulted in significantly higher PAH emissions.

Three mercury and trace element activities were performed, which involved evaluating ceramic filters as a control option for mercury removal, evaluating trace elements emissions from deeply-cleaned coals produced in DOE's Premium Clean Coal Program, and developing a sampling train and methodology capable of simultaneously sampling mercury species and all inorganic trace elements. As part of the ceramic filter evaluation, a long-term demonstration of the filters was performed, similar to the one conducted in Phase II of the project, to assess the technical feasibility of using ceramic filters in lieu of fabric filters.

The ceramic filter chamber was modified after the second phase of the project (first 1,000-hour ceramic filter demonstration) to enhance filter regeneration, a new set of filters was installed, and the system was operated for  $\approx$ 930 hours. The filters were regenerable; however, the pressure drop continued to increase, which is believed to be primarily due to the plugging of the filter substrate pores following the loss of the membrane through erosion. This is a concern for commercialization in a boiler setting and needs to be addressed by the manufacturer. The ceramic member filter particulate collection efficiencies ranged from 99.80 to 99.86%, which were higher than baghouse collection efficiencies using high-performance bags. The stack particulate emissions were below DOE's LEBS target of 0.01 lb/million Btu; however, the design of the ceramic membrane filters evaluated was not able to meet DOE's HIPPS target of 0.003 lb/million Btu.

The ceramic membrane filters were more efficient in reducing trace elements in the stack gas, accounting for an additional 45 to 61% reduction (excluding mercury) over that removed by the fabric filters. The ceramic membrane filters effectively removed 79% more mercury from the gas phase than the fabric filters, even at elevated temperatures. The use of the ceramic membrane filter is a potential control option for both particulate and gas phase mercury emissions provided the high pressure drop issue can be resolved.

The effect of coal cleaning on trace elements emissions was investigated using cleaned coals from CQ, Inc. (cleaned by a combination of heavy media cyclones, water spirals, and froth flotation) and from AMAX Research & Development (cleaned either by advanced flotation or selective agglomeration) to investigate the basic assumption that there is a direct relationship between the depletion/enrichment of an element in the fuel to its depletion/enrichment in the flue gas. The data from the AMAX fuels indicate that there is not always a direct relationship between the reduction of the trace elements in a fuel and a corresponding reduction in emissions.



By contrast, the data obtained from the CQ Inc. fuels suggested that there was a direct relationship between depletion/enrichment of an element in the fuel and its concentration in the flue gas. These different results suggest that trace element emissions can not be predicted solely from their concentration in the fuel. The interaction of the inorganics within the combustion system often affects the partitioning and concentration of the trace elements in the gas and ash streams. Therefore, the effectiveness of extensive coal cleaning in the reduction of trace element emissions should be determined on an individual basis, taking into account the coal composition and system configuration.

A study was performed to develop a sample train and methodology capable of simultaneously sampling mercury species and all inorganic trace elements EPA has listed as inorganic hazardous air pollutants (IHAPs). The advantage of such a system is that it will enable IHAPs and mercury species to be sampled simultaneously, thereby reducing time and cost for stack gas sampling. The train and methodology developed, referred to as the PSU Method, consist of components of both the Ontario Hydro Mercury Speciation Method and Method 29 (total metals) sampling trains. Of particular interest was whether the differences in the PSU Method train configuration compared to the Method 29 and Ontario Hydro trains compromised the measurement of either or both of the total trace elements or mercury species. This was found not to be the case as statistical analysis of the data verified the use of the PSU Method for measuring trace elements and mercury species in combustion flue gas.

Novel CO<sub>2</sub> “molecular basket” adsorbents, based on polyethylenimine (PEI)-modified mesoporous molecular sieve of MCM-41 type (MCM-41-PEI), were successfully developed for CO<sub>2</sub> removal from combustion flue gas. Carbon dioxide was selectively separated from boiler flue gases by using the adsorbent. The adsorbent adsorbed little N<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub>. The selectivity of CO<sub>2</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> was 2.5 for natural gas-fired flue gas and the separation selectivity for CO<sub>2</sub>/SO<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> were 10.7 and 2.86, respectively, for coal-fired flue gas. The desorption of CO<sub>2</sub> was complete; however, very little NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> desorbed after adsorption indicating the need for pre-removal of NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> from the flue gas mixture before capture of CO<sub>2</sub> by the PEI based “molecular basket” adsorbent.

## **Economic Evaluation**

The objectives of this activity were to determine cost and market penetration, selection of incentives, and regional economic impacts of coal-based fuel technologies. In addition, DOD's fuel mix was determined and a national energy portfolio constructed that minimizes energy price shock effects.

A market penetration model was formulated to find the equilibrium optimal mix of boiler retrofit technology adoption (to MCWM firing) among a sample population of watertube boilers located in the Pennsylvania counties of Cambria and Indiana (two main coal-producing counties) and, after model development, for an expanded study region of the entire state. It was estimated that only 40% of Pennsylvania's  $\approx 7,000$  watertube boilers can be considered for MCWM retrofitting, of which 36 would benefit from adopting the retrofit technology.

A study was performed on the selection of incentives for commercializing the MCWM technology. The study focused on the microeconomic responses generated by the firms to the incentives. The results show that in the existence of a no-risk opportunity, a tax incentive is the best alternative to offer to the industry to induce an increase in their profits.

Community sensitivity to using coal in a power facility was studied using methods which integrated economic valuation with techniques used in psychology to characterize risk perceptions to value the welfare impacts due to the presence of energy production facilities. Results from the study show that an individual's willingness to pay for risk prevention or reduction is a function of their perceptions of the health, environmental, aesthetic, and economic impacts as well as their socio-economic characteristics. Individuals appear unable to distinguish between the probability and the severity of a risk in the manner suggested by the definition of risk. Perceived environmental, health, and aesthetic impacts play a larger role in determining option prices than potential economic impacts, explaining in part why residents may oppose a facility even when it will likely bring economic benefits to an area.

A review was performed to estimate the effects on the U.S. economy and its energy sectors of conservation strategies to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The analysis was undertaken with a 20-sector computable general equilibrium model by simulating various responses to command and control, carbon tax, and carbon emission permit policies. The results indicate that the characterization of energy conservation as a no-regrets strategy is too strong. In all of the simulations, energy sectors stand to lose, though, in some cases, not anywhere near as much as

would be expected. Each of the simulations of mandated conservation also lead to decline in output and employment for the U.S. economy. In contrast, some of the price-induced conservation response strategies also simulated have a neutral impact on the overall economy.

An activity to examine U.S. military fuel consumption and describe alternative technologies that could be currently or potentially applied to the military in order to comply with U.S. government directives to lower emissions, lower dependence on imported oil, and to become more energy efficient was performed. It was shown that for both power/heat generation and transport applications, there is a variety of possible alternatives that could be applied for military use. Energy use in the military could also be significantly affected by new energy management systems and implementation of modified, more efficient, conventional technology.

Portfolio theory was used to demonstrate how the energy mix consumed in the U.S. could be chosen if the goal is to reduce the risks to the domestic macroeconomy of unanticipated energy price shocks. The results indicate that the electric utility industry is operating very close to the minimum variance position with a risk aversion strategy. In contrast, overall energy consumption in the U.S. is far from an efficient mix. A shift towards coal consumption would reduce price volatility. With the inclusion of potential externality costs, the shift remains away from oil but is towards natural gas instead of coal. To achieve such shifts, policymakers could use regulation or tax incentives to industries to encourage the use of certain fuels. Of course, a minimum risk portfolio does not imply a minimum cost portfolio, and selecting a low-risk portfolio may lead to higher energy costs overall. The costs associated with an occasional energy price shock may be less than the cost associated with energy dependence or a dramatic shift towards coal, synfuels, and other alternative energy sources.

### **Evaluation of Deeply-Cleaned Coals as Boiler Fuels**

Deeply-cleaned coals produced by Cyprus/Amax Research & Development Center were evaluated as industrial boiler fuels. The coals, produced in DOE's Premium Fuel Program using advanced column flotation and oil agglomeration cleaning techniques, were tested by Penn State to evaluate their combustion, emissions, and handling characteristics. The testing at Penn State complemented the Premium Fuel Program, which had the overall objectives of producing an alternative fuel that will emit less toxic emissions, moving advanced cleaning technologies from the laboratory to a fine coal cleaning plant, and producing highly-loaded MCWMs that are

competitive with fuel oil. The Penn State activities included modifying a MCWM circuit to handle filter cake to produce MCWMs, determining the MCWMs atomization performance, stability, and rheological characteristics, performing bench-scale evaluations of filter cake handleability, and conducting pilot-scale and demonstration-scale combustion tests to evaluate combustion performance and emissions, specifically trace elements.

The objective of the filter cake handleability study was to evaluate the flow characteristics of fine, filter-cake coal using the Jenike shear-testing procedure and to investigate the use of a pilot-scale test bin for validation of the results. The Jenike shear tester was modified to eliminate inherent weaknesses of the system to increase the sensitivity and range of results. Tests were performed using fine, filter-cake material, the corresponding parent coal, and various blends of the two. The results from this work showed that the effective yield locus, a measure of the stresses required to maintain steady flow in a consolidated powder, appears to be relatively insensitive to mixture composition and moisture content. Increasing coarseness due to the addition of the coarser, parent coal caused a slight increase in the frictional resistance to flow, while moisture addition reduced friction, probably by a lubrication effect. The effects of mixture composition, i.e., size consist, on the (static) yield locus, a measure of the stresses needed to initiate flow in a consolidated powder, revealed that blends of the filter-cake material with the parent coal tended to be more cohesive than either of the separate components. This rather surprising result is attributed to enhanced packing in the blends and indicates potential materials-handling problems if coal fines are added to the normal feed coal in an existing system. Increased moisture content increases cohesion, probably through capillary forces, but reduces internal friction, presumably by lubrication. Because of their bimodal size distributions, the coarse/fine blends generally packed to higher bulk density than the separate components. The filter-cake material was slightly compressible – bulk density increases with applied stress – while the parent coal is essentially incompressible. Flow functions for these materials indicated that while the flowabilities of the filter cake and parent coal were relatively insensitive to consolidation, those for the blends tended to decrease as consolidation stresses were increased. It is postulated that consolidation stresses applied to the blends affected the fine component disproportionately, leading to enhanced cohesion despite very little change in overall bulk density. Measurements of wall friction against a steel reference material showed very little variation with mixture composition and lead consistently to angles of wall friction of about 27°.

The filter cakes were prepared into MCWMs that exhibited satisfactory handling and short-term storage properties (the MCWMs were prepared without stabilizers or particle size manipulation) for use as industrial boiler fuels. The combustion performance of the MCWMs was good, with the exception of one of the MCWMs (i.e., prepared from the Taggart seam coal cleaned by column flotation), and combustion efficiencies for a suite of tests ranged from  $\approx 97$  to 98%. The filter cake MCWMs performed as well or better than MCWMs prepared in the single- or double-stage grinding circuit. The level of natural gas cofire that was required to achieve these combustion efficiencies was 23 to 30%.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xix
LIST OF TABLES .....	xxxii
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 DOD Project Objectives.....	1-1
1.2 Summary of Phase I Activities.....	1-2
1.2.1 Coal Beneficiation and Preparation Studies .....	1-2
1.2.2 MCWM and DMC Combustion Performance Evaluation .....	1-2
1.2.3 Engineering Design.....	1-3
1.2.4 Cost/Economic Analysis .....	1-3
1.3 Summary of Phase II Activities.....	1-4
1.3.1 Emissions Reduction .....	1-4
1.3.2 Coal Preparation/Utilization .....	1-5
1.3.3 Engineering Design and Cost; and Economic Analysis.....	1-6
1.4 Phase III Project Outline .....	1-6
1.5 References .....	1-7
2.0 COAL PREPARATION/UTILIZATION .....	2-1
2.1 Particle Size Control .....	2-1
2.1.1 Conventional Ball Milling .....	2-1
2.1.2 Stirred-Media Milling.....	2-9
2.1.3 Attrition Milling.....	2-13
2.1.4 Grinding Circuit Simulation .....	2-20
2.1.5 Integrated Grinding/Cleaning Circuit.....	2-25
2.2 Physical Separations .....	2-27
2.2.1 Fine Coal Classification .....	2-28
2.2.2 Dense-Medium Separation .....	2-39
2.2.3 Magnetic Fluid Separation.....	2-44
2.2.4 Centrifugal/Flotation Separations .....	2-56
2.3 Surface Based Separation Processes.....	2-59
2.3.1 Continuous Froth Flotation.....	2-59
2.3.1.1 Results and Discussion.....	2-63
2.3.1.2 Conclusions .....	2-76
2.3.2 Column Flotation .....	2-76
2.3.2.1 Effect of Hydrostatic Pressure Setting.....	2-82
2.3.2.2 Effect of Recovery Zone Height.....	2-83
2.3.2.3 Effect of Feed Solids Concentration.....	2-84
2.3.2.4 Effect of Air Flow Rate.....	2-86
2.3.2.5 Evaluation of Vortactor Turbulent Contactor.....	2-86
2.3.2.6 Correlation for Column Carrying Capacity and Yield....	2-89

2.3.3	Overall Evaluation .....	2-91
2.3.4	Conclusion .....	2-92
2.4	Dry Processing .....	2-94
2.4.1	Continuous TriboElectrostatic Separation.....	2-95
2.4.2	Charging/Deagglomeration Testing .....	2-99
2.4.3	Integrated Grinding/Separation.....	2-103
2.5	References .....	2-105
3.0	EMISIONS REDUCTION .....	3-1
3.1	NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction/SO <sub>2</sub> Removal.....	3-1
3.1.1	Low-Temperature Selective Catalytic Reduction.....	3-2
3.1.1.1	System Modifications and Shakedown.....	3-3
3.1.1.2	Preliminary Testing and Results.....	3-16
3.1.1.3	Low-Temperature SCR Testing and Results.....	3-19
3.1.2	BioLime™ Injection.....	3-31
3.1.2.1	Experimental.....	3-34
3.1.2.2	Down-Fired Combustor (DFC) .....	3-36
3.1.2.3	Results and Discussion.....	3-37
3.1.2.4	Conclusions .....	3-50
3.1.3	Reburning .....	3-51
3.1.3.1	Objectives.....	3-51
3.1.3.2	Background.....	3-51
3.1.3.3	NO <sub>x</sub> Control Technologies .....	3-54
3.1.3.4	Test Program .....	3-58
3.1.3.5	Conclusions .....	3-70
3.2	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons.....	3-71
3.2.1	Introduction.....	3-71
3.2.2	Objectives .....	3-71
3.2.3	Description of Equipment and Experimental Matrix .....	3-72
3.2.3.1	Drop-Tube Reactor .....	3-72
3.2.3.2	Demonstration Boiler.....	3-72
3.2.3.3	Fuel Analysis .....	3-75
3.2.4	Analytical Methodology .....	3-75
3.2.5	Operation of the MM5 Sampling Train.....	3-77
3.2.6	Sample Recovery and Preparation for Analysis .....	3-78
3.2.7	GC Analysis.....	3-79
3.2.8	GC/MS System, Calibration and Operation .....	3-79
3.2.9	Results .....	3-81
3.2.9.1	Drop-Tube Reactor Results.....	3-81
3.2.9.2	Demonstration Boiler Results.....	3-83
3.2.10	Discussion .....	3-84
3.2.10.1	Discussion of Drop-Tube Reactor Results.....	3-84
3.2.10.2	Discussion of Demonstration Boiler Results.....	3-86
3.2.11	Conclusions.....	3-87

3.3	Trace Elements .....	3-88
3.3.1	Fine Particulate Matter/Mercury .....	3-89
3.3.1.1	Ceramic Filter Testing .....	3-89
3.3.1.2	Effect of Particle Control Device on Trace Elements Emissions .....	3-113
3.3.2	Effect of Coal Cleaning on Trace Element Emissions .....	3-120
3.3.2.1	Background.....	3-121
3.3.2.2	Analysis of AMAX Fuels.....	3-123
3.3.2.3	AMAX Combustion Tests and Results .....	3-125
3.3.2.4	Combustion Tests and Results of the CQ, Inc. Coals.....	3-131
3.3.2.5	Effect of Atomization Quality on Trace Element Emissions .....	3-136
3.3.2.6	Conclusions .....	3-137
3.3.3	Methodology Development .....	3-139
3.3.3.1	Introduction .....	3-139
3.3.3.2	Early Development of the PSU Method.....	3-141
3.3.3.3	Preliminary Test Results – Multielements .....	3-144
3.3.3.4	Preliminary Test Results – Total Mercury .....	3-149
3.3.3.5	Further Test Results .....	3-151
3.3.3.6	Comparison of PSU Method to ATS Unified Method....	3-163
3.3.3.7	Conclusions .....	3-165
3.4	CO <sub>2</sub> Removal.....	3-166
3.4.1	Experimental.....	3-168
3.4.1.1	Preparation of the Adsorbents .....	3-168
3.4.1.2	Characterization of the Adsorbents.....	3-170
3.4.1.3	Measurement of the CO <sub>2</sub> Adsorption/Desorption Performance.....	3-170
3.4.1.4	Adsorption Separation of Simulated Flue Gas Mixture..	3-171
3.4.1.5	Adsorption Separation of a Boiler Flue Gas Mixture.....	3-171
3.4.2	Results and Discussion .....	3-173
3.4.2.1	Preparation of the CO <sub>2</sub> “Molecular Basket” Adsorbent Preparation and Characterization of the CO <sub>2</sub> “Molecular Basket” Adsorbent.....	3-173
3.4.2.2	Adsorption Separation of CO <sub>2</sub> from Simulated Flue Gas Adsorption Separation of CO <sub>2</sub> from Simulated Flue Gas.....	3-192
3.4.2.3	Adsorption Separation of Boiler Flue Gas .....	3-208
3.4.3	Conclusions.....	3-212
3.5	References .....	3-213
4.0	ECONOMIC EVALUATION .....	4-1
4.1	Cost and Market Penetration of Coal-Based Fuel Technologies .....	4-1
4.1.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.1.2	Market Penetration Model Approach and Structure .....	4-2
4.1.2.1	Optimization Model.....	4-3



	4.1.2.2	Market Penetration Model Formulation.....	4-5
	4.1.2.3	Fuel Supply Costs.....	4-7
	4.1.2.4	Transportation Costs.....	4-9
	4.1.2.5	Retrofit Technology Costs.....	4-9
	4.1.2.6	Potential MCWM Supply Sites.....	4-11
	4.1.2.7	Boiler Inventory.....	4-11
	4.1.2.8	Pennsylvania Inventory of Active Boilers.....	4-13
	4.1.2.9	Focus on Cambria and Indiana Counties.....	4-14
	4.1.3	Results and Conclusions.....	4-18
	4.1.3.1	Market Penetration Model Results.....	4-18
	4.1.3.2	Sensitivity Analysis.....	4-22
	4.1.4	Conclusions.....	4-26
4.2		Selection of Incentives for Commercialization of the Coal-Using Technology.....	4-28
	4.2.1	Motivation and Aim of the Study.....	4-28
	4.2.2	Data.....	4-33
	4.2.3	Methodology.....	4-39
	4.2.4	Empirical Results.....	4-42
	4.2.5	Conclusion.....	4-51
4.3		Community Sensitivity to Coal Fuel Usage: Economic Valuation of Risk Perceptions: Measuring Public Perceptions and Welfare Impacts of Electric Power Facilities.....	4-54
	4.3.1	Introduction.....	4-54
	4.3.2	Background And Previous Research.....	4-56
	4.3.2.1	Risk Perceptions.....	4-56
	4.3.2.2	Valuation and Perceived Risks.....	4-58
	4.3.3	Theory.....	4-60
	4.3.4	Survey Design.....	4-63
	4.3.5	Estimation And Results.....	4-67
	4.3.6	Conclusions.....	4-74
4.4		Regional/National Economic Impacts of New Coal Utilization Technologies.....	4-75
	4.4.1	Introduction.....	4-75
	4.4.2	Basic Features of the Conservation Strategy.....	4-76
	4.4.3	The U.S. CGE Model.....	4-80
	4.4.4	Simulation Results.....	4-81
	4.4.4.1	Basic Results.....	4-82
	4.4.4.2	Sensitivity Analysis.....	4-88
	4.4.5	Conclusions.....	4-92
4.5		Economic Analysis of the Defense Department's Fuel Mix.....	4-93
	4.5.1	Introduction.....	4-93
	4.5.2	Power Generation Technologies that could Lead to Changes in Fuel Consumption Patterns in the Military.....	4-95
	4.5.2.1	Energy Management Initiatives.....	4-95
	4.5.2.2	Flue Gas Desulfurization : "e-scrub technology".....	4-96

	4.5.2.3	Dry Micronized Coal and Coal/Water Mixture Technology – New Boiler and Handling Technologies..	4-96
	4.5.2.4	Fuel Cell Technology.....	4-97
	4.5.2.5	Combined Cycle Gas Turbine .....	4-100
	4.5.2.6	Other Clean Coal Technology Programs .....	4-100
	4.5.3	Transport: Technology that could Lead to Changes in Fuel Consumption Patterns in the Military .....	4-101
	4.5.3.1	Alternative Fuels.....	4-101
	4.5.3.2	State and Federal Government Initiatives and Legislative Aspects.....	4-102
	4.5.4	Conclusions.....	4-103
4.6		Constructing a National Energy Portfolio which Minimizes Energy Price Shock Effects.....	4-104
	4.6.1	Introduction.....	4-104
	4.6.2	Methodology.....	4-107
	4.6.3	Estimation and Results .....	4-110
	4.6.4	Policy Recommendations .....	4-116
	4.6.5	Conclusions.....	4-118
4.7		Proposed Research on the Coal Markets and their Impact on Coal-Based Fuel Technologies .....	4-119
	4.7.1	Historical and Prospective Changes in Electric Power Coal Use 1947-1993 .....	4-119
	4.7.1.1	Air Quality Legislation .....	4-120
	4.7.1.2	Influence of Regulations on Fuel Use.....	4-121
	4.7.1.3	Slower Generation Growth.....	4-122
	4.7.2	Fuel Use in the Electric Utility Industry 1947-1993.....	4-122
	4.7.2.1	Regional Electricity Fuel Use.....	4-123
	4.7.3	Coal Consumption in Electric Utilities 1947 to 1993 .....	4-127
	4.7.4	Trends in Coal Consuming Electric Utilities.....	4-128
	4.7.5	Historical Patterns in Electric Utility Power Plant Additions, Developments 1947-1993.....	4-128
	4.7.5.1	Coal Capacity Additions .....	4-131
	4.7.5.2	Oil Capacity Additions.....	4-131
	4.7.5.3	Natural Gas Capacity Additions .....	4-132
	4.7.6	Market Structure and Reorganization of the U.S. Electric Utility Industry.....	4-132
	4.7.6.1	Status Quo of the Electric Utility Industry.....	4-133
	4.7.6.2	Existing Proposals for Restructuring Total Deregulation .....	4-136
	4.7.6.3	Factors to be Considered for Restructuring.....	4-142
	4.7.6.4	A New Proposal.....	4-142
	4.7.6.5	Conclusion.....	4-150
4.8		References .....	4-151

5.0	EVALUATION OF DEEPLY-CLEANED COAL AS BOILER FUELS .....	5-1
5.1	Modification of the MCWM Preparation Circuit .....	5-1
5.2	Fuels Characterization .....	5-3
5.2.1	AMAX Filter Cakes .....	5-3
5.2.2	MCWM Preparation – Shakedown .....	5-4
5.2.3	MCWM Formulation.....	5-5
5.2.4	MCWM Full-Scale Production.....	5-11
5.2.5	MCWM Atomization Performance.....	5-12
5.2.6	Fine Coal Handleability.....	5-17
5.2.6.1	Background.....	5-17
5.2.6.2	Experimental.....	5-25
5.2.6.3	Shear Cell Test Results .....	5-32
5.2.6.4	Design Criteria.....	5-40
5.2.6.5	Bin Testing .....	5-42
5.2.6.6	Conclusions .....	5-46
5.3	Pilot-Scale Combustion Tests .....	5-48
5.4	Demonstration-Scale Combustion Tests.....	5-48
5.4.1	Demonstration Boiler System.....	5-48
5.4.2	Combustion Performance .....	5-51
5.4.2.1	AMAX Filter Cake MCWMs.....	5-53
5.4.2.2	Comparison of the AMAX Filter Cake MCWMs with other MWMs Tested at Penn State .....	5-55
5.4.3	Concluding Remarks .....	5-56
5.5	References.....	5-57
6.0	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	6-1
	APPENDIX 3A Summary Sheets for Phase III MCWM and DMC Testing.....	3A-1
	APPENDIX 3B Ceramic Filter Chamber Pressure Drop as a Function of Time Firing Coal .....	3B-1
	APPENDIX 4A Market Penetration Model Source Code Listing .....	4A-1
	APPENDIX 4B MCWM Supply Cost Model.....	4B-1
	APPENDIX 4C MCWM Retrofit Technology Cost Model.....	4C-1
	APPENDIX 4D Electric Power In Your Community .....	4D-1
	APPENDIX 4E Sector Definition .....	4E-1

## LIST OF FIGURES

		<u>Page</u>
FIGURE 2.1.1	Various Grinding Circuit Configurations used in Industry .....	2-5
FIGURE 2.1.2	Variation of Ball Mill Capacity with Mill Diameter.....	2-8
FIGURE 2.1.3	Comparison of Product Size Distributions Resulting from Open and Closed-Circuit Grinding .....	2-9
FIGURE 2.1.4	Effect of Circulation Ratio on Capacity in Closed-Circuit Grinding ..	2-10
FIGURE 2.1.5	Disappearance Plots for Coarse (16x20 US mesh) Coal “Media” in Attrition Grinding .....	2-15
FIGURE 2.1.6	Size Distribution of the Products of “Media” Attrition .....	2-16
FIGURE 2.1.7	Application of Chipping/Abrasion Model to Attrition of Nominal 16x20 Mesh Taggart Seam Coal at Different Solids Concentrations ..	2-18
FIGURE 2.1.8	Product Size Distributions in the Attrition Milling of Quartz using Quartz Media (6x8 mesh). (a) 270x400 mesh feed, (b) 20x30 mesh feed, (c) 6x8 mesh media .....	2-19
FIGURE 2.1.9	Two-Stage Grinding Circuit for Producing Coal-Water Mixtures with a Bimodal Size Distribution.....	2-21
FIGURE 2.1.10	General Two-Mill Grinding Circuit.....	2-22
FIGURE 2.1.11	Product Size Distrubtions in a Two-Stage Grinding Circuit.....	2-25
FIGURE 2.1.12	Example of an Integrated Cleaning/Size-Reduction Process for Micronized Coal-Water Mixture (MCWM) Production .....	2-27
FIGURE 2.2.1	Schematic of a Solid-Bowl Centrifuge (courtesy of Alfa Centrifuges) .....	2-29
FIGURE 2.2.2	Feed and Product Size Distrubtions for Centrifuge Tests 1a and 2a when Separating -100 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal (test 1a: filled symbols; test 2a: open symbols).....	2-32
FIGURE 2.2.3	Effect of Scroll Speed on the Size Selectivity Curves in the Solid-Bowl Centrifuge for Weir Setting 1 .....	2-33
FIGURE 2.2.4	Effect of Scroll Speed on the Size Selectivity Curves in the Solid-Bowl Centrifuge for Weir Setting 2.....	2-35
FIGURE 2.2.5	Feed and Product Size Distributions for Centrifuge Tests 1c and 2c when Separating -100 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal (test 1c: filled symbols; test 2c: open symbols).....	2-36
FIGURE 2.2.6	Effect of Scroll Speed on the Size Selectivity Curves in the Solid-Bowl Centrifuge for Weir Setting 3 .....	2-37
FIGURE 2.2.7	Reduced Classification Curve for Centrifuge Tests 1c-4c .....	2-38

FIGURE 2.2.8	Effect of Bowl Speed on the Grade-Yield Values for the Solid-Bowl Centrifuge at a Constant Scroll Speed of 300 rpm and a Medium Relative Density of 1.30 for the 100x500 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal.....	2-41
FIGURE 2.2.9	Effect of Bowl Speed on the Partition Curves when Separating 100x150 Mesh Upper Upper Freeport Seam Coal in the Solid-Bowl Centrifuge (600 rpm (test 15): $E_r=0.13$ , $r_{50}=2.04$ ; 800 rpm (test 16): $E_r=0.05$ , $r_{50}=1.80$ ; 3200 rpm (test 17): $E_r=0.12$ , $r_{50}=1.94$ ).....	2-43
FIGURE 2.2.10	Schematic of the Batch Magnetic Fluid Separator and Magnet Pole Pieces.....	2-45
FIGURE 2.2.11	Variation of the Relative Density of the Fluid as a Function of the Applied Current for the Magnetic-Fluid Separator.....	2-46
FIGURE 2.2.12	Washability Curves for the 12x14 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal (open symbols: organic liquids; closed symbols: magnetic fluid).....	2-47
FIGURE 2.2.13	Washability Curves for the 28x100 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal (open symbols: organic liquids; closed symbols: magnetic fluid).....	2-48
FIGURE 2.2.14	Continuous Magnetic Fluid Separator Test Circuit .....	2-49
FIGURE 2.2.15	Partition Curves for the Magnetic Fluid Separator as a Function of Flow Rate at a Medium Relative Density of 1.3 for the 28x32 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal .....	2-51
FIGURE 2.2.16	Partition Curves for the Magnetic Fluid Separator as a Function of Medium Relative Density of 1.7 L/min for the 28x32 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal .....	2-52
FIGURE 2.2.17	Effect of Flow Rate and Medium Density on the Grade-Yield Values For the 28x32 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal .....	2-53
FIGURE 2.2.18	Dynawhirpool Magnetic Fluid Separator Test Circuit.....	2-55
FIGURE 2.2.19	Clean Coal Yield-Ash Curves when Separating -100 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal using Dense-Medium Cycloning (DMC), Froth Flotation (FF), and the Integrated Process (INT). The washability Curve is also included (Wash).....	2-58
FIGURE 2.2.20	Clean Coal Yield-Sulfur Curves when Separating -100 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal using Dense-Medium Cycloning (DMC), Froth Flotation (FF), and the Integrated Process (INT). The Washability curve is also included (Wash) .....	2-59
FIGURE 2.3.1	Size Distribution of the Feed .....	2-60
FIGURE 2.3.2	Rough-Cleaner Flotation Circuit used in Continuous Flotation Tests. ....	2-61

FIGURE 2.3.3	Estimation of Induction Time.....	2-64
FIGURE 2.3.4	Cumulative Recovery from Each Cell at Different Frother Concentrations .....	2-66
FIGURE 2.3.5	Fractional Recovery from Each Cell at Different Frother Concentrations .....	2-66
FIGURE 2.3.6	Kinetics Plots at Different Frother Concentrations.....	2-67
FIGURE 2.3.7	Estimation of Flotation Rate Constants.....	2-67
FIGURE 2.3.8	Kinetics Plots at Different Collector Concentrations (frother conc.=0.3 kg/T).....	2-69
FIGURE 2.3.9	Kinetics Plots for Different Size Fractions for Tests Conducted at a Frother Concentration of 0.3 kg/T .....	2-70
FIGURE 2.3.10	Estimation of Kinetics Rate Constants for Each Size Fraction .....	2-71
FIGURE 2.3.11	Variation of Flotation Rate Constant with Particle Size .....	2-72
FIGURE 2.3.12	Cumulative Recovery of Each Size Fraction from Each Cell .....	2-73
FIGURE 2.3.13	Comparison of Flotation Rate Constants for the Batch, Batch with No Paddling (BATCH*), and Pilot Plant Tests at Different Frother Concentrations .....	2-74
FIGURE 2.3.14	Effect of Collector Addition on Flotation Rate Constant for the Batch, Batch with no Paddling (BATCH*), and Pilot Plant Tests .....	2-75
FIGURE 2.3.15	A Schematic Representation of the Experimental Set-up .....	2-77
FIGURE 2.3.16	Experimental Verification of the Attainment of Steady State: (a) Concentrate; (b) Tailings Material (Filled symbols represent the concentrate and tailings grade) .....	2-79
FIGURE 2.3.17	Detailed Drawing of the Vortactor Turbulent Contact Chamber .....	2-81
FIGURE 2.3.18	Variation of Clean Coal Yield and Grade with Recovery Zone Height (Air Flow Rate = 6 LPM).....	2-83
FIGURE 2.3.19	Effect of Feed Solids Concentration on Flotation Response (a) Clean Coal Yield and Grade (b) Concentration Flow Rate (Air Flow Rate = 3 LPM) .....	2-85
FIGURE 2.3.20	Effect of Air Flow Rate on (a) Clean Coal Yield and Grade (b) Concentrate Flow Rate (Feed Solids Concentration = 5%) .....	2-87
FIGURE 2.3.21	Variation of Carrying Capacity with Column Operational Parameters .....	2-90
FIGURE 2.3.22	Variation of Fractional Yield with Particle Projected Surface Area Per Unit Bubble Surface Area .....	2-92
FIGURE 2.3.23	Comparison of Column Flotation and Washability Results.....	2-93

FIGURE 2.3.24	Variation of Clean Coal Yield and Grade with Froth Phase Gas Hold-Up.....	2-94
FIGURE 2.4.1	Schematic of the Continuous Triboelectrostatic Separator .....	2-96
FIGURE 2.4.2	Schematic of the Batch Triboelectrostatic Separator.....	2-101
FIGURE 2.4.3	Clean Coal and Refuse Yields as a Function of Distance along the Batch Separator for Different Charging/Deagglomeration Techniques when Processing -100 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal.	2-102
FIGURE 2.4.4	Cumulative Ash Content for the Clean Coal and Refuse Streams as a Function of Distance Along the Batch Separator for Different Charging/Deagglomeration Techniques when Processing -100 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal.....	2-103
FIGURE 2.4.5	Clean Coal Ash-Yield Curves for Different Charging/Deagglomeration Techniques when Processing -100 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal in the Batch Separator .....	2-104
FIGURE 2.4.6	Results for the Integrated Pulverizer/Electrostatic Separator Circuit when Processing Upper Freeport Seam Coal .....	2-106
FIGURE 3.1.1	Schematic Diagram of the 500,000 Btu/h Down-Fired Combustor and Auxiliary Components.....	3-4
FIGURE 3.1.2	Cross Section of Baghouse Containing Monoliths in Filter Bags .....	3-6
FIGURE 3.1.3	Exploded View of Monolith Chamber with Retaining Ring.....	3-7
FIGURE 3.1.4	Ammonia Injection System Installed in 8-Inch Inlet Duct.....	3-9
FIGURE 3.1.5	Cross Section of Baghouse with Monoliths above Filter Bags .....	3-11
FIGURE 3.1.6	30-Inch Spacer used in Holding Monoliths.....	3-12
FIGURE 3.1.7	Side and Top View with Lo-Flo Stations and Tubing .....	3-14
FIGURE 3.1.8	Exploded View of Monolith Chamber with Retaining Wire.....	3-17
FIGURE 3.1.9	Cross Section of Baghouse with Monoliths above Filter Bags .....	3-22
FIGURE 3.1.10	Side and Top View with Lo-Flo Stations and Tubing .....	3-24
FIGURE 3.1.11	Comparison of SO <sub>2</sub> Removal as a Function of NSR and Particle Size PSU Flue Gas Temperature: (Demonstration Boiler ~380°F; DFC ~425°F) – All others tested at ~300°F .....	3-26
FIGURE 3.1.12	Percent NO <sub>x</sub> Conversion as a Function of Catalyst Temperature (space velocity ~21,000 h <sup>-1</sup> , NH <sub>3</sub> /NO molar ratio ~ 1.0).....	3-28
FIGURE 3.1.13	NO <sub>x</sub> Conversion Versus Monolith Temperature for 21,000 h <sup>-1</sup> (■) In the DFC and 12,000 h <sup>-1</sup> (◆) and 24,000 h <sup>-1</sup> (Δ) in the Bench-Scale Testing.....	3-30
FIGURE 3.1.14	Schematic Diagram of the Flow Reactor used for Flash Pyrolysis .....	3-36

FIGURE 3.1.15	Ash-Free Weight as a Function of Temperature for BioLime™ I.....	3-38
FIGURE 3.1.16	Ash-Free Weight as a Function of Temperature for BioLime™ III ....	3-38
FIGURE 3.1.17	<sup>13</sup> C-NMR Spectra for BioLime™ I.....	3-41
FIGURE 3.1.18	<sup>13</sup> C-NMR Spectra for BioLime™ III .....	3-42
FIGURE 3.1.19	Influence of BioLime™ used on NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction. The Percent NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction is Predicted from the Model for both BioLime™ for each Run Condition. (Series 1 – BioLime™ I, Series 2 – BioLime™ III.....	3-47
FIGURE 3.1.20	Effect of CO <sub>2</sub> Concentration on NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction (■ Experimental, ◆ Model A) .....	3-48
FIGURE 3.1.21	Effect of H <sub>2</sub> Concentration on NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction (using Model A) .....	3-48
FIGURE 3.1.22	Effect of CO Concentration on NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction (using Model A).....	3-49
FIGURE 3.1.23	Influence of Hydrocarbon Concentration on Percent NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction (■ Experimental, ◆ Model A) .....	3-49
FIGURE 3.1.24	Schematic Diagram of the Delavan Nozzle.....	3-59
FIGURE 3.1.25	NO <sub>x</sub> Profile when Firing 100% PC with all of the Air Introduced through the Burner .....	3-61
FIGURE 3.1.26	Schematic Diagram of Nitrogen Transformations during Pulverized Coal Combustion .....	3-62
FIGURE 3.1.27	NO <sub>x</sub> Profile in the Combustor when Firing 90% PC and 10% CWSF with all of the Air Introduced through the Burner.....	3-62
FIGURE 3.1.28	NO <sub>x</sub> Concentration Profile when Firing 80% PC and 20% CWSF with all of the Air Introduced through the Burner .....	3-63
FIGURE 3.1.29	NO <sub>x</sub> Profile when Firing 70% PC and 30% CWSF with all of the Air Introduced through the Burner.....	3-63
FIGURE 3.1.30	NO <sub>x</sub> Emission Profile when Firing 90% PC and 10% CWSF with Make-Up Air Introduced through Port 3 .....	3-64
FIGURE 3.1.31	NO <sub>x</sub> Emission Profile when Firing 80% PC and 20% CWSF with Make-Up Air Introduced through Port 3 .....	3-64
FIGURE 3.1.32	NO <sub>x</sub> Emission Profile when Firing 70% PC and 30% CWSF with Make-Up Air Introduced through Port 3 .....	3-65
FIGURE 3.1.33	Temperature Profile for Various Confiring Configurations.....	3-66
FIGURE 3.1.34	Carbon Burnout as a Function of Distance from the Burner.....	3-67
FIGURE 3.1.35	Percent Nitrogen Remaining in the Solid Sample as a Function of Distance from the Burner .....	3-67
FIGURE 3.1.36	Effect of Reburn Fuel Heat Input on NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction for Different	



	Fuels and Air-Staging Configurations .....	3-69
FIGURE 3.2.1	Schematic Diagram of the Drop-Tube Reactor .....	3-73
FIGURE 3.2.2	Generalized Diagram of Penn State’s Micronized Coal-Fired Demonstration Boiler System with a Ceramic Membrane Filter Chamber and Pulse-Jet Baghouse.....	3-74
FIGURE 3.2.3	Generalized Diagram of Penn State’s Micronized Coal-Fired Demonstration Boiler System with a Pulse-Jet Baghouse .....	3-74
FIGURE 3.3.1	Details of Corning Incorporated’s Ceramic Membrane Gas Filter.....	3-90
FIGURE 3.3.2	Interior of the Ceramic Filter Chamber Showing Baffles and Ceramic Membrane Filters .....	3-91
FIGURE 3.3.3	Ceramic Filter Pressure Drop as a Function of Time Firing Coal (Second demonstration).....	3-95
FIGURE 3.3.4	HD250 CT Scanner with a Filter Supported within the Scanning Aperture.....	3-98
FIGURE 3.3.5	A Digital Radiograph of Filter #8122 .....	3-99
FIGURE 3.3.6	CT Scans (2mm scan thickness and spacing) for the Inlet of Filter #8122 – CT Range: -1000 to 2000 (Scans progress from left to right starting at top left corner).....	3-100
FIGURE 3.3.7	CT Scans (2mm scan thickness and spacing) for the Outlet of Filter #8122 – CT Range: -1000 to 2000 (Scans progress from left to right starting at top left corner).....	3-100
FIGURE 3.3.8	SEM Photograph of the Outlet End of Filter #8112 (a-Inlet Cell; b-Outlet Cell) .....	3-102
FIGURE 3.3.9	Comparison Inlet CT Scans of Filter #8122 Before (Left scan) and after Use (Right scan) ( Note that scans were conducted at same location along filter length) .....	3-103
FIGURE 3.3.10	Average CT Number as a Function of Location in the Filter (Zero represents filter inlet, scan spacing is 2 cm) .....	3-104
FIGURE 3.3.11	SEM Photomicrograph of a Dirty Cell (Inlet Cell) in the Middle of Filter #8112.....	3-105
FIGURE 3.3.12	SEM Photomicrograph of a Dirty Cell (Inlet Cell) in the Inlet End of Filter #8112 .....	3-105
FIGURE 3.3.13	Inlet Fine Particulate Emissions from the Ceramic Membrane Filter Chamber when Firing Middle Kittanning Seam DMC Coal.....	3-111
FIGURE 3.3.14	Outlet Fine Particulate Emissions from the Ceramic Membrane Filter Chamber when Firing Middle Kittanning Seam DMC Coal .....	3-111
FIGURE 3.3.15	Percent of Each Fine Particulate Fraction that Penetrates	

	Collection Device.....	3-112
FIGURE 3.3.16	Percent Filter Penetration of Selected Trace Elements for the Middle Kittanning Coal (Fabric Filter vs. Ceramic Filter) .....	3-116
FIGURE 3.3.17	Mercury Emissions from the Demonstration Boiler when Firing Middle Kittanning Seam Micronized Coal.....	3-117
FIGURE 3.3.18	Percent Mercury Penetration through the Fabric and Ceramic Filters when Firing Middle Kittanning Seam Micronized Coal.....	3-119
FIGURE 3.3.19	Fuel Analysis of Cleaned Taggart Fuels .....	3-127
FIGURE 3.3.20	Fuel Analysis of Cleaned Hiawatha Fuels .....	3-127
FIGURE 3.3.21	Emissions Measured by Method 29 at PCD Outlet during Combustion of Taggart Clean Coals.....	3-128
FIGURE 3.3.22	Emissions Measured by Method 29 at PCD Outlet during Combustion of Hiawatha Clean Coals .....	3-129
FIGURE 3.3.23	Relationship of Element Concentration in Fuel as a Function of Cleaning and Corresponding Element Emissions for the Taggart Oil Agglomeration and Column Flotation Fuels ( $\% \text{ Difference} = \frac{\text{Element}_{\text{Taggart Oil Agglomeration}} - \text{Element}_{\text{Taggart Column Flotation}}}{\text{Element}_{\text{Taggart Oil Agglomeration}}}$ ).....	3-129
FIGURE 3.3.24	Relationship of Element Concentration in Fuel as a Function of Cleaning and Corresponding Element Emissions for the Hiawatha Oil Agglomeration and Column Flotation Fuels ( $\frac{\text{Element}_{\text{Hiawatha Oil Agglomeration}} - \text{Element}_{\text{Hiawatha Column Flotation}}}{\text{Element}_{\text{Hiawatha Oil Agglomeration}}}$ ) .....	3-130
FIGURE 3.3.25	Schematic Diagram of the Research Boiler.....	3-131
FIGURE 3.3.26	Trace Elements Emissions of Pittsburgh Raw and Cleaned Coal .....	3-134
FIGURE 3.3.27	The Relationship between Reduction in Trace Elements Due to Coal Cleaning and their Reduction in Stack Emissions for the Pittsburgh Coal (Solid line represents theoretical 1:1, Dash lines represent $\pm 20\%$ of theoretical) .....	3-135
FIGURE 3.3.28	The Relationship between Carbon in Ash and the Retention of Mercury on Particulates.....	3-136
FIGURE 3.3.29	Percent System Penetration of Selected IHAPS for the Taggart MCWM (Oil Agglomeration) as a Function of Atomizing Air Pressure .....	3-137
FIGURE 3.3.30	Sample Train Configurations for Method 29, Ontario Hydro Mercury Speciation Method and PSU Method.....	3-142
FIGURE 3.3.31	Sampling Preparation and Analytical Protocol for the PSU Method (Falcone Miller, et al., 1999a) .....	3-143

FIGURE 3.3.32	Emissions Measured for the Taggart Fuel at the Baghouse Inlet of the Demonstration Facility .....	3-145
FIGURE 3.3.33	Emissions Measured for the Taggart Fuel at the Baghouse Outlet for the Demonstration Facility .....	3-145
FIGURE 3.3.34	Emissions Measured for the Taggart Fuel at the Baghouse Inlet of the Research Boiler .....	3-146
FIGURE 3.3.35	Emissions Data of Co and Ni Measured by Multiple Methods .....	3-148
FIGURE 3.3.36	Emissions Data of Inorganic HAPS Measured by Multiple Methods .	3-149
FIGURE 3.3.37	Mercury Species Measured by Method 29 and PSU Method at the Demonstration Boiler Baghouse Inlet and Outlet.....	3-150
FIGURE 3.3.38	Preliminary Statistical Representation of Total Mercury Data Obtained via PSU Method and Ontario Hydro Method at the Baghouse Inlet .....	3-151
FIGURE 3.3.39	Preliminary Statistical Representation of Total Mercury Data Obtained via PSU Method and Ontario Hydro Method at the Baghouse Outlet.....	3-152
FIGURE 3.3.40	System Capture Measured by Method 29 and PSU Method.....	3-157
FIGURE 3.3.41	Probability Distribution of Multielements Measured at the Baghouse Inlet and Outlet as Calculated by the Two Sample T-Test (Dashed line represents $P=0.05$ acceptance of $H_0:\mu_1=\mu_2$ at the 95% confidence interval) .....	3-158
FIGURE 3.3.42	Mercury Species Emissions Measured by PSU Method (n=4) and Ontario Hydro Mercury Speciation Method (n=3) at the Baghouse Inlet (Bars represent one standard deviation from the mean).....	3-161
FIGURE 3.3.43	Probability (P) Calculated by Two Sample T-Test for Mercury Species Measured by the PSU Method and Ontario Hydro Mercury Speciation Method (Dashed line represents $P=0.05$ acceptance of $H_0:\mu_1=\mu_2$ at the 95% confidence interval) .....	3-162
FIGURE 3.3.44	PSU and ATS Method Trains.....	3-164
FIGURE 3.4.1	Set-Up of the On-Line CO <sub>2</sub> Monitoring System.....	3-172
FIGURE 3.4.2	XRD Patterns of Si-MCM-41-PEI With Different PEI Loadings as Shown by the Trailing Digits (The top three curve were shown at different Y-scales).....	3-174
FIGURE 3.4.3	The Pore Size Distribution of Si-MCM-41-PEI with Different PEI Loadings .....	3-175
FIGURE 3.4.4	The Surface Area and Pore Volume of Si-MCM-41-PEI with Different PEI Loadings .....	3-175

FIGURE 3.4.5	TGA Profile for Si-MCM-41-PEI with Different Loadings.....	3-177
FIGURE 3.4.6	DTGA Profile for Si-MCM-41-PEI with Different PEI Loadings.....	3-177
FIGURE 3.4.7	The Influence of Operating Temperature on the Adsorption and Desorption Performance of Si-MCM-41-PEI-50 .....	3-179
FIGURE 3.4.8	Temperature Programmed Adsorption of CO <sub>2</sub> By Si-MCM-41-PEI-50 (Pure CO <sub>2</sub> atmosphere, CO <sub>2</sub> flow rate: 100 ml/min).....	3-180
FIGURE 3.4.9	The Influence of CO <sub>2</sub> Concentration in the CO <sub>2</sub> /N <sub>2</sub> Mixture on the Adsorption Performance of Si-MCM-41-PEI-50 (Operating temperature 75°C, flow rate 100 ml/min).....	3-181
FIGURE 3.4.10	The Influence of PEI Loadings on the Adsorption and Desorption Performance of Si-MCM-41-PEI.....	3-183
FIGURE 3.4.11	The Effect of PEG on the CO <sub>2</sub> Adsorption/Desorption Performance of Si-MCM-41-PEI (PEI loading: 30 wt%, PEG loading: 20 wt%)....	3-186
FIGURE 3.4.12	The Influence of Si/Al Ratio of the MCM-41 Support on the CO <sub>2</sub> Adsorption Performance of MCM-41 and MCM-41-PEI (PEI loading: 50 wt%).....	3-187
FIGURE 3.4.13	Synergetic Effect of Si-MCM-41 on the Adsorption of PEI as a Function of PEI Loading in MCM-41-PEI .....	3-188
FIGURE 3.4.14	Schematic Diagram of PEI Loaded in the Mesoporous Molecular Sieve of MCM-41 ((A) MCM-41 support; (B) Low PEI Loading; (C) High PEI loading; (D) Extremely high PEI loading).....	3-188
FIGURE 3.4.15	Comparison of the CO <sub>2</sub> Adsorption Kinetics of Si-MCM-41-PEI-50, Si-MCM-41-PEI-75, and PEI .....	3-191
FIGURE 3.4.16	Breakthrough Curve of CO <sub>2</sub> with MCM-41-PEI-50 (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; feed composition: 14.9% CO <sub>2</sub> , 4.25% O <sub>2</sub> and 80.85% N <sub>2</sub> ; feed flow rate: 10 ml/min; temperature: 75°C).....	3-194
FIGURE 3.4.17	Normalized Adsorption Volume of CO <sub>2</sub> , O <sub>2</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> ( $V_{ad}/V_0$ ) as a Function of Adsorption Time During the Adsorption Separation of CO <sub>2</sub> from Simulated Flue Gas Mixture By “Molecular Basket” Adsorbent ( $V_{ad}$ : volume of CO <sub>2</sub> , O <sub>2</sub> or N <sub>2</sub> adsorbed; $V_0$ : Volume of CO <sub>2</sub> , O <sub>2</sub> , or N <sub>2</sub> feed into the system).....	3-194
FIGURE 3.4.18	The Adsorption Capacity of MCM-41-PEI-50 as a Function of Feed CO <sub>2</sub> Concentration Measured by both TGA and the Flow Adsorption System.....	3-195
FIGURE 3.4.19	The Influence of Operating Temperature on the Breakthrough Curve of CO <sub>2</sub> (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; Feed composition: 14.9% CO <sub>2</sub> , 4.25% O <sub>2</sub> , and 80.85% N <sub>2</sub> ; feed flow Rate: 10 ml/min) .....	3-196

FIGURE 3.4.20	The Influence of Feed Flowrate on the Breakthrough Curve of CO <sub>2</sub> (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; feed composition: 14.9% CO <sub>2</sub> , 4.25% O <sub>2</sub> and 80.85% N <sub>2</sub> ; temperature: 75°C) .....	3-197
FIGURE 3.4.21	The Influence of Feed CO <sub>2</sub> Concentration on the Breakthrough Curve of CO <sub>2</sub> (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; temperature: 75°C; feed flow rate: 30 ml/min).....	3-197
FIGURE 3.4.22	Comparison of the CO <sub>2</sub> Breakthrough Curve in the Absence and in the Presence of 10% Moisture (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; temperature: 75°C; feed flow rate; 10 ml/min).....	3-199
FIGURE 3.4.23	The Influence of Sweep Gas Flow Rate on the Desorption of CO <sub>2</sub> (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; temperature: 75°C; feed flow rate: 10 ml/min).....	3-201
FIGURE 3.4.24	Stability of the Adsorbent at 75°C. (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; temperature: 75°C; feed flow rate: 10 ml/min) .....	3-202
FIGURE 3.4.25	Stability of the Adsorbent at 100°C. (Operating condition: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; temperature: 100°C; feed flow rate: 10 ml/min) .....	3-202
FIGURE 3.4.26	Comparison of the Oxygen “Adsorption” at Different Temperatures Indicating the Degree of Oxidation of the Polymer (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; feed flow rate: 10 ml/min).....	3-203
FIGURE 3.4.27	Stability of the “Molecular Basket” Adsorbent Under Dry Flue Gas Conditions (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; feed composition: 14.9% CO <sub>2</sub> , 4.25% O <sub>2</sub> and 80.85%; temperature: 75°C; Feed flow rate: 10 ml/min).....	3-204
FIGURE 3.4.28	XRD Patterns of the “Molecular Basket” Adsorbent before and after Cyclic Operation under Dry Flue Gas Conditions at 75°C .....	3-205
FIGURE 3.4.29	Stability of the “Molecular Basket” Adsorbent under Moist Flue Gas Conditions (Operating conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; feed composition: 13.4% CO <sub>2</sub> , 3.8% O <sub>2</sub> , 10.4% H <sub>2</sub> O and 72.4%; temperature: 75°C; feed flow rate: 10 ml/min).....	3-206
FIGURE 3.4.30	XRD Patterns of MCM-41 before and after Operating under Moist Simulated Flue Gas Conditions at 75°C.....	3-206
FIGURE 3.4.31	XRD Patterns of the “Molecular Basket” Adsorbent before and after Operating under Moist Simulated Flue Gas Conditions at 75°C.....	3-207
FIGURE 3.4.32	Breakthrough Curve of CO <sub>2</sub> for Flue Gas from Natural Gas-Fired Boiler.....	3-208
FIGURE 3.4.33	NO <sub>x</sub> Concentration Change During the Separation of Flue Gas	

	from a Natural Gas-Fired Boiler.....	3-209
FIGURE 3.4.34	Breakthrough Curve of CO <sub>2</sub> for Flue Gas from a Coal-Fired Boiler...	3-209
FIGURE 3.4.35	SO <sub>2</sub> Concentration Change During the Separation of a Coal-Fired Flue Gas Mixture .....	3-210
FIGURE 3.4.36	NO <sub>x</sub> Concentration Change During the Separation of a Coal-Fired Flue Gas Mixture .....	3-210
FIGURE 3.4.37	Comparison of the CO <sub>2</sub> Breakthrough Curve of the “Molecular Basket” Adsorbent in Pellet and in Powder Form (Operating Conditions: weight of adsorbent: 2.0 g; feed composition: 14.9% CO <sub>2</sub> , 4.25% O <sub>2</sub> and 80.85%; temperature: 75°C; feed flow rate: 10 ml/min) .....	3-211
FIGURE 4.1.1	Opportunity Costs of Retrofitting Versus Boiler Utilization .....	4-4
FIGURE 4.1.2	MCWM Production and Utilization Block Flow Diagram .....	4-8
FIGURE 4.1.3	MCWM Cost Curve for a Single Supply Point .....	4-8
FIGURE 4.1.4	Total Capital Requirement Versus Boiler Size.....	4-10
FIGURE 4.1.5	Distribution of “Large” Boiler MCWM Costs .....	4-21
FIGURE 4.1.6	Distribution of “Small” Boiler MCWM Costs .....	4-21
FIGURE 4.2.1	Efficient Frontier and the Market Portfolio.....	4-41
FIGURE 4.4.1	CO <sub>2</sub> Cost Function .....	4-78
FIGURE 4.6.1	Historical Energy Return (MM Btu/\$) for Each Energy Type.....	4-111
FIGURE 4.6.2	GARCH Estimates of Energy Return Volatility.....	4-114
FIGURE 4.6.3	1990 Efficient Portfolio Frontiers for the Utility Industry and General U.S. Consumption.....	4-115
FIGURE 4.6.4	1990 Efficient Portfolio and Efficient Environmental Portfolio .....	4-118
FIGURE 4.6.5	1990 Efficient Portfolio With and Without a \$9.00/BBL Security Premium .....	4-119
FIGURE 5.1.1	Schematic Diagram of the Hybrid MCWM Double-Stage Grinding/Mixing Circuit Located in the Fuel Preparation Facility .....	5-2
FIGURE 5.2.1	Apparent Viscosity Vs Solids Loading for the Taggart Seam Selective Agglomeration Filter Cake .....	5-7
FIGURE 5.2.2	Apparent Viscosity Vs Solids Loading for the Hiawatha Seam Column Flotation Filter Cake .....	5-7
FIGURE 5.2.3	Apparent Viscosity Vs Solids Loading for the Indiana VII Seam Column Flotation Filter Cake .....	5-8

FIGURE 5.2.4	Apparent Viscosity Vs Solids Loading for the Hiawatha Seam MCWM Prepared With and Without Dispersant.....	5-8
FIGURE 5.2.5	Dispersant Concentration Vs Apparent Viscosity of the Hiawatha Seam Selective Agglomeration Filter Cake (a: 1.0 wt.% dispersant; b: 0.75 wt.% dispersant) .....	5-9
FIGURE 5.2.6	Dispersant Concentration Vs Apparent Viscosity of the Hiawatha Seam Selective Agglomeration Filter Cake (a: 0.5 wt.% dispersant; b: 0.35 wt.% dispersant) .....	5-10
FIGURE 5.2.7	Flocon Concentration Vs Apparent Viscosity of the Hiawatha Seam Selective Agglomeration Filter Cake .....	5-11
FIGURE 5.2.8	Front View of the Atomization Test Chamber .....	5-14
FIGURE 5.2.9	Side View of Atomization Chamber .....	5-14
FIGURE 5.2.10	Atomization Results for the MCWM Produced from the Hiawatha Seam Advanced Column Flotation Filter Cake .....	5-15
FIGURE 5.2.11	Summary of Atomization Results .....	5-17
FIGURE 5.2.12	Example of an Effective Yield Locus (EYL) for the Taggart Coal Showing the Major and Minor Principal Consolidation Stresses, $\sigma_{1C}$ and $\sigma_{3C}$ .....	5-19
FIGURE 5.2.13	Yield Locus (YL) for Taggart Coal Consolidated At 6.3 KN/M <sup>2</sup> Showing The Unconfined Yield Stress, $F_C$ .....	5-20
FIGURE 5.2.14	Flow Function (FF) for Taggart Coal with Line Corresponding to a Flow Factor (FF) of 1.7 .....	5-21
FIGURE 5.2.15	Estimated Flow Factor Contours For $\delta = 35^\circ$ Based on Interpolation From Charts Published by Jenike (1970) (A) Conical; (B) Plane Flow.....	5-24
FIGURE 5.2.16	Schematic Diagram of the Jenike Shear Cell .....	5-30
FIGURE 5.2.17	Example of a Shear Force/Time Profile.....	5-32
FIGURE 5.2.18	Size Distributions of Indiana 7 Coal Samples .....	5-33
FIGURE 5.2.19	Effective Yield Loci for Indiana 7 Parent Coal, Filter Cake and a Blend of the Filter Cake Material with 20% of the Parent Coal.....	5-34
FIGURE 5.2.20	Effective Yield Loci for 20% Indiana-7 Parent Coal Blend at 5% and 25% Moisture .....	5-35
FIGURE 5.2.21	Typical Yield Loci Plots at Varying Consolidation Loads for a	

	20% Indiana-7 Parent Blend.....	5-35
FIGURE 5.2.22	The Effect of Composition on Yield Loci for Blends of Indiana 7 Coal Consolidated Under a Normal Stress of 4KN/M <sup>2</sup> .....	5-36
FIGURE 5.2.23	Effect of Moisture Content on the Yield Locus for a Blend Containing 80% Parent Coal Consolidated at 4 KN/M <sup>2</sup> .....	5-37
FIGURE 5.2.24	Flow Functions for Blends of Indiana 7 Coal.....	5-38
FIGURE 5.2.25	The Effect of Moisture Content on the Flow Function for 80% Indiana 7 Parent Coal .....	5-39
FIGURE 5.2.26	Wall Yield Loci for 1% and 80% Indiana 7 Parent Coal .....	5-40
FIGURE 5.2.27	Flow Functions and Flow Factor for Indiana 7 Blends.....	5-42
FIGURE 5.2.28	Bin Test Conditions Indicated on the Flow-Factor Chart for Plane Flow With $\delta = 35^\circ$ (A: Test 9-12; B: Tests 1-4; C: Tests 7 & 8; D: Tests 5 & 6 .....	5-45
FIGURE 5.4.1	Generalized Diagram of Penn State's Coal-Water Slurry Fuel-Fired Demonstration Boiler System With a Pulse-Jet Baghouse (Note: Coal handling and coal-water slurry fuel Preparation equipment are not shown).....	5-50
FIGURE 5.4.2	Schematic Diagram of the RSFC Burner and Atomizer .....	5-51



## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1.1	Breakage Parameters for the Coals Tested at 70% Solids by Weight ....	2-6
TABLE 2.1.2	Comparison of Circuit Capacity for Open and Closed Circuit Systems.....	2-7
TABLE 2.1.3	Characteristic Parameters for the Cyclone Size Selectivity at Different Cut Sizes.....	2-24
TABLE 2.2.1	Summary of the Operating Conditions and Test Results for the Solid-Bowl Centrifuge (Feed Rate = 11.4 L/min, Solids Concentration = 10% by weight).....	2-31
TABLE 2.2.2	Summary of the Operating Conditions and Test Results for the Solid-Bowl Centrifuge (Medium Relative Density = 1.3, Feed Rate = 11.3 L/min (3 gpm), Medium-to-Coal Ratio = 10:1, Scroll Speed = 300 rpm).....	2-40
TABLE 2.2.3	Summary of the Operating Conditions and Test Results for the Solid-Bowl Centrifuge.....	2-42
TABLE 2.2.4	Summary of Operating Conditions and Results when Separating 28x32 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal in the Magnetic Fluid Separator.....	2-50
TABLE 2.3.1	Flotation Rate Constants at Different Frother Concentrations .....	2-68
TABLE 2.3.2	Flotation Rate Constants at Different Collector Concentrations .....	2-69
TABLE 2.3.3	Flotation Rate Constants for Different Size Fractions .....	2-71
TABLE 2.3.4	Flotation Rate Constants and Froth Factors for the Batch, Batch with No Paddling (Batch*), and Pilot Plant Tests .....	2-73
TABLE 2.3.5	Change in Flotation Rate Constants and Froth Factors Due to the Addition of Collector for the Batch, Batch with no Paddling (Batch*), Pilot-Plant Tests.....	2-75
TABLE 2.3.6	Effect of Hydrostatic Pressure Setting on Froth Phase Gas Hold-up, Concentrate Flow Rate and Grade .....	2-82
TABLE 2.3.7	Preliminary Evaluation of Vortactor Bubble Generation in Fine Coal Cleaning .....	2-88
TABLE 2.4.1	Continuous Triboelectrostatic Separator Results with Processing -100 Mesh Indiana Seam Coal (feed ash = 9.1%), -100 Mesh Pittsburgh Seam Coal (feed ash = 6.8%), and -100 Mesh Upper Freeport Seam Coal (feed ash = 11.2%).....	2-98
TABLE 3.1.1	Low-Temperature SCR Test Matrix .....	3-18
TABLE 3.1.2	Typical Composition of the Middle Kittanning Seam Coal.....	3-23
TABLE 3.1.3	Operating Parameters for SCR Catalyst/Dry Sorbent Injection .....	3-29

TABLE 3.1.4	Compositional Analysis of the Two BioLime™ Samples (wt.%).....	3-34
TABLE 3.1.5	Analysis of the Coal used in the Testing.....	3-37
TABLE 3.1.6	DFC Reburn Zone Parameters.....	3-37
TABLE 3.1.7	Various Zones of Weight Loss during the Pyrolysis of BioLime™ Samples .....	3-39
TABLE 3.1.8	Cumulative Volatile Matter Yield (wt.%) during Pyrolysis of BioLime™ I and III.....	3-39
TABLE 3.1.9	Percent Volatile Matter Released in Zones II and III for the BioLime™ Samples .....	3-40
TABLE 3.1.10	Signal Assignment and Percent Intensity of Chemical Shifts in <sup>13</sup> C-CP/MAS NMR Spectra of BioLime™ Samples.....	3-42
TABLE 3.1.11	I <sub>lig</sub> and Weight Percent of Lignin Calculated for BioLime™ I and III....	3-43
TABLE 3.1.12	Composition of Pyrolysis Products at 1100°C .....	3-44
TABLE 3.1.13	Composition of Pyrolysis Products for BioLime™ III at 1,100 and 1,200°C.....	3-45
TABLE 3.1.14	Model Predictions for Percentage NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction with NO <sub>x</sub> Reduction Observed in the DFC.....	3-46
TABLE 3.1.15	Parameters and Characteristic of Reported Reburning Experiments.....	3-55
TABLE 3.1.16	Summary of the Test Matrix.....	3-60
TABLE 3.2.1	Proximate Analysis and Higher Heating Value.....	3-76
TABLE 3.2.2	Ultimate Analysis.....	3-76
TABLE 3.2.3	PAH Concentrations (µg/MJ) from Solid Phase Extracts at Air-to-Fuel Ratio of 1.25/1.....	3-81
TABLE 3.2.4	PAH Concentrations (µg/MJ) from Condensed Vapor Phase Extracts at Air-to-Fuel Ratio of 1.25/1 .....	3-81
TABLE 3.2.5	PAH Concentrations (µg/MJ) from Solid Phase Extracts at Air-to-Fuel Ratio of 1/1.....	3-82
TABLE 3.2.6	PAH Concentrations (µg/MJ) from Condensed Vapor Phase Extracts at Air-to-Fuel Ratio of 1/1 .....	3-82
TABLE 3.2.7	DTR Combustion Efficiencies for Varying Air to Fuel Ratios.....	3-83
TABLE 3.2.8	PAH Concentrations (µg/MJ) from Condensed Vapor Phase Extracts Collected Upstream of the Baghouse.....	3-83
TABLE 3.2.9	PAH Concentrations (µg/MJ) from Condensed Vapor Phase Extracts Collected Downstream of the Baghouse .....	3-83

TABLE 3.3.1	Filter Exchange Schedule.....	3-101
TABLE 3.3.2	Change in the Average Inlet/Outlet CT Number as a Function of Hours of Operation .....	3-106
TABLE 3.3.3	Bench-Top Filter Pressure Testing .....	3-106
TABLE 3.3.4	Particulate Emissions as Measured by EPA Methods 5 and Modified 201A (fly ash) when Firing Middle Kittanning Seam DMC. The Ceramic Filter Chamber was the Particulate Collection Device used Except where Noted .....	3-108
TABLE 3.3.5	Fine Particulate Emissions for the Ceramic Membrane Filter Chamber, as Determined by EPA Methods 201A (modified) and 202, when Firing Middle Kittanning Seam DMC .....	3-110
TABLE 3.3.6	Middle Kittanning Coal Analysis and Trace Element Emissions as a Function of PCD .....	3-116
TABLE 3.3.7	Fuel Analysis (ppm).....	3-124
TABLE 3.3.8	Fuel Analysis for Cleaned Coals (lb/MM Btu) .....	3-125
TABLE 3.3.9	Filter Cake and MCWM Analysis .....	3-126
TABLE 3.3.10	Combustion Tests Completed on the Demonstration Boiler.....	3-128
TABLE 3.3.11	Trace Element Analysis of Parent and Cleaned Pittsburgh Coals.....	3-133
TABLE 3.3.12	Reproducibility of Replicate Test using Method 29 in the Demonstration Test Facility .....	3-147
TABLE 3.3.13	Average Coal, Fuel and Flue Gas Composition for Test Runs .....	3-153
TABLE 3.3.14	Average Percent Closure across the Baghouse.....	3-156
TABLE 3.3.15	Descriptive Statistics for Emissions Measured at the Inlet (Units in lb/10 <sup>12</sup> Btu).....	3-160
TABLE 3.3.16	Descriptive Statistics for Emissions Measured at the Outlet (Units in lb/10 <sup>12</sup> Btu).....	3-160
TABLE 3.3.17	Descriptive Statistics for Mercury Emissions Measured at the Baghouse Inlet (Units in lb/10 <sup>12</sup> Btu).....	3-162
TABLE 3.3.18	Descriptive Statistics for Mercury Emissions Measured at the Baghouse Outlet (Units in lb/10 <sup>12</sup> Btu) .....	3-163
TABLE 3.4.1	Preparation Conditions and the Adsorption/Desorption Performance of the Adsorbents .....	3-169
TABLE 3.4.2	Comparison of CO <sub>2</sub> Adsorption Performance of “Molecular Basket” Adsorbent and other Adsorbents.....	3-193
TABLE 3.4.3	The Influence of Moisture Concentration on the Adsorption Separation of Carbon Dioxide from the Simulated Flue Gas.....	3-200

TABLE 4.1.1	Cambria and Indiana County Premium Bituminous Coal Mines .....	4-12
TABLE 4.1.2	Summary of Pennsylvania Boilers by Type .....	4-14
TABLE 4.1.3	Candidate Retrofit Boilers – Location and AWP .....	4-16
TABLE 4.1.4	Candidate Retrofit Boilers Operating Characteristics.....	4-17
TABLE 4.1.5	Driving Mileage From Mine to Boiler Zip Code.....	4-17
TABLE 4.1.6	Summary of Optimal Retrofit Results .....	4-19
TABLE 4.1.7	Detailed Optimal Retrofit Results.....	4-20
TABLE 4.1.8	Marginal Cost of Fuel Supply Conditional Upon MCWM Siting (\$/MM Btu) .....	4-24
TABLE 4.1.9	Sensitivity of Aggregate Project Results to MCWM Plant Siting.....	4-25
TABLE 4.1.10	Sensitivity of Aggregate Project Results to Number of Retrofits.....	4-26
TABLE 4.1.11	Breakeven Retrofit Radius for “Large” Boiler .....	4-27
TABLE 4.1.12	Estimated Number of Boiler Retrofits and Coal Consumption.....	4-29
TABLE 4.2.1	List of Firms Included in the Sample.....	4-34
TABLE 4.2.2	Selected Items from the Balance Sheets of Included Firms.....	4-35
TABLE 4.2.3	Selected Financial Ratios for the Firms in the Sample .....	4-37
TABLE 4.2.4	Results of the Regression Equation .....	4-43
TABLE 4.2.5	Boiler-Specific Costs .....	4-43
TABLE 4.2.6	Factors and their Effectiveness.....	4-46
TABLE 4.2.7	The Correlation Matrix of Estimated Coefficients .....	4-48
TABLE 4.2.8	Risk and Return of Various Portfolios (with COGS) .....	4-49
TABLE 4.2.9	Risk and Return of Various Portfolios (without COGS) .....	4-49
TABLE 4.3.1	Specific Concerns and Composite Risk Categories.....	4-65
TABLE 4.3.2	Mean Values of Perceived Risk Attributes .....	4-68
TABLE 4.3.3	Perceptions Measures.....	4-70
TABLE 4.3.4	WTP and Socio-Demographic Summary Statistics .....	4-71
TABLE 4.3.5	Tobit Regression Results (Standard Errors in Parenthesis).....	4-73
TABLE 4.4.1	Allen Elasticities of Substitution for Selected Sectors.....	4-81
TABLE 4.4.2	Transformation of a Carbon Tax to an Ad Valorem Tax.....	4-83
TABLE 4.4.3	Economywide Impacts of CO <sub>2</sub> Mitigation, Year 2000: Base Cases (percentage change from baseline) .....	4-84

TABLE 4.4.4	Energy Sector Impacts of the Conservation (100% Savings) Response, Year 2000: Base Case (percentage change from baseline)...	4-85
TABLE 4.4.5	Energy Sector Impacts of the Conservation (100% Equipment Offset) Response, Year 2000: Base Case (percentage change from baseline)...	4-87
TABLE 4.4.6	Energy Sector Impacts of the Interfuel Substitution Response to Tax on Domestically Produced Energy, Year 2000: Base Case (percentage change from baseline) .....	4-88
TABLE 4.4.7	Definitions of Subcases of Simulation 5 .....	4-90
TABLE 4.4.8	Interfuel Substitution Impacts, Year 2000: Sensitivity Tests (percentage change from baseline) .....	4-91
TABLE 4.5.1	Consumption of Energy (1992) (trillion Btu).....	4-94
TABLE 4.5.2	Military Fuel Use Forecasts.....	4-94
TABLE 4.5.3	DOD Coal Consumption (short tons).....	4-97
TABLE 4.5.4	Summary of Worldwide Fuel Cell Development Progress.....	4-99
TABLE 4.5.5	Possibilities for Conversion of Vehicles to Alternative Fuels.....	4-102
TABLE 4.5.6	Alternative Fuels and Technologies Development for Transportation...	4-103
TABLE 4.5.7	Alternative Fueled Vehicle Targets for the Federal Fleet as proposed in Two Pieces of Legislation .....	4-104
TABLE 4.6.2	Historical Moments of Price Series .....	4-112
TABLE 4.6.3	Correlation of Changes in Monthly Energy Return (MM Btu/\$) Series 1973-1995 .....	4-112
TABLE 4.6.4	GARCH Estimation of Energy Return Series (T-statistics in parenthesis).....	4-114
TABLE 4.7.1	1969 Top 25 Coal Consumers 25 Largest Coal Consuming Utilities, 1969 .....	4-129
TABLE 4.7.2	1993 Top 25 Coal Consumers 25 Largest Coal Consuming Utilities, 1993 .....	4-130
TABLE 4.7.3	Selected Electric Utility Data by Ownership, 1991 .....	4-135
TABLE 5.2.1	Analysis of the Taggart, Indiana VII, and Hiawatha Seam Filter Cakes .....	5-6
TABLE 5.2.2	Production Summary of the Amax Filter Cakes.....	5-13
TABLE 5.2.3	Coal and MCWM Analyses.....	5-16
TABLE 5.2.4	Proximate Analyses of Coal Samples .....	5-33
TABLE 5.2.5	Ultimate Analyses of Coal Samples .....	5-33

TABLE 5.2.6	Effect of Consolidation Stress on the Bulk Density of Filter Cake/Parent Coal Blends.....	5-37
TABLE 5.2.7	Effect of Particle Size Consist (blend composition) on the Bulk Density of Consolidated Specimens .....	5-38
TABLE 5.2.6	Effect of Consolidation Stress on the Bulk Density of Filter Cake/Parent Coal Blends.....	5-39
TABLE 5.2.8	Critical Stresses and Minimum Outlet Dimensions for Storage of Indiana 7 Blends in Conical and Plane-Flow Hoppers .....	5-42
TABLE 5.2.9	Bin Settings and Test Results .....	5-44
TABLE 5.4.1	Selected Combustion Results .....	5-52