119
12-15-77

LA. 1678

BNL-50663

TEC

Distribution Category

EXXON RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING COMPANY

MASTER

PRODUCTION ECONOMICS FOR HYDROGEN, AMMONIA
AND METHANOL DURING THE 1980-2000 PERIOD

Prepared by
Hampton G. Corneil, Fred J. Heinzelmann,
and Edward W. S. Nicholson

Government Research Laboratories
Exxon Research and Engineering Company
P. O. Box 8
Linden, New Jersey 07036

April 1977

Contract No. 368150-S

Prepared for
Brookhaven National Laboratory
Upton, New York 11973
Dr. F. Salzano, Representative

**government
research**

Sponsored by
Division of Energy Storage Systems
U. S. Energy Research and
Development Administration

P. O. BOX 8 ■ LINDEN, NEW JERSEY 07036

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of 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. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Energy Research and Development Administration, 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, products or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
RECOMMENDATIONS	7
INTRODUCTION.	8
ABBREVIATIONS/DEFINITIONS/CONVERSION FACTORS.	9
CONVERSION FACTORS - ENGLISH TO METRIC (SI) UNITS	10
1. U.S. REQUIREMENTS FOR INDUSTRIAL HYDROGEN	11
• Hydrogen for Petroleum Refining.	11
• Ammonia Requirements	15
• Methanol Requirements.	16
• Requirements for Small Uses.	16
Tables 1.01-1.13	
Figure 1.01	
Tables 1.14-1.17	
2. BASES FOR ECONOMIC STUDIES.	42
• Processes Studied.	42
• Escalation Rates	46
• Energy Prices.	47
• Cost Estimates by Chem Systems, Inc.	48
• Financial Structure.	49
• Sensitivities.	49
Tables 2.01-2.02	
Figures 2.01-2.03	
Table 2.03	
3. ECONOMICS OF HYDROGEN MANUFACTURE	56
• Reforming, Resid Partial Oxidation, and Coal Gasification.	57
• Electrolysis	59
Table 3.01	
Figure 3.01	
Tables 3.02-3.03	
Figure 3.02	
Tables 3.04-3.13	
Figure 3.03	
Tables 3.14-3.15	
Figure 3.04	
Table 3.16	

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

	<u>Page</u>
4. ECONOMICS OF AMMONIA MANUFACTURE	83
Tables 4.01-4.02	
Figure 4.01	
Tables 4.03-4.04	
Figure 4.02	
Tables 4.05-4.06	
5. ECONOMICS OF METHANOL MANUFACTURE.	93
Tables 5.01-5.02	
Figure 5.01	
Tables 5.03-5.04	
Figure 5.02	
Tables 5.05-5.06	
6. ECONOMICS OF SMALL USER HYDROGEN	103
Tables 6.01-6.03	
Figure 6.02	
7. POTENTIAL SAVINGS OF NATURAL GAS	110
Tables 7.01-7.03	
Figure 7.01	
Tables 7.04-7.06	
8. ERDA INCENTIVES.	119
Tables 8.01-8.03	
9. REFERENCES	125
APPENDIX A - Cost of Production Estimates for Hydrogen, Ammonia, and Methanol by Chem Systems, Inc. October, 1976	127

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
S-1	U.S. Industrial Hydrogen Requirements	4
S-2	Hydrocarbon and Coal Feed Stocks for U.S. Industrial Hydrogen Production	4
S-3	Economics for Industrial Hydrogen Production	5
S-4	U.S. Small User Hydrogen Requirements	6
S-5	Economics of Electrolytic Hydrogen Manufacture	7
1.01	Summary of U.S. Industrial Hydrogen Requirements, 1975-2000 and Natural Gas Feed Stock Required to Produce this Hydrogen by Steam Reforming	19
1.02	Comparison of Future Industrial Hydrogen Requirements Estimated in this Study with Those Prepared by Jet Propulsion Laboratory	20
1.03	U.S. Energy Demand, 1974-2000	21
1.04	U.S. Liquid Petroleum Supply, 1980-2000	22
1.05	U.S. Refining Processing Requirements, 1977-2000	23
1.06	Hydrogen Consumption in Refining Processes	24
1.07	U.S. Refinery Hydrogen Requirements, 1977-2000	25
1.08	U.S. Crude Runs with Hydrogen Requirements by Geographical Area	26
1.09	U.S. Ammonia Requirements	27
1.10	U.S. Methanol Requirements	28
1.11	U.S. Small Uses Hydrogen Market 1960-70	29
1.12	U.S. Small Uses Hydrogen Market 1971-75	31
1.13	Summary of U.S. Small Uses Hydrogen Market, 1960-75	32
1.14	U.S. Refinery Hydrogen Plants as of January, 1976	34
1.15	U.S. Ammonia Capacity, 1976-80	36

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1-16	Foreign Ammonia Plants Using Coal Gasification Technology	40
1-17	U.S. Methanol Manufacturing Plants	41
2.01	Escalation Rates Assumed for 1980-2000 Period	50
2.02	Assumed Prices of Natural Gas, High Sulfur Resid, Coal, and Electricity Delivered to Large Industrial Customers, 1980-2000	51
2.03	Prices of Coal Delivered to Large Industrial Customers	55
3.01	Summary of Investments and Operating Costs for Hydrogen Manufacturing Plants	62
3.02	Economics Data for Hydrogen Manufacture by Methane Reforming and Resid Partial Oxidation	64
3.03	Economics Data for Hydrogen Manufacture by Coal Gasification	65
3.04	Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture, Reforming and Resid Partial Oxidation	69
3.05	Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture by K-T Coal Gasification	70
3.06	Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture by New Coal Gasification	71
3.07	Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification - East Coast Location	72
3.08	Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification - Mid-Continent Location	73
3.09	Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification - Gulf Coast Location	74
3.10	Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification - West Coast Location	75

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.11	Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D Plants - Cost of Hydrocarbon Feedstock Released When Using New Coal Gasification Process	76
3.12	Comparison of Current and SPE Electrolysis Systems	77
3.13	Production Costs for Hydrogen--SPE Electrolysis Off-Peak Electricity Operation	78
3.14	Production Cost Analysis for Hydrogen Storage by Iron Titanium Hydride System	79
3.15	Production Costs for Hydrogen Product - SPE Electrolysis Coupled to Iron Titanium Hydride Hydrogen Storage	80
3.16	Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture by Electrolysis	82
4.01	Summary of Investments and Operating Costs for Ammonia Manufacture	85
4.02	Summary of Economics for Ammonia Manufacture	86
4.03	Sensitivities for Ammonia Manufacture	88
4.04	Sensitivities for Ammonia Manufacture in 2000 ST/SD Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification	89
4.05	U.S. Ammonia Requirements and Capacity	91
4.06	Cost of Releasing Natural Gas Feed Stock for Ammonia Manufacture by New Coal Gasification	92
5.01	Summary of Investments and Operating Costs for Methanol Manufacture	95
5.02	Summary of Economics for Methanol Manufacture	96
5.03	Sensitivities for Methanol Manufacture	98
5.04	Sensitivities for Methanol Manufacture in 2000 ST/SD Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification	99
5.05	U.S. Methanol Requirements and Capacity	101
5.06	Cost of Releasing Natural Gas Feed Stock for Methanol Manufacture by New Coal Gasification	102

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
6.01	Economics of Hydrogen Manufacture in Small Reformers	105
6.02	Economics of Hydrogen Manufacture - SPE Electrolysis	106
6.03	Requirements and Capacity for U.S. Small User Hydrogen	108
7.01	Summary of Natural Gas Requirements and Natural Gas Saved by New Coal Process	112
7.02	Natural Gas Feed Stock Required if All Industrial Hydrogen is Manufactured by Natural Gas Reforming	113
7.03	Natural Gas Feed Stock Saved by New Coal Gasification for Manufacture of Ammonia, Methanol, and Small User Hydrogen	114
7.04	Coal Feed Stock Required for New Coal Gasification	116
7.05	Electricity Required for U.S. Electrolytic Hydrogen Production	117
7.06	Additional Investment Required for New Coal Gasification Plants Over that Required for Natural Gas Reforming	118
8.01	Summary of Discounted Values of Future Savings for Use of New Coal Process for Methanol and Ammonia Manufacture	121
8.02	Discounted Value of Future Savings for Methanol Production Using New Coal Gasification Process	122
8.03	Discounted Value of Future Savings for SPE Electrolysis Technology Over Current Electrolysis Technology	124

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.01	U.S. Small Uses Hydrogen Market	33
2.01	Assumed Prices of Energy Feed Stocks Delivered to Large Industrial Centers - Minimum Prices	52
2.02	Assumed Prices of Energy Feed Stocks Delivered to Large Industrial Centers - Most Likely Prices	53
2.03	Assumed Prices of Energy Feed Stocks Delivered to Large Industrial Centers - Maximum Prices	54
3.01	Hydrogen Manufacturing Costs - Midcontinent Location	63
3.02	Hydrogen Manufacturing Costs - New Coal Gasification	67
3.03	Hydrogen Manufacture and Storage Using Off-Peak Electricity	68
3.04	Hydrogen Manufacturing Costs - Electrolysis	81
4.01	Ammonia Manufacturing Costs - Midcontinent Location	87
4.02	Production Costs, Ammonia and Methanol by Natural Gas Reforming and New Coal Gasification	90
5.01	Methanol Manufacturing Costs - Midcontinent Location	97
5.02	Production Costs, Ammonia and Methanol by Natural Gas Reforming and New Coal Gasification	100
6.01	Hydrogen Costs by Reforming, Electrolysis, and Truck Delivery vs. Quantity Required	107
6.02	Processes Used in Production of U.S. Requirements for Small User Hydrogen	109
7.01	Potential for Replacing Natural Gas Feed with Coal for Manufacture of Ammonia, Methanol, and Small User Hydrogen	115

ABSTRACT

Refinery hydrogen, ammonia and methanol, the principal industrial hydrogen products, are now manufactured mainly by catalytic steam reforming of natural gas or some alternative light hydrocarbon feed stock. Anticipated increases in the prices of hydrocarbons are expected to exceed those for coal, thus gradually increasing the incentive to use coal gasification as a source of industrial hydrogen during the 1980-2000 period. Although the investment in industrial hydrogen plants will exceed those for reforming by a factor of 2 or more, coal gasification will provide lower production costs (including 20%/yr. before tax return) for methanol manufacture in the early 1980's and for ammonia 5 years or so later. However, high costs for transporting coal to major refining centers will make it difficult to justify coal gasification for refinery hydrogen production during the 1980-2000 period. By the year 2000, 40-45% of the U.S. industrial hydrogen requirements will be provided by coal gasification thus conserving natural gas and light hydrocarbon feed stocks equivalent to about 600,000 B/D of crude oil.

Electrolytic hydrogen production costs will be reduced by improved electrolysis technology such as the solid polymer electrolyte process. These improved processes will reduce electrolysis plant investments by a factor of 2 or more and reduce electricity requirements by about 20%. Although the production cost, including return for electrolytic hydrogen, will continue to exceed those for reforming and coal gasification, the use of electrolytic hydrogen will be attractive for many small users when the new technology is available in the early 1980's. Electrolytic hydrogen now about 0.7% of total U.S. industrial hydrogen requirements will probably increase to about 1.2% of the total by the year 2000.

" THIS PAGE IS PURPOSELY LEFT BLANK ".

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The principal requirements for industrial hydrogen are for use in petroleum refining, for the manufacture of ammonia and methanol, and for a wide variety of small uses including chemicals manufacture, metallurgy, welding, etc. Nearly all U.S. industrial hydrogen is now manufactured by catalytic steam reforming of natural gas or some other light hydrocarbon feed stock. Some industrial hydrogen, particularly in Europe, is produced by the partial oxidation of resid. Outside the U.S., significant amounts are produced by the Koppers-Totzek coal gasification process. Small quantities of hydrogen are produced by electrolysis in the U.S. and in many other foreign countries for small user hydrogen requirements.

U.S. industrial hydrogen requirements expressed as the heating value of refinery hydrogen and the heating value of the hydrogen contained in ammonia and methanol were 0.58 Quads/year in 1975 (0.58×10^{15} Btu/yr). By 1980 these requirements are expected to be about 0.78 Quads/yr. and by the year 2000 this figure is likely to be 1.77 Quads/yr corresponding to a growth rate during the 1980-2000 period of 4.2%/yr. These requirements are summarized in Table S-1.

In 1975 natural gas (or other light hydrocarbon feed stock) required to produce these U.S. industrial hydrogen requirements was equivalent to about 450,000 B/D of crude oil. By 1980 this requirement will probably increase to 612,000 B/D. If natural gas reforming were used to produce all industrial hydrogen in the year 2000, the crude oil equivalent would be about 1.4 million B/D. This would correspond to 6% of the projected crude oil imports in 1980 and 15% in the year 2000. However, by the year 2000 it is likely that coal gasification will be used to provide 40-45% of U.S. industrial hydrogen requirements. Coal requirements for hydrogen production by gasification will then be 58 M ST/yr corresponding to 4% of the U.S. projected coal consumption for the year 2000. Assuming coal gasification is used to this extent, 615,000 B/D of natural gas (crude equivalent) will be saved in the year 2000; this saving will correspond to 7% of the U.S. gas consumption, or 3% of total U.S. crude requirements, or 6% of projected U.S. imports of crude oil. Feed stock requirements for industrial hydrogen for the years 1980 and 2000 are summarized in Table S-2.

Steam reforming is now the most attractive process for manufacturing refinery hydrogen, ammonia and methanol in the U.S. Although resid partial oxidation is used for a small portion of refinery hydrogen manufacture in the U.S. and is used more extensively in Europe, it appears that this process will not be attractive in the U.S. during the 1980-2000 period except for the special situations where resid stocks can be obtained at prices substantially less than those assumed in this study. As natural gas and light hydrocarbon feed stocks become more expensive relative to coal, industrial hydrogen production will shift from reforming to coal gasification even though the investments for coal gasification hydrogen plants will be more than 2 times those for steam reforming. By 1982, production costs (including 20%/yr before

tax return) for methanol manufacture by reforming and coal gasification will be equal, and thereafter costs by coal gasification will be lower. For ammonia the break-even year will be about 1989. Refinery hydrogen production will be more attractive by reforming throughout the 1980-2000 period due in part to very large incremental investments for coal gasification and in part to the high transportation costs required to deliver coal to major U.S. refining centers. The economics for these processes and products for the years 1980 and 2000 are summarized in Table S-3.

These economics data assume that an improved coal gasification process will replace the Koppers-Totzek system which is now used commercially. This improved process has been extensively developed during the past several years, but as yet has not been demonstrated commercially. This improved process will probably provide investments about 10% lower than those for K-T and will require about 7% less coal compared to K-T. These savings are provided by the use of 400-500 psig pressure on the gasification reactor compared to atmospheric pressure used in the K-T process. It appears that this improved process (hereafter called new coal) will be available for commercial use by 1982-83.

Electrolysis is now used to provide 0.004 Quad/yr of industrial hydrogen in the U.S. This is equivalent to about 0.7% of the total industrial hydrogen produced in the U.S. or 17% of the "small user" hydrogen category. The remainder of the small user hydrogen market is provided by on site manufacture in small reformers or from large reformers through over the fence deliveries by pipeline, or by truck delivery in pressure cylinders or as a liquid. The increased cost and difficulty of obtaining light hydrocarbon feed stocks for reforming will increase the economic incentive for using electrolysis. By the year 2000 electrolysis is expected to provide 25% of the small user hydrogen market or 0.02 Quad/yr. This will then be about 1.2% of the total U.S. industrial hydrogen requirements. The small user hydrogen requirements and production processes are summarized in Table S-4.

Electrolytic hydrogen production costs are very high compared to those for reforming in large plants. However, for the small user, production costs in small capacity reformers may be even greater than by electrolysis. Procuring hydrogen by purchase from a nearby reformer by pipeline or truck delivery may therefore be the optimum procedure for many small users.

Investments for electrolysis plants are now about \$500-750/kw of hydrogen product over a broad range of plant capacity (1980\$). Production costs including 20%/yr before tax return are about \$21/MBtu of hydrogen assuming electricity can be obtained at 2.7¢/kwhr. Development work currently in progress employing a solid polymer electrolyte (SPE) is likely to lower the investment to \$200/kw and production cost to about \$13/MBtu. If off-peak electricity could be obtained for say 10 hours per day at 1.0¢/kwhr, the production cost would be about \$11/MBtu but the hydrogen product would be produced intermittently. The corresponding cost for producing hydrogen in large reformers (100 MSCF/SD) is \$6.12/MBtu. Electrolysis economics data are summarized in Table S-5.

An important economic difficulty in producing electrolytic hydrogen is that the efficiency of converting primary fuel (coal, oil or nuclear energy) to electrolytic hydrogen is very low compared to that for converting these feed stocks to hydrogen by reforming or coal gasification. The thermal efficiency for converting coal, nuclear or oil fuels to electricity is about 35% and that for converting electricity to electrolytic hydrogen may be 90% for the new electrolysis processes. The overall efficiency of converting coal (or nuclear fuel or oil) to electrolytic hydrogen is, therefore, about 32%. The corresponding thermal efficiency for converting natural gas to hydrogen by reforming is 70% and for converting coal to hydrogen by the K-T process is 61% and by the new coal gasification process is 66%. Electrolysis involves this low overall thermal efficiency and there is no foreseeable way to reduce this large conversion loss. Electrolysis therefore requires essentially twice as much primary energy as reforming or coal gasification. However, electrolysis provides the only available procedure for converting hydro or nuclear energy to a gaseous fuel.

The economic values developed in this study are based on the estimated cost of process plants constructed for startup in 1980 expressed in 1980\$. It was assumed that construction costs, coal, electricity, chemicals, catalyst, and operating labor would escalate during the 1980-2000 period at 5%/yr, the assumed general inflation rate. Thus, all these costs are assumed to remain constant during this 20 year period when expressed in 1980\$. Costs of natural gas and resid feed stocks were assumed to escalate at 6.5%/year due to decreasing supplies of these petroleum feed stocks and the probability that the cost of imported hydrocarbons will increase in step with the world inflation rate which will be somewhat greater than that for the U.S. The prices assumed for coal, natural gas, resid and electricity are summarized in Table 2.02, page 51.

Throughout these economic studies, the cost comparisons of one production system versus another were calculated to show the effect of several sensitivities. These calculations indicate that a reasonable change in these variables will not change the basic conclusions that were developed for the most likely (base) case. the following factors were studied in these sensitivity calculations:

- Higher feed stock costs
- Lower feed stock costs
- 10% increase in investment
- Construction costs escalate 1%/yr above general inflation
- Construction costs escalate 1%/yr below general inflation
- Coal prices escalate 1%/yr above general inflation
- Coal prices escalate 1%/yr below general inflation

TABLE S-1

U.S. Industrial Hydrogen Requirements

	<u>1980</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>Growth Rate %/yr</u>
Refinery hydrogen, MSCF/CD	1780	4725	5.0
Ammonia, MST/yr	21.3	41.8	3.4
Methanol, MST/yr	5.3	15.3	5.4
Small user hydrogen, MSCF/CD	<u>261</u>	<u>700</u>	5.0
Total, Quads/yr of H ₂	0.78	1.77	4.2

TABLE S-2

Hydrocarbon and Coal Feed Stocks for U.S.
Industrial Hydrogen Production

	<u>1980</u>	<u>2000</u>
Natural gas required if all U.S. industrial hydrogen were produced by reforming, KB/D crude equivalent	613	1401
Natural gas saved by coal gasification, KB/D crude equivalent	-	615
Coal required for gasification, MST/yr	-	58

TABLE S-3

Economics for Industrial Hydrogen Production

1980 \$

		<u>Natural Gas Reforming</u>	<u>Resid Partial Oxidation</u>	<u>New Coal Gasification</u>
<u>Investment, \$ Millions (1980-2000)</u>				
Refinery hydrogen, 100 MSCF/SD plants		63	159	200
Ammonia, 2000 ST/SD plants		181	281	362
Methanol, 2000 ST/SD plants		135	231	310
<u>Production Cost Including 20%/yr Before Tax Return</u>				
Refinery hydrogen, \$/MBtu	1980	6.12	8.14	8.17
" " , "	2000	7.54	9.19	8.17
Ammonia, \$/ST	1980	210	248	227
" , "	2000	248	283	227
Methanol, \$/ST	1980	195	221	198
" , "	2000	236	255	198

TABLE S-4

U.S. Small User Hydrogen Requirements

	Btu/yr x 10 ¹²		
	1975	1980	2000
Supplied by electrolysis	4	4	21
" by reforming	20	27	41
" by new coal gasification	--	--	<u>21</u>
Total	24	31	83

TABLE S-5

Economics of Electrolytic Hydrogen Manufacture

1980 \$

	Electrolysis			Steam Reforming
	Current	SPE	SPE	
Hours per year operation	7920	7920	3300	7920
Investment, \$ per 7920 kwhr per year hydrogen product	750	206	494	148
Production Cost, \$/MBtu				
Electricity @ 2.7¢/kwhr	10.44	10.19	-	-
" @ 1.0¢/kwhr	-	-	3.77	-
Natural gas @ \$3.15/MBtu	-	-	-	4.09
Other operating costs	1.19	0.38	0.80	0.31
Capital charges inc. return	<u>9.36</u>	<u>2.65</u>	<u>6.08</u>	<u>1.72</u>
Total	20.99	13.22	10.65	6.12

RECOMMENDATIONS

Reducing the future consumption of natural gas and/or light hydrocarbon feed stocks for the manufacture of industrial hydrogen can best be achieved during the 1980-2000 period by employing coal gasification to replace steam reforming in ammonia and methanol manufacture. Processes such as the thermal disassociation of water using nuclear energy and the catalytic photolysis of water are at an early stage of development and probably will not be available for commercial use before the end of this century.

The pressurized coal gasification process is in an advanced stage of development, and this process appears to offer attractive advantages over current K-T technology. Although the pressurized gasification process has been studied extensively in pilot plants it must be demonstrated in a full scale plant to assure that commercial use is feasible. Several other coal gasification processes (such as steam/iron) are also being developed.

To assure that an improved coal gasification process is available for commercial use at an early date, the pressurized coal gasification process for hydrogen manufacture should be demonstrated as soon as possible. Such a demonstration may be in the planning stage at present and may be conducted without delay. However, if such a demonstration is not being planned, ERDA should consider a program of cost-sharing with industry to assure that the demonstration is conducted without delay.

It is beyond the scope of this study to determine the status of the several coal gasification processes that are likely candidates for the demonstration program. Organizations that may be involved in planning such a demonstration are Texaco, Shell, Koppers, IGT and possibly others. In June, 1976 ERDA published a Program Opportunity Notice, PON-FE-6 for a commercial plant to produce hydrogen by coal gasification.

ERDA is supporting the development of improved electrolyzers, including the solid polymer electrolyte process. Although electrolysis will probably not be attractive for the production of refinery hydrogen, ammonia or methanol, it will gradually become more attractive as a supply source for small user hydrogen requirements. Also, several new uses are likely to provide attractive opportunities for the use of an improved electrolysis process capable of reducing investments and increasing thermal efficiencies. These new uses include the conversion of off-peak hydro and nuclear produced electricity to hydrogen; the conversion of remote hydro power to hydrogen for ammonia manufacture at sites too far from population centers to permit economic delivery of electricity; and the conversion of ocean thermal energy to electrolytic hydrogen and/or ammonia. ERDA should continue to support the development of improved electrolysis processes.

" THIS PAGE IS PURPOSELY LEFT BLANK "

INTRODUCTION

Hydrogen has been widely considered as an energy carrier because it can be produced from nuclear, hydro or solar energy and thus reduce the consumption of fossil fuels. The hydrogen energy system has been discussed by many groups (References 1-6). It has been suggested that in the near term hydrogen manufacture should employ coal or lignite as a means of conserving natural gas or petroleum feed stocks. Low Btu coal deposits in remote locations might be converted to substitute natural gas (SNG) or hydrogen and the gas could be transported to distant population centers by pipeline. In the longer term solar or nuclear energy resources might be used to replace fossil fuels now used for industrial hydrogen production. These concepts are of considerable interest to ERDA because of the administration's responsibility of providing RD and D programs directed to reducing the consumption of natural gas and petroleum.

Today large quantities of industrial hydrogen are used in petroleum refining; for the manufacture of ammonia, methanol, and other chemicals; and for many small volume uses such as vegetable oil hydrogenation, metals processing, etc. In the U.S. almost all of the hydrogen for these industrial uses is currently manufactured by steam reforming of a light hydrocarbon such as natural gas or the partial oxidation of a heavy petroleum feed stock. However, small quantities of hydrogen are produced by water electrolysis.

In this study published information has been used:

- to predict the quantities of hydrogen that will be needed in the U.S. during the 1980-2000 period for these current industrial uses;
- to determine the most economic method of hydrogen manufacture during this period;
- to predict the quantities of hydrogen that are likely to be made by the various processes assuming new facilities installed during this period are selected on the basis of their manufacturing costs including return; and
- to identify technology developments that could have a significant impact in reducing the consumption of natural gas and petroleum for hydrogen manufacture during this period.

From this work suggestions have been made regarding programs that ERDA could sponsor as a means of accelerating the use of coal for manufacturing industrial hydrogen during the 1980-2000 period thereby reducing the consumption of natural gas and liquid petroleum feed stocks.

" THIS PAGE IS PURPOSELY LEFT BLANK ".

ABBREVIATIONS/DEFINITIONS/CONVERSION FACTORS

bbl = petroleum barrel, 42 U.S. gallons
 Btu = British thermal unit, 252 g cal
 Heating Value = heat of combustion (gross)
 = 23860 Btu/lb for methane
 = 61100 Btu/lb for hydrogen
 = 4345 Btu/lb for carbon monoxide
 lb = pound, 454 grams
 M = millions (10^6)
 k = thousands (10^3)
 gal = U.S. gallon, 3.785 liters
 resid = petroleum residuum
 CD = calendar days
 SD = stream days
 SCF = standard cubic feet (60°F, 1.0 atm)
 ton or ST = 1.0 U.S. ton, 2000 pounds, 908000 grams

1.0 bbl crude oil = 5.56×10^6 Btu Gross
 1.0 " resid fuel oil = 6.37×10^6 " "
 1.0 " gasoline or naphtha = 4.80×10^6 " "

1.0 Quad = 1.0×10^{15} Btu

1.0 kwhr = 3415 Btu

1.0 MB/D crude oil = 2.0294×10^{15} Btu/year

Hydrogen = 2.016 molecular weight
 = 61100 Btu/lb gross heat of combustion
 = 322 Btu/scf " " " "

Methanol = 6.63 lbs/gal
 = 9760 Btu/lb gross heat of combustion

CONVERSION FACTORS - ENGLISH TO METRIC (SI) UNITS

	<u>English Units</u>	<u>Metric Equivalent</u>
Length	in	2.54 cm
	ft	0.305 m
Area	in ²	6.45 cm ²
	ft ²	0.0930 m ²
Volume	in ³	16.39 cm ³
	ft ³	28.32 l
	US gal	3.785 l
Mass	oz	28.35 g
	lb	453.6 g
	ton (short)	907.2 kg
Pressure	lb/in ²	6.89 kN/m ²
	ft H ₂ O (60°F)	3.38 kN/m ²
Temperature	°F	1.8 (°C) + 32
	°R	1.8°K
Energy	Btu	1.055 kJ
	cal	4.184 J
Power	Btu/s	1.055 kw
	HP	0.746 kw

1. FUTURE U. S. REQUIREMENTS FOR INDUSTRIAL HYDROGEN

Industrial hydrogen is currently used for petroleum refining, for the manufacture of ammonia and methanol and for dozens, possibly hundreds, of other uses including chemical synthesis (chemicals other than ammonia and methanol), metallurgy, semi-conductor manufacture, vegetable oil hydrogenation, etc. Present U. S. consumption of hydrogen for these uses has been estimated to the year 2000.

In addition to the current requirements, new uses for hydrogen will develop in the future for synthetic fuels manufacture, iron ore direct reduction, and possibly as automotive and aircraft fuels. These new uses have not been included in the estimates of future requirements prepared in this study.

Table 1.01 summarizes the future requirements to the year 2000. Current requirements are about 0.58 Quad/yr; by the year 2000 requirements are estimated to be 1.77 Quad/year, an annual growth rate of about 4.5%.

Nearly all industrial hydrogen is currently manufactured in the U. S. using catalytic steam reforming of natural gas or some other light hydrocarbon feed stock. Table 1.01 also shows the natural gas required to produce all current and future U. S. industrial hydrogen requirements assuming all this hydrogen is made by steam reforming. The natural gas feed stock is expressed as crude oil equivalent. Currently (1975) the natural gas requirement is equivalent to 451 thousand B/D of crude. If all the industrial hydrogen required in the year 2000 were produced by reforming the light hydrocarbon feed stock would be equivalent to 1.4 million B/D of crude oil. However, as will be explained in later sections, coal gasification is likely to be used after 1985 for some of this industrial hydrogen production thereby saving natural gas or other hydrocarbon feed stocks.

Future industrial hydrogen requirements were estimated by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in 1975 (Reference 2). Table 1.02 compares the JPL estimates with those prepared in this study. The two estimates agree reasonably well for the hydrogen required for petroleum refining; however, the JPL estimates are substantially higher than those from this study for the other hydrogen requirements.

Hydrogen for Petroleum Refining

The quantity of hydrogen required for petroleum refining depends on the quantity of crude oil processed in U. S. refineries, the quality of the crudes processed, the type of processing used and the product slate required.

Future crude oil requirements have been prepared by several groups (References 7, 8, 9, and 10). The estimates prepared by Exxon Co. USA (Reference 9) and Texaco, Inc. (Reference 10) have been used as the basis of the data developed in this study.

Future U. S. energy requirements to the year 2000 are shown in Table 1.03. Total U. S. energy consumption increased by about 4.0%/year during the 1960-73 period. Future growth rates will be less than this because of the higher current and future prices of energy products and the resulting conservation and efficiency improvement measures. These projected growth rates are as follows:

1974-80	- 2.1%/yr.
1980-90	- 2.8%/yr.
1990-2000	- 2.1%/yr.

Nuclear energy will be the most rapidly growing segment in the future. It will grow from 1.2 Quad/yr. in 1974 to 34.5 Quad/yr in the year 2000, an average growth rate over this period of about 14%/yr.

Natural gas supplies from various domestic and foreign sources were 23.5 Quad/yr in 1974 and are expected to decrease to 19.2 Quad/yr in 1980. Gas requirements will remain about constant during the period 1980-2000 and are estimated to be 18.1 Quad/yr in the year 2000.

Coal provided 14.8 Quad/year or 19% of the total U. S. energy requirements in 1974. Coal consumption is expected to increase to 18.2 Quad/year in 1980 and to 32.1 Quad/year by the year 2000; it will then provide 23% of the total energy requirements.

Table 1.03 also shows forecasts of projected U. S. requirements for oil. Liquid petroleum will remain the leading source of energy for the U. S. throughout this period. This component will increase from 34 Quad/year in 1974 to 41.3 Quad/year in 1980 and 50.3 Quad/year by the year 2000. However, oil's share of the total energy supply will decrease from 44% in 1974 to 36% in the year 2000.

Table 1.04 shows projected U. S. supplies of liquid petroleum and synthetic crudes. U. S. crude oil production has decreased slightly since 1970 and this trend is expected to continue until about 1980. At this time crude production from the Alaskan North Slope will begin to increase overall U. S. production. By the late 1980's crude production should again reach the levels achieved in the early 1970's assuming additional reserves are discovered as expected. Over half of the U. S. crude production in 1990 must come from as yet undiscovered reserves. Energy supplied by crude oil will reach its peak about 1990. Thereafter its availability is expected to decrease in the U. S. and in the world as a whole.

Synthetic crudes produced from shales and coal are expected to be of little significance prior to about 1990. In that year synthetic crude production should be about 0.7 million B/D or 3% of the total U. S. liquid petroleum supply. Thereafter synthetic liquid production should increase rapidly to about 3.0 million B/D or 13% of the U. S. liquid supply by the year 2000. Beyond the year 2000 synthetic crude will increase significantly as crude oil reserves are depleted.

The difference between U. S. liquid petroleum demand and U. S. crude production will be provided by imported crude and products. These data are also shown in Table 1.04. By 1980 imported crude and products will be about 10.7 million B/D or 41.3% of the total supply. Imports will grow to 12.5 million B/D (49.9% of total) by 1990 and will then start to decline reaching 11.0 million B/D (50.3% of total) by the year 2000.

In recent years, the use of hydrogen has become increasingly more important in petroleum refining mainly because crude supplies have become heavier and of higher sulfur content, and the economic need to reduce resid fuel oil yields. In addition, stringent environmental restrictions requiring lower sulfur content products have accelerated the use of hydrogen processing.

Hydrogen is used principally for the hydrodesulfurization of petroleum streams and also for hydrocracking of heavy hydrocarbons, a process that produces high quality gasoline components by the cracking of heavy oils in the presence of hydrogen. Until recent years, most hydrogen consumption has been for the desulfurization of light distillate streams (650°F-). In general, these processes require little hydrogen ranging from about 10-20 SCF/B for light naphthas up to 100-200 SCF/B for the heavier distillates. Hydrogen demand for these processes has in the past, and will in the future, be provided by the hydrogen produced in catalytic reformers that are used to increase the octane number of motor gasoline. Hydrogen, a by-product from these reformers, is typically of 70-80% purity but is satisfactory for desulfurizing distillate stocks.

The development of hydrocracking processes, heavy gas oil desulfurization, and residuum desulfurization brought in refining processes requiring large volumes of high purity hydrogen (95%+). Hydrogen consumption for these processes ranges from approximately 300 SCF/B for light gas oil desulfurization to 3000 SCF/B for severe hydrocracking. Because of their high hydrogen consumption and their requirement for high purity hydrogen, hydrocrackers and heavy oil desulfurization processes are usually installed with their own hydrogen generation facilities. The hydrogen is produced by either steam reforming of natural gas or some other light hydrocarbon or partial oxidation of resid, although most of this hydrogen is produced in steam reformers.

Future hydrogen requirements were estimated assuming hydrogen required for hydrocracking, gas oil desulfurization, and residuum desulfurization would be specifically manufactured for these processes and that all hydrogen produced by catalytic reforming for octane improvement is consumed by distillate reforming and other miscellaneous consumers and would not be replaced by hydrogen generated from non-petroleum sources.

Projected crude runs, product slates, and processing requirements were estimated through the year 2000. These data are shown in Tables 1.04 and 1.05. Between 1977 and 2000 there is a marked increase in residuum processing requirements due to an overall increase in crude runs, a declining market for heavy fuel oils, and also from some "heavying up" of the crude slate.

Two alternative processing routes are available for processing residuum and the choice has significant effects on refinery hydrogen requirements. Residuum processes can be characterized as either carbon removal processes, e.g. coking, or hydrogen addition processes, i.e. hydrocracking. The hydrocracking alternative obviously requires much greater quantities of refinery hydrogen (Reference 21).

The choice between these two alternative processing methods depends on specific economic factors, and such an evaluation of the alternatives is beyond the scope of this study. The estimated processing requirements developed in this study assumed coking as the most economical residuum conversion process. The reasons for this choice are discussed in Reference 21. This will, of course, give lower hydrogen requirements than would be required if extensive hydrocracking were utilized. As a sensitivity, an additional case was estimated for the year 2000 in which hydrocracking was used instead of coking to provide the required product slate. This case is also shown on Table 1.05 and would result in the maximum anticipated hydrogen demand.

Future hydrogen requirements were estimated from the processing requirements shown on Table 1.05 by using typical hydrogen consumption figures for the various processes given in Table 1.06. The hydrogen consumption figures allow for theoretical hydrogen consumption and typically 20% additional for hydrogen purge required to maintain a high hydrogen purity in the process. If the hydrogen is produced by steam reforming, the purge can efficiently be used as part of the feed stream to the reformer. If hydrogen is provided from external sources, the purge would be burned as refinery fuel.

Table 1.07 lists the estimated refinery hydrogen requirements through the year 2000 and the crude oil equivalent of the natural gas feed required to produce this hydrogen by steam reforming. While liquid petroleum feed stock is usually not used as feed or fuel in hydrogen manufacture, reducing hydrogen production would release an equivalent amount of refinery fuel gas or naphtha for alternative use in the refinery and this would result in a reduction in crude requirements. The study shows refinery hydrogen consumption increasing from 0.17 Quad/year in 1977 to 0.56 Quad/year in 2000, if the coking processing sequence is utilized. If hydrocracking is utilized for residuum conversion, the hydrogen required by 2000 would be 1.5 Quad/year.

The hydrogen requirement of 0.17 Quad/year estimated for the year 1977 agrees well with published information on hydrogen producing capacity in U. S. refineries. As of January 1976, the U. S. capacity totaled 0.16 Quad/year with most of this being supplied by steam reforming of methane. Table 1.14 lists existing U. S. refinery hydrogen plants.

If all of the hydrogen required for processing heavy oils were supplied from non-petroleum sources, this would reduce crude imports in the year 2000 by 394,000 B/D assuming coking is employed for residuum processing. If hydrogen treating were employed, crude imports could be reduced by 1,161,000 B/D. These quantities of crude correspond to 4-11% of the projected crude imports in the year 2000. However, this does not

suggest that substitution of non-petroleum hydrogen for petroleum produced hydrogen is economically attractive. The economics of hydrogen production are discussed in Section 3. Non-petroleum sources of hydrogen do, though, offer potential means of reducing imported crude if hydrogen can be produced economically.

The production cost of hydrogen by coal gasification is discussed in Section 3. Since the cost varies substantially from one geographical area to another, the refinery hydrogen requirements in various geographical areas are needed to determine the quantities of refinery hydrogen that possibly could be produced by coal gasification. The data in Table 1.08 show the projected crude runs in these four geographical areas: East Coast, Midcontinent, Gulf Coast and the West Coast and Mountain areas. This table also shows the hydrogen requirements per barrel of crude for each area based on the anticipated quality of crude for each area. The table then shows the hydrogen requirements for each of the four geographical areas. In the year 2000, about 12% of the refinery hydrogen will be needed at East Coast refineries, 24% at Midcontinent refineries, 42% at Gulf Coast refineries, and 22% at the refineries on the West Coast and in the Mountain area.

Ammonia Requirements

Table 1.09 presents estimates of U. S. ammonia requirements for the period 1970-2000. These data have been prepared by Chem Systems Inc. and are from Reference 11, page 101. The hydrogen requirements are the stoichiometric quantity of hydrogen (17.8 wt%) contained in ammonia.

Essentially all, if not all, of the current U. S. ammonia capacity employs catalytic steam reforming of natural gas as the hydrogen manufacturing process. The natural gas required for feed stock plus fuel for the manufacture of these quantities of ammonia are shown. These natural gas requirements have been converted to crude oil equivalent using the gross heat of combustion for both fuels.

These estimates of future ammonia requirements are similar to those made in unrelated, independent studies. Growth rates for the 1970-80 and 1980-2000 periods are also shown in Table 1.09 for each of the main ammonia consumption sectors.

About 75% of the total ammonia production was used for fertilizer in 1970. This sector is estimated to grow at 2.9%/year during the 1980-2000 period. The other sectors will have growth rates in the range of 5.4%/year (explosives) and 3.5%/year (all other uses). Overall, the growth rate will be 3.4%/year during the period.

U. S. ammonia plants are listed in Table 1.15 by owner, location, and 1976 capacity. The new plants which have been announced have been added to show capacity in 1980. However, the 1980 capacity has not been adjusted for the shut down of old, obsolete plants since such shutdowns are seldom announced prior to the date of actual shutdown.

Ammonia plants built outside the U. S. using coal gasification as the source of hydrogen are listed in Table 1.16.

Methanol Requirements

Table 1.10 shows current and future U. S. methanol requirements for the 1970-2000 period. These data have been prepared by Chem Systems, Inc. and are presented on page 102 of Reference 11. These estimates are similar to those made by other groups which are not published in the open literature. These data include only the methanol required for the manufacture of various chemicals. They do not include future new uses of methanol as a fuel which have been suggested by various groups.

Essentially all current U. S. methanol plants employ steam reforming of natural gas for synthesis gas manufacture. The "hydrogen equivalent" numbers shown in Table 1.10 are the stoichiometric hydrogen contained in the methanol molecule (12.6 wt%). The natural gas feed stock plus fuel requirements have been converted to crude oil equivalent using the gross heat of combustion for both fuels.

The growth rate for these chemical uses of methanol is expected to average overall about 7.7%/year during the 1970-80 period and 5.4%/year during the 1980-2000 period. Formaldehyde manufacture accounts for about 41% of the total methanol consumption and this segment is expected to grow at 5.9%/year during the 1980-2000 period. Dimethyl terephthalate, a monomer used in synthetic fiber manufacture, and methyl methacrylate, a monomer used in plastics manufacture, are also important methanol consumers.

U. S. methanol manufacturing plants are shown in Table 1.17 by owner, location, and 1976 capacity. Announced capacity additions are also shown. However, current plants that are likely to be shut down are not identified because such shutdowns are seldom announced.

Requirements for Small Uses

In addition to the three major industrial uses (refinery hydrogen, ammonia and methanol manufacture) hydrogen is used for dozens, possibly hundreds of small uses such as chemicals synthesis, metallurgical processing, reducing gas blanketing, semi-conductor and electronic component manufacturing, and vegetable oil hydrogenation (Reference 2). It is beyond the scope of this study to identify all these uses and to indicate the current quantity of hydrogen that is required for each. However, the sum of all these small uses constitutes a major hydrogen market, and the total quantity of hydrogen required for this category has been developed.

The uses for hydrogen in chemical processing other than for the manufacture of ammonia and methanol include the following:

- cyclohexane production by benzene hydrogenation
- benzene production by toluene hydrodialkylation
- production of hexamethylenediamine
- production of toluene diamine
- production of oxo chemicals
- processing of non-edible fats and oils
- processing of edible fats and oils
- production of aniline
- production of hydrogen peroxide

- production of tetrahydrofuran
- production of soribitol
- production of furfuryl alcohol
- production of fatty alcohols
- production of fatty amines

Non-chemical uses for hydrogen include the following:

- pharmaceuticals manufacture
- hydrogenation of fats and oils
- liquid hydrogen for space vehicle engines and the testing of these engines
- welding and cutting
- direct reduction of ores (iron, tungsten, molybdenum)
- production of sintered metal parts
- cooling medium in electric generators, large electric motors, and frequency generators
- reducing atmosphere for fabrication of electronic components
- reducing gas atmosphere in float glass manufacture
- liquid hydrogen in bubble chambers for nuclear research

Hydrogen used to supply these chemical and other small uses is now made mostly by the catalytic steam reforming of natural gas or some alternate light hydrocarbon feed stock although some of it is produced by electrolysis. Most of the hydrogen consumed for these uses is produced on site but some of it is purchased by the consumer from a producer or distributor and is obtained either by pipeline delivery or by truck delivery as cylinder hydrogen or as liquid hydrogen.

Many of these small uses require high purity hydrogen (99.9%+) and a few of them require ultra-high purity (99.999%+). The highest purity hydrogen is made by molecular sieve processing of reformer hydrogen. Hydrogen purity is of critical importance in vegetable oil processing and the manufacture of semi-conductors and other electronic components.

Data on the small uses of hydrogen are compiled by the Bureau of Census, U. S. Department of Commerce (Reference 12). Data used in these Bureau of Census reports covers well over 98% (possibly over 99%) of the total consumption of hydrogen for these small uses.

The Bureau of Census data for the years 1960 through 1970 are shown in Table 1.11. The total quantity of hydrogen consumed is broken down into that produced by electrolysis and that produced by all other procedures, mainly natural gas or light hydrocarbon steam reforming. The shipments (hydrogen other than that consumed on site) is also shown by the electrolytic and all other categories. Data for the 1960-70 period includes hydrogen of "lower purity," 70-75% of which was used for petroleum refining. These data include the dollar value of the shipments which permits the calculation of the value of shipments as \$/MBtu.

In 1970 the Bureau of Census changed the format of the small use hydrogen report to provide the data shown in Table 1.12. The revised format does not include either the low purity hydrogen used for petroleum

refining or the data to indicate the production method. However, the revised report includes data to show the method of delivery; e.g., consumed in production plant, shipped by pipeline, and shipped in cylinders or as a liquid. The value of the pipeline and cylinder plus liquid shipments is also shown.

Table 1.13 summarizes these Census Bureau Reports for the 16 year period, 1960-75. These data are plotted in Figure 1.01. The data in Table 1.13 and Figure 1.01 exclude the low purity hydrogen used for petroleum refining shown in the Bureau of Census reports for 1960-1970.

During the 1963-68 period a substantial amount of liquid hydrogen was used in testing liquid hydrogen powered engines for space vehicles. Hydrogen required for this program decreased substantially after 1968.

Table 1.13 also includes a forecast of future small uses requirements to the year 2000 assuming the annual growth rate of this category is 5%/year. These data are further summarized as follows:

<u>Hydrogen Required for All Small Uses</u>					
Year	1975	1980	1985	1990	2000
Hydrogen, Quad/year	24	31	40	51	83
Hydrocarbon feed stock Stock required if all were produced by reforming kB/CD	14	21	28	35	56

Data shown in Table 1.11 indicate that the price of purchased "high purity" hydrogen during the 1960-1970 period increased from \$3.49 to \$5.46/MBtu. The price of purchased cylinder and liquid hydrogen (shown in Table 1.12) increased from \$11.07/MBtu in 1970 to \$20.09/MBtu in 1975.

Table 1.01

Summary of U. S. Industrial Hydrogen Requirements, 1975-2000
and Natural Gas Feed Stock Required to Produce this
Hydrogen by Steam Reforming

Year	<u>1975</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>
<u>Hydrogen Required Quads/Year</u>					
For petroleum refining	0.15	0.21	0.28	0.38	0.56
For ammonia	0.35	0.46	0.55	0.66	0.90
For methanol	0.06	0.08	0.11	0.14	0.23
For all small uses	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>0.05</u>	<u>0.08</u>
Total	0.58	0.78	0.98	1.23	1.77
<u>Natural Gas Feed Stock Required to Produce, kB/D Crude Equivalent</u>					
Hydrogen for petroleum refining	106	147	197	267	394
Ammonia	268	357	427	511	700
Methanol	63	87	118	155	251
Hydrogen for all small uses	<u>14</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>56</u>
Total	451	612	770	968	1401

Table 1.02

Comparison of Future Industrial Hydrogen Requirements
Estimated in this Study with Those Prepared by
Jet Propulsion Laboratory

Data are Quads/Year of Hydrogen

<u>Year</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>2000</u>
<u>Estimates from this Study</u>			
For petroleum refining	0.15	0.28	0.56
For ammonia	0.35	0.55	0.90
For methanol	0.06	0.11	0.23
For all miscellaneous other uses	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>0.08</u>
Total	0.58	0.98	1.77
<u>Estimates by Jet Propulsion Laboratory (Ref. 2)</u>			
For petroleum refining	0.14	0.35	0.55
For ammonia	0.41	0.73	1.73
For methanol and all other uses	<u>0.13</u>	<u>0.23</u>	<u>0.64</u>
Total	0.68	1.31	2.92

TABLE 1.03

U.S. Energy Demand, 1974-2000

All data are Quads (10^{15} Btu) per year

Year	1974 Actual	1980	1985	1990	2000
Gas	23.5	19.2	19.4	19.6	18.1
Oil	34.0	41.3	44.4	49.9	50.3
Coal	14.8	18.2	20.9	23.6	32.1
Hydro, geothermal, solar	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.7	5.7
Nuclear	1.2	4.7	10.1	17.6	34.5
Total	76.8	86.9	98.5	114.4	140.7

These data were derived from References 9 and 10.

TABLE 1.04

U.S. Liquid Petroleum Supply, 1980-2000

All data are Million B/CD

Year	1980	1985	1990	2000
Domestic crude oils	8.4	9.5	10.3	10.0
Imported crudes	7.4	6.6	8.8	8.0
Synthetic crudes	-	0.3	0.7	3.0
Total crude processed	15.8	16.4	19.8	21.0
Domestic natural gas liquids	1.2	1.0	0.9	0.8
Total refinery feed stocks	17.0	17.4	20.7	21.8
Imported refined products	3.3	4.4	3.7	3.0
Total liquid petroleum supply	20.3	21.8	24.4	24.8
Imported crude + imported products	10.7	11.0	12.5	11.0
Imported crude and products, % of total liquids	52.7	50.5	51.2	44.4
Total liquid petroleum supply, Quad/yr	41.3	44.4	49.9	50.3

These data were derived from Reference 9.

TABLE 1.05

U.S. Refining Processing Requirements, 1977-2000

All data are million B/CD for U.S. industry

Year	1977	1980	1985	1990	2000 Most Likely	2000* Alternate
Primary distillation	14.5	15.8	16.3	19.8	21.0	21.0
Catalytic cracking	5.3	5.4	5.5	5.8	5.6	5.6
Catalytic reforming	3.4	3.2	4.9	5.0	5.5	5.5
Coking	0.6	0.8	1.3	2.1	3.2	0.6
Gas oil desulfurization	0	1.2	1.9	3.2	5.5	4.6
Residuum hydrocracking	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.1	4.8
Resid desulfurization	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	1.9

*Based on maximum residuum hydroprocessing.

TABLE 1.06

Hydrogen Consumption in Refining Processes

<u>Process</u>	<u>Hydrogen Consumption SCF/Bbl</u>
Naphtha hydrotreating	10-50
Distillate hydrotreating	50-250
Heavy oil hydrotreating	300-750
Residuum hydrotreating	650-1600
Residuum hydrocracking	1500-3000
Catalytic reforming	(800-1200)*

*Hydrogen production

TABLE 1.07

U.S. Refinery Hydrogen Requirements, 1977-2000

Year	1977	1980	1985	1990	2000 Most Likely	2000 (1) Alternate
Hydrogen Consumed, Million SCF/CD for						
Gas oil desulfurization	--	424	672	1127	1925	1610
Resid desulfurization	120	210	210	385	600	2850
Resid hydrocracking	1265	1150	1522	1746	2200	9600
Total	1385	1784	2404	3258	4725	14060
Total, Quad/yr	0.17	0.21	0.28	0.38	0.56	1.65
Crude oil equivalent of feed stock required to produce this total quantity of hydrogen, kB/CD (2)	120	147	197	267	394	1161

(1) Based on maximum residuum hydroprocessing.

(2) Assuming 70% thermal efficiency for hydrogen manufacture

TABLE 1.08

U.S. Crude Runs and Hydrogen Requirements by Geographical Area

Year	1976	1980	1985	1990	2000
<u>Crude Runs by Geographical Area, MB/CD</u>					
East Coast	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.5	2.6
Midcontinent	4.0	4.3	4.3	5.2	5.4
Gulf Coast	6.8	7.3	7.5	8.9	9.4
West Coast + Mountain	3.2	3.4	3.5	4.1	4.4
Total U.S.	15.9	17.0	17.4	20.7	21.8
<u>Hydrogen Required, SCF/Bbl</u>					
East Coast	63	80	114	136	210
Midcontinent	40	63	109	135	210
Gulf Coast	48	71	112	137	210
West Coast + Mountain	243	244	243	243	243
Total U.S. (average)	87	105	138	157	217
<u>Required Hydrogen, MSCF/CD</u>					
East Coast	120	160	240	340	545
Midcontinent	160	270	470	700	1135
Gulf Coast	325	520	840	1220	1975
West Coast + Mountain	780	830	850	1000	1070
Total U.S.	1385	1780	2400	3260	4725

TABLE 1.09

U.S. Ammonia Requirements

Year	1970	1975	1980	1990	2000
<u>Million ST/yr of NH₃ for</u>					
Fertilizer	10.3	11.2	15.0	20.4	26.6
Synthetic fibers and plastics	0.9	1.8	2.6	4.1	6.4
Explosives	0.5	0.6	0.7	1.2	2.0
Livestock feed	0.4	0.7	1.1	2.0	3.0
All other uses	1.6	1.7	1.9	2.8	3.8
TOTAL	13.7	16.0	21.3	30.5	41.8
Hydrogen equivalent, Quad/yr	0.295	0.345	0.459	0.658	0.901
Natural gas feed required, Quad/yr	0.465	0.544	0.724	1.037	1.421
" " " " , MB/CD crude oil equivalent	0.229	0.268	0.357	0.511	0.700

<u>Growth Rates, %/yr</u>	<u>1970-80</u>	<u>1980-2000</u>
Fertilizer	3.8	2.9
Synthetic fibers & plastics	11.2	4.6
Explosives	3.4	5.4
Livestock feed	10.7	5.1
All other uses	1.7	3.5
TOTAL	4.5	3.4

Data from Reference 11, page 101. In this reference the data are erroneously reported as billion pounds per year. They should be labeled million ST/year.

TABLE 1.10

U.S. Methanol Requirements

Current Chemical Uses Only

Year	1970	1975	1980	1990	2000
<u>Million Gallons Per Year for</u>					
formaldehyde	313	440	640	1210	2020
dimethylterephthalate	95	170	260	640	1200
methyl amines	32	45	65	100	140
methyl halides	24	31	45	60	80
methyl methacrylate	25	35	50	100	170
solvents	42	50	60	80	110
acetic acid	32	80	130	210	280
miscellaneous	202	299	350	450	600
TOTAL	765	1150	1600	2850	4600
Total, million ST/yr	2.54	3.81	5.30	9.45	15.25
Hydrogen equivalent, Quad/yr	0.039	0.058	0.081	0.144	0.233
Natural gas feed required, Quad/yr	0.085	0.127	0.177	0.315	0.510
" " " " , MB/D oil equiv.	0.042	0.063	0.087	0.155	0.251

<u>Growth Rates, %/yr</u>	<u>1970-80</u>	<u>1980-2000</u>
formaldehyde	7.4	5.9
dimethylterephthalate	10.6	3.2
methyl amines	7.3	3.9
methyl halides	6.5	2.9
methyl methacrylate	7.2	6.3
solvents	3.6	3.1
acetic acid	15.0	3.9
miscellaneous	5.7	2.7
TOTAL	7.7	5.4

Data from Reference 11, page 102.

TABLE 1.11

U.S. Small Uses Hydrogen Market 1960-70 (Page 1 of 2)⁽¹⁾

Year	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
<u>Hydrogen Production, Million SCF/yr.</u> ⁽²⁾						
Electrolytic	10292	10535	11086	12553	12593	12813
Other high purity	<u>2986</u>	<u>2932</u>	<u>4251</u>	<u>10114</u>	<u>13022</u>	<u>17301</u>
Total high purity	13278	13467	15337	22667	25615	30114
Lower purity	<u>51958</u>	<u>51768</u>	<u>57721</u>	<u>72941</u>	<u>82355</u>	<u>91521</u>
Total hydrogen consumption	65236	65235	73058	95608	107970	121635
<u>Shipments, Million SCF/yr.</u>						
Electrolytic	7804	7814	*	*	*	8496
Other high purity	<u>327</u>	<u>315</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>14364</u>
Total high purity	8131	8129	9284	15656	18548	22860
Lower purity	<u>3751</u>	<u>3472</u>	<u>3294</u>	<u>4292</u>	<u>4997</u>	<u>3112</u>
Total hydrogen shipments	11882	11601	12578	19948	23545	25977
<u>Value of Shipments, \$/MBtu</u>						
Electrolytic hydrogen	3.51	3.78	*	*	*	2.78
Other high purity	2.86	3.41	*	*	*	6.22
Total high purity	3.49	3.77	4.90	4.75	5.60	4.94
Lower purity	1.12	1.07	0.81	0.75	0.89	0.99
Total hydrogen shipments	2.74	2.96	3.83	3.89	4.60	4.48

* Not available

TABLE 1.11

U.S. Small Uses Hydrogen Market (1960-70) (Page 2 of 2)

Year	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
<u>Hydrogen Production, Million SCF/yr.</u> ⁽¹⁾					
Electrolytic	13709	14374	13656	14444	11534
Other high purity	21785	19714	21043	17756	17357
Total high purity	35494	34088	34699	32180	28891
Lower purity	102225	124451	167053	32641	30763
Total hydrogen consumption	137719	158539	201752	64821	59654
<u>Shipments, Million SCF/yr.</u>					
Electrolytic	9446	9693	9359	10202	7265
Other high purity	18403	15914	16228	12876	11831
Total high purity	27849	25607	25587	23078	19096
Lower purity	2800	2059	2668	2378	1844
Total hydrogen shipments	30649	27666	28255	25456	20940
<u>Value of Shipments, \$/MBtu</u>					
Electrolytic hydrogen	3.56	3.51	3.28	2.99	4.02
Other high purity	5.09	5.16	4.99	6.38	6.34
Total high purity	4.57	4.53	4.37	4.88	5.46
Lower purity	0.92	1.05	0.95	1.04	1.46
Total hydrogen shipments	4.24	4.27	4.04	4.52	5.10

Note 1 Data from Bureau of Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Reference 12

Note 2 These data are for all hydrogen produced and consumed in the U.S., except that used for fuel, vented, used in the manufacture of ammonia and methanol, and for petroleum refining. Part (70 to 75%) of the lower purity hydrogen shown herein for years through 1969 was used in petroleum refining.

TABLE 1.12

U.S. Small Uses Hydrogen Market 1971-75⁽¹⁾

Year	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
<u>Hydrogen Production, Million SCF/yr.</u> ⁽²⁾					
Consumed in production plant	38015	40596	46093	52221	45890
Shipped by pipeline	12312	13539	13416	21860	20780
Shipped in cylinders and as liquid	<u>5311</u>	<u>4755</u>	<u>5659</u>	<u>7455</u>	<u>6882</u>
Total	55639	58890	65168	81536	73552
<u>Value of Shipments, \$/MBtu</u>					
Shipped by pipeline	3.05	2.51	2.41	2.99	3.42
Shipment in cylinders and as liquid	11.07	12.30	14.86	21.56	20.09
Total shipments	5.48	5.10	6.09	7.71	7.76

Note 1 Data from Bureau of Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Reference 12

Note 2 These data are for all hydrogen produced and consumed in the U.S., except that used for fuel, vented, used in the manufacture of ammonia and methanol, and for petroleum refining.

TABLE 1.13

Summary of U.S. Small Uses Hydrogen Market, 1960-75⁽¹⁾data are MBtu/yr. x 10⁶

<u>Year</u>	<u>Produced by Electrolysis</u>	<u>Other High Purity</u>	<u>25% of Low Purity</u>	<u>Consumed on site</u>	<u>Shipped by Pipeline</u>	<u>Shipped as Liquid or Cylinders</u>	<u>Total Small User Market</u>
1960	3.4	1.0	4.3	-	-	-	8.7
1961	3.5	1.0	4.3	-	-	-	8.8
1962	3.7	1.4	4.8	-	-	-	9.9
1963	4.2	3.3	6.0	-	-	-	13.5
1964	4.2	4.3	6.8	-	-	-	15.3
1965	4.2	5.7	7.6	-	-	-	17.5
1966	4.5	7.2	8.5	-	-	-	20.2
1967	4.8	6.5	10.3	-	-	-	21.6
1968	4.5	7.0	13.8	-	-	-	25.3
1969	4.8	5.9	10.8	-	-	-	21.5
1970	3.8	5.8	10.2	-	-	-	19.8
1971	-	-	-	12.6	4.1	1.8	18.5
1972	-	-	-	13.4	4.5	1.6	19.5
1973	-	-	-	15.3	4.4	1.9	21.6
1974	-	-	-	17.3	7.2	2.5	27.0
1975	-	-	-	15.2	6.9	2.3	24.4
1980		5%/yr. growth rate					31
1985		5%/yr. growth rate					40
1990		5%/yr. growth rate					51
1995		5%/yr. growth rate					65
2000		5%/yr. growth rate					83

(1) Data from Bureau of Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Reference 12.

FIGURE 1.01

U.S. Small Uses Hydrogen Market

1960-75

Data from Bureau of Census,
U.S. Dept. of Commerce

TABLE 1.14

(Page 1 of 2)

U.S. Refinery Hydrogen Plants as of January, 1976

<u>Company</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Capacity, MSCF/SD</u>	<u>Process Type</u>
Apco Oil Corp.	Arkansas City, Kan.	4.2	1
Atlantic Richfield	Carson, Cal.	50.0	1
	Philadelphia, Pa.	45.0	1
	Cherry Point, Wash.	60.0	1
Exxon	Benicia, Cal.	104.0	1
	Billings, Mont.	16.7	4
Cross Oil & Ref. Co.	Smackover, Ark.	2.9	1
Gary Western Co.	Fruita, Col.	1.0	1
Getty Oil	Delaware City, Del.	72.0	1
Gulf Oil	Sante Fe Springs, Cal.	12.0	4
	Port Arthur, Tex.	28.0	1
Kerr McGee	Wynnewood, Okla.	9.5	1
Marathon	Robinson, Ill.	25.0	1
Mobil	Torrence, Cal.	55.0	1
	Beaumont, Tex.	60.0	1
Quacker State	Newell, W. Vir.	1.2	1
Shell	Martinez, Cal.	65.0	1
	Wood River, Ill.	57.0	1
	Norco, La.	51.0	1
	Deer Park, Tex.	71.0	1
Standard Oil, Cal.	El Segundo, Cal.	67.5	2
	El Segundo, Cal.	57.5	3
	Richmond, Cal.	135.0	2
	Barkers Point, Ha.	2.5	1
Standard Oil, Kentucky	Pascagoula, Miss.	109.0	2
Standard Oil, Ohio	Toledo, Ohio	24.0	1
Sun Oil	Duncan, Okla.	50.0	1

TABLE 1.14

(Page 2 of 2)

<u>Company</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Capacity, MSCF/SD</u>	<u>Process Type*</u>
Tenneco	Chalmette, La.	22.0	1
Texaco	Wilmington, Cal.	48.0	3
Toscopetro Corp.	Bakersfield, Cal.	20.0	1
Union Oil	Los Angeles, Cal.	49.4	1
	Rode, Cal.	70.0	1
Total Capacity. MSCF/D		1445.4	

* Process Type

- 1 - Methane Steam Reforming
- 2 - Naphtha Steam Reforming
- 3 - Partial Oxidation
- 4 - Other

(1) Reference: Oil & Gas Journal, Vol. 74, No. 13, 3-29-76.

TABLE 1.15

(Page 1 of 4)

U.S. Ammonia Capacity, 1976-80

Company	Location	Capacity K ST/yr of NH ₃	
		1976	1980
Agrico Chemical Co.	Blytheville, Ark.	349	349
" " "	Donaldsonville, La.	349	772
" " "	Tulsa, Okla.	423	845
Air Products & Chemicals, Inc.	New Orleans, La.	230	313
" " " "	Pensacola, Fla.	90	90
Allied Chemical Corp.	Geismar, La.	329	329
" " "	Hopewell, Va.	329	329
" " "	La Platte, Neb.	203	203
" " "	South Point, Ohio	135	135
American Cyanamid Co.	Fortier, La.	348	348
Amoco International Oil Co.	Texas City, Tex.	769	769
Apache Powder Co.	Benson, Ari.	15	15
Atlas Powder Co.	Joplin, Mo.	134	134
Baker Industries Corp.	Carlsbad, N.M.	199	342
" " "	Conda, Idaho	99	99
Borden Chemical Co.	Geismar, La.	329	329
CF Industries, Inc.	Donaldsonville, La.	658	1051
" " "	Fremont, Neb.	40	40
" " "	Terre Haute, Ind.	115	115
Cherokee Nitrogen	Pryor, Okla.	52	52
Chevron Chemical Co.	Ft. Madison, Iowa	99	99
" " "	Pascagoula, Miss.	494	494
" " "	Richmond, Cal.	118	118
Collier Carbon & Chemical Co.	Kenai, Alaska	519	1013
" " " "	Wilmington, Cal.	259	259
Columbia Nitrogen Corp.	Augusta, Ga.	118	614
Cominco American Inc.	Borger, Tex.	399	399
Commercial Solvents Corp.	Sterlington, La.	342	342
Co-op Farm Chemical Association	Lawrence, Kan.	328	328

TABLE 1.15

(Page 2 of 4)

U.S. Ammonia Capacity, 1976-80

Company	Location	Capacity K ST/yr of NH ₃	
		1976	1980
Diamond Shamrock Corp.	Sumray, Tex.	161	161
Dow Chemical Co.	Freeport, Tex.	115	115
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours	Beaumont, Tex.	329	329
" " " " " "	Belle, W. Va.	329	329
" " " " " "	Victoria, Tex.	99	99
El Paso Products Co.	Odessa, Tex.	108	108
Farmers Chemical Association, Inc.	Tunis, N.C.	198	198
" " " " " "	Tyner, Tenn.	149	149
Farmers National Chemical Inc.	Plainview, Tex.	60	60
Farmland Industries	Alexandria, La.	--	424
" "	Dodge City, Kan.	198	198
" "	Enid, Okla.	396	820
" "	Ft. Dodge, Iowa	198	198
" "	Hastings, Neb.	122	122
Fremont Oil Co.	Olean, N.Y.	79	79
FIRSTMISS INC.	Ft. Madison, Iowa	354	354
FMC Corp.	Charleston, W. Va.	20	20
Frontier Chemical Co.	Wichita, Kan.	23	33
Gardiner Inc.	Helena, Ark.	198	198
" "	Tampa, Fla.	130	130
Goodpasture Inc.	Dimit, Tex.	70	70
W. R. Grace, Inc.	Big Spring, Tex.	88	88
" " " " " "	Memphis, Tenn.	329	329
Grun Valley Chemical Corp.	Criston, Iowa	35	35
Hawkeye Chemical Co.	Clinton, Iowa	132	132
Hercules, Inc.	Hercules, Cal.	70	70
" "	Louisiana, Mo.	70	70
Hooker Chemical Corp.	Tacoma, Wash.	21	21

TABLE 1.15

(Page 3 of 4)

U.S. Ammonia Capacity, 1976-80

Company	Location	Capacity K ST/yr of NH ₃	
		1976	1980
International Mineral & Chemical Corp., Inc.	Sterlington, La.	--	379
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp.	Savannah, Ga.	214	214
Mississippi Chemical Co.	Pascagoula, Miss.	181	181
" " "	not avail.	--	379
" " "	Yazoo City, Miss.	388	388
Mobil Chemical Co.	Beaumont, Tex.	290	290
Monsanto Co.	El Dorado, Ark.	230	230
" "	Luling, La.	437	839
New Jersey Zinc Co.	Palmerton, Pa.	32	32
Nipak Inc.	Kerens, Tex.	106	106
" "	Pryor, Okla.	99	99
Occidental Chemical Co.	Lathrop, Cal.	169	169
" " "	Plainview, Tex.	52	52
" " "	Taft, La.	110	110
Oklahoma Nitrogen Co.	Woodward, Okla.	--	396
Olin Corp.	Lake Charles, La.	460	460
Pennsalt Chemicals Inc.	Portland, Ore.	7	7
Pennzoil Chemicals Inc.	Hanford, Cal.	40	40
Phillips Pacific Chemical Co.	Kennewick, Wash.	150	150
Phillips Petroleum Co.	Pasadena, Tex.	227	227
" " "	Beatrice, Neb.	209	209
PPC Industries	Natrium, W. Va.	47	47
Reichold Chemicals Co.	St. Helens, Ore.	83	83
Rohm and Haas Co.	Deer Park, Tex.	91	91
J. R. Simplot and Co.	Pocatello, Idaho	104	104
St. Paul Ammonia Products Inc.	East Dubuque, Ill.	230	230

TABLE 1.15

(Page 4 of 4)

U.S. Ammonia Capacity, 1976-80

<u>Company</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Capacity K ST/yr of NH₃</u>	
		<u>1976</u>	<u>1980</u>
Tenneco Manufacturing Co.	Houston, Tex.	198	198
Terra Chemicals International Inc.	Port Neal, Iowa	206	206
Tipperary Corp.	Lovington, N.M.	35	102
Triad Chemicals Inc.	Donaldsonville, La.	388	388
Tennessee Valley Authority	Muscle Shoals, Ala.	74	74
USS Agri Chemicals Inc.	Cherokee, Ala.	165	165
" " " "	Clairton, Pa.	377	377
" " " "	Geneva, Utah	65	65
Valley Nitrogen Products Inc.	Chandler, Ariz.	40	40
" " " "	El Centro, Cal.	221	221
" " " "	Helm, Cal.	201	201
Vistron Corp.	Lima, Ohio	498	498
Wycon Chemical Co.	Cheyenne, Wyo.	131	131
TOTAL		18,507	23,442

TABLE 1.16

Foreign Ammonia Plants Using Coal Gasification Technology

Company, Location	Capacity k ST NH ₃ /yr			Year Construction Started
	Winkler	Lurgi	Koppers- Totzek	
Azot Gorazde, Yugoslavia	18	-	-	1950
Empreso Nacional Calvo, Spain	51	-	-	1950
Azot Sanayii, Turkey	44	-	-	1950
Typpi Oy, Finland	-	-	22	1950
Nippon Suiso, Onahama, Japan	-	-	37	1954
Empreso Nacional Calvo Sotelo, Spain	-	-	37	1954
Typpi Oy, Finland	-	-	22	1955
Daudhkel, Pakistan	-	22	-	1956
Nitrogenous Fertilizer, Greece	-	-	110	1959
Neyveli, South Ascot, India	110	-	-	1960
Naju Fertilizer, Korea	-	55	-	1962
Chemical Fertilizer, Mae Moh, Thailand	-	-	37	1963
Azot Sanayii, Kutahya, Turkey	-	-	92	1966
Industrial Development Corp., Zambia	-	-	37	1966
Nitrogenous Fertilizer, Greece	-	-	27	1969
Fertilizer Corp. of India, Ramagundam, India	-	-	329	1969
" " of " , Talcher Plant, India	-	-	329	1970
Nitrogenous Fertilizer, Greece	-	-	55	1970
Fertilizer Corp. of India, Korba Plant, India	-	-	329	1972
AE&Cl Ltd., Republic of South Africa	-	-	365	1972
Industrial Development Corp., Zambia	-	-	100	1974
TOTALS	223	77	1928	

From Reference 16.

TABLE 1.17

U.S. Methanol Manufacturing Plants

	<u>Capacity, Million Gal/yr.</u>		
	<u>As of 1/1/76</u>	<u>Announced Additions</u>	<u>Total After Additions</u>
Du Pont - Orange, Tex.	115	-	115
- Beaumont, Tex.	200	-	200
- Houston, Tex.	-	400	400
Celanese - Bishop, Tex.	60	100	160
- Clear Lake, Tex.	230	-	230
- Southeastern New Mex.	-	225	225
Borden - Geismar, La.	160	-	160
Georgia Pacific - Plaquemine, La.	100	-	100
Hercules - Iberville Parish, La.	100	-	100
Monsanto - Texas City, Tex.	100	-	100
Tenneco - Pasadena, Tex.	80	-	80
Air Products - Pace, Fla.	50	-	50
Commercial Solvents - Sterlington, La.	50	-	50
Rohm & Haas - Deer Park, Tex.	<u>22</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>22</u>
TOTALS	1267	725	1992

2. BASES FOR ECONOMIC STUDIES

The following paragraphs discuss the processes, assumptions, and procedures used in conducting these economic studies.

Processes Studied

Current state-of-the-art processes for hydrogen manufacture are natural gas or light hydrocarbon catalytic steam reforming (hereafter called steam reforming); resid partial oxidation; Koppers-Totzek coal gasification (hereafter called K-T); and water electrolysis using KOH electrolyte. Several other coal gasification processes are being developed for hydrogen manufacture. These include a high pressure oxidation process being developed by Texaco; a similar process being developed jointly by Shell and Koppers-Totzek; and the U-Gas and Steam-Iron processes being developed by the Institute of Gas Technology. These IGT processes are discussed in Chapter VII of Reference 2.

Steam reforming has been gradually improved during its many years of commercial use. In this process a light hydrocarbon feed stock such as methane is reacted with steam in the presence of nickel catalyst at about 1500°F and 250 psig to produce synthesis gas, a mixture of carbon monoxide and hydrogen:

The energy required for reaction (1) is transferred to the feed stock and steam across furnace tubes. Some of the hydrocarbon feed stock is used as fuel for the furnace to provide the required heat input. The products of reaction (1) are then cooled and reacted with additional steam in the shift reaction which is conducted at about 660°F in the presence of metallic iron catalyst:

The overall reaction is therefore:

Half of the hydrogen product is provided by the methane feed stock and the other half is provided by the steam. Hydrogen can be produced from any light hydrocarbon feed stock that can be vaporized, but methane is the most desirable feed stock because it has the highest H/C ratio of any of the hydrocarbons.

Partial oxidation typically employs a heavy black oil residue feed stock that cannot be vaporized. The resid feed stock (H/C = 1.8) is reacted with steam and oxygen in a gasification (partial oxidation) reactor operated at about 2400°F. The resid conversion can be described by the reactions:

and by the water gas shift, reaction (2). The heat required for the endothermic reaction (4) is supplied by the oxidation reaction (5). Oxygen is used instead of air to avoid diluting the synthesis gas with nitrogen. The products from the gasification reactor are cooled to about 700°F and the CO is shifted to H₂ as in reaction (2). The overall reaction for resid partial oxidation is therefore:

Hydrogen production from coal is a partial oxidation process similar to resid partial oxidation but is substantially more difficult to conduct because coal, a solid, is difficult to handle, is relatively unreactive, and requires the removal of ash from the gasification reactor. These solid handling requirements involve substantially higher operating costs than with resid feed stock. Another difficulty with coal feed is that the H/C ratio of about 0.8 is much lower than in resid or methane.

For coal feed, as for resid partial oxidation, the hydrogen is produced by reforming, oxidation and shift reactions:

The overall reaction for producing hydrogen from coal is therefore:

For coal feed the gasification reactor is typically run at 2700°F. The heat required for the gasification reaction (7) is supplied by burning part of the coal with oxygen; reaction (8). When substitute natural gas (SNG) is the desired product, coal is gasified at a lower temperature compared to that required for hydrogen production. A higher overall thermal efficiency occurs in the SNG operation.

As in hydrogen manufacture, the first step in ammonia manufacture is the production of synthesis gas by either steam reforming, resid partial oxidation or coal gasification. When steam reforming is used, air is added to the synthesis gas to supply the required nitrogen. Oxygen in the air reacts with some of the synthesis gas to release additional heat needed to complete the reforming reaction. This gas is then cooled and the CO is shifted (Reaction 2) to provide additional hydrogen. The shifted gas is then further cooled; CO₂ is removed and residual CO and CO₂ are removed by methanation using a nickel catalyst at about 600° F:

When resid partial oxidation or coal gasification are used to produce the synthesis gas, the gas from the gasifier is cooled and then shifted to convert CO to additional hydrogen. The CO₂ is then removed and high purity nitrogen from the air separation is then added.

The ammonia synthesis gas then is compressed to 2000 - 4500 psig and sent to the synthesis reactor where ammonia is formed at about 900° F over a promoted iron catalyst:

Methanol is produced by the reaction of hydrogen with carbon monoxide or carbon dioxide at 750-1500 psi and at 400-600° F over a catalyst:

The synthesis gas feed can be produced by either methane reforming, resid partial oxidation or coal gasification. With methane reforming the synthesis gas has a H₂/CO ratio of about 3.0 (Reaction 1). To utilize all of the H₂ in the synthesis gas, this ratio must be corrected by the addition of CO₂ from an outside source. Most existing methanol plants, however, designed based on relatively low cost natural gas, take a high hydrogen content purge stream from the methanol plant to maintain the correct gas ratio.

If the synthesis gas is obtained by resid partial oxidation or coal gasification, the H₂/CO ratio is below 2.0 and this is corrected by shifting only a portion of the raw synthesis gas and then combining the two streams. Some of the remaining CO₂ is usually removed by scrubbing. This gas stream is then compressed and sent to the methanol synthesis reactor.

The K-T process is used commercially to produce hydrogen from coal for use in ammonia manufacture at 15 plants located outside the U.S. (see Table 1.16). This process is discussed in References 4 and 16. In the K-T process, finely ground coal is gasified with oxygen and steam at about 2700°F and atmospheric pressure to produce synthesis gas, a mixture of H₂, CO, CO₂, H₂O, H₂S, COS, and SO₂. The gases are compressed to about 300 psig and then processed for CO shift conversion to H₂ and CO₂ and H₂S removal. This product gas is either produced as H₂ gas or is processed further for ammonia or methanol manufacture.

The investment and operating costs for the K-T gasification process could be reduced by operating the gasifier at say 450 psig. This would reduce the physical size of the gasifier vessels and would reduce the costs of gas compression. Pressurized operation of the gasifier would, however, require facilities for forcing the pulverized coal feed into the 450 psig gasifier vessel and removing the ash from this vessel. In this study the investment and operating costs for the pressurized gasification method have been estimated and these costs are referred to hereafter as the new coal process. To provide the economic advantages over K-T assumed in this study, the new coal process should have the following characteristics:

1. Gasification would be conducted at 400-500 psig;
2. A single gasifier would convert 2500 T/D of coal to high yields of synthesis gas with essentially zero methane content;
3. The gasifier would operate above 2000°F to minimize methane production;
4. The gasifier would provide 95%+ conversion of coal to synthesis gas.

Koppers and Shell are jointly developing a gasifier that will achieve these objectives. The Texaco gasifier has been proven on commercial scale for hydrocarbon feed stocks and extensive operations with coal have been conducted in a large pilot unit operated at 300 psig and 100 T/D coal feed rate. Another Texaco pilot plant has been operated with 15 T/D coal feed at pressures up to 2500 psig. Commercial scale operation of the Texaco gasifier with coal has not yet been conducted; however, this extensive development work is likely to result in the construction of a full scale gasifier in the 1977-79 period. It has been assumed, therefore, that the new coal gasification process will be available for commercial use in the 1980-81 period.

The light hydrocarbon reforming, resid partial oxidation, and coal gasification plants assumed in these economic studies are essentially self-contained plants complete with oxygen plants, and the utility systems are essentially in balance. Details concerning the utility systems are presented on pages 6-8 of Appendix A.

Current state-of-the-art water electrolysis plants require very large investments. Although electricity is the main component of the cost of electrolytic hydrogen, costs associated with the plant investment are very significant. Costs included in this study for current state-of-the-art electrolysis facilities are indicative of the equipment supplied by Lurgi or Teledyne but are not intended to relate to a specific process.

It is quite likely that electrolysis costs can be reduced significantly by making the electrolysis modules more compact; by operating the equipment under pressure (say 450-500 psig) and by improving the electrolysis mechanism to provide for higher thermal efficiency. In this study, such a "new" electrolysis process has been included to indicate the reduction in electrolysis costs that possibly could be achieved with further R&D work. The "new" electrolysis process involves costs similar to those that have been suggested for the GE Solid Polymer Electrolyte process (Reference 18) but it is possible that such an improvement in costs could be achieved by other groups conducting R&D on electrolysis.

Hydrogen storage using iron-titanium alloy has been studied extensively by Brookhaven National Laboratory (Reference 19). The investment and operating costs for hydrogen storage using this process are discussed in Reference 20. The costs of storage used in this study have been arrived at using this Brookhaven information.

Escalation Rates

Predictions in this study regarding the use of petroleum, coal, and electrolysis for the manufacture of hydrogen and its derivatives are based primarily on the estimated future costs for manufacturing these products during 1980-2000, the period of interest. Estimating future manufacturing costs involves making assumptions regarding future costs of natural gas, oil products, coal, electricity, construction costs, and other factors. Assumptions made concerning these economic factors are summarized in Table 2.01 and are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

During the 1980-2000 period, the general or overall rate of inflation of all commodities including coal, electricity, and construction costs is assumed to average 5% per year.

Prices of natural gas and petroleum products delivered to large industrial customers are assumed to escalate at 6-1/2% per year during this period. This higher rate, compared to the general inflation rate, is probable because of:

- The decreasing domestic production of these products;
- Increasing demand for these products;
- Prices of imported gas, crude oil, and refined products will follow the inflation rate of the free world rather than that of the U.S.;
- The high cost of synthetic products manufactured from coal and/or oil shale.

Estimates of future costs for hydrogen, ammonia and methanol have been calculated for the period 1980-2000 using 1980 \$. The procedure involves comparing escalation rates during this period for each component of total cost with the general escalation rate of 5.0% per year for the general economy. Thus, if natural gas increases at 6.5% per year, the natural gas price for 1980 in 1980 \$ is increased by about 1.5% per year to obtain the natural gas price (in 1980 \$) for the year in question. For example, assume the natural gas price in 1980 (1980 \$) is \$3.15 per million Btu. The price in the year 2000 would then be:

$$\$3.15 \times (1.065)^{20} = \$11.10 \text{ in current (2000) \$}$$

$$\frac{11.10}{(1.05)^{20}} = \$4.18 \text{ in 1980 \$}$$

Energy Prices

Table 2.02 and Figures 2.01, 2.02, and 2.03 show the prices of natural gas, resid fuel oil, electricity and coal used in this study. The prices are presented on the basis of the "most likely" price; the "minimum" price and the "maximum" price. Various other studies (References 1, 2, and 3) suggest prices that cover a rather broad range. In general, the most likely prices are those suggested by Chem Systems Inc. (Appendix A) and Exxon Co. USA; the minimum prices are those suggested by FEA (Reference 14) and the President's Council on Wage and Price Stability (Reference 15); the maximum prices are those suggested by A. D. Little (Reference 13).

The prices of natural gas or an alternate light hydrocarbon reformer feed, resid, and electricity are assumed to apply to all geographical locations in the U.S. However, delivered coal prices vary from one geographical location to another. Mine month coal prices are affected by mining requirements and the transportation cost for moving the coal to manufacturing sites is proportional to this distance.

Coal prices delivered to manufacturing sites on the East Coast, the Mid-Continent (Illinois), the Gulf Coast and the West Coast were estimated according to the data shown in Table 2.03. The estimated transportation cost using unit trains was added to the estimated mine month coal prices to provide estimated prices of coal delivered to the manufacturing sites.

High sulfur coal would be the optimum feed stock for coal gasification plants since the sulfur content of the feed stock has little effect on manufacturing costs and high sulfur coal will probably be priced substantially below low sulfur coals of equivalent heating value.

Cost Estimates by Chem Systems, Inc.

Chem Systems, Inc. of New York City provided as an input to this study investment and operating costs as of mid-year 1980 for the following processes:

Hydrogen Manufacture by

- methane reforming
- resid partial oxidation
- K-T coal gasification
- "new" coal gasification
- SPE electrolysis

Ammonia Manufacture by

- methane reforming
- resid partial oxidation
- K-T coal gasification
- "new" coal gasification

Methanol Manufacture by

- methane reforming
- resid partial oxidation
- K-T coal gasification
- "new" coal gasification

These data prepared by Chem Systems Inc. are consistent for the several products and processes thus permitting the cost of products to be compared using 1980 \$ during the 1980-2000 period. The Chem Systems data are presented verbatim in Appendix A.

The investments presented in the Chem Systems report represent the "instantaneous" cost for a new grass roots plant starting up in mid-year 1980. These costs are arrived at by estimating materials costs, labor, etc., and assuming the plant is constructed "overnight" in the mid-1980 period. This procedure provides somewhat higher costs than would occur if construction occurred over a period of 24-30 months. However, this procedure does not require the addition of interest charges during construction. Thus, these two factors essentially off-set one another.

These Chem Systems investments include a contingency item which is normally added to the basic estimate to provide for startup and other unforeseen difficulties. Included in the Chem Systems data for hydrogen manufacture are contingencies of 10% for methane steam reforming, 15% for resid partial oxidation, 15% for K-T coal gasification, 20% for new coal gasification, and 30% for SPE electrolysis.

Financial Structure

All economics data prepared in this study assume 100% equity ownership of the manufacturing facility; the purchase of natural gas, oil, coal, and electricity feed stocks at their market price; and a before tax return of 20%/year on total plant investment. The working capital is assumed to be borrowed at an interest rate of 10%/year. Working capital requirements are approximately equal to the costs incurred over a period of two months (1/6 of annual charges) for feed stock, utilities, and labor and supervision.

Sensitivities

Costs for manufacturing hydrogen or ammonia or methanol by the several processes are affected by several variables of primary importance such as investment and feed stock cost which are included directly in the calculations. Several other factors which may also be important have been included in the calculations by showing their effect on manufacturing costs as sensitivities. Factors handled in this way are as follows:

1. The effects of variations in feed stock price from the low price level to the high price level;
2. The effect of a 10% higher investment than those assumed;
3. The effect of construction costs escalating 1%/yr above the general inflation rate, and 1%/yr below the general inflation rate;
4. The effect of coal prices escalating 1%/yr above and 1%/yr below the general inflation rate.

TABLE 2.01

Escalation Rates Assumed for 1980-2000 Period

	<u>During 1980- 2000 Period</u>
<u>Average annual rate of increase in costs and prices, %/yr.</u>	
For general economy	5.0
Natural gas (delivered)	6.5
Crude oil and refined products	6.5
Electricity	5.0
Coal, delivered, most likely	5.0
" " , lower sensitivity	4.0
" " , higher "	6.0
Construction costs, most likely	5.0
" " , lower sensitivity	4.0
" " , higher "	6.0

TABLE 2.02

Assumed Prices of Natural Gas, High Sulfur Resid, Coal, and
Electricity Delivered to Large Industrial Customers, 1980-2000

All data are 1980 \$

Pricing Unit	Minimum Price		Most Likely Price		Maximum Price	
	1980	2000	1980	2000	1980	2000
Intrastate natural gas	\$/MBtu	2.50 3.37	3.15 4.24		3.40 4.58	
High sulfur resid	\$/bbl	10.00 13.47	15.00 20.20		17.50 23.57	
" " "	\$/MBtu	1.57 2.11	2.35 3.17		2.75 3.70	
Electricity, continuous	\$/kwhr	0.020 0.020	0.027 0.027		0.030 0.030	
" "	\$/MBtu	5.85 5.85	7.91 7.91		8.78 8.78	
Electricity, off peak	\$/kwhr	0.005 0.005	0.010 0.010		0.015 0.015	
" " "	\$/MBtu	1.46 1.46	2.93 2.93		4.39 4.39	
Coal delivered to East Coast plants	\$/ton	19.01 19.01	27.00 27.00		34.00 34.00	
" " to Mid Cont. "	"	14.82 14.82	21.80 21.80		30.80 30.80	
" " to Gulf Coast "	"	20.52 20.52	25.40 25.40		27.35 27.35	
" " to West Coast "	"	15.72 15.72	20.60 20.60		22.55 22.55	
Coal delivered to East Coast plants	\$/MBtu	0.73 0.73	1.04 1.04		1.31 1.31	
" " to Mid Cont. "	"	0.65 0.65	0.96 0.96		1.35 1.35	
" " to Gulf Coast "	"	1.24 1.24	1.54 1.54		1.66 1.66	
" " to West Coast "	"	0.95 0.95	1.25 1.25		1.37 1.37	

FIGURE 2.01

Assumed Prices of Energy Feed Stocks
Delivered to Large Industrial Centers

1980 \$

Minimum Prices

FIGURE 2.02

Assumed Prices of Energy Feed Stocks
Delivered to Large Industrial Centers

1980 \$

Most Likely Prices

FIGURE 2.03

Assumed Prices of Energy Feed Stocks
Delivered to Large Industrial Centers

1980 \$

Maximum Prices

TABLE 2.03

Prices of Coal Delivered to Large Industrial Customers

All data are 1980-2000 prices, 1980 \$

Mine location Plant location	Illinois Mid. Cont.	Wyoming Gulf Coast	Wyoming West Coast	W.V. East Coast
Types of coal	High Sulfur	Sub-Bit.	Sub-Bit.	High Sulfur
Heating value, MBtu/ton	22.8	16.5	16.5	26.0
Distance, mine to plant, miles	100	1900	1300	500
Transportation cost by unit trains, \$/ton mile	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008
\$/ton	0.80	15.20	10.40	4.00
<u>Min Month Price, \$/ton</u>				
Minimum	14.02	5.32	5.32	15.01
Most likely	21.00	10.20	10.20	23.00
Maximum	30.00	12.15	12.15	30.00
<u>Delivered Price, \$/ton</u>				
Minimum	14.82	20.52	15.72	19.01
Most likely	21.80	25.40	20.60	27.00
Maximum	30.80	27.35	22.55	34.00
<u>Delivered Price, \$/MBtu</u>				
Minimum	0.65	1.24	0.95	0.73
Most likely	0.96	1.54	1.25	1.04
Maximum	1.35	1.66	1.37	1.31

3. ECONOMICS OF HYDROGEN MANUFACTURE

The increasing cost and decreasing supplies of natural gas and light hydrocarbon feed stocks provide an incentive for developing new processes for hydrogen manufacture using coal gasification or electrolysis. Nearly all industrial hydrogen currently produced in the U.S. is manufactured by the catalytic steam reforming of natural gas or another light hydrocarbon feed stock. However, the partial oxidation of residuum is used to some extent in the U.S. and is more generally used in Europe. Coal gasification using Koppers-Totzek and Luigi gasifiers is used in several plants outside the U.S. as has already been discussed. Improved coal gasification procedures have been studied in pilot plants and may soon be used commercially. Improved electrolysis processes requiring lower investments and electricity consumption are currently under development.

Future hydrogen manufacturing costs for the 1980-2000 period for large plants (100 MSCF/SD) have been developed by Chem Systems, Inc. and are presented in the Chem Systems report reproduced in Appendix A. Costs for ammonia and methanol are discussed in later sections.

Economics data for the several hydrogen manufacturing processes are summarized in Table 3.01 and Figure 3.01 for plants of 100 MSCF/SD capacity for the most likely feed stock and electricity prices expected for 1980. These data are further summarized as follows along with the anticipated hydrogen costs corresponding to feed stock costs predicted for the year 2000:

Investments and Operating Costs for Hydrogen Plants of 100 MSCF/SD Capacity

	1980 \$		
	Investment	Production Cost. Inc.	
	<u>\$ Millions</u>	<u>Return, \$/MBtu</u>	
	1980 or 2000	1980	2000
Steam reforming	62.6	6.12	7.54
Resid partial oxidation	159.3	8.14	9.19
K-T coal gasification *	246.4	9.81	9.81
New coal gasification *	200.1	8.17	8.17
Continuous SPE electrolysis	81.0	13.22	13.22

* For Midcontinent location

Steam reforming of natural gas or an alternative light hydrocarbon feed stock is currently the most attractive hydrogen manufacturing process and will apparently continue to be so during the 1980-2000 period. The investment for reforming is substantially lower than that for the other processes. The operating cost including return is substantially less for reforming throughout the 1980-2000 period than for the other processes. The investment cost for resid partial oxidation is nearly twice that for reforming. The investment for K-T coal gasification is nearly four times that of reforming and the new coal process is 3 fold that of reforming. The investment for the SPE electrolysis process is somewhat higher than that for reforming but the production cost is nearly twice that of reforming due to the electricity being a very expensive energy input. On the basis of these forecasts, there appears to be little chance that large volumes of refinery hydrogen will be made by any process other than reforming during the 1980-2000 period. Resid partial oxidation would be attractive in the U.S. if a long term supply of resid could be obtained at prices substantially less than the resid price structure assumed in these calculations.

Reforming, Resid Partial Oxidation and Coal Gasification

The 1980 economics data for methane reforming and resid partial oxidation are shown in Table 3.02. Although these data are indicated to be for the Gulf Coast location, they actually apply to all U.S. locations where the feed stock cost is \$3.15/MBtu for natural gas or \$15.00/bbl. for resid.

Coal gasification for both K-T and the new process are shown in Table 3.03 for four locations, East Coast, Midcontinent, Gulf Coast and West Coast corresponding to the four major petroleum refining centers of the U.S. Coal quality and prices are different in each of these areas. This results in differences in the manufacturing cost for hydrogen for each area because of differences in investment cost and coal price. The data for hydrogen manufacturing costs for each of the four areas shown in Table 3.03 are further summarized as follows:

Summary of Hydrogen Manufacturing Costs By Coal Gasification at Various Locations

100 SCF/SD Plants, 1980 Operation, 1980\$

Locations Coal Source	East Coast W. Virginia	Midcontinent Illinois	Gulf Coast Wyoming	West Coast Wyoming
Cost of Coal feed, \$/MBtu	1.04	0.96	1.54	1.25
<u>Plant investment \$Millions</u>				
K-T	240	246	272	272
New	191	200	224	224
<u>Cost of Hydrogen inc. return \$/MBtu</u>				
K-T	9.73	9.81	11.56	11.06
New	7.98	8.17	9.85	9.39

The production cost data for new coal gasification in the four geographical areas are compared to that for reforming in Figure 3.02. Costs are lower for the East Coast and Midcontinent areas than for the Gulf Coast and West Coast locations. However, hydrogen costs in the year 2000 by new coal gasification are somewhat higher than for reforming for all four locations.

Several economic factors that may have an important effect on total production costs have been studied as sensitivities. These factors were previously discussed (page 49). The calculated sensitivity data for methane reforming and resid partial oxidation are shown in Table 3.04; for K-T coal gasification in Table 3.05; and for new coal gasification in Table 3.06.

The important relationship shown by these sensitivity data is the comparison of manufacturing costs for reforming versus those for new coal gasification, the process that provides closely competitive production costs. This relationship is shown for the East Coast location in Table 3.07; for the Midcontinent location in Table 3.08; for the Gulf Coast location in Table 3.09; and for the West Coast location in Table 3.10. In each of these tables and for each of the sensitivities except one, reforming has a cost advantage over new coal gasification. The only exception is for the sensitivity of construction costs escalation of 1%/yr. below that of general inflation. In this case new coal gasification would provide slightly lower production costs in the year 2000. However, in all the other sensitivities reforming has a competitive edge over new coal gasification. This advantage is much greater for the year 1980 when natural gas prices (1980\$) are lower than for the year 2000. These data for the Gulf Coast location, where 42% of the total U.S. refinery hydrogen will be required in the year 2000 are further summarized as follows:

Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture

Natural Gas Reforming vs New Coal Gasification
100 MSCF/D Plants, 1980 \$
Gulf Coast Location

	Advantage for Natural Gas Reforming, \$/MBtu	
	1980	2000
Most likely fuel prices	3.73	2.31
High fuel prices	3.82	2.28
Low fuel prices	4.22	3.09
10% additional investment	4.14	2.72
Construction costs escalate +1%/yr.	--	3.44
Construction costs escalate -1%/yr.	--	1.39
Coal prices escalate +1%/yr.	--	2.89
Coal prices escalate -1%/yr.	--	1.84

The use of the new coal process to produce refinery hydrogen would release natural gas or light hydrocarbon feed stock required if the hydrogen were produced by reforming. The cost of releasing the natural gas feed is shown in Table 3.11 for the new coal process and the Midcontinent (Illinois) location. The cost of the released natural gas is \$4.56/MBtu for the most likely coal price, \$4.16 for the low coal price, and \$5.06 for the high coal price. These calculated natural gas "release" prices correspond to \$25.35/bbl. of crude equivalent for the most likely coal price; \$23.13/bbl. for the low coal price; and \$28.13/bbl. for the high coal price. These release values are substantially higher than the anticipated prices of imported crude oil during the 1980-2000 period thus confirming that coal gasification will not be competitive with reforming for producing refinery hydrogen during the 1980-2000 period.

Electrolysis

Costs for producing electrolytic hydrogen are very high compared to those for reforming for plants of large capacity and when electricity is purchased at regular commercial rates. Today electrolysis is more expensive than reforming for plants of 10,000 SCF/Hr capacity or greater. Below this capacity, electrolysis may be more attractive than reforming; however, the exact break even point is affected by the prices of electricity and hydrocarbon feed. Capital costs per unit of electrolytic hydrogen product change only slightly with plant capacity, while reforming plants of small capacity have relatively high unit capital costs. The capital costs for current technology electrolysis, advanced (solid polymer electrolyte) electrolysis and reforming for plants of several capacities are as follows:

Capital Costs of Hydrogen Plants of Various Capacities

Capacity SCF/SH	4,000	20,000	100,000	4.17 M
Capacity, kw hydrogen product	380	1,903	9,517	0.397 M
<u>Investment, \$/kw (1980\$)</u>				
electrolysis, current technology	510	510	510	510
electrolysis, advanced	213	210	208	204
natural gas reforming	1,970	683	273	158

Electrolysis plants are currently manufactured by Luigi Apparate-Technik BmbH (Frankfort, West Germany); several other European manufacturers; The Electrolyzer Corp., Ltd. (Toronto, Canada); General Electric (U.S.); and Teledyne Isotopes (U.S.). Data from Reference 17 and other sources were used in this study to estimate costs for manufacturing electrolytic hydrogen using "current" electrolysis technology.

A new electrolysis process is being developed by General Electric. This process (discussed in References 17 and 18) employs a solid polymer electrolyte as a replacement for the traditional aqueous potassium hydroxide (KOH) solution. The solid polymer electrolyte has ion exchange properties and with the addition of liquid water, hydrogen ions flow through the electrolyte and are converted to hydrogen gas at the cathode. Chem Systems Inc. (Appendix A) have used data obtained from General Electric to estimate production costs for this advanced electrolysis process which is referred to as "SPE Electrolysis."

The investment and operating costs for current technology electrolysis and SPE electrolysis are compared in Table 3.12 for continuously operating plants of 100 M SCF/SD capacity using electricity priced at 2.7¢/kwhr. The cost of the hydrogen including 20%/yr before tax return is \$20.99 and \$13.22/MBtu respectively (1980 \$).

In the future, electricity may be priced substantially less during off-peak periods than during on-peak periods. Table 3.13 shows the estimated costs for the SPE electrolysis process when electricity is available at 1.0¢/kwhr. Assuming the electrolysis plant could operate 3300 hours/year (10 hours per day or 0.38 Capacity Factor) the electrolytic hydrogen would cost \$10.65/MBtu. This figure is somewhat less than the \$13.22 figure for continuous operation with 2.7¢/kwhr electricity; however, most industrial hydrogen consuming plants require a steady constant rate of hydrogen addition and would not be able to use hydrogen produced only in off-peak periods.

Hydrogen produced intermittently could be supplied continuously to a hydrogen consuming operation if hydrogen storage were imposed between the production and consumption operations. Hydrogen storage using iron/titanium hydride as the storage medium has been extensively studied by Brookhaven National Laboratory; design and costs for the iron/titanium hydride storage system are discussed in References 19 and 20. The diagram shown in Figure 3.03 shows how the 4.167 SCF/hr electrolyzer (10 hours/day operation) could be coupled to iron/titanium hydride storage to provide a continuous flow of 1.736 MSCF/hr to the load. Investment data for the iron/titanium hydride storage facility are shown in Table 3.14. Costs for the electrolyzer and iron titanium hydride storage facility are combined in Table 3.15. The cost of the hydrogen product from the system for 1.0¢/kwhr electricity is \$14.71/MBtu which is somewhat higher than the \$13.22/MBtu figure for continuous electrolyzer operation using 2.7¢/kwhr electricity.

Hydrogen production costs including 20%/yr before tax return for these electrolysis systems are plotted in Figure 3.04; hydrogen costs by reforming are shown for comparison. As has been emphasized previously, electrolytic hydrogen costs are substantially above those for reforming for the large capacity plants (100 MSCF/hr) used in this comparison.

It is unlikely that a market for the oxygen by-product from electrolysis plants could be found, particularly for plants operating with intermittent off-peak electricity. However, if the oxygen could be sold at a price of \$24/ton, the oxygen credit would correspond to \$1.54/MBtu of hydrogen.

Sensitivity data for electrolytic hydrogen are shown in Table 3.16. The various factors considered in these sensitivity calculations provided some change in the hydrogen production costs, but these variations are small compared to the large differences between the costs for electrolysis and reforming.

TABLE 3.01

Summary of Investments and Operating Costs for Hydrogen Manufacturing Plants

All Plants are 100 MSCF/SD Capacity, Operation in 1980, 1980 \$

Process	Methane Steam Reforming	Resid Partial Oxidation	Coal Gasification ⁽¹⁾		SPE Electrolysis	
			K-T	New	Continuous	Intermittent + Storage
<u>Investment, \$ Millions</u>						
Onsite	41.3	93.9	146.7	122.4	65.6	258.2
Offsite	21.3	65.4	99.7	77.7	15.4	47.0
Total	62.6	159.3	246.4	200.1	81.0	305.2
Cost of feed stock, \$/MBtu	3.15	2.35	0.96	0.96	--	--
Cost of electricity, ¢/kwhr	--	--	--	--	2.7	1.0
<u>Costs and Charges, \$/MBtu Product</u>						
Feed stock or electricity	4.09	2.84	1.61	1.50	10.19	3.78
Other operating costs	0.06	0.31	0.53	0.43	0.13	0.43
Capital charges ⁽²⁾	1.97	4.99	7.67	6.24	2.90	10.50

(1) Coal gasification plants are located in Illinois and use Illinois high sulfur coal.

(2) Capital charges include maintenance, overhead, insurance, property taxes, depreciation, interest on working capital and 20%/yr before tax return.

FIGURE 3.01

Hydrogen Manufacturing Costs - Midcontinent Location

\$/MBtu - 100 MSCF/D Plants - 1980 \$

TABLE 3.02

Economics Data for Hydrogen Manufacture by
Methane Reforming and Resid Partial Oxidation

1980 operation, 1980 \$

Process	<u>Methane Reforming</u>		<u>Resid Partial Oxidation</u>	
Plant Location	Gulf Coast		Gulf Coast	
<u>Design Capacity, Hydrogen product</u>				
MSCF/Hour	4.167		4.167	
MSCF/Day	100		100	
MSCF/Year	35000		33000	
MBTU/Year x 10 ⁶	11.27		10.63	
Feed stock cost at plant	--		\$15.00/bbl	
Feed stock cost at plant, \$/MBtu	3.15		2.35	
Btu product/Btu feed, %	70.2		82.7	
<u>Investment, \$Millions</u>				
Onsite	41.3		93.9	
Offsite	21.3		65.4	
Total plant	62.6		159.3	
% contingency in these investments	10		15	
Working capital	7.8		5.6	
<u>Costs and Charges</u>				
	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>
Feed stock or electricity	50.590	4.49	30.195	2.84
Utilities	(4.553)	(0.40)	1.902	0.18
Chemicals and catalyst	--	--	--	--
Labor and supervision	0.682	0.06	1.364	0.13
Maintenance (4% onsite)	1.652	0.15	3.756	0.35
Plant overhead (2.6% onsite)	1.074	0.10	2.441	0.23
Insurance, property taxes (1.5%) total Plant	0.939	0.08	2.390	0.22
Depreciation (10% onsite + 5% offsites)	5.195	0.46	12.660	1.19
Interest on working capital (10%)	0.780	0.07	0.560	0.05
Return on investment (20% total plant)	12.520	1.11	31.860	3.00
Total cost including return	68.879	6.12	87.128	8.19
Sulfur credit (\$50/ton)	--	--	(0.500)	(0.05)
Net cost including return	68.879	6.12	86.628	8.14

TABLE 3.03 (Page 1 of 2)

Economics Data for Hydrogen
Manufacture by Coal Gasification

1980 operation, 1980 \$

Coal Source	W. Virginia		W. Virginia		Illinois		Illinois	
Plant location	East Coast		East Coast		Midcontinent		Midcontinent	
Process	K-T		New		K-T		New	
<u>Design Capacity, Hydrogen Product</u>								
MSCF/Day	100		100		100		100	
MSCF/Year	33000		33000		33000		33000	
MBtu/Year x 10 ⁶	10.63		10.63		10.63		10.63	
Coal heating value, MBtu/ton	26.0		26.0		22.8		22.8	
Coal cost at plant, \$/ton	27.00		27.00		21.80		21.80	
Coal cost at plant, \$/MBtu	1.04		1.04		0.96		0.96	
Btu product/Btu feed, %	59.7		64.1		59.4		64.1	
<u>Investment, \$ Millions*</u>								
Onsite	142.7		116.5		146.7		122.4	
Offsite	97.0		74.0		99.7		77.7	
Total plant	239.7		190.5		246.4		200.1	
% Contingency in these investments	15		20		15		20	
Working capital	4.0		3.6		3.8		3.4	
<u>Costs and Charges</u>								
	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>
Feed stock	18.496	1.74	17.221	1.62	17.114	1.61	15.839	1.49
Utilities	4.039	0.33	2.976	0.28	4.049	0.38	2.972	0.28
Chemicals and catalyst	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Labor and supervision	1.591	0.15	1.591	0.15	1.591	0.15	1.591	0.15
Maintenance (4% onsite)	5.708	0.54	4.660	0.44	5.868	0.55	4.896	0.46
Plant overhead (2.6% onsite)	3.710	0.35	3.029	0.28	3.814	0.36	3.182	0.30
Insurance, property taxes 1.5% total plant	3.596	0.34	2.858	0.27	3.696	0.35	3.002	0.28
Depreciation (10% onsite + 5% offsites)	19.120	1.80	15.350	1.44	19.655	1.85	16.125	1.52
Interest on working capital (10%)	0.402	0.04	0.363	0.03	0.380	0.04	0.340	0.03
Return on investment (20% total plant)	47.940	4.51	38.100	3.58	49.280	4.64	40.020	3.76
Total cost including return	104.602	9.85	86.148	8.09	105.462	9.93	88.020	8.28
Sulfur credit (\$50/ton)	(1.276)	(0.12)	(1.169)	(0.11)	(1.320)	(0.12)	(1.215)	(0.11)
Net cost including return	103.326	9.73	84.979	7.98	104.142	9.81	86.805	8.17

TABLE 3.03 (Page 2 of 2)

Economics Data for Hydrogen
Manufacture by Coal Gasification

1980 operation, 1980 \$

Coal Source	Wyoming	Wyoming	Wyoming	Wyoming				
Plant location	Gulf Coast	Gulf Coast	West Coast	West Coast				
Process	K-T	New	K-T	New				
<u>Design Capacity, Hydrogen Product</u>								
MSCF/Day	100	100	100	100				
MSCF/Year	33000	33000	33000	33000				
MBtu/Year x 10 ⁶	10.63	10.63	10.63	10.63				
Coal heating value, MBtu/ton	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.5				
Coal cost at plant, \$/ton	25.40	25.40	20.60	20.60				
Coal cost at plant, \$/MBtu	1.54	1.54	1.25	1.25				
Btu product/Btu feed, %	59.4	63.7	59.4	63.7				
<u>Investment, \$ Millions</u>								
Onsite	161.8	136.7	161.8	136.7				
Offsite	110.0	86.8	110.0	86.8				
Total plant	271.8	223.5	271.8	223.5				
% Contingency in these investments	15	20	15	20				
Working capital	5.3	4.9	4.4	4.1				
<u>Costs and Charges</u>								
	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>
Feed stock	27.532	2.59	25.618	2.41	22.323	2.10	20.835	1.96
Utilities	2.764	0.26	2.232	0.21	2.764	0.26	2.232	0.21
Chemicals and catalyst	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Labor and supervision	1.591	0.15	1.591	0.15	1.591	0.15	1.591	0.15
Maintenance (4% onsite)	6.472	0.61	5.468	0.51	6.472	0.61	5.468	0.51
Plant overhead (2.6% onsite)	4.207	0.40	3.554	0.33	4.207	0.40	3.554	0.33
Insurance, property taxes (1.5% total plant)	4.077	0.38	3.353	0.32	4.077	0.38	3.353	0.32
Depreciation (10% onsite + 5% offsites)	21.680	2.04	18.010	1.69	21.680	2.04	18.010	1.69
Interest on working capital (10%)	0.532	0.05	0.491	0.05	0.445	0.04	0.411	0.04
Return on investment (20% total plant)	54.360	5.11	44.700	4.21	54.360	5.11	44.700	4.21
Total cost including return	123.215	11.59	105.017	9.88	117.919	11.09	100.154	9.42
Sulfur credit	(0.319)	(0.03)	(0.319)	(0.03)	(0.319)	(0.03)	(0.319)	(0.03)
Net cost including return	122.896	11.56	104.698	9.85	117.600	11.06	99.835	9.39

FIGURE 3.02

Hydrogen Manufacturing Costs - New Coal Gasification

\$/MBtu - 100 MSCF/D Plants - 1980 \$

FIGURE 3.03

Hydrogen Manufacture and Storage Using Off-Peak Electricity

		Hours <u>1-10</u>	Hours <u>11-24</u>
Electricity to electrolyzer, mw		510	0
Hydrogen from electrolyzer, total	MSCF/Hr	4.167	0
" " " to storage	" "	2.431	0
" " " to load	" "	1.736	0
" " storage to load	" "	0	1.736

TABLE 3.04

Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture,
Reforming and Resid Partial Oxidation

Data are hydrogen production cost including 20% before
tax return, 100 MSCF/SD plants, \$/MBtu, 1980 &

Location	Year	<u>Methane</u> <u>Reforming</u>	<u>Resid</u> <u>Partial Ox.</u>
		All U. S.	All U. S.
Base Case, most likely fuel price	1980	6.12	8.14
	2000	7.54	9.19
Base Case, high fuel price	1980	6.44	8.64
	2000	7.98	9.87
Base Case, low fuel price	1980	5.28	7.13
	2000	6.41	7.83
Additional 10% investment	1980	6.30	8.59
	2000	7.72	9.64
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr above gen. inflation	2000	7.97	10.29
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr below gen. inflation	2000	7.19	8.29
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr above gen. inflation	2000	7.54	8.14
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr below gen. inflation	2000	7.54	9.19

TABLE 3.05

Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture by K-T Coal Gasification

Data are hydrogen production cost including 20% before tax return
for 100 MSCF/SD plants, \$/MBtu, 1980 \$

	<u>Years</u>	<u>East Coast</u>	<u>Mid- Continent</u>	<u>Gulf Coast</u>	<u>West Coast</u>
Base case - most likely fuel price	1980	9.73	9.81	11.56	11.06
	2000	9.73	9.81	11.56	11.06
Base case - high fuel price	1980	10.28	10.62	11.78	11.29
	2000	10.28	10.62	11.78	11.29
Base case - low fuel price	1980	9.10	9.17	11.00	10.49
	2000	9.10	9.17	11.00	10.49
Additional 10% investment	1980	10.38	10.48	12.30	11.80
	2000	10.38	10.48	12.30	11.80
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr above gen. inflation	2000	11.37	11.50	13.44	12.94
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr below gen. inflation	2000	8.39	8.43	10.02	9.52
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr above gen. inflation	2000	10.20	10.25	12.19	11.58
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr below gen. inflation	2000	9.35	9.45	11.05	10.64

TABLE 3.06

Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture by New Coal Gasification

Data are hydrogen production cost including 20% before tax return
for 100 MSCF/SD plants, \$/MBtu, 1980 \$

	<u>Years</u>	<u>East Coast</u>	<u>Mid- Continent</u>	<u>Gulf Coast</u>	<u>West Coast</u>
Base case - most likely fuel price	1980	7.98	8.17	9.85	9.39
	2000	7.98	8.17	9.85	9.39
Base case - high fuel price	1980	8.47	8.87	10.26	9.72
	2000	8.47	8.87	10.26	9.72
Base case - low fuel price	1980	7.41	7.59	9.50	8.96
	2000	7.41	7.59	9.50	8.96
Additional 10% investment	1980	8.47	8.69	10.44	9.98
	2000	8.47	8.69	10.44	9.98
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr above gen. inflation	2000	9.28	9.55	11.41	10.95
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr below gen. inflation	2000	6.91	7.05	8.58	8.12
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr above gen. inflation	2000	8.40	8.56	10.43	9.87
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr below gen. inflation	2000	7.64	7.85	9.38	9.00

TABLE 3.07

Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D
Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification

East Coast Location, 1980 \$, \$/MBtu

	1980			2000		
	Methane Reforming	New Coal Gasification	Advantage For MR	Methane Reforming	New Coal Gasification	Advantage For MR
Base Case - Most likely fuel prices	6.12	7.98	1.86	7.54	7.98	0.44
" " - High fuel prices	6.44	8.47	2.03	7.98	8.47	0.49
" " - Low fuel prices	5.28	7.41	2.13	6.41	7.41	1.00
10% Additional Investment	6.30	8.47	2.17	7.72	8.47	0.75
Construction costs escalate +1%/yr	-	-	-	7.97	9.28	1.31
" " " -1%/yr	-	-	-	7.19	6.91	-0.28
Coal prices escalate +1%/yr	-	-	-	7.54	8.40	0.86
" " " -1%/yr	-	-	-	7.54	7.64	0.10

TABLE 3.08

Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D
Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification

Mid-Continent Location, 1980 \$, \$/MBtu

	1980			2000		
	Methane Reforming	New Coal Gasification	Advantage For MR	Methane Reforming	New Coal Gasification	Advantage For MR
Base Case - Most likely fuel prices	6.12	8.17	2.05	7.54	8.17	0.63
" " - High fuel prices	6.44	8.87	2.43	7.98	8.87	0.89
" " - Low fuel prices	5.28	7.59	2.31	6.41	7.59	1.18
10% Additional Investment	6.30	8.69	2.39	7.72	8.87	1.15
Construction costs escalate +1%/yr	-	-	-	7.97	9.55	1.58
" " " -1%/yr	-	-	-	7.19	7.05	-0.14
Coal prices escalate +1%/yr	-	-	-	7.54	8.56	1.02
" " " -1%/yr	-	-	-	7.54	7.85	0.31

TABLE 3.09

Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D
Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification

Gulf Coast Location, 1980 \$, \$/MBtu

	1980			2000		
	<u>Methane Reforming</u>	<u>New Coal Gasification</u>	<u>Advantage For MR</u>	<u>Methane Reforming</u>	<u>New Coal Gasification</u>	<u>Advantage For MR</u>
Base Case - most likely fuel prices	6.12	9.85	3.73	7.54	9.85	2.31
Base Case - high fuel prices	6.44	10.26	3.82	7.98	10.26	2.28
Base Case - low fuel prices	5.28	9.50	4.22	6.41	9.50	3.09
10% additional investment	6.30	10.44	4.14	7.72	10.44	2.72
Construction costs escalate +1%/yr.	--	--	--	7.97	11.41	3.44
Construction costs escalate -1%/yr.	--	--	--	7.19	8.58	1.39
Coal prices escalate +1%/yr.	--	--	--	7.54	10.43	2.89
Coal prices escalate -1%/yr.	--	--	--	7.54	9.38	1.84

TABLE 3.10

Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D
Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification

West Coast Location, 1980 \$, \$/MBtu

	1980			2000		
	Methane Reforming	New Coal Gasification	Advantage For MR	Methane Reforming	New Coal Gasification	Advantage For MR
Base Case, most likely fuel prices	6.12	9.39	3.27	7.54	9.39	1.85
Base Case, high fuel prices	6.44	9.72	3.28	7.98	9.72	1.74
Base Case, low fuel prices	5.28	8.96	3.68	6.41	8.96	2.55
10% additional investment	6.30	9.98	3.68	7.72	9.98	2.26
Construction costs escalate +1%/yr.	--	--	--	7.97	10.95	2.98
Construction costs escalate -1%/yr.	--	--	--	7.19	8.12	0.93
Coal prices escalate +1%/yr.	--	--	--	7.54	9.87	2.33
Coal prices escalate -1%/yr.	--	--	--	7.54	9.00	1.46

TABLE 3.11

Hydrogen Manufacture in 100 MSCF/D Plants - Cost of Hydrocarbon
Feedstock Released When Using New Coal Gasification Process

Coal gasification plants located in Illinois, 1980-2000, 1980 \$

Illinois high sulfur coal delivered to plant, \$/ton	14.82	21.80	30.80
Illinois high sulfur coal delivered to plant, \$/MBtu	0.65	0.96	1.35
<u>Costs for producing refinery hydrogen, \$/MBtu</u>			
Total cost from coal	7.60	8.17	8.89
Deduct methane reforming cost exclusive of feedstock	(1.63)	(1.63)	(1.63)
Cost of releasing 1.434 MBtu of natural gas feed required for reforming	5.97	6.54	7.26
Cost of natural gas released, \$/MBtu	4.16	4.56	5.06
Cost of natural gas released, \$/bbl crude equivalent	23.13	25.35	28.13

TABLE 3.12

Comparison of Current and SPE Electrolysis Systems
1980 Operation, 1980 \$

Process	<u>Current Technology</u> <u>KOH Electrolyte</u>		<u>New Technology</u> <u>SPE Electrolyte</u>	
Plant capacity M SCF/Day	100		100	
Plant capacity M SCF/yr	33000		33000	
Plant capacity MBtu/yr x 10 ⁶	10.63		10.63	
Hours per year operation	7920		7920	
MBtu Hydrogen product/MBtu electricity x 100	75.7		77.6	
<u>Investment</u>	<u>\$/kw</u>	<u>\$M</u>	<u>\$/kw</u>	<u>\$M</u>
Onsites	650	255	167	65.6
Offsites	100	40	39	15.4
Total	750	295	206	81.0
% contingency in investments	15	15	30	30
Working capital	--	18.9	--	18.3
<u>Operating Costs</u>	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>	<u>\$M/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>
Electricity @ \$0.027/kwhr	111.016	10.44	108.298	10.19
Water and chemicals	1.246	0.12	0.741	0.07
Labor and supervision	1.204	0.11	0.602	0.06
Maintenance (4% of onsite)	10.200	0.96	2.624	0.25
Plant overhead (2.6% of onsite)	6.630	0.62	1.706	0.16
Insurance, property taxes (1.5% of total plant)	4.425	0.42	1.215	0.11
Depreciation (10% of onsite, 4% of offsites)	27.500	2.59	7.330	0.69
Interest on working capital (10%)	1.890	0.18	1.830	0.17
Return on investment (20% of total)	59.000	5.55	16.200	1.52
Total cost inc. return	223.111	20.99	140.546	13.22
Oxygen credit (\$24/ton)	(16.704)	(1.57)	(16.704)	(1.57)
Net cost including return	206.407	19.42	123.842	11.65

TABLE 3.13

Production Costs for Hydrogen--SPE Electrolysis
Off-Peak Electricity Operation

1980 Operation, 1980 \$

Capacity--4.167 MSCF/SH

<u>Investment--M\$</u>	<u>\$/kw Hydrogen</u>
Onsite 65.6	167
Offsite 15.4	39
Total 81.0	206

% contingency in investment--30

Operating hours/year
MBtu/yr x 10⁶

Operating Costs

Electricity @ \$0.01/kwhr

Water and chemicals

Labor and supervision

Maintenance (4% of onsites)

Plant overhead (2.6% of onsite)

Insurance, property tax (1.5% of T.P.)

Depreciation (10% of onsites + 4% OS)

Interest on working capital

Return on investment (20% of total)

	7920	
	10.63	
	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>
Electricity @ \$0.01/kwhr	40.110	3.77
Water and chemicals	0.741	0.77
Labor and supervision	0.602	0.06
Maintenance (4% of onsites)	2.624	0.25
Plant overhead (2.6% of onsite)	1.706	0.16
Insurance, property tax (1.5% of T.P.)	1.215	0.11
Depreciation (10% of onsites + 4% OS)	7.330	0.69
Interest on working capital	0.691	0.07
Return on investment (20% of total)	<u>16.200</u>	<u>1.52</u>
	71.219	6.70

	3300	
	4.43	
	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/MBtu</u>
Electricity @ \$0.01/kwhr	16.713	3.77
Water and chemicals	0.309	0.07
Labor and supervision	0.602	0.14
Maintenance (4% of onsites)	2.624	0.59
Plant overhead (2.6% of onsite)	1.706	0.39
Insurance, property tax (1.5% of T.P.)	1.215	0.27
Depreciation (10% of onsites + 4% OS)	7.330	1.69
Interest on working capital	0.294	0.07
Return on investment (20% of total)	<u>16.200</u>	<u>3.66</u>
	46.993	10.65

TABLE 3.14

Production Cost Analysis for Hydrogen Storage
by Iron Titanium Hydride System⁽¹⁾

1980 \$

Location - U.S. Gulf Coast, 1980-2000 period

Pressure - input hydrogen - 450 psig

- hydrogen product - 290 psig

Storage capacity = 3.0M SCF/hr for 10 hours

= 30.0M SCF total for one storage cycle

= 159,580 lbs. total for one storage cycle

Product rate from plant = 1.736 MSCF/hr for 14 hours

= 24.310 MSCF total for one storage cycle

= 129,310 lbs. for one storage cycle

= 8022M SCF/yr

= 2.583×10^5 MSCF/yr

Investment, \$ Millions

Fe/Ti alloy - 13.8×10^6 lbs @ \$1.50	20.7
---	------

Process equipment	11.6
-------------------	------

Offsites	3.2
----------	-----

Contingency	<u>10.7</u>
-------------	-------------

Total plant	46.2
-------------	------

Onsites	42.0
---------	------

Offsites	<u>4.2</u>
----------	------------

Total plant	46.2
-------------	------

(1) Data from Reference 19

TABLE 3.15

Production Costs for Hydrogen Product -
SPE Electrolysis Coupled to
Iron Titanium Hydride Hydrogen Storage

1980 operation, 1980 \$

This system involves operating the SPE electrolysis system with off-peak electricity for 10 hours per day with Fe/Ti hydride storage to provide for continuous delivery of hydrogen to load.

Capacity - Electrolysis - 4.167 MSCF/hr, 10 hrs/day, 330 days/yr
 - Fe/Ti Hydride Stg. - 159,520 lbs/hr hydrogen storage
 per cycle to provide 1.736 MSCF/hr to load for 14 hours.
 Capacity - Overall to Load - 1.736 MSCF/hr for 24 hrs/day
 - " " " - 4.427 MBtu x 10⁶ per year

	<u>Electrolysis</u>	<u>Storage</u>	<u>Total</u>	
<u>Investment, \$M</u>				
Onsites	65.6	42.0	107.6	
Offsites	15.4	4.2	19.6	
Total	81.0	46.2	127.2	
% Contingency in investment	30	30	30	
Working capital	2.937	0.166	3.103	
				<u>Total Cost</u>
				<u>\$/MBtu</u>
<u>Operating Cost, \$M/yr</u>				
Electricity @ \$0.01/kwhr	16.713	-	16.713	3.78
Chemicals, catalyst, utilities	0.309	0.995	1.304	0.29
Labor and supervision	0.602	-	0.602	0.14
Maintenance (4% onsite)	2.624	1.680	4.304	0.97
Plant overhead (2.6% onsite)	1.706	1.092	2.798	0.63
Ins. property taxes (1.5% total)	1.215	0.693	1.908	0.43
Depreciation (10% onsite + 5% off)	7.330	4.410	11.740	2.65
Interest on working capital (10%)	0.294	0.017	0.311	0.07
Return on investment (20%)	16.200	9.240	25.440	5.75
Total cost inc. return	46.993	18.127	65.120	14.71

FIGURE 3.04

Hydrogen Manufacturing Costs - Electrolysis

\$/MBtu - 1980 \$

TABLE 3.16

Sensitivities for Hydrogen Manufacture by Electrolysis

All data are hydrogen production costs including
20% before tax return, \$/MBtu, 1980 \$

Process	Year	Current KOH Elect.	New Technology SPE Electrolyte		
		Continuous	Continuous	Off-Peak	Off-Peak + Storage
Operating mode					
Base case, most likely electricity prices	1980	20.99	13.22	10.65	14.71
	2000	20.99	13.22	10.65	14.71
Base case, high electricity prices	1980	22.15	14.35	12.51	16.60
	2000	22.15	14.35	12.51	16.60
Base case, low electricity prices	1980	18.28	10.58	8.73	12.82
	2000	18.28	10.58	8.73	12.82
Additional 10% investment contingency	1980	21.89	13.44	11.28	15.76
	2000	21.89	13.44	11.28	15.76
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr above inflation	2000	23.26	13.86	12.08	17.08
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr below inflation	2000	19.13	12.70	9.41	12.80

" THIS PAGE IS PURPOSELY LEFT BLANK "

4. ECONOMICS OF AMMONIA MANUFACTURE

Ammonia provides the largest single requirement for industrial hydrogen. In the U. S. essentially all ammonia currently produced (about 16 MST/yr) is made by catalytic steam reforming of natural gas or some other light hydrocarbon feed stock. Future shortages of these feed stocks and increases in their prices will provide the incentive for seriously considering coal or residuum as alternative feed stocks for ammonia manufacture.

In this study economics for ammonia manufacture in the 1980-2000 period have been calculated for steam reforming, resid partial oxidation, K-T coal gasification, and new coal gasification. Production cost data for these processes were developed by Chem Systems, Inc. and are presented in Appendix A.

Investments and operating cost data for ammonia plants of 2000 ST/SD capacity are summarized in Table 4.01 and are shown in greater detail in Table 4.02. The production cost data are compared in the diagrams shown in Figure 4.01. These data are further summarized as follows:

Investments and Operating Costs for Ammonia Plants of 2000 ST/SD Capacity

	Investment \$ Millions <u>1980 or 2000</u>	Production Cost Including	
		Return, \$/ST Ammonia	
		<u>1980</u>	<u>2000</u>
Steam Reforming	180.6	210	248
Resid Partial Oxidation	280.6	248	283
K-T Coal Gasification	395.0	248	248
New Coal Gasification	362.0	227	227

In the year 1980 steam reforming will be the most attractive ammonia producing process because of its substantially lower investment and operating costs. However, by the year 2000 the price of natural gas (or an alternative light hydrocarbon feed stock) will increase substantially thus providing equivalent production costs for reforming and K-T coal gasification. In the year 2000, costs for ammonia production by new coal gasification will be \$227/ST compared to \$248/ST for both reforming and K-T coal gasification, thereby making it attractive to consider new coal gasification.

It has been assumed that the ammonia plants using new coal gasification would be located in Illinois and Illinois high sulfur coal would be used as the feed stock. This Illinois location provides the lowest cost ammonia manufacture using coal gasification and is in the corn belt, the largest ammonia consuming area of the U. S.

Resid partial oxidation is not competitive in either 1980 or 2000 unless resid feed stock could be purchased at prices substantially below those assumed in this study.

Table 4.03 presents data regarding the sensitivity of ammonia manufacturing costs for the several economic effects previously discussed. These data are compared for reforming and new coal gasification in Table 4.04 for the years 1980 and 2000. In 1980 reforming has an advantage over new coal gasification of \$17 to 26/ST (8-12%). However, by the year 2000 the higher cost of reformer feed stock compared to coal provides an advantage for new coal gasification over reforming of \$5 to 38/ST (2 to 15%).

Plotting the ammonia manufacturing costs for reforming and new coal gasification for the most likely feed stock prices against time shows that the cost with new coal gasification equals that with reforming in the year 1989. After the year 1989, new coal gasification provides lower ammonia manufacturing costs than reforming. This relationship is shown in Figure 4.02. The corresponding data for methanol (Section 5) are also shown in this plot for comparison.

Table 4.05 presents estimates to show new U. S. ammonia manufacturing capacity added during the 1980-2000 period including capacity installed as reforming and new coal gasification. By the year 2000, the U. S. ammonia capacity will be 41.8 M ST/yr; 21.4 M ST/yr will be with new coal gasification and 20.4 M ST/yr will be with reforming. The reformer capacity will require natural gas or some other light hydrocarbon feed stock equivalent to 352,000 B/D of crude. The new coal gasification capacity will replace reformer capacity that would require 370,000 B/D crude equivalent. This saving of hydrocarbon feed stock is discussed further in Section 7.

If the new coal gasification process were available for commercial use, ammonia plants installed with this process would have the overall effect of releasing natural gas or light hydrocarbon feed stock that would be required if the ammonia were produced by reforming. Table 4.06 shows the calculated cost of releasing reformer feed stock by using the new coal gasification process for producing ammonia from Illinois high sulfur coal. When the coal is purchased at its most likely price, the cost of releasing reformer feed is \$3.66/MBtu or \$20.35/bbl crude equivalent. If the coal were purchased at its low price, the corresponding values are \$3.26/MBtu and \$18.13/bbl crude equivalent. The high coal price corresponds to \$4.14/MBtu and \$23.02/bbl crude equivalent. All these values are in excess of the anticipated 1980 price of imported crude (about \$15/bbl) thus confirming that reforming is the preferred ammonia manufacturing process in 1980.

TABLE 4.01

Summary of Investments and Operating Costs for Ammonia Manufacture

All plants are 2000 ST/SD capacity; operation in 1980, 1980 \$

	Methane Steam <u>Reforming</u>	Resid Partial <u>Oxidation</u>	<u>Coal Gasification⁽¹⁾</u>	
			<u>K-T</u>	<u>New</u>
<u>Investment, \$ Millions</u>				
Onsite	116.5	170.6	235.1	209.2
Offsite	<u>64.1</u>	<u>110.0</u>	<u>159.9</u>	<u>152.9</u>
Total	180.6	280.6	395.0	362.1
Cost of feed stock, \$/MBtu	3.15	2.35	0.96	0.96
<u>Costs and Charges, \$/ST ammonia</u>				
Feed stock	110.39	93.18	38.65	36.13
Other operating costs	4.53	12.01	11.31	10.58
Capital charges ⁽²⁾	<u>94.91</u>	<u>142.88</u>	<u>197.81</u>	<u>179.94</u>
Total	209.83	248.07	247.77	226.65

(1) Coal gasification plants are located in Illinois and use Illinois high sulfur coal.

(2) Capital charges include maintenance, overhead, insurance property taxes, depreciation, interest on working capital and 20%/year before tax return.

TABLE 4.02

Summary of Economics for Ammonia Manufacture

1980 Operation; 1980\$

Process Plant location	<u>Methane Reforming</u> Gulf Coast		<u>Resid Partial Oxidation</u> Gulf Coast		<u>K-T Coal Gasification</u> Mid-Continent		<u>New Coal Gasification</u> Mid-Continent	
Design capacity ST NH ₃ /Day	2000		2000		2000		2000	
Design capacity ST NH ₃ /yr x 10 ⁶	0.660		0.660		0.660		0.660	
Feed stock cost at plant	---		\$15.00/bbl		\$21.80/ton		\$21.80/ton	
Feed stock cost at plant \$/MBtu	3.15		2.35		0.96		0.96	
<u>Investment, \$ Millions</u>								
Onsite	116.5		170.6		235.1		209.2	
Offsite	64.1		110.0		159.9		152.9	
Total plant	180.6		280.6		395.0		362.1	
Working capital	12.6		11.6		5.5		5.1	
<u>Costs and Charges</u>	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/ST</u>	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/ST</u>	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/ST</u>	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/ST</u>
Feed stock	72.860	110.39	61.500	93.18	25.506	38.65	23.849	36.13
Utilities	0.711	1.08	5.046	7.65	4.678	7.09	4.131	6.26
Chemicals and Catalyst	0.800	1.21	0.800	1.21	0.700	1.06	0.700	1.06
Labor and supervision	1.480	2.24	2.082	3.15	2.086	3.16	2.086	3.16
Maintenance (4% onsite)	4.660	7.06	6.824	10.34	9.404	14.25	8.368	12.68
Plant overhead (2.6% onsite)	3.029	4.59	4.436	6.72	6.113	9.26	5.439	8.24
Insurance, property taxes (1.5% total plant)	2.709	4.10	4.209	6.38	5.925	8.98	5.432	8.23
Depreciation (10% onsite + 5% offsite)	14.855	22.51	22.560	34.18	31.503	47.73	28.565	43.28
Interest on working capital (10%)	1.264	1.92	1.157	1.75	0.550	0.83	0.513	0.78
Return on investment (20% total pl.)	36.120	54.73	56.120	85.03	79.000	119.70	72.420	109.73
Total including return	138.488	209.83	164.734	249.59	165.467	250.71	151.503	229.55
Sulfur credit (\$50/ton)	---	---	(1.000)	(1.52)	(1.940)	(2.94)	(1.915)	(2.90)
Net cost including return	138.488	209.83	163.734	248.07	163.527	247.77	149.588	226.65

FIGURE 4.01

Ammonia Manufacturing Costs - Midcontinent Location

\$/ST - 2000 T/D Plants - 1980 \$

TABLE 4.03

Sensitivities for Ammonia Manufacture

All data are ammonia production costs including
20% below tax return, \$/ST, 1980 \$

Location	Year	Methane Reforming	Resid Partial Oxid.	Coal Gasification	
				K-T	New
		All	All	Midcontinent	
Base case - most likely fuel price	1980	210	248	248	227
	2000	248	283	248	227
Base case - high fuel price	1980	219	265	266	244
	2000	260	306	266	244
Base case - low fuel price	1980	187	214	233	213
	2000	218	238	233	213
Additional 10% investment contingency	1980	218	261	265	242
	2000	256	296	265	242
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr. above gen. infl.	2000	269	314	292	267
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr. below gen. infl.	2000	231	257	211	193
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr. above gen. infl.	2000	--	--	258	236
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr. below gen. infl.	2000	--	--	239	219

TABLE 4.04

Sensitivities for Ammonia Manufacture in 2000 ST/SD
Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification

Midcontinent Location, 1980 \$, \$/ST

	1980			2000		
	<u>Methane Reforming</u>	<u>New Coal Gasification</u>	<u>Advantage For MR</u>	<u>Methane Reforming</u>	<u>New Coal Gasification</u>	<u>Advantage For MR</u>
Base Case, most likely fuel prices	210	227	17	248	227	-21
Base Case, high fuel prices	219	244	25	260	244	-16
Base Case, low fuel prices	187	213	26	218	213	-5
10% additional investment	218	242	24	256	242	-14
Construction costs escalate +1%/yr.	--	--	--	269	267	-2
Construction costs escalate -1%/yr.	--	--	--	231	193	-38
Coal prices escalate +1%/yr.	--	--	--	248	236	-12
Coal prices escalate -1%/yr.	--	--	--	248	219	-29

FIGURE 4.02

Production Costs, Ammonia and Methanol
by Natural Gas Reforming and New Coal Gasification

2000 T/D Plants, Midcontinent Location, 1980 \$
Most Likely Feed Stock Prices

TABLE 4.05

U.S. Ammonia Requirements and Capacity

Year	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
Ammonia requirements, MST/yr.	16.0	21.3	25.2	30.5	35.7	41.8
<u>Ammonia production cost in new plants, \$/ST</u>						
Reforming (1980 \$)	--	210	220	229	239	248
New coal (1980 \$)	--	--	223	227	227	227
<u>Capacity added, 5 years ending, MST/yr.</u>						
For growth	--	5.3	3.9	5.3	5.2	6.1
For replacement	--	4.0	5.3	6.3	7.6	8.9
Total	--	9.3	9.2	11.6	12.8	15.0
Total, cumulative	--	--	9.2	20.8	33.6	48.6
Reformer capacity added		9.3	9.2	10.0	5.0	3.0
New coal capacity added		--	--	1.6	7.8	12.0
Total		9.3	9.2	11.6	12.8	15.0
<u>Capacity in operation, MST/yr.</u>						
Reformer	16.0	21.3	25.2	28.9	26.3	20.4
New coal	--	--	--	1.6	9.4	21.4
Total	16.0	21.3	25.2	30.5	35.7	41.8
<u>Natural gas equivalent of ammonia production, MB/D crude*</u>						
For reformer ammonia	0.276	0.368	0.435	0.499	0.454	0.352
For new coal ammonia	--	--	--	0.028	0.162	0.370
Total	0.276	0.368	0.435	0.527	0.616	0.722

* 1.0 ST of ammonia requires 35.045 MBtu of natural gas feed = 6.303 bbl. crude oil.

TABLE 4.06

Cost of Releasing Natural Gas Feed Stock for Ammonia
Manufacture by New Coal Gasification

1980 operation, 1980 \$

Price of Illinois High Sulfur Coal, \$/Tcr	14.82	21.80	30.80
Price of Illinois High Sulfur Coal, \$/MEtu	0.65	0.96	1.35
<u>Costs for Producing Ammonia \$/ST</u>			
Total cost - new coal process	213	227	244
Deduct reforming costs exclusive of feedstock	<u>99</u>	<u>99</u>	<u>99</u>
Cost of releasing 35.04 MBtu of natural gas	114	128	145
Cost of releasing natural gas feed, \$/MBtu	3.26	3.66	4.14
Cost of releasing natural gas feed, \$/bbl crude equiv.	18.13	20.35	23.02

5. ECONOMICS OF METHANOL MANUFACTURE

Essentially all methanol manufactured in the U. S. is produced by catalytic steam reforming of natural gas or some other light hydrocarbon feed stock. However, a large methanol plant was recently announced for the Houston ship channel area will employ resid partial oxidation. Future shortages of natural gas and other light hydrocarbon feed stocks will encourage the consideration of resid and coal as alternative feed stocks.

As was done for ammonia manufacture, economics for methanol manufacture for the 1980-2000 period have been calculated for steam reforming, resid partial oxidation, K-T coal gasification and new coal gasification. Production cost data for these processes were developed by Chem Systems, Inc. and are presented in Appendix A.

Investments and operating cost data for methanol plants of 2000 ST/SD capacity are summarized in Table 5.01 and are shown in greater detail in Table 5.02. The production cost data are compared in Figure 5.01. These data are further summarized as follows:

Investments and Operating Costs for Methanol Plants of 2000 ST/SD Capacity

	1980 \$	Production Cost Including Return, \$/ST Methanol	
	Investment \$ Millions 1980 or 2000	1980	2000
Steam Reforming	135.3	195	236
Resid Partial oxidation	231.1	221	255
K-T coal gasification	350.4	226	226
New coal gasification	310.1	198	198

In the year 1980 steam reforming will be the most attractive methanol process because of its low investment and low operating costs. However, by the year 2000, production costs for methanol manufacture by the new coal process will be substantially below those for reforming or resid partial oxidation. Predicted methanol manufacturing costs for the year 2000 will be \$198/ST for the new coal process compared to \$236/ST for reforming.

Methanol plants using the new coal process will be located in geographical areas where low cost high Btu coal is available and methanol markets can be serviced with low transportation costs. These requirements would correspond to plants being located in the East Coast area or possibly the Midcontinent area. The economics shown above assume the coal based plant is located in Illinois and would use Illinois high sulfur coal as feed stock.

Resid partial oxidation is not competitive in either 1980 or 2000 unless resid feed stock could be purchased at prices substantially below those assumed in this study.

Table 5.03 presents data to show the sensitivity of methanol manufacturing costs for the several economic effects previously described. These data for reforming and new coal gasification are compared in Table 5.04 for the years 1980 and 2000. In 1980 reforming has a small advantage over new coal gasification of \$3 to 14/ST (2 to 7%). By the year 2000 new coal gasification has an advantage over reforming of \$18 to 53/ST (8 to 22%).

Plotting the methanol manufacturing cost (most likely feed stock prices) for reforming and new coal gasification against time shows the two processes provide equal costs in the year 1982. After 1982, the cost with new coal is less than for reforming. This relationship is shown in Figure 5.02. The corresponding data for ammonia manufacture (Section 4) are shown in this plot for comparison.

Table 5.05 presents estimates to show the new U. S. methanol capacity added during the 1980-2000 period including capacity installed as reforming and as new coal gasification. By the year 2000 the U. S. methanol capacity will be 15.3 million ST/yr; 13.2 million ST/yr will employ new coal gasification and 2.1 will be with reforming. The reformer capacity will require natural gas or another light hydrocarbon feed stock equivalent to 37,000 B/D of crude. The new coal gasification capacity will replace reformer capacity that would require 230,000 B/D of crude equivalent. This saving is discussed further in Section 7.

Table 5.06 shows the calculated cost of releasing reformer feed stock by using the new coal gasification process for producing methanol using Illinois high sulfur coal. When the coal is purchased at its most likely price the cost of releasing reformer feed is \$3.22/MBtu or \$17.90/bbl crude equivalent. The corresponding data are \$2.85/MBtu and \$15.85/bbl for the low coal price and \$3.67/MBtu and \$20.41/bbl for the high coal price. These values are somewhat in excess of the anticipated price of imported crude (about \$15/bbl), thus confirming that reforming is the more attractive methanol manufacturing process in 1980.

TABLE 5.01

Summary of Investments and Operating Costs for Methanol Manufacture

All plants are 2000 ST/SD capacity; operation in 1980; 1980 \$

	Methane Steam Reforming	Resid Partial Oxidation	Coal Gasification ⁽¹⁾	
			K-T	New
<u>Investment, \$ Millions</u>				
Onsite	87.9	137.9	206.1	175.2
Offsite	47.4	93.3	144.3	134.9
Total	135.3	231.1	350.4	310.1
Cost of feed stock, \$/MBtu	3.15	2.35	0.96	0.96
<u>Costs and Charges, \$/ST Methanol</u>				
Feed stock	111.68	93.18	37.46	35.01
Other operating costs	11.69	10.32	10.26	9.49
Capital charges ⁽²⁾	71.84	117.24	177.86	153.35
Total	195.21	220.74	225.58	197.85

(1) Coal gasification plants are located in Illinois and use Illinois high sulfur coal.

(2) Capital charges include maintenance, overhead, insurance, property taxes, depreciation, interest on working capital, and 20%/year before tax return.

TABLE 5.02

Summary of Economics for Methanol Manufacture

1980 Operation; 1980 \$

Process	<u>Methane Reforming</u>		<u>Resid Partial Oxidation</u>		<u>K-T Coal Gasification</u>		<u>New Coal Gasification</u>	
Plant location	Gulf Coast		Gulf Coast		Mid-Continent		Mid-Continent	
Design capacity ST CH ₃ OH/day	2000		2000		2000		2000	
Design capacity ST CH ₃ OH/year x 10 ⁶	0.660		0.660		0.660		0.660	
Feed stock cost at plant	--		\$15.00/bbl		\$21.80/ton		\$21.80/ton	
Feed stock cost at plant \$/MBtu	3.15		2.35		0.96		0.96	
<u>Investment, \$ Millions</u>								
Onsite	87.9		137.9		206.1		175.2	
Offsite	47.4		93.3		144.3		134.9	
Total plant	135.3		231.1		350.4		310.1	
Working capital	13.6		11.4		5.2		4.9	
<u>Costs and Charges</u>								
	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/ST</u>	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/ST</u>	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/ST</u>	<u>M\$/yr</u>	<u>\$/ST</u>
Feed stock	73.710	111.68	61.500	93.18	24.721	37.46	23.108	35.01
Utilities	4.090	6.20	3.933	5.96	4.235	6.42	3.732	5.65
Chemicals and catalyst	2.147	3.25	0.800	1.21	0.450	0.68	0.450	0.68
Labor and supervision	1.480	2.24	2.082	3.15	2.086	3.16	2.086	3.16
Maintenance (4% onsite)	3.516	5.33	5.516	8.36	8.244	12.49	7.008	10.62
Plant overhead (2.6% onsite)	2.285	3.46	3.585	5.43	5.359	8.12	4.555	6.90
Insurance, property taxes (1.5% total plant)	2.030	3.08	3.467	5.25	5.256	7.96	4.652	7.05
Depreciation (10% onsite + 5% offsite)	11.160	16.91	18.455	27.96	27.825	42.16	24.265	36.77
Interest on working capital (10%)	1.357	2.06	1.139	1.73	0.525	0.80	0.490	0.74
Return on onvestment (20% tot. plant)	27.060	41.00	46.220	70.03	72.080	109.21	62.020	93.97
Total including return	128.835	195.21	146.697	222.26	150.781	228.46	132.366	200.55
Sulfur credit (\$50/ton)	--	--	(1.000)	(1.52)	(1.900)	(2.88)	(1.780)	(2.70)
Net cost including return	128.835	195.21	145.697	220.74	148.881	225.58	130.586	197.85

FIGURE 5.01

Methanol Manufacturing Costs - Midcontinent Location

\$/ST - 2000 T/D Plants - 1980 \$

TABLE 5.03

Sensitivities for Methanol Manufacture

All data are methanol production costs including
20% before tax return, \$/ST, 1980 \$

Location	Year	Methane Reforming	Resid Partial Oxid.	Coal Gasification	
				K-T	New
		All	All	Midcontinent	
Base case - most likely fuel price	1980	195	221	226	198
	2000	236	255	226	198
Base case - high fuel price	1980	205	237	243	214
	2000	249	277	243	214
Base case - low fuel price	1980	171	187	211	185
	2000	203	210	211	185
Additional 10% investment contingency	1980	202	231	241	211
	2000	242	265	241	211
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr. above gen. infl.	2000	251	280	265	232
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr. below gen. infl.	2000	223	233	193	170
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr. above gen. infl.	2000	--	--	235	207
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr. below gen. infl.	2000	--	--	218	190

TABLE 5.04

Sensitivities for Methanol Manufacture in 2000 ST/SD
Plants for Methane Reforming and New Coal Gasification

Midcontinent Location, 1980 \$, \$/ST

	1980			2000		
	<u>Methane Reforming</u>	<u>New Coal Gasification</u>	<u>Advantage For MR</u>	<u>Methane Reforming</u>	<u>New Coal Gasification</u>	<u>Advantage for MR</u>
Base Case, most likely fuel prices	195	198	3	236	198	-38
Base Case, high fuel prices	205	214	9	249	214	-35
Base Case, low fuel prices	171	185	14	203	185	-18
10% additional investment	202	211	9	242	211	-31
Construction costs escalate +1%/yr.	--	--	--	251	232	-19
Construction costs escalate -1%/yr.	--	--	--	223	170	-53
Coal prices escalate +1%/yr.	--	--	--	236	207	-29
Coal prices escalate -1%/yr.	--	--	--	236	190	-46

FIGURE 5.02

PRODUCTION COSTS, AMMONIA AND METHANOL
BY NATURAL GAS REFORMING AND NEW COAL GASIFICATION

2000 T/D Plants, Midcontinent Location, 1980 \$

Most Likely Feed Stock Prices

TABLE 5.05

U.S. Methanol Requirements and Capacity

Year	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
Methanol requirements, MST/yr.	3.8	5.3	6.6	9.5	12.1	15.3
<u>Methanol production cost in new plants, \$/ST</u>						
Reforming (1980 \$)	--	195	205	216	226	236
New coal (1980 \$)	--	198	198	198	198	198
<u>Capacity added, 5 years ending, MST/yr.</u>						
For growth	--	1.5	1.3	2.9	2.6	3.2
For replacement	--	0.9	1.3	1.6	2.4	3.0
Total		2.4	2.6	4.5	5.0	6.2
Reformer capacity added	--	2.4	1.6	1.5	1.0	1.0
New coal capacity added	--	--	1.0	3.0	4.0	5.2
Total		2.4	2.6	4.5	5.0	6.2
<u>Capacity in operation, MST/yr.</u>						
Reformer	3.8	5.3	5.6	5.5	4.1	2.1
New Coal	--	--	1.0	4.0	8.0	13.2
Total	3.8	5.3	6.6	9.5	12.1	15.3
<u>Natural gas equivalent of methanol production, MB/D crude*</u>						
For reformer ammonia	0.066	0.093	0.098	0.096	0.072	0.037
For new coal ammonia	--	--	0.017	0.070	0.140	0.230
Total	0.066	0.093	0.115	0.166	0.212	0.267

 * 1.0 ST of methanol requires 35.455×10^6 Btu of feed = 6.38 bbl. of crude oil.

TABLE 5.06

Cost of Releasing Natural Gas Feed Stock for Methanol
Manufacture by New Coal Gasification

1980 Operation, 1980 \$

Price of Illinois High Sulfur Coal, \$/Ton	14.82	21.80	30.80
" " " " " " , \$/MBtu	0.65	0.96	1.35
<u>Costs for Producing Methanol, \$/ST</u>			
Total cost, new coal process	185	198	214
Deduct reforming costs exclusive of feed	<u>84</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>84</u>
Cost of releasing 35.45 MBtu of natural gas	101	114	130
Cost of releasing natural gas feed, \$/MBtu	2.85	3.22	3.67
" " " " " " , \$/bbl crude equiv.	15.85	17.90	20.41

6. ECONOMICS FOR SMALL USER HYDROGEN

Requirements for hydrogen for the various small uses were discussed previously in Section 1 including Tables 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, and Figure 1.01.

The consumer who requires a "small" quantity of hydrogen in the range of 1000 to 1.0 million SCF/D has several choices for procuring his hydrogen supply. If his facility is near a large hydrogen producer he may arrange to purchase hydrogen for over the fence pipe line delivery. If this cannot be done, he would consider the purchase of hydrogen from an industrial gas producer with delivery by truck either as a gas in pressurized cylinders or as liquid hydrogen. Since hydrogen purchased by truck delivery is rather expensive, another choice would be to install a steam reformer or water electrolyzer as a hydrogen manufacturing facility and use either natural gas, LPG, or electricity as the energy source. It is beyond the scope of this report to show the economics for these choices for all geographical locations. However, the general range of costs that apply to these choices are discussed so as to provide general guidance.

Economics data for steam reforming in 100 MSCF/SD plants are presented in Section 3 (Table 3.02). Economics data for small capacity reformers is discussed in Reference 22. Data from this reference have been adjusted to 1980 operation and 1980 \$ using the feed stock and other values used previously for calculating the economics of large reformers. These data for small reformers are presented in Table 6.01. The unit investment cost for these small reformers increases substantially as plant size is decreased:

0.100 MSCF/SD	-	\$68.81/MBtu/yr
0.480 MSCF/SD	-	24.81/MBtu/yr
2.400 MSCF/SD	-	9.92/MBtu/yr
100 MSCF/SD	-	5.55/MBtu/yr

Labor costs for operating small reformer plants have a large effect on total production costs. The data shown in Table 6.01 assume each of these small reformers is operated essentially unattended (0.15 to 0.26 operator/shift). If one full time operator were required the total cost for hydrogen would be as follows:

0.100 MSCF/SD	-	\$37.94/MBtu
0.480 MSCF/SD	-	20.77/MBtu
2.40 MSCF/SD	-	10.12/MBtu

The investment in SPE electrolysis plants should be essentially constant at \$200/kw. Production cost data for small capacity SPE electrolysis plants have been calculated as shown in Table 6.02. It was also assumed that these plants would operate essentially unattended. If one full time operator per shift were required, the electrolytic hydrogen costs would be as follows:

0.100 MSCF/SD - \$44.38/MBtu
0.480 MSCF/SD - 19.68/MBtu
2.40 MSCF/SD - 14.37/MBtu

Currently available electrolysis plants cost about \$500/kw rather than \$200/kw projected for the SPE process. Electrolytic hydrogen from currently available electrolysis plants will cost about \$6.00/MBtu more than that from SPE electrolysis plants.

Current costs (late 1976) for hydrogen purchased for truck delivery have been converted to 1980 \$ using a 5%/yr escalation rate. These costs are plotted in Figure 6.01 along with the costs including return for manufacturing hydrogen by reforming and SPE electrolysis.

In the requirement range up to about 50,000 SCF/day it is probably more attractive to purchase hydrogen for truck delivery than to manufacture it on site, assuming the dealer does not have to truck it more than about 50 miles. Purchased hydrogen will cost about \$100/MBtu at the rate of 100 SCF/day and will decrease to \$25-40/MBtu for 100,000 SCF/day.

For requirements in the range of 50,000 to 500,000 SCF/day, SPE electrolysis would provide the lowest cost assuming this process were available. Costs with SPE electrolysis would be in the range of \$15-20/MBtu. Above 500,000 SCF/day reforming using either natural gas or LPG feed stock is probably the most attractive system (\$6 to 15/MBtu). However, the cost and availability of natural gas and LPG feed stock varies considerably from one geographical area to another.

Many small hydrogen users consume hydrogen only a few hours per day. Reforming is not attractive under these circumstances since these plants require several hours to achieve economic, steady operation.

This small user hydrogen market will be supplied by either reforming, new coal gasification through pipeline or tank truck delivery from an ammonia or methanol plant, or electrolysis during the 1980-2000 period. The quantities supplied by each system have been predicted as shown in Table 6.03. These data (also plotted in Figure 6.02) assume that the small user hydrogen market will grow at 5%/yr during the 1975-2000 period and that electrolysis would gradually increase its percentage of the total from the current 17% to 25% by the year 2000. It was also assumed that coal gasification would start supplying hydrogen to the small user market in 1990 and would provide 30% of the total by the year 2000. In the year 2000, supplies for the small user hydrogen market are predicted to be:

	<u>MBtu/yr x 10⁶</u>	<u>MSCF/day</u>
By reforming	37	310
By new coal gasification	25	210
By electrolysis	<u>21</u>	<u>180</u>
Total	83	700

TABLE 6.01

Economics of Hydrogen Manufacture in Small Reformers*

1980 Operation, 1980 \$

Hydrogen capacity, MSCF/SD	0.100	0.480	2.400
" " , kSCF/hr	4.17	20.0	100.0
" " , MSCF/yr	33.0	158.4	792
" " , MBtu/yr x 10 ⁶	0.0109	0.0524	0.262
Operating days per year	330	330	330
" hours per year	7920	7920	7920
Operators per shift	0.15	0.20	0.26
<u>Investment, \$ Millions</u>			
Onsite	0.600	1.04	2.08
Offsite	0.150	0.26	0.52
Total	0.750	1.30	2.60
% contingency in investments	10	10	10
\$/MBtu/yr	68.81	24.81	9.92
Working capital, \$ thousands	18	57	241
<u>Costs & Charges, \$/MBtu product</u>			
Natural gas @ \$3.15/MBtu	5.09	5.09	5.09
Utilities	0.08	0.08	0.08
Labor and supervision	4.68	1.32	0.34
Maintenance (4% of onsites)	2.20	0.80	0.32
Plant overhead (2.6% of onsites)	1.47	0.52	0.21
Insurance, property taxes (1.5% of total)	1.01	0.38	0.15
Depreciation (10% onsites, 5% offsites)	6.24	2.23	0.89
Interest on working capital (10%/yr)	0.18	0.11	0.09
Return on investment (20%/yr)	13.76	4.96	1.98
Total	34.71	15.49	9.15
Total Cost, \$/kscf	11.42	5.13	3.03

TABLE 6.02

Economics of Hydrogen Manufacture - SPE Electrolysis

1980 Operation, 1980 \$

Hydrogen capacity, MSCF/SD	0.100	0.480	2.400
" " , kSCF/hr	4.17	20.0	100.0
" " , MSCF/yr	33.0	158.4	792
" " , MBtu/yr x 10 ⁶	0.0109	0.0524	0.262
Operating days per year	330	330	330
" hours per year	7920	7920	7920
Operators per shift	0.15	0.20	0.26
Thermal efficiency, %	77.6	77.6	77.6
<u>Investment, \$ Millions</u>			
Onsite	0.065	0.310	1.550
Offsite	0.016	0.080	0.390
Total	0.081	0.390	1.940
Investment, \$/MBtu/yr	7.43	7.43	7.43
" , \$/kw product	200	200	200
Working capital, \$ thousands	25	89	401
<u>Costs and Charges, \$/MBtu product</u>			
Electricity @ \$0.027/kwhr	10.19	10.19	10.19
Other utilities	0.07	0.07	0.07
Labor and supervision	4.68	1.32	0.34
Maintenance (4% of onsites)	0.24	0.24	0.24
Plant overhead (2.6% of onsites)	0.15	0.15	0.15
Insurance, property taxes (1.5% of total)	0.11	0.11	0.11
Depreciation (10% onsite, 5% offsite)	0.67	0.67	0.67
Interest on working capital (10%/yr)	0.27	0.17	0.15
Return on investment, 20%/yr	1.48	1.48	1.48
Total	17.86	14.40	13.40
Total Cost, \$/kscf	5.80	4.68	4.36

FIGURE 6.01

Hydrogen Costs by Reforming, Electrolysis
and Truck Delivery vs. Quantity Required

1980 Operation, 1980 \$

TABLE 6.03

Requirements and Capacity for U.S. Small User Hydrogen

Year	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
Small user hydrogen requirements, MSCF/CD	202	261	337	430	548	700
<u>Capacity Added, 5 years ending, MSCF/CD</u>						
For growth	-	59	76	93	118	152
For replacement	-	50	65	65	65	66
Total	-	109	141	158	183	218
Reformer capacity added	-	109	114	124	65	47
New coal " "	-	-	-	-	70	105
Current electrolysis capacity added	-	3	27	9	-	-
SPE " " "	-	-	-	25	48	66
Total	-	112	141	158	183	218
<u>Capacity in Operation, MSCF/CD</u>						
Reformer	170	226	284	352	361	350
New coal	-	-	-	-	70	175
Current electrolysis	32	35	53	53	44	36
SPE " "	-	-	-	25	73	139
Total	202	261	337	430	548	700
<u>Natural gas equivalent of small user hydrogen production, k B/D crude equivalent*</u>						
Reformer hydrogen	14.2	18.9	23.7	29.5	30.2	29.3
New coal " "	-	-	-	-	5.8	14.6
Current electrolysis hydrogen	2.7	2.9	4.4	4.4	3.7	3.0
SPE " "	-	-	-	2.1	6.1	11.6
Total	16.9	21.8	28.1	36.0	45.8	58.5

*Assuming this hydrogen is produced by steam reforming and that 1.0 MSCF hydrogen requires natural gas equivalent to 83.6 bbl. crude.

FIGURE 6.02

Processes Used in Production of U. S.
Requirements for Small User Hydrogen

7. POTENTIAL SAVINGS OF NATURAL GAS

As has been explained in Sections 4, 5, and 6, some of the ammonia, methanol and small user hydrogen will likely be produced by the new coal gasification process starting about 1985. After 1985, hydrocarbon feed stocks will become more expensive than coal and the use of coal gasification will increase.

The economics data presented in Section 3 indicate that new coal gasification is likely not to be attractive for refinery hydrogen production during the 1980-2000 period.

Economics data for ammonia, methanol and small user hydrogen were used in Sections 4, 5, and 6 to estimate the new capacity that is likely to be built using the new coal process. From these estimates of new coal capacity, the quantities of natural gas feed stock saved by the new coal process have been calculated as is discussed in the following paragraphs. These data are summarized in Table 7.01 and are further summarized as follows:

Natural Gas Feed Stock Saved by New Coal Gasification Process, 1990-2000

Year	1990	2000
<u>Natural gas required if all production were by reforming, kB/D crude equiv.</u>		
Refinery hydrogen	273	395
Ammonia	527	722
Methanol	166	267
Small user hydrogen	36	59
Total	1002	1443
<u>Natural gas saved by new coal gasification, kB/D crude equiv.</u>		
Refinery hydrogen	--	--
Ammonia	28	370
Methanol	70	230
Small user hydrogen	--	15
Total	98	615
Saving, % of total	10	43

By 1990 the new coal process will likely save natural gas equivalent to 98,000 B/D crude equivalent or about 10% of the natural gas feed stock required for all the industrial hydrogen production. Afterward the use of new coal gasification will increase until in the year 2000 it will save natural gas equivalent to 615,000 B/D of crude or 43% of the total natural gas feed stock requirement.

Table 7.02 shows the annual production of refinery hydrogen, ammonia, methanol and small user hydrogen during the 1980-2000 period and the corresponding requirements for natural gas feed stock assuming reforming were used to provide 100% of the industrial hydrogen production.

Table 7.03 shows the quantities of ammonia, methanol, and small user hydrogen that is likely to be produced by new coal gasification. Also shown in this table are the quantities of natural gas saved each year by the new coal process. These data are also shown in Figure 7.01..

The coal required to manufacture these annual quantities of ammonia, methanol, and small user hydrogen are shown in Table 7.04. In 1990 the coal required is 9.1 MST/yr. In the year 2000 this requirement is 58 MST/yr.

The electricity required to produce the small user hydrogen manufactured by electrolysis is shown in Table 7.05. In 1980 the electricity is estimated to be 1.6 billion kwhr/yr. By 1990 this requirement is estimated to be 3.5 billion kwhr/yr and in the year 2000 the estimate is 7.9 billion kwhr/yr. These estimates assume the total U. S. small user hydrogen market will grow at 5%/yr during the 1975-2000 period and that electrolysis will supply 16% of this production in 1975 increasing to 25% in the year 2000. Electricity required to produce this hydrogen was estimated using 77.6% thermal efficiency throughout the entire period. If this efficiency were 90%, the electricity required in the year 2000 would be 6.8 billion kwhr instead of 7.9 billion kwhr shown in the table.

The investment required to install the reformer and new coal gasification capacity during the 1980-2000 period is shown in Table 7.06. Substantially more capital will be required to build the new coal gasification capacity than would be required if all the new capacity were installed as reformer plants. If only reforming were used, the new capacity during this 20 year period would require an investment of \$20.7 billion. However, the reformer and new coal capacity shown by these estimates will require an investment of \$30.4 billion. The new coal capacity requires \$9.7 billion more capital than would be required if only reforming were used. These investment data are expressed as 1980 \$.

TABLE 7.01

Summary of Natural Gas Requirements and Natural
Gas Saved by New Coal Process

Year	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
<u>Industrial Hydrogen Production</u>						
Refinery hydrogen, MSCF/CD	1385	1780	2400	3260	3924	4725
Ammonia, MST/yr	16.0	21.3	25.2	30.5	35.7	41.8
Methanol, MST/yr	3.8	5.3	6.6	9.5	12.1	15.3
Small user hydrogen, MSCF/CD	202	261	337	430	548	700
<u>Natural Gas Required if Used for 100% of Production, k B/D crude equivalent</u>						
Refinery hydrogen	116	149	201	273	328	395
Ammonia	276	368	435	527	616	722
Methanol	67	93	115	166	212	267
Small user hydrogen	17	22	28	36	46	59
Total	<u>476</u>	<u>632</u>	<u>779</u>	<u>1002</u>	<u>1202</u>	<u>1443</u>
<u>Natural Gas Saved by New Coal Gasification, k B/D crude equivalent</u>						
Refinery hydrogen	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ammonia	-	-	-	28	162	370
Methanol	-	-	17	70	140	230
Small user hydrogen	-	-	-	-	6	15
Total	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>308</u>	<u>615</u>

TABLE 7.02

Natural Gas Feed Stock Required if All Industrial Hydrogen
is Manufactured by Natural Gas Reforming

Total Industrial Hydrogen Production					Natural Gas Feed Stock Required if All Industrial Hydrogen Were Produced by Reforming B/D crude equivalent x 10 ³				
Year	Refinery Hydrogen	Ammonia	Methanol	Small User Hydrogen	Refinery Hydrogen	Ammonia	Methanol	Small User Hydrogen	Total
	MSCF/CD	MST/yr	MST/yr	MSCF/CD					
1980	1780	21.3	5.3	261	149	368	93	22	632
81	1904	22.1	5.6	276	159	382	98	23	662
82	2028	22.9	5.8	291	170	395	101	24	690
83	2152	23.6	6.1	307	180	408	107	26	721
84	2276	24.4	6.3	322	190	421	110	27	748
85	2400	25.2	6.6	337	201	435	115	28	779
86	2572	26.3	7.2	356	215	454	126	30	825
87	2744	27.3	7.8	374	229	471	136	31	867
88	2915	28.4	8.3	392	244	490	145	33	912
89	3083	29.4	8.9	411	258	508	156	34	956
90	3260	30.5	9.5	430	273	527	166	36	1002
91	3383	31.5	10.0	454	283	544	174	38	1039
92	3511	32.6	10.5	477	294	563	184	40	1081
93	3643	33.6	11.1	501	305	580	194	42	1121
94	3781	34.7	11.6	524	316	599	203	44	1162
95	3924	35.7	12.1	548	328	616	212	46	1202
96	4072	36.9	12.7	578	340	637	222	48	1247
97	4225	38.1	13.4	609	353	658	234	51	1296
98	4385	39.4	14.0	639	367	680	245	53	1345
99	4552	40.6	14.7	669	381	701	257	56	1395
2000	4725	41.8	15.3	700	395	722	267	59	1443
Total Bbl x 10 ⁶ *	--	--	--	--	2054	4073	1294	289	7710

*During 1980-2000 period.

TABLE 7.03

Natural Gas Feedstock Saved by New Coal Gasification
for Manufacture of Ammonia, Methanol, and Small User Hydrogen

Year	<u>Manufactured by New Coal Process</u>			<u>Natural Gas Feedstock Saved by Use of New Coal Process, B/CD x 10³ crude equiv.</u>			
	<u>Ammonia MST/yr</u>	<u>Methanol MST/yr</u>	<u>Small User Hydrogen MSCF/CD</u>	<u>For Ammonia</u>	<u>For Methanol</u>	<u>For Small User Hydrogen</u>	<u>Total</u>
1985	-	1.0	-	-	17	-	17
86	-	1.6	-	-	28	-	28
87	-	2.2	-	-	38	-	38
88	-	2.8	-	-	49	-	49
89	-	3.4	-	-	59	-	59
90	1.6	4.0	0	28	70	-	98
91	3.1	4.8	12	54	84	1.0	139
92	4.6	5.6	25	80	98	2.1	180
93	6.1	6.4	40	105	112	3.3	220
94	7.6	7.2	55	131	125	4.6	261
95	9.4	8.0	70	162	140	5.8	308
96	11.8	9.0	84	204	157	7.0	368
97	14.2	10.1	101	246	176	8.4	430
98	16.6	11.1	121	287	193	10.0	490
99	19.0	12.2	145	328	213	12.0	553
2000	21.4	13.2	175	370	230	14.5	615
Total*	-	-	-	728	653	25	1406

*Million bbl during the 1985-2000 period.

FIGURE 7.01

Potential for Replacing Natural Gas Feed With
Coal for Manufacture of Ammonia, Methanol
and Small User Hydrogen

TABLE 7.04

Coal Feed Stock Required for New Coal Gasification

Year	<u>Manufactured by New Coal Process</u>			<u>Coal Required for New Coal Plants</u>			
	<u>Ammonia</u>	<u>Methanol</u>	<u>Small User</u> <u>Hydrogen</u>	<u>MST/yr⁽¹⁾</u>			<u>Total</u>
				<u>For</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>For Small</u>	
	<u>MST/yr</u>	<u>MST/yr</u>	<u>MSCF/CD</u>	<u>Ammonia</u>	<u>Methanol</u>	<u>User Hydrogen</u>	
1985	-	1.0	-	-	1.6	-	1.6
86	-	1.6	-	-	2.6	-	2.6
87	-	2.2	-	-	3.5	-	3.5
88	-	2.8	-	-	4.5	-	4.5
89	-	3.4	-	-	5.5	-	5.5
90	1.6	4.0	-	2.7	6.4	-	9.1
91	3.1	4.8	12	5.1	7.7	0.10	12.9
92	4.6	5.6	25	7.6	9.0	0.20	16.8
93	6.1	6.4	40	10.1	10.3	0.32	20.7
94	7.6	7.2	55	12.6	11.6	0.44	24.6
95	9.4	8.0	70	15.6	12.8	0.57	29.0
96	11.8	9.0	84	19.6	14.4	0.68	34.7
97	14.2	10.1	101	23.5	16.2	0.82	40.5
98	16.6	11.1	121	27.5	17.8	0.98	46.3
99	19.0	12.2	145	31.5	19.6	1.17	52.3
2000	<u>21.4</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>35.5</u>	<u>21.2</u>	<u>1.41</u>	<u>58.1</u>
Total	-	-	-	191	165	7	363

(1) Assumes Illinois high sulfur coal is used, 1.0 ST NH₃ requires 1.657 ST coal; 1.0 ST methanol requires 1.606 ST coal; 1.0 MSCF H₂ requires 22.1 tons coal.

TABLE 7.05

Electricity Required for U.S. Electrolytic Hydrogen Production

<u>Year</u>	<u>Electrolytic Hydrogen Production</u>		<u>Electricity Required</u> <u>kwhr/yr x 10⁹</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Electrolytic Hydrogen Production</u>		<u>Electricity Required</u> <u>kwhr/yr x 10⁹</u>
	<u>MBtu/yr x 10⁶</u>	<u>MSCF/CD</u>			<u>MBtu/yr x 10⁶</u>	<u>MSCF/CD</u>	
1965*	4.2	35	1.59	1984	5.8	49	2.19
66*	4.5	38	1.70	85	6.3	53	2.38
67*	4.8	40	1.81	86	6.9	58	2.60
68*	4.5	38	1.70	87	7.5	63	2.83
69*	4.8	40	1.81	88	8.0	68	3.02
70*	3.8	32	1.43	89	8.7	73	3.28
71	3.8	32	1.43	90	9.3	78	3.51
72	3.8	32	1.43	91	10.2	86	3.85
73	3.8	32	1.43	92	11.2	94	4.23
74	3.8	32	1.43	93	12.0	101	4.53
75	3.8	32	1.43	94	13.0	109	4.91
76	3.9	33	1.47	95	13.9	117	5.25
77	3.9	33	1.47	96	15.4	129	5.81
78	4.0	34	1.51	97	16.7	140	6.30
79	4.0	34	1.51	98	18.1	152	6.83
80	4.2	35	1.58	99	19.4	163	7.32
81	4.6	39	1.74	2000	20.8	175	7.85
82	5.0	42	1.89				
83	5.5	46	2.08				

*Data reported by Bureau of Census. Other data are estimates.

TABLE 7.06

Additional Investment Required for New Coal Gasification Plants
Over That Required for Natural Gas Reforming

	<u>Refinery Hydrogen</u>	<u>Ammonia</u>	<u>Methanol</u>	<u>Small User Hydrogen</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>New Capacity Installed, 1980-2000</u>					
Measuring units	MSCF/CD	MST/yr	MST/yr	MSCF/CD	-
By natural gas reforming	4725	27.2	5.1	350	-
By new coal	-	21.4	13.2	175	-
Total	<u>4725</u>	<u>48.6</u>	<u>18.3</u>	<u>525</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Investment, \$M/unit (1980 \$)</u>					
Natural gas reforming	0.692	273.6	205.0	0.692	-
New coal	2.472	548.6	470.0	2.472	-
Investment During 1980-2000 Period if All Capacity Were Nat. Gas Reforming, \$M	3270	13296	3751	363	20680
<u>Investment (Actual), 1980-2000 Period, \$M</u>					
Natural gas reforming	3270	7442	1046	242	12000
New coal	0	11740	6204	433	18377
Total	<u>3270</u>	<u>19182</u>	<u>7250</u>	<u>675</u>	<u>30377</u>
Additional Investment Required for New Coal Capacity, \$M	-	5886	3499	312	9697

" THIS PAGE IS PURPOSELY LEFT BLANK ".

8. ERDA INCENTIVES

An objective of several ERDA programs is to reduce the U.S. consumption of natural gas and liquid hydrocarbons through the development of systems using coal or nuclear fuels. Reducing hydrocarbon consumption by such procedures would maintain the productivity of the U.S. industrial system and would reduce the requirements for imported petroleum. The production of industrial hydrogen provides an opportunity to reduce the consumption of hydrocarbon fuels through the substitution of coal and/or nuclear fuels. Two specific opportunities for accomplishing this change are (1) to produce ammonia and methanol by coal gasification rather than by steam reforming, and (2) to produce hydrogen for the small user market by electrolysis rather than by steam reforming.

The economics data developed in this study and discussed in the preceding sections provide a means of estimating the economic savings that would occur in converting from a reforming oriented hydrogen economy to one based on coal and/or nuclear fuel. The present (1977) value of future earnings for plants using the new coal process for manufacturing ammonia and methanol have been calculated. These savings discounted to 1977 are those realized during the first 20 years of operation of all new coal gasification plants installed in the 1985-2000 period, when these future earnings are discounted to 1977 using a discount factor of 10%/year. Details of this calculation for methanol plants are shown in Table 8.02 for (1) the base case situation (most likely fuel price); (2) the high fuel price case; and (3) the low fuel price case.

The 1977 savings represented by these future plants are summarized in Table 8.01. For the base case (first line) the 1977 value of these future earnings are \$647M for methanol and \$561M for ammonia making a total of \$1208M. For the several sensitivities (next 8 lines), the total is \$1280M maximum and \$597M minimum. It is likely that the commercial use of the new coal process should provide future earnings corresponding to a 1977 value of \$500-1200M.

ERDA should, therefore, determine what is needed to accelerate the commercial use of the new coal gasification process. It is beyond the scope of this study to identify the program needed to accelerate the new coal program. It is likely that the developers of this improved gasification process are doing all that can be done to speed up the development. However, if the development of the improved gasification process could be assisted by an early demonstration plant, ERDA should consider sponsoring with industry on a cost sharing basis a demonstration of the process.

The development of an improved electrolyzer such as the SPE system would lower the investment and decrease the electricity requirements compared to electrolysis systems currently available. The data shown in Table 3.12 indicate that the cost including 20%/yr before tax return for hydrogen produced with the improved process might be about \$8.00/MBtu less than that for the current electrolysis system. To be conservative, the present value of future savings for the improved electrolysis system were calculated assuming a saving of \$5.00/MBtu. This saving of \$5.00/MBtu has been used for the electrolysis plants projected for the small user hydrogen market as is shown by Table 6.02.

Table 8.03 shows the details of calculating the present (1977) value of future savings for SPE electrolysis capacity installed according to the schedule shown in Table 6.03. The savings were calculated for SPE plants installed during the 1988-2000 period over their entire 20 year life. The annual savings were discounted to 1977 by using discount factors for 10%/year.

The 1977 value of these future savings is \$152 million. This figure does not include any savings that may accrue in using the SPE process for new uses not considered in this study such as for conversion of off-peak nuclear or hydro electricity to hydrogen, or utilization of remote hydro power, or ocean thermal energy for hydrogen manufacture.

It is beyond the scope of this study to determine what work should be conducted to accelerate the development of an improved electrolysis process. It is clear that an improved process capable of reducing the investment in electrolysis plants by say 50% and increase the thermal efficiency to say 90% would provide a substantial incentive for using electrolysis rather than steam reforming as the source of small user hydrogen. Such an improved electrolysis system would also be useful for hydrogen generation for new uses not considered in this study.

TABLE 8.01

Summary of Discounted Values of Future Savings for
Use of New Coal Process for Methanol and Ammonia Manufacture

	<u>For Methanol</u>	<u>For Ammonia</u>	<u>Methanol + Ammonia</u>
<u>Present Value* of Future Savings for Plants Installed in 1985-2000 Period, \$ Millions</u>			
Base Case (most likely feedstock prices)	647	561	1208
High Fuel Prices	609	481	1090
Low Fuel Prices	356	241	597
Additional 10% Investment	584	454	1038
Construction costs escalate 1%/yr above gen infl.	458	220	678
" " " 1%/yr below " "	606	580	1186
Coal prices escalate 1%/yr above gen. infl.	577	413	990
" " " 1%/yr below " "	681	599	1280

*Future savings are discounted to 1976 using a discount factor of 10%/yr.

TABLE 8.02

(Page 1 of 2)

Discounted Value of Future Savings for Methanol Production
Using New Coal Gasification Process

1980 \$ Discounted to 1976

Year	Discount Factor ⁽¹⁾	New Coal Installed Capacity, MST/yr		Base Case - Most Likely Fuel Prices				
		Added During Yr.	Cumulative	Reforming or K-T* \$/ST	New Coal Gasification \$/ST	Saving \$/ST	Savings, \$M/yr	
							Current	Discounted
1985	0.424	1.0	1.0	205.2	198.0	7.2	7.2	3.05
86	0.386	0.6	1.6	207.3		9.3	14.9	5.74
87	0.350	0.6	2.2	211.4		13.4	29.5	10.32
88	0.319	0.6	2.8	213.4		15.4	43.1	13.76
89	0.290	0.6	3.4	215.5		17.5	59.5	17.26
90	0.263	0.6	4.0	217.6		19.6	78.4	20.62
91	0.239	0.8	4.8	219.6		21.6	103.7	24.78
92	0.218	0.8	5.6	221.6		23.6	132.1	28.81
93	0.198	0.8	6.4	223.7		25.7	164.5	32.57
94	0.180	0.8	7.2	225.8		27.8	200.2	36.03
95	0.164	0.8	8.0	226.0*		28.0	224.0	36.74
96	0.149	1.0	9.0				252.0	37.55
97	0.135	1.1	10.1				282.8	38.18
98	0.123	1.0	11.1				310.8	38.23
99	0.112	1.1	12.2				341.6	38.26
2000	0.102	1.0	13.2				369.6	37.70
2001	0.092	-	13.2				369.6	34.00
2	0.084	-	13.2				369.6	31.05
3	0.076	-	13.2				369.6	28.09
4	0.069	-	13.2				369.6	25.50
5	0.063	-1.0	12.2				341.6	21.52
6	0.057	-0.6	11.6				324.8	18.51
7	0.052	-0.6	11.0				308.0	16.02
8	0.047	-0.6	10.4				291.2	13.69
9	0.043	-0.6	9.8				274.4	11.80
10	0.039	-0.6	9.2				257.6	10.05
11	0.036	-0.8	8.4				235.2	8.47
12	0.032	-0.8	7.6				212.8	6.81
13	0.029	-0.8	6.8				190.4	5.52
14	0.027	-0.8	6.0				168.0	4.53
15	0.024	-0.8	5.2				145.6	3.49
16	0.022	-1.0	4.2				117.6	2.59
17	0.020	-1.1	3.1				86.8	1.74
18	0.018	-1.0	2.1				58.8	1.06
19	0.017	-1.1	1.0				28.0	0.48
2020	0.015	-1.0	0				0	0
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	7133.1	664.52

*Value for K-T

TABLE 8.02

(Page 2 of 2)

**Discounted Value of Future Savings for Methanol Production
Using New Coal Gasification Process**

1980 \$ Discounted to 1976

	High Fuel Price Case					Low Fuel Price Case				
	Reforming	New Coal	Saving	Savings, \$M/yr		Reforming	New Coal	Saving	Savings, \$M/yr	
	or K-T \$/ST	Gasification \$/ST		Current	Discounted	or K-T \$/ST	Gasification \$/ST		Current	Discounted
1935	216.0	214.0	2.0	2.0	0.85	179.0	185.0	-	-	-
36	218.2		4.2	6.7	2.59	180.6		-	-	-
37	220.4		6.4	14.1	4.93	182.2		-	-	-
38	222.6		8.6	24.1	7.68	183.8		-	-	-
39	224.8		10.8	36.7	10.65	185.4		0.4	1.4	0.39
30	227.0		13.0	52.0	13.68	187.0		2.0	8.0	2.10
31	229.2		15.2	73.0	17.44	188.6		3.6	17.3	4.13
32	231.4		17.4	97.4	21.24	190.2		5.2	29.1	6.35
33	233.6		19.6	125.4	24.84	191.8		6.8	43.5	8.62
34	235.8		21.8	157.0	28.25	193.4		8.4	60.5	10.89
35	238.0		24.0	192.0	31.49	195.0		10.0	80.0	13.12
36	240.2		26.2	235.8	35.13	196.6		11.6	104.4	15.56
37	242.4		28.4	286.8	38.72	198.2		13.2	133.3	18.00
38	243.0*		29.0	321.9	39.59	199.8		14.8	164.3	20.21
39				353.8	39.63	201.4		16.4	200.1	22.41
2000				382.8	39.05	203.0		18.0	237.6	24.24
2001				382.8	35.22	204.6		19.6	258.7	23.80
2				382.8	32.16	206.2		21.2	279.8	23.51
3				382.8	29.09	207.8		22.8	301.0	22.89
4				382.8	26.41	209.4		24.4	322.1	22.22
5				353.8	22.29	211.0*		26.0	317.2	19.98
6				336.4	19.17				301.6	17.19
7				319.0	16.59				286.0	14.87
8				301.6	14.18				270.4	12.71
9				284.2	12.22				254.8	10.96
10				266.8	10.41				239.2	9.33
11				243.6	8.77				218.4	7.86
12				220.4	7.05				197.6	6.32
13				197.2	5.72				176.8	5.13
14				174.0	4.70				156.0	4.21
15				150.8	3.62				135.2	3.24
16				121.8	2.68				109.2	2.40
17				89.9	1.80				80.6	1.61
18				60.9	1.10				54.6	0.98
19				29.0	0.49				26.0	0.44
20				0	0				0	0
Total				7042.1	609.43				5064.7	355.65

*Value for K-T

TABLE 8.03

Discounted Value of Future Savings for SPE Electrolysis
Technology Over Current Electrolysis Technology

1980 \$ Discounted to 1977

Year	Discount Factor ⁽¹⁾	SPE Electrolysis Capacity, MSCF/CD		Savings, \$M/yr ⁽²⁾	
		Added	Cumulative	Current	Discounted
1985	0.467	-	-		
86	0.424	-	-		
87	0.386	-	-		
88	0.350	8	8	4.74	1.66
89	0.319	8	16	9.47	3.02
90	0.290	9	25	14.80	4.29
91	0.263	10	35	20.72	5.45
92	0.239	9	44	26.05	6.23
93	0.218	10	54	31.97	6.97
94	0.198	9	63	37.30	7.38
95	0.180	10	73	43.22	7.78
96	0.164	13	86	50.91	8.35
97	0.149	13	99	58.61	8.73
98	0.135	14	113	66.90	9.03
99	0.123	13	126	74.59	9.17
2000	0.112	13	139	82.29	9.22
2001	0.102	-	139	82.29	8.39
2	0.092	-	139	82.29	7.57
3	0.084	-	139	82.29	6.91
4	0.076	-	139	82.29	6.25
5	0.069	-	139	82.29	5.68
6	0.063	-	139	82.29	5.18
7	0.057	-	139	82.29	4.69
8	0.052	-8	131	77.55	4.03
9	0.047	-8	123	72.82	3.42
10	0.043	-9	114	67.49	2.90
11	0.039	-10	104	61.57	2.40
12	0.036	-9	95	56.24	2.02
13	0.032	-10	85	50.32	1.61
14	0.029	-9	76	44.99	1.30
15	0.027	-10	66	39.07	1.05
16	0.024	-13	53	31.38	0.75
17	0.022	-13	40	23.68	0.52
18	0.020	-14	26	15.39	0.31
19	0.018	-13	13	7.70	0.14
2020	0.017	-13	0	0	0
Total				1646	152

(1) At 10%/yr to 1977.

(2) Assumes SPE electrolysis saves \$5.00/MBtu over current electrolysis technology or 1.0 MSCF/CD = \$0.592 x 10⁶/yr saving.

REFERENCES

1. Dickson, Edward M.; Ryan, John W.; and Smulyan, Marilyn H.; Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, Cal. 94025; The Hydrogen Economy, A Preliminary Assessment," February, 1976, Prepared for RANN, National Science Foundation, Washington D.C., 20550, Grant ERP 73-02706.
2. Kelley, James H., and Laumann, Eugene A.; Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, "Hydrogen Tomorrow, Demands and Technology Requirements." December, 1976, JPL 5040-1, Prepared under Contract No. NAS 7-100.
3. Linke, Simpson; editor; "Proceedings of the Cornell International Symposium and Workshop on the Hydrogen Economy, Aug. 20-22, 1973," Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. 14853, April, 1975; Sponsored by RANN Program of National Science Foundation.
4. Gregory, Derek P.; Pangborn, Jan B.; and Gillis, Jay C.; Institute of Gas Technology, 3424 South State Street, Chicago, Illinois 60616; "Survey of Hydrogen Production and Utilization Methods," Vol. 1 Executive Summary; Vol. 2, Discussion, Vol. 3, Appendices, August, 1975.
5. Gregory, D. P. and other contributors, Institute of Gas Technology, 3424 South State Street, Chicago, Illinois 60616, "A Hydrogen Energy System," August, 1972 prepared for American Gas Association.
6. Savage, Robert L.; Blank, Lee; Cady, Tom; Cox, Kenneth; Murray, Richard; and Williams, Richard Dee, editors; University of Houston and Rice University, Houston, Texas, "A Hydrogen Energy Carrier," Vol. 1, Summary; Vol. 2, Systems Analysis, September, 1973.
7. Dupree, Walter G. Jr.; and Corsentine, John S.; U.S. Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington; "United States Energy Through the Year 2000 (Revised)," December, 1975.
8. Beller, M. Editor and other contributors, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York, 11973; "Sourcebook of Energy Assessment," December, 1975. Prepared for Office of Assistant Administrator for Planning and Analysis, U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration.
9. Exxon Co., U.S.A., "Energy Outlook, 1976-1990" Public Affairs Dept., Exxon Co., U.S.A., P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Texas 77001.
10. Granville, Maurice F., Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10017, Presentation to Aluminum Association, New York, October 29, 1975.
11. Chem Systems, Inc.; 747 Third Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017; June, 1975, "Chemicals From Coal and Shale - An R&D Analysis For National Science Foundation," NTIS No. PB 243 393.
12. U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Washington, D. C.; Industrial Gas Statistics, Annual Reports for Years 1964 Through 1975; These are known as the M28A reports for the years 1964-68 and M28C reports for the years 1969 and later.

13. Stickles, R. P.; Interest, E.; Sweeney, G. C.; Mawn, P.E.; and Parry, J. M.; A. D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass. 02140; "Assessment of Fuels For Power Generation By Electric Utility Fuel Cells." Prepared for Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, Cal., 94304; October, 1975; Research Project No. 318; NTIS No. PB-247 216.
14. Federal Energy Administration; Washington D.C.; "National Energy Outlook;" February, 1976.
15. Executive Office of The President, Council on Wage and Price Stability; Washington, D.C., "A Study of Coal Prices," March, 1976.
16. Wintrell, Reginald; Koppers Company, Inc.; Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219; "The K-T Process: Koppers Commercially Proven Coal and Multi-fuel Gasifier for Synthetic Gas Production in the Chemical and Fertilizer Industries," presented at the National Meeting of AIChE, Salt Lake City, Utah, August 18-21, 1974.
17. Biederman, Nicholas; Darrow, Kenneth Jr.; and Konopka, Alex; Institute of Gas Technology, Chicago, Illinois 60616; "Utilization of Off-Peak Power to Produce Industrial Hydrogen," prepared for Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, California 94304, August, 1975.
18. Nuttall, L. S.; Aircraft Equipment Division, General Electric Co., 50 Fordham Road, Wilmington, Mass. 01887; "Conceptual Design of Large Scale Electrolysis Plant Using Solid Polymer Electrolyte Technology;" Presented at 1st World Hydrogen Energy Conference, Miami Beach, Florida, March 1-3, 1976.
19. Isler, R. S.; Salzano, F. S.; Suuberg, E. M.; and Yu, W. S.; Department of Applied Science, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973; "Reference Design of a 26 mwe Electric Energy Storage System;" July, 1974.
20. Salzano, E. S.; Braun, C.; Beaufriere, A.; Srinivasan, S.; Strickland, G.; and Reilly, H.; Department of Applied Science, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973; "Hydrogen For Energy Storage; A Progress Report of Technical Developments and Possible Applications," January, 1976.
21. Brown, E. C.; Eccles, R. M.; Lukk, G. G.; and Rabolini, F. R.; Exxon Research and Engineering Co., Florham Park, N. J.; "Residuum Processing for Conversion;" AM-76-38; paper presented at 1976 NPRA Annual Meeting, March 30, 1976; San Antonio, Texas.
22. Montemayor, Arthur A; Howe-Baker Engineers Inc., Tyler, Texas; "Hydrogen Manufacturing and Operating Costs and Purities Using Steam-Hydrocarbon Reforming Followed by Selective Adsorption Purification," Presented at American Oil Chemists Society, Dallas, Texas, April 30, 1975.

CHEM SYSTEMS INC.

APPENDIX A

Cost of Production Estimates
For
Hydrogen, Ammonia and Methanol

A Study for Exxon Research
and Engineering Company

CHEM SYSTEMS INC.
747 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10017

October 21, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
Basis for Economic Calculations	1
General Rate of Inflation	1
Capital Cost Escalation	1
Location Factors	4
Battery Limits Capital Cost	4
Offsites Costs	6
Working Capital	7
Utility Costs	7
Labor and Related Costs	9
Capital Related Costs	9
Contingency	10
Return on Investment	10
Hydrogen	11
Ammonia	25
Methanol	31

BASIS FOR ECONOMIC CALCULATIONS

For this study all investment costs are presented in mid-1980 (July, 1980) dollars in consideration of the following factors:

- No commercial-sized coal based plant now presently planned could be built and ready for operation much before 1980.
- Expressing 1980 economics on a 1976 basis could result in apparent future costs lower than 1976 costs which could, in our view, be a misleading comparison.

General Rate of Inflation

Based on the slow recovery the United States is making from the recent recession and the slowdown in inflationary rates of the past two years, we have assumed that inflation will still continue at a moderate to high rate through 1980 (7.0% per year).

Capital Cost Escalation

During the past two to three years, the United States has experienced a phenomenon in engineering and construction costs that has never been encountered previously. Equipment and material costs escalated rapidly. Fabricators and vendors of these bulk materials were, for a long period of time, refusing to offer firm price quotations. Final costs were geared to date of delivery rather than date of purchase.

It was not uncommon for prices to increase from 1 to 2% per month between date of purchase order and date of equipment delivery. In addition, material shortages also plagued the construction industry. In many instances, availability and assuredness of supply became more

important than price. This situation radically changed the engineering construction business for refinery, chemical, and petrochemical plants. Engineering contractors no longer bid on a lump sum basis. Even on a cost plus basis, clients were told to include large contingencies in their budget figures because of continually escalating material costs.

In the past few months, this situation has eased somewhat but certainly conditions have not returned to what they were several years ago. In view of this situation, we have assumed that process plant investments will escalate at 2 percentage points greater than the general inflation rate, i.e., 9% per year. Historically the gap has been 1.7 percentage points.

Plant Capacity, On-Stream Factor, and Location

The following capacities, on-stream factors, and locations were assumed for the thirteen (13) plants analyzed in this study:

<u>Production of Hydrogen</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>On-Stream Factor</u>	<u>Location</u>
1. Coal Gasification - Illinois #6 Coal, Koppers-Totzek Process	100 MSCFD	330 days/yr	U.S. Mid-Cont. (Mine Mouth)
2. Coal Gasification - Illinois #6 Coal, Pressurized Koppers-Totzek Type Process	100 MSCFD	330 days/yr	U.S. Mid-Cont. (Mine Mouth)
3. Partial Oxidation of Residual Fuel Oil	100 MSCFD	330 days/yr	U.S. Gulf Coast
4. Steam Reforming of Natural Gas	100 MSCFD	330 days/yr	U.S. Gulf Coast
5. Electrolysis of Water - Solid Polymer Electrolyte Electrolytic Cell	100 MSCFD	330 days/yr	U.S. Gulf Coast
<u>Production of Ammonia</u>			
6. Coal Gasification - Illinois #6 Coal, Koppers-Totzek Process	2000 STPD	330 days/yr	U.S. Mid-Cont. (Mine Mouth)
7. Coal Gasification - Illinois #6 Coal, Pressurized Koppers-Totzek Type Process	2000 STPD	330 days/yr	U.S. Mid-Cont. (Mine Mouth)
8. Partial Oxidation of Residual Fuel Oil	2000 STPD	330 days/yr	U.S. Gulf Coast
9. Steam Reforming of Natural Gas	2000 STPD	330 days/yr	U.S. Gulf Coast
<u>Production of Methanol</u>			
10. Coal Gasification - Illinois #6 Coal, Koppers-Totzek Process	2000 STPD	330 days/yr	U.S. Mid-Cont. (Mine Mouth)
11. Coal Gasification - Illinois #6 Coal, Pressurized Koppers-Totzek Type Process	2000 STPD	330 days/yr	U.S. Mid-Cont. (Mine Mouth)
12. Partial Oxidation of Residual Fuel Oil	2000 STPD	330 days/yr	U.S. Gulf Coast
13. Steam Reforming of Natural Gas	2000 STPD	330 days/yr	U.S. Gulf Coast

In addition, for the coal sensitivity analysis, the Western coal gasification plants were assumed to be located at the Western coal mine.

Location Factors

In any economic analyses the geographic location of the plant may cause variations in capital costs. Based on Chem Systems' estimates of construction cost factors, taking into account weather conditions, labor rates, labor productivity, transportation costs, etc., investment location factors have been estimated for the following areas:

U.S. Gulf Coast	1.00
U.S. Mid-Continent	1.10
Chicago	1.15
Philadelphia	1.20
Western Coal Mine	1.15 - 1.20
West Coast	1.10 - 1.15

Battery Limits Capital Cost (BLCC)

Investment costs have been based on several sources of information available to Chem Systems. These include capital estimates developed for other internal studies, plus cost data obtained from contractors for hydrogen, ammonia, and methanol plants. This has provided us with a wide source of capital cost data, and we have used our judgment in soliciting what we feel represents the most reasonable estimates to work up battery limits capital costs for the various plants being considered.

The battery limits capital cost represents an "instantaneous" cost for a plant starting up in 1980 with an "overnight" construction period. Therefore, estimation of project costs during construction, interest on borrowed monies during construction, and inflationary effects during construction are eliminated from our analysis.

FIGURE 1

**OXYGEN PLANT INVESTMENT COST
VS.
CAPACITY**

(99.5% O₂ @ 500 PSIG)
1980 COSTS IN 1980 DOLLARS

For this study it has been assumed that any air separation plant required would be part of the battery limits capital cost. The 1980 investment for oxygen plants as a function of capacity is shown in Figure 1. The following utility requirements have been estimated per ton of oxygen required.

	99.5% O ₂ @ 500 psig	99.5% O ₂ @ 50 psig
Power, KWH	435	325
Cooling Water MGal	36.5	36.5
Process Water MGal	1.2	1.2

In the partial oxidation and coal-based plants larger power users have been put on turbine drive with the net required high pressure steam generated in oil (for partial oxidation plants) or coal-fired (for coal-based plants) boilers. Similarly, large power users in the natural gas-based plants have been put on turbine drive, but since these plants are net exporters of high pressure steam, there is no need for steam boilers. Extraction turbines are used to provide any medium pressure steam required. The heat rate used to convert HP steam to electrical power is 10,300 BTU/KWH, and the boiler efficiency is 85% on HHV for the large boilers required.

Instead of converting large power users from motor to turbine-drive, the HP steam raised could be used to produce electricity in an inside-battery limits (ISBL) power plant, but the small size of the power generating facilities make this approach uneconomical. Thus, the HP steam drives these large users directly without intervening and more costly electrical generation. It should be noted that a small amount of electrical power is still required for users which cannot be placed on turbine-drive.

The electrolysis process for the production of hydrogen requires no steam.

Offsites Costs

Sufficient data were available to directly estimate the offsites costs for the plants based on steam-methane reforming. Since these plants are net exporters of steam, no inclusion of a steam system capital cost is made. Also, cooling water is charged as a direct operating cost under utilities and is not capitalized for the steam-methane plants.

For the partial oxidation and coal-based plants, we have estimated offsites costs as the sum of the following:

- (1) 30% of battery limits cost - This allows for storage, waste disposal facilities, general and administrative facilities, etc.
- (2) Steam system capital cost - This cost includes stack gas scrubbing equipment plus ash and dust collection equipment for the coal-based plants. The production cost analysis sheets show the amount of steam generated with the note "internal."
- (3) Cooling water system capital cost - This provides a complete system including cooling tower, circulatory pumps, additive injection, etc. The quantities of cooling water circulated have been estimated and noted on the production cost analysis sheets with the note "internal."

Working Capital

The amount of working capital usually depends upon arrangements for payments on feedstock purchases and product sales, and on storage volumes maintained for both. In our 1980 production cost analysis, we have used one month storage of major feedstocks at cost, (excluding gaseous feedstocks) and one month's accounts receivables to estimate working capital. Working capital is considered as borrowed capital and only interest charges, at 10%, are included in the overall production cost.

Utility Costs

Utility costs have been estimated in 1980 for three different areas in the United States and are summarized in Table I.

TABLE I
UTILITY COSTS AT SELECTED LOCATIONS

<u>Illinois Area</u>	<u>Unit</u>	<u>1980¢/Unit</u>
Illinois Coal (11,390 BTU/lb)	M BTU	92
Power (Coal Based)	KWH	2.7
Cooling Water	Kgal	5.3
Steam (600 psig, 750°F, ex coal)	Klbs	250
Steam (1500 psig, 900°F, ex coal)	Klbs	260
BFW	Kgal	85
Process Water	Kgal	55
 <u>Montana/Wyoming Area</u>		
Mont./Wy. Coal (8500 BTU/lb)	M BTU	47
Power (Coal-based)	KWH	2.0
Cooling Water	Kgal	4.6
Steam (600 psig 750°F, ex coal)	Klbs	115
Steam (1500 psig, 900°F, ex coal)	Klbs	120
BFW	Kgal	80
Process Water	Kgal	50
 <u>Gulf Coast Area</u>		
Mont./Wy Coal (delivered)	M BTU	98
Fuel Oil	M BTU	317
Gas, New	M BTU	315
Gas, Average	M BTU	150
Power (From mix of fuels)	KWH	2.7
Cooling Water	Kgal	5.3
Steam (600 psig, 750°F, ex oil)	Klbs	500
Steam (1500 psig, 900°F, ex oil)	Klbs	525
BFW	Kgal	85
Process Water	Kgal	55

CHEM SYSTEMS INC.

Labor and Related Costs

Operating labor costs have been projected to escalate at 8.0% per year through 1980.

The following annual salaries have been estimated for 1980:

Shift Operators	\$21,500
Shift Foremen	24,200
Supervisors	28,800

The total number of laborers has been estimated by multiplying the men per shift by 4.6 and rounding to the next higher whole number. This assumes a 40 hour average work week and 48 work weeks per year.

Our production cost analysis has been divided into labor related and capital related categories to allow for easy comparison among alternate technologies. Labor related costs, in addition to direct labor charges, include a part of maintenance and general plant overhead. These costs have been assumed at 100% of direct labor costs.

CAPITAL RELATED EXPENSES

This includes all items related to the plant investment. The following percentages have been assumed:

Maintenance	4.0% of battery limits capital cost
General Plant Overhead	2.6% of battery limits capital cost
Insurance and Property Taxes	1.5% of Total Fixed Investment (BLCC + Off-sites)
Depreciation	10.0% battery limits capital cost plus 5% off-site cost
Interest	10% of Working Capital

Contingency

Based upon suggestions from Exxon, the following contingency factors have been applied to the capital cost estimates:

Steam-Methane Reforming	1.10
Partial Oxidation of Residual Fuel Oil	1.10
Coal Gasification (Koppers-Totzek)	1.15
Coal Gasification (New Process)	1.20
Electrolysis (Solid Polymer Electrolyte)	1.30

Return on Investment

In order to estimate sales or transfer price, we include a gross return before taxes of 20% on the Total Fixed investment. This assumes full equity financing of all projects.

Hydrogen

The Koppers-Totzek process was chosen as being typical of existing coal gasification processes which could be utilized to manufacture hydrogen. The low methane yield from the gasifier makes the gasifier effluent suitable for hydrogen production by adding process equipment for shift conversion, CO₂ removal, and final carbon oxides removal (methanation).

Figure 2 is a block flow diagram depicting the major steps in the production of hydrogen, ammonia, or methanol from coal.

Table 2 is a production cost analysis for manufacturing 100 MSCFD hydrogen via a totally integrated K-T gasification process. The battery limits capital cost for this project (including 15% contingency) can be delineated as follows:

	<u>\$M (Mid 1980)</u>	<u>Percent</u>
K-T Synthesis Gas Production (Incl. O ₂ Plant)	106.4	72.5
Shift Conversion and Methanation	16.7	11.4
CO ₂ Removal	<u>23.6</u>	<u>16.1</u>
Total	146.7	100.0

The hydrogen cost plus return on these bases is about 311¢/KSCF with coal priced at \$21/ton.

The K-T gasifiers, as well as the compression cost of the synthesis gas produced to 450 psig, represent a considerable portion of the overall investment requirements. Therefore, a "new" or "second generation" gasification process should offer significant cost advantages, if it possesses the following characteristics:

Figure 2
Block Flow Diagram
Hydrogen, Ammonia, or Methanol
Via K-T or New Coal Gasification

TABLE 2
CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS

HYDROGEN VIA KOPPERS-TOTZEK COAL GASIFICATION WITH
INTEGRATED OXYGEN PLANT

*Includes 15% Contingency

Plant Hydrogen Via Koppers-Totzek Coal Gasification	*Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ M
Location U.S. Mid Cont. Mid-1980	*Offsites Capital Cost	146.7
Capacity 100 MSCF/Day	Total Fixed Investment	99.7
Production Rate 33,000 M SCF/Year	Working Capital	246.4
	Total Fixed & Working Capital	11.0
		257.4

<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Illinois Coal (HHV=11,390 Btu/Lb.)	786,000	Ton	21.00	16,500,000	¢/KSCF

TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST

16,500,000 50.00

UTILITIES

Power	11,428,000	KWH	0.027	309,000	
Cooling Water	35,857,000	KGal. Internal			
Process Water	2,514,000	KGal.	0.55	1,383,000	
Fuel		MBtu			
Steam	2,357,000	KLbs. Internal			
Stack Gas Clean-Up	"		0.35	825,000	
<u>TOTAL UTILITIES COST</u>				2,517,000	7.63

LABOR & RELATED

	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>		
Labor @ \$21,500	7	30	645,000	
Supervision @ -- Foreman \$28,800/24,200 1		1/5	150,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S			796,000	

TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST

\$1,591,000 4.82

CAPITAL RELATED

Maintenance	4.0% BLCC	5,868,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC	3,814,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment	3,696,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites	19,655,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital	1,100,000	
<u>TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES</u>		34,133,000	103.43

BY-PRODUCT CREDIT

Sulfur	26,400	Ton	50	1,320,000	
--------	--------	-----	----	-----------	--

TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT

(1,320,000) (4.00)

TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION

53,421,000 161.88

RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %

49,280,000 149.33

TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN

\$102,701,000 311.21

CHEM SYSTEMS INC.

- Pressure operation: in the range of 300 to 500 psi.
- High productivity: capable of handling 2500 tons per day of coal feed and producing 100 to 150 MSCFD per gasifier.
- High temperature operation, ca. 2000⁰F to minimize methane content.
- High carbon utilization.

Koppers is engaged in a joint effort with Shell Development to design the K-T gasifier to operate at approximately 450 psig and achieve the above objectives.

Table 3 is a production cost analysis for manufacturing 100 MSCFD of hydrogen via a totally integrated "new" coal gasification process. The battery limits capital costs (including 20% contingency) can be delineated as follows:

	<u>\$M (Mid-1980)</u>	<u>Percent</u>
New Synthesis Gas Production (Incl. O ₂ Plant)	82.1	67.1
Shift Conversion and Methanation	16.7	13.6
CO ₂ Removal	<u>23.6</u>	<u>19.3</u>
TOTAL	122.4	100.0

The hydrogen transfer price on these bases is about 260¢/KSCF or a potential savings of about 16% over hydrogen via existing K-T technology.

TABLE 3

**CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS**

**HYDROGEN VIA "NEW" COAL GASIFICATION PROCESS WITH
INTEGRATED OXYGEN PLANT**

*Includes 20% Contingency

Plant Hydrogen Via New Coal	*Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ M
Gasification Process	*Offsites Capital Cost	122.4
Location U.S. Mid Cont. Mid-1980	Total Fixed Investment	77.7
Capacity 100 MSCF/Day	Working Capital	200.1
Production Rate 33,000 MSCF/Year	Total Fixed & Working Capital	10.0
		210.1

<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Illinois Coal (HHV = 11,390 Btu/Lb)	729,000	Ton	21.00	15,309,000	¢/KSCF
<u>TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST</u>				15,309,000	46.39
<u>UTILITIES</u>					
Power	11,428,000	KWH	0.027	309,000	
Cooling Water	32,000,000	KGal.	Internal		
Process Water	2,243,000	KGal.	0.55	1,234,000	
Fuel		MBtu			
Steam	1,429,000	KLbs.	Internal		
Stack Gas Clean-Up	"		0.35	500,000	
<u>TOTAL UTILITIES COST</u>				2,043,000	6.19
<u>LABOR & RELATED</u>					
	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>			
Labor @ \$21,500	7	30		645,000	
Supervision @ Foreman \$28,800/24,200	1	1/5		150,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S				796,000	
<u>TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST</u>				1,591,000	4.82
<u>CAPITAL RELATED</u>					
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			4,896,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC			3,182,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment			3,002,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites			16,125,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital			1,000,000	
<u>TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES</u>				28,205,000	85.47
<u>BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>					
Sulfur	24,300	Ton	50	1,215,000	
<u>TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>				(1,215,000)	(3.68)
<u>TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION</u>				45,933,000	139.19
<u>RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %</u>				40,020,000	121.27
<u>TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN</u>				\$85,953,000	260.46

Hydrogen production based upon coal gasification can be compared against production via:

- Partial Oxidation of Residual Fuel Oil
- Steam Reforming of Methane
- Electrolysis of Water

Figure 3 is a block flow diagram showing the various process options available in partial oxidation. Certain basic processing steps must be accomplished and can be classified as:

- Gasification
- Cooling
- Carbon Removal
- Sulfur Removal

If hydrogen is the desired product, then additional processing steps are required:

- Shift Conversion
- Carbon Dioxide Removal
- Final Carbon Oxides Removal

Table 4 is a production cost analysis for a 100 M SCFD plant. With residual fuel oil valued at a 1980 price of \$15 per barrel, the hydrogen transfer price is estimated at about 263¢/KSCF.

Figure 4 is a block flow diagram depicting the major steps in producing H_2 via conventional steam-methane reforming, and Table 5 is a production cost analysis for a 100 M SCFD plant. With natural gas valued at a 1980 price of \$3.15/M Btu, the hydrogen transfer price is estimated at about 200¢/KSCF.

Figure 3
Block Flow Diagram
Hydrogen, Ammonia, or Methanol
Via Partial Oxidation

**CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS**

**HYDROGEN VIA PARTIAL OXIDATION WITH
INTEGRATED OXYGEN PRODUCTION**

*Includes 10% Contingency

Plant Hydrogen Via Partial Oxidation	*Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ M 93.9
Location U.S. Gulf Coast Mid 1980	*Offsites Capital Cost	65.4
Capacity 100 M SCFD	Total Fixed Investment	159.3
Production Rate 33,000 MSCF/Yr	Working Capital	10.0
	Total Fixed & Working Capital	169.3

<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Residual Fuel Oil	2,013,000	Bbl	15.00	\$ 30,195,000	¢/KSCF
<u>TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST</u>				30,195,000	91.50
<u>UTILITIES</u>					
Power	11,285,000	KWH	0.27	307,000	
Cooling Water	28,694,000	KGal. Internal			
Process Water	964,000	KGal.	.55	530,000	
Fuel		MBtu			
Steam	1,065,000	KLbs. Internal			
Stack Gas Clean-up	"	"	0.35	373,000	
<u>TOTAL UTILITIES COST</u>				1,210,000	3.67
<u>LABOR & RELATED</u>					
	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>			
Labor @ \$21,500	6	26		559,000	
Supervision @ \$24,200/28,800	2	9/1		247,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S				806,000	
<u>TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST</u>				1,612,000	4.88
<u>CAPITAL RELATED</u>					
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			3,756,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC			2,441,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment			2,390,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites			12,660,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital			1,000,000	
<u>TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES</u>				22,247,000	67.42
<u>BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>					
Sulfur	10,000	Tons	50	500,000	
<u>TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>				(500,000)	(1.52)
<u>TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION</u>				54,764,000	165.95
<u>RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %</u>				31,860,000	96.55
<u>TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN</u>				\$86,624,000	262.50

Figure 4
Block Flow Diagram
Hydrogen Via Conventional
Steam-Methane Reforming

TABLE 5

**CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS**

HYDROGEN VIA CONVENTIONAL STEAM-METHANE REFORMING

* Includes 10% Contingency
\$ M

Plant Hydrogen Via Conventional	Battery Limits Capital Cost	41.3
Steam-Methane Reforming	Offsites Capital Cost	21.3
Location Gulf Coast, Mid-1980	Total Fixed Investment	62.6
Capacity 100 MSCF/Day	Working Capital	6.0
Production Rate 33,000 M SCF/Yr	Total Fixed & Working Capital	68.6

<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Natural Gas	15,142,000	MBtu	3.15	47,699,000	¢/KSCF

TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST	47,699,000	144.54
---------------------------------	------------	--------

UTILITIES

Power	34,428,000	KWH	0.027	930,000
Cooling Water	4,429,000	KGal.	0.053	234,000
Process Water	315,000	KGal.	0.55	173,000
Fuel		MBtu.		
Steam	(1,122,000)	KLbs.	5.00	(5,610,000)

TOTAL UTILITIES COST	(4,273,000)	(12.95)
-----------------------------	-------------	---------

LABOR & RELATED

	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>	
Labor @ 10 men @ \$21,500			215,000
Supervision @ Foreman 1/4 Men \$28,800/\$24,200			126,000
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S			341,000

TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST	682,000	2.07
---------------------------------------	---------	------

CAPITAL RELATED

Maintenance	4.0% BLCC	1,652,000
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC	1,074,000
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment	939,000
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites	5,195,000
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital	600,000
TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES		9,460,000
		28.67

BY-PRODUCT CREDIT

TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT		
--------------------------------	--	--

TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION	53,568,000	162.33
RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %	12,520,000	37.94
TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN	66,088,000	200.27

CHEM SYSTEMS INC.

Production cost estimates for hydrogen manufacture via electrolysis have been developed for "new" developing technology as represented by General Electric's Solid Polymer Electrolyte Process (see Figure 5).

Table 6 summarizes the production cost for 100 M SCFD of H₂ using GE's SPE system. Battery limits capital cost is based upon a recent GE estimate for a 58 MW unit to start up in 1980. Since the unit we are considering is roughly six times as large as the estimate module, the supply voltage for our unit will probably range up to 1000 volts, if available, rather than the 500 volt electrical source used in the estimate.

The battery limits capital for this plant (including 30% contingency) can be delineated as follows:

	<u>\$M (Mid-1980)</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Electrolysis Module	7.1	10.5
Power Conversion and Switch Gear	37.4	55.4
Ancillary Equipment (See Figure 5)	15.8	23.4
Installation	<u>7.2</u>	<u>10.7</u>
TOTAL	67.5	100.0

Offsites facilities have been estimated at only 20% since this is not a conventional petrochemical plant and neither feed nor product storage are required.

The cost of electrical power is the key item in determining the overall cost of hydrogen via electrolysis. At a value of 2.7¢/KWH (an average 1980 value based on a mix of nuclear, fossil fuel and hydroelectric plants), the estimated hydrogen transfer price is about 374¢/KSCF.

FIGURE 5. SIMPLIFIED SPE ELECTROLYTIC H₂ GENERATING PLANT SCHEMATIC

**CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS**

**HYDROGEN AT 450 PSIG VIA NEW ELECTROLYTIC PROCESS
(SOLID POLYMER ELECTROLYTE ELECTROLYTIC CELL)**

* Includes 30% Contingency

Plant Hydrogen Via New Electrolytic Process	*Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ M
Location U.S. Gulf Coast Mid-1980	*Offsites Capital Cost	67.5
Capacity 100 M SCFD	Total Fixed Investment	13.5
Production Rate 33,000 MSCF/Yr	Working Capital	81.0
	Total Fixed & Working Capital	11.0
		92.0

<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Process Water	190,000	KGal	.55	105,000	¢/KSCF
TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST				105,000	0.32
UTILITIES					
Power	4,008,228,000	KWH	.027	108,222,000	
Cooling Water	12,000,000	KGal	.053	636,000	
Process Water		KGal.			
Fuel		MBTU			
Steam		KLbs.			
TOTAL UTILITIES COST				108,858,000	329.87
LABOR & RELATED					
	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>			
Labor @ \$21,500		10		215,000	
Supervision @ 28,800		3		86,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S				301,000	
TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST				602,000	1.82
CAPITAL RELATED					
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			2,700,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC			1,755,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment			2,215,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites			7,425,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital			1,100,000	
TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES				14,195,000	43.02
BY-PRODUCT CREDIT					
Oxygen	696,000	Ton	24	(16,704,000)	
TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT				(16,704,000)	(50.62)
TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION				107,056,000	324.41
RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %				16,200,000	49.09
TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN				123,256,000	373.50

Table 7 shows that the use of low sulfur, lower priced Western coals does not reduce the cost of hydrogen via the gasification route but actually increases it by 3 to 4%. Although there are savings in raw material costs based upon the price differential between Western and Eastern coals and also capital savings in sulfur recovery equipment, these savings are more than offset by increased costs for coal handling and drying of the lower heating value, higher moisture Western coal. Note that the four plants are assumed to be mine-mouth and equipped with stack gas scrubbing equipment.

TABLE 7

Hydrogen Via Coal Gasification - Coal Sensitivity Analysis

	<u>Illinois Coal</u> <u>@ \$21/ton</u>		<u>Montana/Wyoming Coal</u> <u>@ \$8/ton</u>	
	<u>Total Fixed</u> <u>Investment</u> \$M	<u>Transfer</u> <u>Price</u> ¢/MSCF	<u>Total Fixed</u> <u>Investment</u> \$M	<u>Transfer</u> <u>Price</u> ¢/MSCF
K-T Coal Gasification	246.4	311.21	269.0	320.47
"New" Coal Gasification	200.1	260.46	223.5	270.16

Ammonia

The same processing steps described previously under hydrogen production via coal gasification are required in ammonia production. In addition, an ammonia synthesis loop is included, preceded by a nitrogen wash or methanation step to remove residual carbon oxides (see Figure 2). We have assumed that conventional ammonia synthesis technology (ca. 2500 psig) is utilized.

Table 8 shows a cost of production analysis for a 2000 short ton per day ammonia plant for synthesis gas generated in K-T gasifiers. Table 9 shows the same production cost analysis for a 2000 short ton per day plant using a "new" coal gasification process. At this capacity level, the "new" technology offers a potential savings of about 9% on the ammonia cost plus return.

Ammonia production based on coal gasification can be compared against production via:

- Partial Oxidation of Residual Fuel Oil
- Steam Reforming of Methane

If ammonia is the desired product from a partial oxidation unit then additional processing steps must be added to the partial oxidation based hydrogen plant (See Figure 3).

- Nitrogen Addition
- Compression to Desired Gas Pressure
- Ammonia Synthesis and Purification

Table 10 shows the production cost analysis for a 2000 ton per day ammonia plant using partial oxidation of a high sulfur residual oil. The estimated transfer price is about 249\$/ton.

TABLE 8 - 154 -
CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS

AMMONIA FROM A K-T COAL
GASIFICATION PROCESS

*Includes 15% Contingency

Plant	Ammonia Via Koppers-Totzek	*Battery Limits Capital Cost		\$ M	
	Coal Gasification	*Offsites Capital Cost		235.1	
Location	U.S. Mid Cont. - 1980	Total Fixed Investment		159.9	
Capacity	2,000 Short Tons/Day	Working Capital		395.0	
Production Rate	660,000 ST/Yr	Total Fixed & Working Capital		15.0	
				410.0	
<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Illinois Coal	1,170,000	Tons	21.00	\$ 24,570,000	\$/T
(HHV=11,390 Btu/Lb)					
Catalyst and Chemicals				700,000	
<u>TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST</u>				\$ 25,270,000	38.29
<u>UTILITIES</u>					
Power	24,500,000	KWH	0.027	662,000	
Cooling Water	64,840,000	KGal.	Internal	-	
Process Water	4,540,000	KGal.	0.55	2,497,000	
Fuel		MBTU			
Steam	4,340,000	KLbs.	Internal	-	
Stack Gas Clean-up	"	"	0.35	1,519,000	
<u>TOTAL UTILITIES COST</u>				4,678,000	7.09
<u>LABOR & RELATED</u>					
	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>			
Labor @ \$21,500	8	37		796,000	
Supervision @ \$28,800/24,200	2	1/9		247,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S				1,043,000	
<u>TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST</u>				\$ 2,086,000	3.16
<u>CAPITAL RELATED</u>					
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			9,404,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6% BLCC			6,113,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment			5,925,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites			31,505,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital			1,500,000	
<u>TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES</u>				54,447,000	82.49
<u>BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>					
Sulfur	38,800	Tons	50	1,940,000	
<u>TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>				(\$ 1,940,000)	(2.94)
<u>TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION</u>				84,541,000	128.09
<u>RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %</u>				79,000,000	119.69
<u>TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN</u>				\$163,541,000	\$247.78

TABLE 9 - 155 -
CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS

AMMONIA FROM A "NEW" COAL
GASIFICATION PROCESS

*Includes 20% Contingency

Plant Ammonia Via "New" Coal Gasification Process				* Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ MI
Location U.S. Mid Cont. 1980				* Offsites Capital Cost	209.2
Capacity 2,000 Short Tons/Day				Total Fixed Investment	152.9
Production Rate 660,000 ST/Yr				Working Capital	14.0
				Total Fixed & Working Capital	376.1
<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Illinois Coal	1,094,000	Tons	21.00	\$ 22,974,000	\$/T
(HHV=11,390 Btu/Lb)					
Catalyst and Chemicals				700,000	
<u>TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST</u>				\$ 23,674,000	35.87
<u>UTILITIES</u>					
Power	24,500,000	KWH	0.027	662,000	
Cooling Water	60,200,000	KGal.	Internal	-	
Process Water	4,220,000	KGal.	0.55	2,321,000	
Fuel		MBTU			
Steam	3,280,000	KLbs.	Internal	-	
Stack Gas Clean-up	"	"	0.35	1,148,000	
<u>TOTAL UTILITIES COST</u>				4,131,000	6.26
<u>LABOR & RELATED</u>					
	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>			
Labor @ \$21,500	8	37		796,000	
Supervision @ \$24,200/28,800	2	9/1		247,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S				1,043,000	
<u>TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST</u>				\$ 2,086,000	3.16
<u>CAPITAL RELATED</u>					
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			8,368,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6% BLCC			5,439,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment			5,432,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites			28,565,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital			1,400,000	
<u>TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES</u>				49,204,000	74.55
<u>BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>					
Sulfur	38,300	Tons	50	1,915,000	
<u>TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>				(\$ 1,915,000)	(2.90)
<u>TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION</u>				77,180,000	116.94
<u>RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %</u>				72,420,000	109.73
<u>TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN</u>				149,600,000	226.67

TABLE 10 - 156 -
CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS

AMMONIA VIA PARTIAL OXIDATION WITH
INTEGRATED OXYGEN PRODUCTION

*Includes 10% Contingency

Plant	Ammonia Via Partial Oxidation	*Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ M 170.6
		*Offsites Capital Cost	110.0
Location	U.S. Gulf Coast, Mid-1980	Total Fixed Investment	280.6
Capacity	2000 Short Tons/Day	Working Capital	18.0
Production Rate	660,000 Tons/Yr	Total Fixed & Working Capital	298.6

<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Residual Fuel Oil	4,100,000	Bbl	15.00	61,500,000	\$/Ton
Catalyst and Chemicals				800,000	
<u>TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST</u>				62,300,000	94.39
<u>UTILITIES</u>					
Power	13,200,000	KWH	0.027	356,000	
Cooling Water	72,451,000	KGal.	Internal		
Process Water	6,780,000	KGal.	0.55	3,731,000	
Fuel		MBTU			
Steam	2,740,000	KLbs.	Internal		
Stack Gas Clean-Up	"	"	0.35	959,000	
<u>TOTAL UTILITIES COST</u>				5,046,000	7.65
<u>LABOR & RELATED</u>					
		<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>		
Labor @ \$21,500		7	30	645,000	
Supervision @ \$24,200/28,800		3	14/2	396,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S				1,041,000	
<u>TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST</u>				\$2,082,000	3.16
<u>CAPITAL RELATED</u>					
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			6,824,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC			4,436,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment			4,209,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites			22,560,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital			1,800,000	
<u>TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES</u>				39,829,000	60.34
<u>BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>					
Sulfur	20,000	Tons	50	(1,000,000)	
<u>TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>				(\$1,000,000)	(1.52)
<u>TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION</u>				108,257,000	164.02
<u>RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %</u>				56,120,000	85.03
<u>TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN</u>				164,377,000	249.05

The production cost analysis for the production of ammonia (2000 STPD) via steam methane reforming is presented in Table 11. The estimated transfer price is about 210 \$/ton.

Table 12 shows that the use of low sulfur, lower priced Western coals does not reduce the cost of ammonia via the gasification route, but increases it by 1 to 2%. Again, the four plants are assumed to be mine mouth and equipped with stack gas scrubbing equipment. Similar to the hydrogen-coal sensitivity analysis, this increase in ammonia cost is the result of increased costs for coal handling and drying of the lower heating value, higher moisture Western coal.

TABLE 12

Ammonia Via Coal, Gasification - Coal Sensitivity Analysis

	<u>Illinois Coal</u> <u>@ \$21/ton</u>		<u>Montana/Wyoming Coal</u> <u>@ \$8/ton</u>	
	<u>Total Fixed</u> <u>Investment</u>	<u>Transfer</u> <u>Price</u>	<u>Total Fixed</u> <u>Investment</u>	<u>Transfer</u> <u>Price</u>
	<u>\$M</u>	<u>\$/Ton</u>	<u>\$M</u>	<u>\$/Ton</u>
K-T Coal Gasification	395.0	247.78	422.2	250.97
"New" Coal Gasification	362.1	226.67	390.4	231.36

TABLE 11
CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS

AMMONIA BY STEAM-METHANE REFORMING

*Includes 10% Contingency

Plant Ammonia by Steam-Methane Reforming	* Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ M. 116.5
Location U.S. Gulf Coast - 1980	* Offsites Capital Cost	64.1
Capacity 2000 ST/SD	Total Fixed Investment	180.6
Production Rate 660,000 ST/Yr	Working Capital	11.0
	Total Fixed & Working Capital	191.6

<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Natural Gas	23,130,000	MBTU	3.15	72,860,000	\$/T
Catalyst and Chemicals				800,000	
<u>TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST</u>				73,660,000	111.60
<u>UTILITIES</u>					
Power	60,600,000	KWH	.027	1,622,000	
Cooling Water	63,171,000	KGal.	.053	3,349,000	
Process Water	140,000	KGal.	0.55	77,000	
Fuel		MBTU			
Steam	(867,000)	KLbs.	5.00	(4,337,000)	
<u>TOTAL UTILITIES COST</u>				\$ 711,000	1.08
<u>LABOR & RELATED</u>					
	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>			
Labor @ \$21,500		25		538,000	
Supervision @ \$28,800		7		202,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S				740,000	
<u>TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST</u>				1,480,000	2.23
<u>CAPITAL RELATED</u>					
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			4,660,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC			3,029,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment			2,709,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites			14,855,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital			1,100,000	
<u>TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES</u>				26,353,000	39.93
<u>BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>					
<u>TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>					
<u>TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION</u>				102,204,000	154.84
<u>RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %</u>				36,120,000	54.73
<u>TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN</u>				\$138,324,000	209.57

Methanol

Methanol production via coal gasification is similar to that for ammonia except that the synthesis gas, following clean-up and sulfur removal, is adjusted to the proper hydrogen to carbon monoxide ratio by sending only part of the stream to a shift conversion step (See Figure 2). Some carbon dioxide is removed and the total synthesis gas stream is compressed to the methanol synthesis pressure. ICI (100 ATM) methanol technology is assumed for this step.

Table 13 shows a production cost analysis for a 2000 short ton per day methanol plant using Koppers-Totzek technology. Table 14 shows a production cost analysis for a 2000 short ton per day plant using a "new" coal gasification process. The "new" coal gasification technology offers potential savings of about 12% on the methanol cost plus return.

As in the case of ammonia production, partial oxidation of heavy residual oil and steam methane reforming are considered as alternative processes for methanol production in the U.S. Table 15 shows the production cost analysis for a 2000 ton per day methanol plant using partial oxidation of a high sulfur residual oil. The estimated transfer price is about 74¢/gal.

The production cost analysis for the production of methanol (2000 STPD) via steam methane reforming is presented in Table 16. The estimated transfer price is about 64¢/gal.

TABLE 13 - 160 -

CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS
METHANOL VIA KOPPERS-TOTZEK COAL
GASIFICATION

*Includes 15% Contingency

Plant Methanol Via Koppers-Totzek Coal Gasification	*Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ M
Location U.S. Mid Continent-1980	*Offsites Capital Cost	206.1
Capacity 2,000 Short Tons/Day	Total Fixed Investment	144.3
Production Rate 660,000 Tons/Yr	Working Capital	350.4
	Total Fixed & Working Capital	14.0
		364.4

RAW MATERIALS	QUANTITY	UNIT	PRICE, \$	ANNUAL COST, \$	UNIT COST	
Illinois Coal (HHV = 11,390 Btu/Lb.)	1,134,000	Tons	21.00	23,814,000	S/T	¢ Gal
Catalyst and Chemicals				450,000		
TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST				24,264,000	36.76	12.25
UTILITIES						
Power	23,000,000	KWH	0.027	621,000		
Cooling Water	59,200,000	KGal.	Internal			
Process Water	4,140,000	KGal.	0.55	2,277,000		
Fuel		MBtu				
Steam	3,820,000	KLbs.	Internal			
Stack Gas Clean-Up	"	"	0.35	1,337,000		
TOTAL UTILITIES COST				4,235,000	6.42	2.14
LABOR & RELATED						
		Men/Shift	Total Men			
Labor @ \$21,500		7	37	796,000		
Supervision @ \$24,200/28,800		2	9/1	247,000		
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S				1,043,000		
TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST				2,086,000	3.16	1.05
CAPITAL RELATED						
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			8,244,000		
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC			5,359,000		
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment			5,256,000		
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites			27,825,000		
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital			1,400,000		
TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES				48,084,000	72.85	24.29
BY-PRODUCT CREDIT						
Sulfur	38,000	Tons	50	1,900,000		
TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT				(1,900,000)	(2.88)	(.96)
TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION				76,769,000	116.31	38.77
RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %				70,080,000	106.18	35.39
TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN				\$146,849,000	222.49	74.16

TABLE 14 - 161 -
CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS

METHANOL VIA "NEW" COAL GASIFICATION

*Includes 20% Contingency

					\$ M	
Plant Methanol Via "New" Coal Gasification						
Location U.S. Mid Cont. - 1980					175.2	
Capacity 2,000 Short Tons/Day					134.9	
Production Rate 660,000 Tons/Yr					310.1	
					13.0	
					323.7	
<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>		<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>
Illinois Coal		1,060,000	Tons	21.00	\$ 22,260,000	\$/T ¢ Gal
(HHV=11,390 Btu/Lb.)						
Catalyst and Chemicals					450,000	
<u>TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST</u>					\$ 22,710,000	34.41 11.47
<u>UTILITIES</u>						
Power	23,000,000	KWH	0.27	\$	621,000	
Cooling Water	55,800,000	KGal.	Internal		-	
Process Water	3,900,000	KGal.	0.55		2,145,000	
Fuel		MBTU				
Steam	2,760,000	KLbs.	Internal		-	
Stack Gas Clean-up	"	"	0.35		966,000	
<u>TOTAL UTILITIES COST</u>					3,732,000	5.65 1.89
<u>LABOR & RELATED</u>						
		<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>			
Labor @ \$21,500		7	37	\$	796,000	
Supervision @ \$24,200/28,800		2	9/1		247,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S					1,043,000	
<u>TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST</u>					\$ 2,086,000	3.16 1.05
<u>CAPITAL RELATED</u>						
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			\$	7,008,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6% BLCC				4,555,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment				4,652,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites				24,265,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital				1,300,000	
<u>TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES</u>					40,480,000	61.33 20.44
<u>BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>						
Sulfur	35,600	Tons	50	\$	1,780,000	
<u>TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>					(\$ 1,780,000)	(2.70) (0.90)
<u>TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION</u>					\$ 67,228,000	101.85 33.95
<u>RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %</u>					62,020,000	93.97 31.32
<u>TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN</u>					\$129,248,000	195.82 65.27

TABLE 15 - 162 -

**CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS**

**METHANOL VIA PARTIAL OXIDATION WITH
INTEGRATED OXYGEN PRODUCTION**

*Includes 10% Contingency

Plant Methanol Via Partial Oxidation	*Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ M
Location U.S. Gulf Coast Mid-1980	*Offsites Capital Cost	137.8
Capacity 2000 Short Tons/Day	Total Fixed Investment	93.3
Production Rate 660,000 Tons/Yr	Working Capital	231.1
	Total Fixed & Working Capital	17.0
		248.1

<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>	
Residual Fuel Oil	4,100,000	Bbl		61,500,000	\$/T	¢/Gal
Catalyst and Chemicals				800,000		
<u>TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST</u>				62,300,000	94.39	31.46
<u>UTILITIES</u>						
Power	6,666,000	KWH	.027	179,000		
Cooling Water	54,400,000	K Gal. Internal				
Process Water	5,080,000	K Gal. C.55		2,795,000		
Fuel		MBTU				
Steam	2,740,000	K Lbs. Internal				
Stack Gas Clean-Up	"	"	0.35	959,000		
<u>TOTAL UTILITIES COST</u>				3,933,000	5.96	1.99
<u>LABOR & RELATED</u>						
	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>				
Labor @ \$21,500	6	30		645,000		
Supervision @ \$24,200/28,800	2	14/2		396,000		
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S				1,041,000		
<u>TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST</u>				2,082,000	3.15	1.06
<u>CAPITAL RELATED</u>						
Maintenance	4.0% BLCC			5,512,000		
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC			3,583,000		
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment			3,467,000		
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites			18,445,000		
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital			1,700,000		
<u>TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES</u>				32,707,000	49.56	16.51
<u>BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>						
Sulfur	20,000	Tons	5.00	1,000,000		
<u>TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT</u>				(1,000,000)	(1.52)	(0.51)
<u>TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION</u>				100,022,000	151.54	50.51
<u>RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20%</u>				46,220,000	70.03	23.34
<u>TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN</u>				146,242,000	221.57	73.85

TABLE 16

**CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS**

METHANOL BY STEAM-METHANE REFORMING

*Includes 10% Contingency

Plant	Methanol by Steam-Methane Reforming	*Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ M 86.1
Location	U.S. Gulf Coast - 1980	*Offsites Capital Cost	47.4
Capacity	2000 ST/SD	Total Fixed Investment	133.5
Production Rate	660,000 ST/Yr	Working Capital	10.0
		Total Fixed & Working Capital	143.5

RAW MATERIALS	QUANTITY	UNIT	PRICE, \$	ANNUAL COST, \$	UNIT COST
Natural Gas	23,400,000	MBTU	3.15	73,710,000	S/T ¢/Gal
CO ₂	4,150,000	KSCF	Nil	Nil	
Catalyst and Chemicals				1,400,000	
TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST				75,110,000	113.80 37.93

UTILITIES

Power	51,027,000	KWH	.027	1,378,000	
Cooling Water	40,411,000	KGal.	.053	2,142,000	
Process Water	140,000	KGal.	0.55	77,000	
Fuel		MBTU			
Steam		KLbs.			
TOTAL UTILITIES COST				3,597,000	5.45 1.82

LABOR & RELATED

	Men/Shift	Total Men		
Labor @ \$21,500		25	538,000	
Supervision @ \$28,800		7	202,000	
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S			740,000	
TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST				1,480,000 2.23 0.74

CAPITAL RELATED

Maintenance	4.0% BLCC	3,444,000	
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC	2,239,000	
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment	2,003,000	
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites	10,980,000	
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital	1,000,000	
TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES			19,666,000 29.80 9.92

BY-PRODUCT CREDIT

None

TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT

TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION	99,853,000	151.28	50.41
RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %	26,700,000	40.45	13.48
TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN	126,553,000	191.73	63.89

Synthesis gas produced from steam methane reforming is typically a mixture of carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, and hydrogen, with the conversion to methanol following the equations:

Since methane is richer in hydrogen than is ideal, CO_2 is normally added to the feed to balance the excess hydrogen. Thus, methanol producers have traditionally located their plants not only close to cheap natural gas sources but also adjacent to ammonia plants where CO_2 would be available cost-free.

Thus, Table 16 shows no charge for the CO_2 raw material. However, it is possible that a methanol plant could be built in an area where cost-free CO_2 is not available. Table 17 presents a production cost analysis for such a case. The estimated transfer price is about 65¢/gal.

**CHEM SYSTEMS
PRODUCTION COST ANALYSIS**

**METHANOL BY STEAM-METHANE REFORMING
(No Captive CO₂)**

*Includes 10% contingency

Plant Methanol by Steam-Methane Reforming	*Battery Limits Capital Cost	\$ MI
Location U.S. Gulf Coast - 1980	*Offsites Capital Cost	87.9
Capacity 2000 ST/SD	Total Fixed Investment	47.4
Production Rate 660,000 ST/Yr	Working Capital	135.3
	Total Fixed & Working Capital	10.0
		145.3

<u>RAW MATERIALS</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PRICE, \$</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST, \$</u>	<u>UNIT COST</u>	
Natural Gas	23,400,000	MBTU	3.15	73,710,000	\$/T	¢/Gal
CO ₂	4,150,000	KSCF	0.18	747,000		
Catalyst and Chemicals				1,400,000		

TOTAL RAW MATERIALS COST

75,857,000 114.93 38.31

UTILITIES

Power	69,296,000	KWH	.027	1,871,000
Cooling Water	40,411,000	KGal.	.053	2,142,000
Process Water	140,000	KGal.	0.55	77,000
Fuel		MBTU		
Steam		K Lbs.		

TOTAL UTILITIES COST

4,090,000 6.20 2.07

LABOR & RELATED

	<u>Men/Shift</u>	<u>Total Men</u>	
Labor @ \$21,500		25	538,000
Supervision @ \$28,800		7	202,000
Direct & General Plant Overhead @ 100% L + S			740,000

TOTAL LABOR & RELATED COST

1,480,000 2.23 0.74

CAPITAL RELATED

Maintenance	4.0% BLCC	3,516,000
General Plant Overhead	2.6 % BLCC	2,285,000
Insurance, Property Taxes	1.5% Total Fixed Investment	2,030,000
Depreciation	10.0% BLCC + 5% Offsites	11,160,000
Interest	10.0% on Working Capital	1,000,000

TOTAL CAPITAL-RELATED EXPENSES

\$19,991,000 30.29 10.08

BY-PRODUCT CREDIT

None

TOTAL BY-PRODUCT CREDIT

<u>TOTAL COST OF PRODUCTION</u>	101,418,000	153.65	51.20
<u>RETURN ON TOTAL FIXED INVESTMENT @ 20 %</u>	27,060,000	41.00	13.66
<u>TOTAL COST PLUS RETURN</u>	\$128,478,000	194.65	64.86

Table 18 shows that the use of low sulfur, lower priced, Western coals does not reduce the cost of methanol via the gasification route, but increases it by 1 to 3%. Again, the four plants are assumed to be mine mouth and equipped with stack gas scrubbing equipment. Similar to the hydrogen and ammonia-coal sensitivity analyses, this increase in methanol cost is the result of increased costs for coal handling and drying of the lower heating value, higher moisture Western coal.

TABLE 18.

Methanol Via Coal Gasification - Coal Sensitivity Analysis

	<u>Illinois Coal</u>		<u>Montana/Wyoming Coal</u>	
	<u>@ \$21/ton</u>		<u>@ \$8/ton</u>	
	<u>Total Fixed</u>	<u>Transfer</u>	<u>Total Fixed</u>	<u>Transfer</u>
	<u>Investment</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Investment</u>	<u>Price</u>
	<u>\$M</u>	<u>¢/Gal</u>	<u>\$M</u>	<u>¢/Gal</u>
K-T Coal Gasification	350.4	74.16	377.2	75.33
"New" Coal Gasification	310.1	65.27	338.3	67.47