Final Report
Task 002

### Coal Conversion Comparisons

K.A. Rogers
R.F. Hill

The Engineering Societies Commission on Energy, Inc.
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 405
Washington, D.C. 20001

Date Published - July 1979

PREPARED FOR THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Under Contract No. EF-77-C-01-2468

## PREFACE

The Engineering Societies Commission on Energy, Inc. (ESCOE) is a nonprofit corporation established by the five Founder Engineering Societies to provide independent, objective technical and economic assessments to the Department of Energy. The professional staff at ESCOE consists of Engineers in Residence who are on loan from their employers for approximately two years. Each Engineer in Residence has an outstanding record of experience and achievement related to fossil energy technology.

The state of the s

Committee Commit

Electrical and a decided the second

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Our special thanks to Thomas J. Joyce, Tom Boyce, Dr. Charles McBeath, and Adrian Wilk, who all contributed directly to various portions of this report. Sincere appreciation also to the many engineers and scientists who gave their time and knowledge in an attempt to make this report as consistent and objective as possible at this point in time. Among the reasons for not naming this group is the wish to avoid any implication that responsibility for the report contents rests on anyone other than the authors.

K.A.R. R.F.H.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This ESCOE Report examines technologies for producing substitute fuels ("synfuels") from domestic coal. Techniques for comparison are developed and applied to fourteen coal conversion processes.

The conclusion is made that many processes are ready for commercial demonstration but at costs greater than for conventional petroleum fuels. All product costs in the report are based on the recently published ESCOE costing guidelines using both utility and private venture financing. All costs are in mid-1979 dollars.

There have been many studies by others covering the same conversion processes included in this report. The results of these other studies cannot usually be compared directly due to differences in size, economic and technical bases. This report puts the process data and costs on a consistent basis to achieve the comparison of product costs.

Most other studies report cost for derived products solely on an energy basis, \$/million Btu. However, because the actual fuels have different inherent values (a gallon of boiler fuel is not usually worth as much as a gallon of gasoline), an economic comparison method was developed to reflect the value differences of the different fuel products. The ESCOE value method assigns relative values to all products from a multi-product synfuel process. This method incorporates the preferences of the marketplace to arrive at the necessary selling prices for each product. This report also gives process costs on the conventional energy basis. Two methods of financing, using typical utility and private venture returns on investment, are included for all products.

The report divides the fourteen conversion processes studied into six groups: solid clean fuel, direct liquefaction, indirect liquefaction, synthetic natural gas, industrial gas, and electric power from a combined cycle-integrated gasifier system. Three of the processes are shown in an alternate mode of operation giving a total of seventeen sets of energy costs.

or extra a large

The prediction is made that no major technological advances are expected which will significantly decrease synfuel costs.

A discussion of impacts and commercialization barriers is included. The obstacles to establishing a viable coal conversion industry are chiefly lack of assured markets and high costs rather than technical uncertainties.

# Table of Contents

			Page		
	Pro	face			
	Exe	facecutive Summary	ii		
			iii		
1.0	Int	Introduction			
	1.1	Purpose of Study	1		
	1.2	Scope	1		
	1.3	Coal Resources	· 3 5		
	1.4	Mechanical Upgrading	5 5		
	1.5	Chemical Processes	6		
	_		•		
2.0	,	parison Methods	9		
	2.1		9		
	2.2		10		
	2.5	TCOMORTCS	11		
			11		
			12		
		2.3.3 Product Value Technique	12		
3.0	Droc	lots Dosewinking			
3.0	3.1	Cess Descriptions	18		
	3.1	Solid Processes3.1.1 SRC-I	18		
	3.2	Liquid Processes	19		
		3.2.1 SRC-II	20		
		3.2.2 EDS	21		
		3.2.3 H-Coal	22 22		
		3.4.4 Fischer-Tropsch	23		
	_	3.2.5 Methanol and M-gasoline	23		
•	3.3	Gas Processes	24		
		3.3.1 CO <sub>2</sub> Acceptor	25		
		3.3.2 Hygas	26		
		3.3.3 Bigas	27		
		3.3.4 Synthane	28		
			28		
	3.4	Other Processes	29		
	~ , 1	3.4.1 Combustion Engineering	30		
		3.4.2 Westinghouse	31		
			31		
4.0	Tech	Technical Review			
	4.1	Process Complexity	34 34		
		4.1.1 Reactor Comparison	37		
	4.2	Process Comparisons	40		
		4.2.1 Efficiency	41		
	4.3	4.2.2 Process Development Status	41		
	4,3	PIODUCTS	44		
		4.3.2 Liquid Products	46		
		4.3.3 Gaseous Products	46		
		4.3.4 By-Products	46		
		4.3.5 Power	48 48		
			= ^		

		Page	
5.0	Economics	49	
5.0		50	
		50	
	* * * *	51	
		52	
	F 7 7 Notation Disparcing	52	
		55	
		55	
	5.5 Product Cost	57	
	1	61	
6.0		61	
	6.1 Commercial Compatibility	61	
		62	
		64	
	6.4 Time Requirements	64	
	6.4 Time Requirements 6.5 Constraints on Commercialization	67	
	6.6 Regulatory Prospects	67	
	6.6 Regulatory Prospects 6.6.1 SNG Regulation	69	5400 €
7.0	Conclusions	72	\$ 12
7.0	References		
	Glossary		
	Appendix 1 - Product Specifications	78	
	Appendix 2 - Product Cost Calculation	81	
	Appendix 3 - Cost Sensitivity and Inflation		•
	Appendix 4 - Coal Resources		
	Appendix 4 - Coal Resources		
	List of Tables		
	Thomas Broducts	- 17	
	Table 2.1: Value Factors for Energy Products	- 36	
		- 41	
	Table 4.3: Process Confidence Index	- 42	
	Table 4.4: Process Confidence Index	- 45	
		~ -	
	Table 5.3: Product Cost - Energy Basis	50	
	Table 5.4: Products Cost Value Basis with Utility Financing		
	mable 5 5. Products Cost Value Basis		
	with Private Financing	- 59 - 83	

er weiter gir