INNOVATIVE CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY (ICCT)

**180 MW DEMONSTRATION OF ADVANCED
TANGENTIALLY-FIRED COMBUSTION TECHNIQUES
FOR THE REDUCTION OF NITROGEN OXIDE (NO_x)
EMISSIONS FROM COAL-FIRED BOILERS**

**Topical Report
LNCFS Levels I and III Tests Results**

**DOE Contract Number:
DE-FC22-90PC89653**

**SCS Contract Number
C-91-000028**

Prepared by:

**Southern Company Services, Inc.
800 Shades Creek Parkway
Birmingham, Alabama 35209**

Cleared by DOE Patent Counsel on August 17, 1993

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared by Southern Company Services, Inc. pursuant to a cooperative agreement partially funded by the U.S. Department of Energy and neither Southern Company Services, Inc. nor any of its subcontractors nor the U.S. Department of Energy, nor any person acting on behalf of either:

- (a) Makes any warranty or representation, express or implied with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately-owned rights; or
- (b) Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of, any information, apparatus, method or process disclosed in this report.

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 U.S. Department of Energy. The views and opinion of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U.S. Department of Energy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents results from the third phase of an Innovative Clean Coal Technology (ICCT) project demonstrating advanced tangentially-fired combustion techniques for the reduction of nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emissions from a coal-fired boiler. The purpose of this project was to study the NO_x emissions characteristics of ABB Combustion Engineering's (ABB CE) Low NO_x Concentric Firing System (LNCFS) Levels I, II, and III. These technologies were installed and tested in a stepwise fashion at Gulf Power Company's Plant Lansing Smith Unit 2.

The project sponsors include the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE), the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), and The Southern Company. The DOE oversees the project through the Office of Clean Coal Technology located at the Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center. EPRI provides technical input to the project management team. Southern Company Services manages the project on behalf of The Southern Company, which includes five electric operating companies serving Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi. ABB C-E Services is co-funding the project by sharing in the cost of the low NO_x combustion technology.

The objective of this report is to provide the results from Phase III. During that phase, Levels I and III of the ABB C-E Services Low NO_x Concentric Firing System were tested. The LNCFS Level III technology includes separated overfire air, close coupled overfire air, clustered coal nozzles, flame attachment coal nozzle tips, and concentric firing. The LNCFS Level I was simulated by closing the separated overfire air nozzles of the LNCFS Level III system.

Based upon long-term data, LNCFS Level III reduced NO_x emissions by 45 percent at full load. LOI levels with LNCFS Level III increased slightly; however, tests showed that LOI levels with LNCFS Level III were highly dependent upon coal fineness. After correcting for leakage air through the separated overfire air system, the simulated LNCFS Level I reduced NO_x emissions by 37 percent. There was no increase in LOI with LNCFS Level I.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. **Summary Report on DOE ICCT II Phase 3A for Lansing Smith Unit 2.
Energy Technology Consultants (ETEC) letter report from Lowell L. Smith to
Robert R. Hardman dated July 12, 1993.**

2. **Summary Report on DOE ICCT II Phase 3B for Lansing Smith Unit 2.
Energy Technology Consultants (ETEC) letter report from Lowell L. Smith to
Robert R. Hardman dated August 3, 1993.**

Summary Report on DOE ICCT II Phase 3A for Lansing Smith Unit 2

July 12, 1993.

July 12, 1993

Mr. Robert H. Hardman
SOUTHERN COMPANY SERVICES
800 Shades Creek Pkwy
Birmingham, Al 35209

SUBJECT: Summary Report on DOE ICCT II Phase 3A for Lansing Smith Unit 2

Dear Rob:

The purpose of this letter is summarize the major findings for the Phase 3A testing on Lansing Smith Unit 2. The objective of this test effort was to evaluate the effectiveness of the ABB-CE LNCFS Level 3 retrofit. Information related to the program structure, responsibilities of the various contractors, test setup, instrumentation and the impact of effluents on ESP performance are discussed in Reference 1. While Reference 1 addresses the findings for Phase 2 (LNCFS Level 2) these sections of the program were not substantially different from that for the Phase 3A effort.

The following paragraphs will provide summary information on the emissions of gaseous and solid matter and will discuss the findings of a Special LOI test effort undertaken subsequent to the completion of Phase 3B. In addition, information related to the unit performance impacts will be discussed. Detailed information related to the mill performance and combustion air flow distribution are presented in Reference 2. Similarly, the detailed results for the ESP measurements are discussed in Reference 3. Pertinent summary results from these efforts will be summarized in this letter.

ENERGY TECHNOLOGY CONSULTANTS, INC.

One Technology Drive, Suite I-809, Irvine, CA 92718 (714) 753-9129 Fax (714) 753-1528
51 Virginia Avenue, West Nyack, NY 10994 (914) 353-0306 Fax (914) 353-0308
12337 Jones Road, Suite 400, Houston, TX 77070 (713) 894-1091 Fax (713) 894-1094

INTRODUCTION

The initial Phase 3A test effort to evaluate LNCFS Level 3 began on December 5, 1991 and was completed on March 11, 1992. This initial test effort consisted of Diagnostic tests to evaluate the short-term emissions trends, Performance tests to evaluate the short-term performance impacts, Long-Term tests to evaluate the normal transient operation and Verification tests to determine if significant changes had occurred during the Long-Term effort. A subsequent series of tests were performed to establish the impact of coal fineness on NOx and LOI. This effort began on November 17, 1992 after the completion of the Phase 3B testing. Reference 4 describes this test effort.

PHASE 3A GASEOUS EMISSION TEST RESULTS

During the Phase 3A test effort, 23 days of short-term testing was performed. Long-term testing was performed over a period of several months beginning in early January 1992 and ending in mid-March 1992. The following paragraphs will describe the gaseous emission results for these two types of testing.

Short-Term Characterization Test Results

Short-term emission result were obtained during two different segments of the characterization - LNCFS Level 3 Normal Operating Characteristics and LNCFS Level 3 Coal Fineness Characteristics.

LNCFS Level 3 Normal Operating Characterization - The three types of testing performed during the initial short-term testing effort were Diagnostic, Performance and Verification. With regard to the gaseous emissions results, data from all three types of testing are determined in a consistent manner and therefore should show the same trends and characteristics. Table 1 provides a summary of all of the LNCFS Level 3 short-term tests results performed during the initial test effort.

Figure 1 illustrates the range of excess oxygen levels that were tested during the short-term testing. Included in this figure is the average control room excess oxygen level (measured at the economizer exit) recommended by ABB-CE. Except at the lower load ranges, the excess oxygen tested provided excursions about the recommended level. At the lower load levels, the excess oxygen level ranges were limited by operational constraints. Figure 2 provides the resultant NO_x levels for these excess oxygen levels tested. Included in this figure is an approximate average NO_x level for all of the tests performed at the various loads at the recommended excess oxygen levels. These approximate averages were obtained from the NO_x data for the individual loads discussed below.

Figures 3 through 7 illustrate the NO_x versus O₂ trends for operation with the LNCFS Level 3 configuration at nominal loads of 200, 180, 135, 115 and 70 MWe. The numbers in the figures represent the test day and test numbers. Solid lines are drawn through tests performed on the same day with the same boiler setting. The curves for loads below 200 MWe show that there is a reasonable amount of data scatter at any given load. In addition, all of the figures show that the NO_x emissions are relatively sensitive to excess oxygen excursions with NO_x increasing with increasing excess oxygen level.

Figure 8 provides a comparison of the NO_x trends for the Baseline and the Level 3 configurations at 180 MWe. While it is not possible to obtain an accurate picture of the effectiveness from the short-term data, the figure illustrates the general trend. As will be shown in the following paragraphs on Long-Term data analysis, emission reductions are the greatest at high loads and diminish as the load is decreased to the control point (80 MWe).

LNCFS Level 3 Mill Fineness Characteristics - As part of the Phase 3A effort, the effect of coal fineness was evaluated during the Special LOI testing. Table 2 provides a summary of the test results performed during the Special LOI test effort. This effort

was initiated after the LNCFS Level 1 test effort was completed. The during this special test effort, the Separated Overfire Air Ports were opened to the prescribed positions to configure the boiler in the Level 3 mode of operation. Detailed information related to these Special LOI tests are included in References 4 and 5. The coal fineness for this test effort was varied in three steps at a nominal load of 180 MWe. During each step in fineness, the fineness was measured by Flame Refractories using their methods (similar to ASME methods) and locations and by plant personnel using the methods recommended by ABB-CE (See Ref 4).

Figure 9 presents the results of the testing over the excess oxygen range normally experienced on the Lansing Smith Unit 2. Fineness values are shown in this and subsequent figures for both FRI and Plant measurements. Figure 10 shows that these data are consistent with data taken during the initial Phase 3A test effort and exhibits the same degree of data scatter. Figures 11 and 12 illustrate that while the LOI is a strong function of coal fineness, the NO_x emissions are, for all intents and purposes, insensitive to the fineness in the range of fineness normally experienced on this boiler.

Long-Term Characterization Test Results

During the long-term testing, virtually no intervention by the test team members was made to adjust the operation. Instructions provided by ABB-CE were utilized to provide guidance to the plant personnel on the proper mode of operation in the LNCFS Level 3 configuration. The most illustrative data from the long-term testing is the emission characteristics over the load range. Table 3 provides a summary of the long-term average NO_x, economizer O₂ and the CO emissions. This table includes the data for the upper 95 percent and the lower 5 percent of the data variation. Data in this table illustrates that the data scatter for long-term data is significant. This scatter is a result of the normal variation of numerous parameters such as coal properties, mill settings, burner settings, etc.

Figures 13 through 16 show the average trends for the Phase 3A NO_x, economizer O₂ and CO compared to those for the Baseline configuration. As shown in Figure 13, over the useful load range (200 to 70 MWe) the average NO_x levels for the LNCFS Level 3 configuration were below those of the Baseline configuration. As the load approached the lowest automatic control load point (70 MWe), the NO_x emission reduction effectiveness began to approach the Baseline levels. This decreased effectiveness is illustrated in Figure 14 which shows that below 140 MWe, the effectiveness decreases significantly until at approximately 70 MWe the NO_x reduction is below 10 percent.

Operationally the LNCFS Level 3 configuration generally required a higher level of excess oxygen. This is illustrated in Figure 15 which shows that over the load range the long-term LNCFS Level 3 excess oxygen was higher than during Baseline operation. At loads above 150 MWe, the excess oxygen was 0.5 to 0.75 percent higher for the LNCFS Level 3 configuration. In spite of the increased excess oxygen levels for LNCFS Level 3, the carbon monoxide emissions were higher than Baseline particularly at loads above 150 MWe as is shown in Figure 16. The average CO levels experienced during long-term LNCFS Level 3 operation were, however, well within the range of safe and efficient operation.

Data from the long-term testing was used to estimate the achievable emission limitations. The achievable emission limitations were calculated for 30-day averages and for an annual average. The following compares the Baseline levels with those obtained from the Level 3 testing.

<u>AVERAGING PERIOD</u>	<u>BASELINE</u>	<u>LEVEL 3</u>
30-Day Average	0.68	0.44
Annual Average	0.63	0.40

These achievable emission results were based upon the load scenarios that were experienced during the Baseline and Level 3 test periods. An indication of the load

scenarios during these phase can be obtained from the data utilized to calculate the achievable emission limitations. Figure 17 shows the percent of time at each load that was experienced during both long-term test periods. The two load scenarios are very similar but are different in the fact that the Baseline configuration spent more time at the top load. The load scenario is an important factor in determining the achievable emissions. Further analyses would be necessary to assess the achievable emission limitations under the same load scenarios.

PHASE 3A PERFORMANCE TEST RESULTS

During the Phase 3A test effort, testing was performed to evaluate the impact of the LNCFS Level 3 retrofit on steaming characteristics, ash characteristics and unit efficiency. Most of these evaluations were made using short-term test data, however, the impact on steaming characteristics were evaluated using long-term data.

Steaming Characteristics

A summary of the average long-term superheat and reheat temperatures and the burner tilts are presented in Table 4. Additional data on the steaming characteristics is provided in Reference 6. This table shows the Baseline values compared to the Phase 3A values for these parameters. It should be pointed out that during the Baseline tests the tilts were fixed in the horizontal position due to mechanical problems. During the LNCFS Level 2 retrofit (Phase 2), the linkages were repaired and the tilts became completely operational. During the Phase 3A testing the linkages began to bind which did not permit the full range of operation of the tilts. The tilts were, however, partially functional during this test phase.

Figures 18 through 20 provide a comparison of the superheat and reheat temperatures, and the burner tilts. As shown in Figure 18 the superheat temperature was not affected by the Level 3 retrofit at the top load however as load was decreased below 150 MWe the temperature began to sag. This depression in temperature occurred even with the ability to utilize the tilts to compensate as shown in Figure 20.

A similar depression in temperature is shown in Figure 19 for the reheat temperature comparisons. The conclusion from this evaluation is that the Level 3 configuration impacted the ability to maintain the superheat and reheat temperature. Utilization of the tilts could not compensate for the impact on temperatures.

Loss-On-Ignition and Boiler Efficiency Characteristics

LOI was determined during the initial testing of Phase 3A and during the Special LOI testing. In both series of tests Southern Research Institute performed EPA Method 17 testing to gather the particulates. This particulate matter was analyzed to determine the LOI and the resulting data is presented in Table 2 for the Special LOI testing and in Table 5 for the Performance tests. Tables 2 and 5 also include information on the mill fineness through 200 mesh and remaining on 50 mesh.

Figure 21 provides a comparison of the Baseline and the Phase 3A LOI results from the Performance testing. This figure illustrates that there is a substantial increase in the LOI for the LNCFS Level 3 configuration. This impact on LOI not only affects the boiler efficiency but could affect the ability to sell the flyash.

During the Performance testing of each Phase of the program sufficient data were gathered to calculate the boiler efficiency using the ASME PTC 4.1 Short Form method. Table 5 presents the results of the PTC 4.1 analysis for the Performance test data for both the Baseline and the LNCFS Level 3 configurations. Figure 22 illustrates that there was a net efficiency loss ranging from 0.6 percent at low loads to 0.3 percent at high loads. A decrease of 0.6 percent is measurable using PTC 4.1 and therefore indicates that the efficiency is decreased at low loads. An efficiency difference of 0.3 percent is not within the accuracy of the PTC 4.1 method and therefore it cannot be said that the efficiency decreased at full load.

CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusions for the Phase 3A testing of the LNCFS Level 3 retrofit are briefly delineated below.

- NOx reductions ranging from as high as 47 percent at high loads to as low as 10 percent at low loads were measured based upon long-term data.
- Increases of Loss-on-ignition ranging from 2.7 percentage points at low loads to approximately one percentage point at high load were measured.
- Boiler efficiency was reduced at lower loads. High load efficiency changes were not discernable from the Baseline level.
- Superheat temperatures were unchanged over the load range. Reheat temperatures were reduced at lower loads.
- Coal fineness affected the LOI significantly. As fineness was increased, LOI decreased.
- Coal fineness had virtually no effect on NOx emissions.

More thorough conclusions will be provided in the final report which discusses the comparison of all four program phases.

If you have any questions concerning these analyses, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Lowell L. Smith

ATTACHMENTS

References

Tables 1 through 5

Figures 1 through 22

REFERENCES

1. "180 Mwe Demonstration of Advanced Tangentially-Fired Combustion Techniques for the Reduction of Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) Emissions form Coal-Fired Boilers", Innovative Clean Coal Technology DOE Contract Number DE-FC22-90PC89653, Prepared by Southern Company Services, Jan 1992.
2. "Phase III Parametric Testing", Service Report No. 1991, Contract No. 5459-036, Prepared by Flame Refractories, Inc., Feb 1992.
3. "ESP Performance Analysis During Phase IIIa of the 180 MWe Demonstration of Advanced Tangentially-Fired Combustion Techniques for the Reduction of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions form Coal-Fired Boilers - Volume 1 - Results and Analysis", SCS Contract No. 196-90-107, Prepared by Southern Research Institute, Dec 1992.
4. Letter to R. H. Hardman (SCS) from L. L. Smith (ETEC), "Effects of Coal Fineness on NOx Emissions and Loss on Ignition for Lansing Smith Unit 2 Testing", Dated Jan 18, 1993.
5. Letter to R. H. Hardman (SCS) from L. L. Smith (ETEC), "Correction to Figures in Smith Special LOI Report dated January 18, 1993", dated June 15, 1993.
6. Letter to R. H. Hardman (SCS) from L. L. Smith (ETEC), "Summary of Steam Temperature and Tilt Profiles for All Phases of Lansing Smith DOE ICCT II Program" dated March 26, 1993.

TABLE 1
LANSING SMITH PHASE IIIa TEST SUMMARY

TEST NO.	DATE	LOAD MWe	MOOS	UCCOFA	LCCOFA	USOFA	MSOFA	LSOFA	BURNER TILT	CR O2 %	STK O2 %	DAS O2 %	NOC ppm	NOx lb/MMB	CO ppm
39-1	12/20/91	199	NONE	100	20	100	100	100	-1.1	4.4	6.1	3.8	234	0.318	13
39-2	12/20/91	200	NONE	100	20	100	100	100	-1.1	4.2	6.0	3.5	229	0.312	16
35-1	12/05/91	179	None	82	30	100	100	100	8.7	5.2	6.8	5.4	257	0.350	26
35-2	12/05/91	180	None	82	20	100	100	100	8.7	4.9	6.6	5.1	248	0.338	58
35-3	12/05/91	180	None	82	20	100	100	100	8.7	5.4	7.0	5.8	264	0.360	15
35-4	12/05/91	180	None	82	20	100	100	100	8.7	5.8	7.7	6.6	300	0.408	5
35-5	12/05/91	179	None	82	20	100	100	100	8.7	6.7	8.4	7.5	323	0.440	7
35-6	12/05/91	180	None	83	20	100	100	100	8.7	5.8	7.8	6.3	283	0.385	6
36-1	12/06/91	182	None	86	20	100	100	100	4.8	4.1	5.8	4.1	224	0.305	109
36-2	12/06/91	182	None	85	20	100	100	100	4.8	4.7	6.4	4.6	241	0.329	26
36-3	12/06/91	182	None	85	20	100	100	100	4.8	5.5	7.2	5.7	299	0.388	33
36-4	12/06/91	182	None	86	20	100	100	100	4.8	6.2	8.2	6.7	293	0.400	15
36-5	12/06/91	183	None	86	20	100	100	100	4.8	5.8	7.8	6.8	284	0.387	15
36-6	12/06/91	183	None	86	20	100	100	100	4.8	5.0	6.9	5.2	253	0.345	17
37-1	12/07/91	179	None	83	20	100	100	100	9.2	4.3	6.0	4.3	235	0.320	110
37-2	12/07/91	179	None	82	20	100	100	100	9.2	4.8	6.6	4.8	252	0.343	26
37-3	12/07/91	179	None	83	20	100	100	100	9.2	5.7	7.2	5.8	273	0.372	20
37-4	12/07/91	179	None	83	20	100	100	100	9.2	6.2	7.9	6.9	302	0.412	15
37-5	12/07/91	179	None	82	20	100	100	100	9.2	6.1	7.9	6.8	304	0.415	14
37-6	12/07/91	180	None	83	20	100	100	100	9.2	5.5	7.3	6.1	284	0.388	14
37-7	12/07/91	179	None	83	20	100	100	100	9.2	5.2	6.9	5.1	256	0.349	32
30-1	12/10/91	182	None	80	85	100	100	100	18.4	3.7	5.3	2.7	219	0.298	79
30-2	12/10/91	181	None	20	85	100	100	100	18.4	4.4	6.1	3.7	242	0.329	18
32-1	12/12/91	180	None	83	20	100	100	100	-0.8	4.5	6.3	4.0	231	0.315	15
32-2	12/12/91	182	None	82	20	100	100	100	-0.7	4.6	6.3	4.0	234	0.318	14
33-1	12/13/91	180	None	84	20	100	100	100	-1.8	4.4	6.4	4.0	222	0.302	12
33-2	12/13/91	179	None	83	20	100	100	100	-1.8	4.5	6.4	4.1	227	0.309	11
36-1	12/19/91	181	None	85	20	100	100	100	-0.8	4.4	6.4	3.9	228	0.308	17
36-2	12/19/91	180	None	82	20	100	100	100	-0.8	4.6	6.4	4.0	229	0.312	15
76-1	03/10/92	177	None	81	20	100	100	100	6	4.8	6.5	4.0	230	0.313	123
76-2	03/10/92	178	None	81	20	100	100	100	6	5.2	7.4	4.9	266	0.362	9
76-3	03/10/92	181	None	86	20	100	100	100	6	4.8		4.3	244	0.332	7
77-1	03/11/92	178	None	82	20	100	100	100	9	5.8		5.5	308	0.420	4
77-2	03/11/92	178	None	82	20	100	100	100	9	4.4		3.7	241	0.328	17
59-1	12/09/91	136	A	20	41	100	100	27	8.1	4.4	8.2	3.8	215	0.293	45
59-2	12/09/91	137	A	20	41	100	100	24	8.0	5.0	6.7	4.4	230	0.314	11
59-3	12/09/91	138	A	20	41	100	100	28	8.0	5.5	7.1	5.0	247	0.337	11
59-4	12/09/91	139	A	20	41	100	100	23	8.0	6.1	8.0	5.9	279	0.380	9
59-5	12/09/91	138	AB	20	41	100	100	28	8.0	6.3	8.1	5.9	291	0.388	11
59-6	12/09/91	138	AB	20	41	100	100	25	8.1	4.4	6.2	3.9	234	0.319	18
61-1	12/11/91	134	A	38	20	100	100	100	13.3	6.1	8.0	5.8	278	0.378	11
61-2	12/11/91	135	A	40	20	100	100	100	13.4	4.1	5.8	3.5	219	0.298	18
61-3	12/11/91	136	AB	38	20	11	100	100	13.4	4.1	6.0	3.4	250	0.340	62
61-4	12/11/91	137	AB	38	20	10	100	100	13.4	5.2	7.0	4.8	271	0.369	13
61-5	12/11/91	136	AB	38	20	12	100	100	13.4	6.5	8.2	6.0	294	0.387	11
66-1	12/17/91	135	A	43	20	31	100	100	-1.1	5.0	6.8	4.8	216	0.294	11
66-2	12/17/91	137	A	41	20	25	100	100	-1.1	5.1	6.8	4.5	218	0.294	11
67-1	12/18/91	133	A	39	20	24	100	100	-0.8	5.1	6.8	4.6	218	0.294	12
67-2	12/18/91	136	A	41	20	24	100	100	-0.8	5.1	6.7	4.4	213	0.290	10
77-3	03/11/92	135	A	38	20	100	100	10	15	6.1		6.0	302	0.412	5
77-4	03/11/92	135	A	38	20	100	100	10	15	6.1		4.9	279	0.380	5
77-5	03/11/92	135	A	38	20	100	100	10	15	3.8	5.9	3.2	234	0.319	17
58-1	12/08/91	114	AB	20	20	100	100	0	9.3	4.1	5.9	4.0	212	0.289	20
58-2	12/08/91	115	AB	20	20	100	100	0	9.3	4.2	6.1	4.2	220	0.299	11
58-3	12/08/91	115	AB	20	20	100	100	0	9.3	3.5	5.4	3.1	212	0.288	12
58-4	12/08/91	115	AB	20	20	100	100	0	9.3	4.8	6.6	4.3	234	0.319	13
58-5	12/08/91	115	AB	20	20	100	100	0	9.3	5.4	7.1	4.9	250	0.341	9
58-6	12/08/91	116	AB	20	20	100	100	0	9.3	5.8	7.6	5.6	282	0.367	9
64-1	12/14/91	111.9	A&B	20	20	-8	100	100	-1.3	5.5	7.3	5.2	229	0.312	8
64-2	12/14/91	112.55	A&B	18	20	-8	100	100	-1.3	5.5	7.4	5.2	231	0.315	7
65-1	12/15/91	113	AB	18	20	-8	100	100	-1.5	5.5	7.4	5.3	241	0.328	7
65-2	12/15/91	113	AB	18	20	-8	100	100	-1.5	5.6	7.4	5.3	238	0.324	4
78-4	03/10/92	116	AB	22	10	-8	100	100	15	6.1		5.8	290	0.365	4
78-5	03/10/92	116	AB	21	10	-8	100	100	15	5.2		4.9	281	0.363	6
78-6	03/11/92	116	AB	22	10	-8	100	100	15	4.6		4.1	286	0.363	6
74-1	01/12/92	68	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	-8	10	-0.8	5.6	6.7	5.8	330	0.460	9
74-2	01/12/92	68	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	-8	12	-0.9	5.0	6.0	4.8	300	0.408	10
74-3	01/12/92	68	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	-8	10	-	6.3	9.3	6.4	380	0.490	11
74-4	01/12/92	68	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	-8	10	-0.9	7.2	10.1	3.7	385	0.525	13
74-5	01/12/92	62	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	17	65	-1.0	5.5	8.7	5.7	233	0.317	15
75-1	01/13/92	60	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	5.9	59	-0.7	5.5	6.0	5.8	250	0.340	12
75-2	01/13/92	62	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	-8	-8	-0.7	5.7	6.2	5.8	327	0.448	11
75-3	01/13/92	69	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	-8	-8	-0.8	6.0	8.3	6.1	354	0.482	7
75-4	01/13/92	69	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	-8	10	-0.9	5.9	8.5	6.2	354	0.482	9
75-5	01/13/92	68	A,B,C	-8	20	-8	-8	40	-0.9	6.1	8.4	6.2	296	0.401	10

E:\SCS\12345\SP3\APP\TABLE 1.WK3

TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF LOI TESTING

LANSING SMITH UNIT 2 SPECIAL LOI TESTING

ALL MILLS IN SERVICE, ZERO BURNER TILT

TEST	DATE	LOAD	CCOFA U/L	SOFA U/M/L	DAS O2 dry Pct	NOC dry ppm	NO dry lb/mmBtu	CO dry ppm	CLASSIF SETTING A/B/C/D/E	COAL FINENESS % THRU 200 MESH A/B/C/D/E	AVG LOI Pct	COMMENTS
103-1	11/17/92	181	83/20	100/100/100	2.3	206	0.279	214	3/1/1/2/3	54/53/50/49/51	11.9	LOI AT MIN XS O2, MINIMUM COAL FINENESS
103-2	11/17/92	181	83/20	100/100/100	3.2	221	0.301	22	3/1/1/2/3	54/53/50/49/51	10.8	LOI AT MED XS O2, MINIMUM COAL FINENESS
103-3	11/17/92	180	83/20	100/100/100	4.1	247	0.338	13	3/1/1/2/3	54/53/50/49/51	7.1	LOI AT HIGH XS O2, MINIMUM COAL FINENESS
104-1	11/18/92	179	83/20	100/100/100	2.4	202	0.275	209	4/2/3/3/4	57/57/58/52/56	7.8	LOI AT MIN XS O2, MEDIUM COAL FINENESS
104-2	11/18/92	180	83/20	100/100/100	3.1	220	0.303	20	4/2/3/3/4	57/57/58/52/56	5.6	LOI AT MED XS O2, MEDIUM COAL FINENESS
104-3	11/18/92	179	83/20	100/100/100	3.9	234	0.322	15	4/2/3/3/4	57/57/58/52/56	4.1	LOI AT HIGH XS O2, MEDIUM COAL FINENESS
104-4	11/18/92	179	83/20	100/100/100	3.3	216	0.297	43	4/2/3/3/4	57/57/58/52/56	6.1	LOI AT MED XS O2, MEDIUM COAL FINENESS
105-1	11/19/92	182	83/20	100/100/100	2.6	204	0.279	125	6/6/6/6/6	64/63/64/63/63	5.0	LOI AT MIN XS O2, MAXIMUM COAL FINENESS
105-2	11/19/92	182	83/20	100/100/100	3.1	215	0.283	39	6/6/6/6/6	64/63/64/63/63	3.4	LOI AT MED XS O2, MAXIMUM COAL FINENESS
105-3	11/19/92	181	83/20	100/100/100	4.2	230	0.315	13	6/6/6/6/6	64/63/64/63/63	2.4	LOI AT HIGH XS O2, MAXIMUM COAL FINENESS
105-4	11/19/92	182	83/20	100/100/100	3.0	214	0.293	21	6/6/6/6/6	64/63/64/63/63	3.2	LOI AT MED XS O2, MAXIMUM COAL FINENESS

FILE: D:\SCS\123R3\SP3ARPT\TABLE 2.WK3

TABLE 3 LNCFS LEVEL 3 LONG-TERM NO_x EMISSIONS DATA

AVG LOAD MWe	LOWER5% OXYGEN Percent	AVG OXYGEN Percent	UPPER95% OXYGEN Percent	LOWER5% NO _x lb/MMB	AVG NO _x lb/MMB	UPPER95% NO _x lb/MMB	LOWER5% CO ppm	AVG CO ppm	UPPER95% CO ppm
59	5.6	7.1	8.3	0.464	0.593	0.755	6	20	56
71	5.6	6.8	7.9	0.407	0.519	0.623	3	20	50
79	5.4	6.6	7.8	0.350	0.471	0.583	3	18	52
90	5.0	6.3	8.2	0.337	0.418	0.512	2	16	44
100	4.7	5.9	7.4	0.306	0.376	0.441	1	15	42
110	4.7	5.7	6.8	0.317	0.372	0.433	2	16	43
120	4.5	5.4	6.4	0.315	0.366	0.414	1	16	42
130	4.4	5.2	6.1	0.299	0.345	0.389	2	17	46
140	4.0	5.0	6.0	0.283	0.322	0.357	4	20	49
150	3.8	4.8	5.9	0.280	0.323	0.361	5	35	139
160	3.6	45.6	5.8	0.285	0.323	0.362	5	53	236
170	3.5	4.5	5.3	0.293	0.333	0.368	5	43	178
179	3.3	4.3	5.1	0.311	0.343	0.378	4	33	110
191	2.9	3.9	4.8	0.313	0.345	0.385	4	30	101
197	3.0	3.8	4.4	0.319	0.345	0.372	2	26	89

E:\SCS\123R3\SP3ARPT\TABLE 3.WK3

**TABLE 4 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 3
STEAMING CHARACTERISTICS**

PHASE 1 Baseline				PHASE 3A LNCFS III			
LOAD MWe	SH TEMP Deg F	RH TEMP Deg F	TILT Deg	LOAD MWe	SH TEMP Deg F	RH TEMP Deg F	TILT Deg
70	998	909	0	71	990	894	5
79	999	919	0	79	981	887	6
90	999	926	0	90	983	895	7
100	1001	934	0	100	992	906	6
110	1002	940	0	110	996	915	6
120	1003	952	0	120	996	923	6
131	1003	959	0	130	998	932	6
140	1003	963	0	140	1002	941	7
150	1003	966	0	150	1003	949	7
160	1003	976	0	160	1002	960	6
170	1001	982	0	171	1004	970	5
180	1001	987	0	179	1005	981	6
191	1001	991	0	191	1004	987	4
198	1000	995	0	197	1005	993	4

E:\SCS\123R3\SP3ARPT\TABLE 4.WK3

**TABLE 5 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 3
PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS**

NOMINAL LOAD MWe	EXCESS OXYGEN		FINENESS THRU 200		FINENESS ON 50		LOSS ON IGNITION		BOILER EFFICIENCY	
	BASELINE EXCESS OXYGEN Percent	LEVEL 3 EXCESS OXYGEN Percent	BASELINE FINENESS THRU 200 MESH Percent	LEVEL 3 FINENESS THRU 200 MESH Percent	BASELINE FINENESS ON 50 MESH Percent	LEVEL 3 FINENESS ON 50 MESH Percent	BASELINE LOI Percent	LEVEL 3 LOI Percent	BASELINE PTC 4.1 EFFICIENCY Percent	LEVEL 3 PTC 4.1 EFFICIENCY Percent
180	4.0	4.0	58.9	60.7	2.9	3.1	5.0	6.1	89.7	89.4
135	2.8	4.4	60.7	58.0	2.3	2.6	4.2	5.8	90.7	90.1
115	3.6	5.2	60.0	58.8	3.1	3.1	4.0	6.6	90.9	90.3

FIGURE 1 PHASE 3A EXCESS OXYGEN LEVELS TESTED

E:\SCS\FREE\SP3\ARPT\FIG2.DRW

FIGURE 3 PHASE 3A 200 MWe NO_x CHARACTERIZATION

FIGURE 4 PHASE 3A 180 MWe NOx CHARACTERIZATION

FIGURE 5 PHASE 3A 135 MWe NO_x CHARACTERIZATION

E:\SCS\FREE\SP3\APPT\FIG5.DRW

FIGURE 6 PHASE 3A 115 MW_e NO_x CHARACTERIZATION

FIGURE 7 PHASE 3A 70 MWe NOx CHARACTERIZATION

ENCLOSURE JUMPING DOWN

FIGURE 8 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 3
180 MWe NO_x EMISSIONS

FIGURE 9
NOx CHARACTERISTICS
FULL-LOAD LNCFS LEVEL 3 CONFIGURATION

D:\SCS\FREE\SLON\NOVS02.DRW

FIGURE 10
PHASE IIIa 180 MWe NOx CHARACTERIZATION
FULL-LOAD LNCFS LEVEL 3 CONFIGURATION

D:\SCS\FREE\SLONPH3\NOX.DRW

FIGURE 11
NOx AND LOI SENSITIVITIES
FULL-LOAD LNCFS LEVEL 3 CONFIGURATION OPERATING AT 3 PERCENT O2

D:\SCS\FREE\SLON\NOX\LOI.DRW

FIGURE 12
NOx AND LOI SENSITIVITIES
FULL-LOAD LNCFS LEVEL 3 CONFIGURATION OPERATING AT 3 PERCENT O2

D:\SCS\FREE\SLON\NOX\LOI\50.DRW

FIGURE 13 LONG-TERM NO_x EMISSION CHARACTERISTICS

FIGURE 14 LNCFS LEVEL 3 NOx REDUCTION EFFECTIVENESS

FIGURE 15 LONG-TERM EXCESS OXYGEN CHARACTERISTICS

FIGURE 16 LONG-TERM CARBON MONOXIDE CHARACTERISTICS

FIGURE 17 LOAD HISTORIES FOR BASELINE AND LEVEL 3 LONG-TERM TESTS

**FIGURE 18 COMPARISON OF LONG-TERM BASELINE AND LNCFS
LEVEL 3 SUPERHEAT TEMPERATURES**

**FIGURE 19 COMPARISON OF LONG-TERM BASELINE AND LNCFS
LEVEL 3 REHEAT TEMPERATURES**

**FIGURE 20 COMPARISON OF LONG-TERM BASELINE AND LNCFS
LEVEL 3 BURNER TILTS**

FIGURE 21 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 3 LOSS ON IGNITION

FIGURE 22 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 3 PTC 4.1 BOILER EFFICIENCY

Summary Report on DOE ICCT II Phase 3B for Lansing Smith Unit 2

August 3, 1993.

August 3, 1993

Mr. Robert H. Hardman
SOUTHERN COMPANY SERVICES
800 Shades Creek Pkwy
Birmingham, Al 35209

SUBJECT: Summary Report on DOE ICCT II Phase 3B for Lansing Smith Unit 2

Dear Rob:

The purpose of this letter is summarize the major findings for the Phase 3B testing on Lansing Smith Unit 2. The objective of this test effort was to evaluate the effectiveness of the ABB-CE LNCFS Level 1 retrofit. Information related to the program structure, responsibilities of the various contractors, test setup, instrumentation and the impact of effluents on ESP performance are discussed in Reference 1. While Reference 1 addresses the findings for Phase 2 (LNCFS Level 2) these sections of the program were not substantially different from that for the Phase 3b effort.

The following paragraphs will provide summary information on the emissions of gaseous and solid matter. In addition, information related to the unit performance impacts will be discussed. Detailed information related to the mill performance and combustion air flow distribution are presented in Reference 2. Similarly, the detailed results for the ESP measurements are discussed in Reference 3. Pertinent summary results from these efforts will be summarized in this letter.

INTRODUCTION

The Phase 3B test effort to evaluate LNCFS Level 1 began on May 14, 1992 and was completed on September 17, 1992. This test effort consisted of Diagnostic tests to evaluate the short-term emissions trends, Performance tests to evaluate the short-term performance impacts, Long-Term tests to evaluate the normal transient operation and Verification tests to determine if significant changes had occurred during the Long-Term effort.

PHASE 3B GASEOUS EMISSION TEST RESULTS

During the Phase 3b test effort, 25 days of short-term testing was performed. Long-term testing was performed over a period of several months beginning in early June 1992 and ending in early-September 1992. The following paragraphs will describe the gaseous emission results for these two types of testing.

Short-Term Characterization Test Results

The three types of testing performed during the initial short-term testing effort were Diagnostic, Performance and Verification. With regard to the gaseous emissions results, data from all three types of testing are determined in a consistent manner and therefore should show the same trends and characteristics. Table 1 provides a summary of all of the LNCFS Level 1 short-term tests results performed during the initial test effort. This table contains only data relevant to the Level 1 normal operation mode. Tests were performed from time-to-time to evaluate the impact of Separated Overfire air (SOFA) settings as well as burner tilts. These data do not reflect the normal mode of operation for Level 1.

Figure 1 illustrates the range of excess oxygen levels that were tested during the short-term testing. Included in this figure is the average control room excess

oxygen level (measured at the economizer exit) recommended by ABB-CE. As can be seen from the figure, the excess oxygen levels tested provided an excursion about the recommended level of approximately one percent excess oxygen. Figure 2 provides the resultant NO_x levels for these excess oxygen levels tested. Included in this figure is an approximate average NO_x level for all of the tests performed at the various loads at the recommended excess oxygen levels. These approximate averages were obtained from the NO_x data for the individual loads discussed below. It should be pointed out that these data are not corrected for leakage of air through the SOFA ports.

The LNCFS Level 1 configuration tested during Phase 3B was a simulation of the ABB-CE offering of Level 1. To simulate Level 1, the SOFA ports were closed and the recommended settings for the Close Coupled Overfire Air (CCOFA) were set by ABB-CE to their recommended positions. In order to provide cooling air to the SOFA ports, stops were provided in the SOFA dampers. Tests were performed to estimate the amount of leakage through the SOFA dampers and the effect on the NO_x emissions during the simulated Level 1 testing. The results of this testing indicated that only a small amount of air was escaping through the SOFA ports and it was likely that this additional OFA was channeled along the walls thus providing little further NO_x reduction. The results of the SOFA leakage tests indicated that at the high loads the leakage resulted in small additional reduction in NO_x over that would be provided by the CCOFA ports alone. At lower loads the effect was negligible. This SOFA leakage effect at high load has been included in the data presented in the following curves for both short- and long-term data at loads above 150 MWe.

Figures 3 through 7 illustrate the NO_x versus O₂ trends for operation with the LNCFS Level 3 configuration at nominal loads of 200, 180, 135, 115 and 70 MWe. The numbers in the figures represent the test day and test numbers. Solid lines are drawn through tests performed on the same day with the same boiler setting. The curves for loads below 200 MWe show that there is a reasonable amount of data scatter at any

given load, however, the trends are similar between data taken on different days. In addition, all of the figures show that the NO_x emissions are relatively sensitive to excess oxygen excursions with NO_x increasing with increasing excess oxygen level.

Figure 8 provides a comparison of the NO_x trends for the Baseline and the Level 1 configurations at 180 MWe. While it is not possible to obtain an accurate picture of the effectiveness from the short-term data, the figure illustrates the general trend. This trend prevailed over the entire load range. In general, the sensitivity of NO_x to excess oxygen decreased with the addition of the Level 1 NO_x control technique.

Long-Term Characterization Test Results

During the long-term testing, virtually no intervention by the test team members was made to adjust the operation. Instructions provided by ABB-CE were utilized to provide guidance to the plant personnel on the proper mode of operation in the LNCFS Level 1 configuration. The most illustrative data from the long-term testing is the emission characteristics over the load range. Table 2 provides a summary of the long-term average NO_x, economizer O₂, and the CO emissions. This table includes the data for the upper 95 percent and the lower 5 percent of the data variation. Data in this table illustrates that the data scatter for long-term data is significant. This scatter is a result of the normal variation of numerous parameters such as coal properties, mill settings, burner settings, etc.

Figures 9 through 12 show the average trends for the Phase 3B NO_x, economizer O₂, and CO compared to those for the Baseline configuration. As shown in Figure 9, over the useful load range (200 to 70 MWe) the average NO_x levels for the LNCFS Level 1 configuration were below those of the Baseline configuration. The NO_x characteristics of the Level 1 configuration were essentially flat - relatively little variation over the load range. The NO_x reduction effectiveness of the Level 1 configuration is

illustrated in Figure 10 which shows that, the effectiveness decreases slightly at lower loads.

Operationally the LNCFS Level 1 configuration generally required approximately the same if not lower levels of excess oxygen than that for the Baseline configuration. This is illustrated in Figure 11 which shows that over the load range the long-term LNCFS Level 1 excess oxygen was equal to the Baseline levels at low loads and was lower during Baseline operation. At loads above 150 MWe, the excess oxygen was 0.5 to 0.75 percent lower for the LNCFS Level 1 configuration. For all intents and purposes, the carbon monoxide emissions were essentially the same for both the Level 1 and Baseline configurations as is shown in Figure 12. The average CO levels experienced during long-term LNCFS Level 1 and Baseline operation were well below that required for safe and efficient operation.

Data from the long-term testing was used to estimate the achievable emission limitations. The achievable emission limitations were calculated for 30-day averages and for an annual average. The following compares the Baseline levels with those obtained from the Level 1 testing.

<u>AVERAGING PERIOD</u>	<u>BASELINE</u>	<u>LEVEL 1</u>
30-Day Average	0.68	0.42
Annual Average	0.63	0.41

These achievable emission results were based upon the load scenarios that were experienced during the Baseline and Level 1 test periods. An indication of the load scenarios during these phase can be obtained from the data utilized to calculate the achievable emission limitations. Figure 13 shows the percent of time at each load that was experienced during both long-term test periods. The two load scenarios are very similar but are different in the fact that the Baseline configuration spent less time at the

top load. The load scenario is an important factor in determining the achievable emissions. Further analyses would be necessary to assess the achievable emission limitations under the same identical load scenarios.

PHASE 3A PERFORMANCE TEST RESULTS

During the Phase 3B test effort, testing was performed to evaluate the impact of the LNCFS Level 1 retrofit on steaming characteristics, ash characteristics and unit efficiency. Most of these evaluations were made using short-term test data, however, the impact on steaming characteristics were evaluated using long-term data.

Steaming Characteristics

A summary of the average long-term superheat and reheat temperatures and the burner tilts are presented in Table 3. Additional data on the steaming characteristics is provided in Reference 4. This table shows the Baseline values compared to the Phase 3B values for these parameters. It should be pointed out that during the Baseline tests the tilts were fixed in the horizontal position due to mechanical problems. During the LNCFS Level 2 retrofit (Phase 2), the linkages were repaired and the tilts became completely operational. During the Phase 3A testing the linkages began to bind which did not permit the full range of operation of the tilts. During the Phase 3B testing the binding had progressed to a point that only limited variation in the tilts could be achieved. The tilts were, however, partially functional during Phase 3B.

Figures 14 through 16 provide a comparison of the superheat and reheat temperatures, and the burner tilts. As shown in Figure 14 the superheat temperature was not affected by the Level 3 retrofit at the top load however as load was decreased below 120 MWe the temperature began to sag. This depression in temperature occurred even with the ability to utilize the tilts to compensate as shown in Figure 16.

A similar but more substantial depression in reheat temperature is shown in Figure 15. The conclusion from this evaluation is that the Level 1 configuration impacted the ability to maintain the superheat and reheat temperature. The limited ability to utilize the tilts could not compensate for the impact on temperatures.

Performance Characteristics

During the Performance tests Flame Refractories, Inc. (FRI) performed mill testing to determine amongst other things the fineness characteristics of the mills. Two locations were utilized to obtain the mill fineness data - 1) in the coal pipe lines and 2) at the mill exhaust exit as recommended by ABB-CE. For the purpose of this report, only the coal pipe data is used since this is believed to be more representative of the actual distribution. Table 4 provides a summary of the pertinent mill fineness results. Based upon these fineness data, the mills had degraded from the period between baseline testing and the retrofit of LNCFS Level 1.

These FRI fineness tests were performed simultaneously with particulate matter testing performed by Southern Research Institute (SoRI). LOI was determined during the short-term Performance testing in Phase 3B utilizing data from particulate matter tests obtained from EPA Method 17 testing. This particulate matter was analyzed to determine the LOI and the resulting data is presented in Table 4.

Figure 17 provides a comparison of the Baseline and the Phase 3B LOI results from the Performance testing. This figure illustrates that there is little change in the LOI between the Baseline and Level 1 configurations except at the intermediate load (135 MWe). At 135 MWe, the LOI appears to increase by slightly more than one percentage point. In any case, this increased level is near that for full-load and consequently may not impact the ability to sell ash based upon the amount of time spent at 135 MWe.

During the Performance testing of each Phase of the program sufficient data were gathered to calculate the boiler efficiency using the ASME PTC 4.1 Short Form method. Table 4 presents the results of the PTC 4.1 analysis for the Performance test data for both the Baseline and the LNCFS Level 1 configurations. Figure 18 illustrates that there was a net efficiency loss ranging from 1.0 percent at low loads to 0.1 percent at the intermediate and high load conditions, respectively. A decrease of 1.0 percent is measurable using PTC 4.1 and therefore indicates that the efficiency is decreased at low loads. An efficiency difference of 0.1 percent is not within the accuracy of the PTC 4.1 method and therefore it can be said that the efficiency did not change at full load. Even if the efficiency decreased 1.0 percentage point at 135 MWe, the amount of time spent at this condition is negligible compared to that spent at full-load.

CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusions for the Phase 3A testing of the LNCFS Level 3 retrofit are briefly delineated below.

- NO_x reductions ranging from as high as 38 percent at the high to intermediate high loads to 32 percent at low loads were measured based upon long-term data.
- Increases of Loss-on-ignition ranging from 1.0 percentage points at low loads to approximately 0.1 percentage point at high load were measured.
- Boiler efficiency was reduced at low to intermediate loads. High load efficiency changes were not discernable from the Baseline level.
- Superheat temperatures were unchanged over most of the load range but decreased slightly at lower loads. Reheat temperatures were measurably reduced at lower loads.
- Coal fineness degradations during the Level 1 testing did not appear to affect the LOI significantly.

More thorough conclusions will be provided in the final report which discusses the comparison of all four program phases.

If you have any questions concerning these analyses, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lowell L. Smith', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Lowell L. Smith

ATTACHMENTS

References

Tables 1 through 4

Figures 1 through 18

REFERENCES

1. **"180 MWe Demonstration of Advanced Tangentially-Fired Combustion Techniques for the Reduction of Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) Emissions form Coal-Fired Boilers", Innovative Clean Coal Technology DOE Contract Number DE-FC22-90PC89653, Prepared by Southern Company Services, Jan 1992.**
2. **"Phase IV Parametric Testing (Level 1)", Service Report No. 1252, Contract No. 5459-036, Prepared by Flame Refractories, Inc., August 1992.**
3. **"ESP Performance Analysis During Phase IIb of the 180 MWe Demonstration of Advanced Tangentially-Fired Combustion Techniques for the Reduction of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions form Coal-Fired Boilers - Volume 1 - Results and Analysis", SCS Contract No. 198-90-107, Prepared by Southern Research Institute, Draft, August 1993.**
4. **Letter to R. H. Hardman (SCS) from L. L. Smith (ETEC), "Summary of Steam Temperature and Tilt Profiles for All Phases of Lansing Smith DOE ICCT II Program" dated March 26, 1993.**

**TABLE 1 LANSING SMITH PHASE 3B TEST SUMMARY
LNCFS LEVEL 1 DATA ONLY**

[illegible]

**TABLE 2 LNCFS LEVEL 1 LONG-TERM
GASEOUS EMISSIONS DATA**

AVG LOAD MWs	OXYGEN			NOx			CO		
	LOWER 5% OXYGEN PERCENT	AVG OXYGEN PERCENT	UPPER 95% OXYGEN PERCENT	LOWER 5% NOx lb/MMB	AVG NOx lb/MMB	UPPER 95% NOx lb/MMB	LOWER 5% CO ppm	AVG CO ppm	UPPER 95% CO ppm
61	6.0	6.7	8.2	0.229	0.399	0.642	8	31	71
70	5.6	6.7	8.3	0.203	0.348	0.590	7	23	48
81	5.4	6.5	8.1	0.293	0.398	0.478	3	17	44
89	5.2	6.1	7.2	0.361	0.405	0.491	2	17	46
100	4.9	5.8	7.0	0.361	0.407	0.476	1	13	27
110	4.4	5.4	6.5	0.340	0.397	0.484	1	11	28
120	4.1	4.9	6.0	0.366	0.395	0.454	2	11	29
131	3.8	4.7	5.8	0.349	0.404	0.471	2	13	32
140	3.4	4.2	5.2	0.322	0.381	0.425	2	11	33
150	3.1	3.9	4.7	0.329	0.380	0.420	2	10	26
160	2.9	3.7	4.3	0.332	0.380	0.418	3	15	36
170	2.7	3.4	4.0	0.337	0.374	0.411	3	15	41
180	2.7	3.2	3.9	0.345	0.376	0.407	2	12	41
183	2.6	3.2	3.9	0.360	0.387	0.411	3	10	27
196	2.5	3.0	3.6	0.361	0.389	0.413	3	10	26

196 TO 150 MWs DATA CORRECTED FOR SOFA LEAKAGE

**TABLE 3 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 1
STEAMING CHARACTERISTICS**

PHASE 1 BASELINE				PHASE 3B LNCFS I			
LOAD MWe	SH TEMP Deg F	RH TEMP Deg F	TILT Deg	LOAD MWe	SH TEMP Deg F	RH TEMP Deg F	TILT Deg
70	998	909	0	70	931	830	3
79	999	919	0	81	966	870	4
90	999	926	0	90	978	886	3
100	1001	934	0	100	991	905	5
110	1002	940	0	111	995	925	5
120	1003	952	0	120	994	929	4
131	1003	959	0	131	994	936	3
140	1003	963	0	139	994	939	4
150	1003	966	0	150	995	950	3
160	1003	976	0	160	993	958	3
170	1001	982	0	170	994	965	3
180	1001	987	0	180	996	980	2
191	1001	991	0	193	995	985	2
198	1000	995	0	196	996	992	3

**TABLE 4 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 1
PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS**

NOMINAL LOAD MWe	EXCESS OXYGEN		FINENESS THRU 200		FINENESS ON 50		LOSS ON IGNITION		BOILER EFFICIENCY	
	BASELINE EXCESS OXYGEN Percent	LEVEL 1 EXCESS OXYGEN Percent	BASELINE FINENESS THRU 200 MESH Percent	LEVEL 1 FINENESS THRU 200 MESH Percent	BASELINE FINENESS ON 50 MESH Percent	LEVEL 1 FINENESS ON 50 MESH Percent	BASELINE LOI Percent	LEVEL 1 LOI Percent	BASELINE PTC 4.1 EFFICIENCY Percent	LEVEL 1 PTC 4.1 EFFICIENCY Percent
180	4.0	2.8	58.9	53.7	2.9	2.6	5.0	4.6	89.7	89.6
135	2.8	3.9	60.7	54.6	2.3	2.7	4.2	5.3	90.7	89.7
115	3.6	4.2	60.0	53.2	3.1	2.7	4.0	4.0	90.9	90.1

FIGURE 1 PHASE 3b OXYGEN LEVELS TESTED

FIGURE 2 PHASE 3b MEASURED NOx LEVELS

FIGURE 3 PHASE 3b 200 MWe CHARACTERIZATION

FIGURE 4 PHASE 3b 180 MWe CHARACTERIZATION

FIGURE 5 PHASE 3b 135 MWe CHARACTERIZATION

FIGURE 6 PHASE 3b 115 MWe CHARACTERIZATION

FIGURE 7 PHASE 3b 80 MWe CHARACTERIZATION

**FIGURE 8 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 1
180 MW NO_x EMISSIONS**

FIGURE 9 LONG-TERM NO_x EMISSION CHARACTERISTIC

FIGURE 10 LNCFS LEVEL 1 NOx REDUCTION EFFECTIVENESS

FIGURE 11 LONG-TERM EXCESS OXYGEN CHARACTERISTICS

FIGURE 12 LONG-TERM CARBON MONOXIDE CHARACTERISTICS

FIGURE 13 LOAD HISTORIES FOR BASELINE AND LEVEL 1 LONG-TERM TESTS

FIGURE 14 COMPARISON OF LONG-TERM BASELINE AND LNCFS
LEVEL 1 SUPERHEAT TEMPERATURES

FIGURE 15 COMPARISON OF LONG-TERM BASELINE AND LNCFS
LEVEL 1 REHEAT TEMPERATURES

FIGURE 16 COMPARISON OF LONG-TERM BASELINE AND LNCFS
LEVEL 1 BURNER TILTS

FIGURE 17 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 1 LOSS ON IGNITION

FIGURE 18 COMPARISON OF BASELINE AND LEVEL 1 ASME PTC 4.1 EFFICIENCY

END

**DATE
FILMED**

12/23/93