RECEIVED
MAY 14 1999
OSTI

**U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
FEDERAL ENERGY TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**BASELINE DESIGN/ECONOMICS
FOR
ADVANCED FISCHER-TROPSCH TECHNOLOGY**

Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027

FINAL REPORT

**April, 1998
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania**

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared by Bechtel Corporation as an account of work sponsored by the United States Department of Energy (DOE). Neither Bechtel, members of their organization, nor any person acting on behalf of any of them: (a) makes any warranty or representation whatsoever, express or implied, with respect to the use of any information, apparatus, method, process, or similar item disclosed in this report, including merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose, or that such use does not infringe or interfere with privately owned rights, including any party's intellectual property, or that this report is suitable to any particular user's circumstance, or (b) assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for consequential damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

DISCLAIMER

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
2	PROJECT SUMMARY	2-1
2.1	Case 1 -- Baseline Design Case	2-3
2.2	Case 2 -- Illinois No. 6 Coal Case with Alternate ZSM-5 Product Upgrading Case	2-11
2.3	Case 3 -- Wyoming Powder River Basin Coal with Conventional Refining Case	2-17
2.4	Case 4 -- Wyoming Powder River Basin Coal with Alternate ZSM-5 Product Upgrading Case	2-23
2.5	Case 5 -- Illinois No. 6 Coal with FCC Wax Upgrading with Beta Zeolite Catalyst Case	2-29
2.6	Case 6 -- Illinois No. 6 Coal with FCC Wax Upgrading with Equilibrium USY Catalyst Case	2-36
2.7	Case 7 --Fischer-Tropsch Liquefaction of Natural Gas Case	2-39
2.8	Case 8 -- Once-Through Fischer-Tropsch Liquefaction of Natural Gas with Power Co-Production Case	2-48
2.9	The ASPEN Plus Process Flowsheet Simulation Models	2-54
2.10	The Lotus Spreadsheet Economics Model.....	2-55
3	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3-1
3.1	Conclusions	3-1
3.2	Recommendations for Future Work	3-2
3.2.1	General Indirect Liquefaction Processes.....	3-2
3.2.2	Coal Based Indirect Liquefaction Processes.....	3-3
3.2.3	Natural Gas Based Indirect Liquefaction Processes.....	3-4

APPENDICES

A	MAJOR PROJECT REPORTS.....	A-1
A.1	Topical Reports.....	A-3
A.2	Quarterly Reports	A-5
A.3	Technical Progress Meeting Conference Notes.....	A-7
A.4	Letter Reports	A-8
B	PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS	B-1

1. INTRODUCTION

Bechtel, along with Amoco as the main subcontractor, developed a Baseline design, two alternative designs, and computer process simulation models for indirect coal liquefaction based on advanced Fischer-Tropsch (F-T) technology for the U. S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) Federal Energy Technology Center (FETC). This study was done under DOE Contract Number DE-AC22-91PC90027.

The objectives of the original 1991 contract were to develop:

- A Baseline design and two alternative designs for indirect liquefaction using advanced F-T technology. The Baseline design uses Illinois No. 6 coal and conventional upgrading and refining. One alternate case uses ZSM-5 upgrading of the vapor stream from the slurry F-T reactor. The other alternate case uses Western coal from the Powder River Basin.
- Capital and operating costs for the Baseline design and the alternatives. Individual plant costs for the alternative cases will be prorated on capacity, wherever possible, from the Baseline case.
- A process flowsheet simulation (PFS) model.

The Baseline design, the economic analysis and PFS computer models formed research planning tools with which PETC could use to plan, guide and evaluate its ongoing and future research and commercialization programs relating to indirect coal liquefaction for the manufacture of synthetic liquid transportation fuels.

The original study was divided into seven major tasks:

- Task 1: Establish the Baseline design and alternatives.
- Task 2: Evaluate the economics for the Baseline and alternate cases.
- Task 3: Develop engineering design criteria.
- Task 4: Develop a process flowsheet simulation (PFS) model for each case.
- Task 5: Perform sensitivity studies using the PFS model.
- Task 6: Document the PFS model and develop a DOE training session on its use.
- Task 7: Perform project management, technical coordination and other miscellaneous support functions.

In 1995, the original study was extended to add the following four additional items

- Item 1: Improve the process flowsheet simulation model (PPS) for the alternative ZSM-5 upgrading case by adding additional components.

- Item 2: Develop another alternative ZSM-5 upgrading case using the Western coal from the Powder River Basin as feedstock.
- Item 3: Develop a case in which fluid catalytic cracking is used to upgrade the F-T wax instead of hydrocracking.
- Item 4: Develop a case in which natural gas instead of coal is used as feedstock for Fischer-Tropsch indirect liquefaction.

In 1996, this study again was extended to investigate another natural gas, Fischer-Tropsch liquefaction case. This case is for a smaller plant processing 100 MMscf/day of natural gas in a once-through mode with power co-production using the proprietary, Fischer-Tropsch, slurry-bed technology of Syncrude Technology, Incorporated.

Report Organization:

This Final Topical Report contains three major sections. Section 1 provides an introduction and general background of this DOE contract.

Section 2 contains a brief summary of the project. This section is intended only to give an executive summary of the project results. This final topical report is not a comprehensive technical report containing the substantial technical detail developed during the course of the project. Detailed technical information has been previously published in various project reports, technical publications, and conference presentations listed in Appendixes A and B.

Since a significant portion of the effort on this project was devoted to the development of ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation models for the various cases and a LOTUS spreadsheet economics model, these models are discussed in the final two parts of Section 2.

Section 3 provides some conclusions and recommendations resulting from this study.

Appendix A contains a listing of the major project reports issued during the execution of this contract. This appendix is divided into four sections containing Topical Reports, Quarterly Reports, Technical Progress Meeting Conference Notes, and selected Letter Reports.

Appendix B contains reprints of all the papers and presentations which were made to DOE sponsored conferences and to the various technical society meetings discussing the results obtained during execution of this contract study.

2. PROJECT SUMMARY

DOE Contract Number DE-AC22-91PC90027 required the development of a conceptual Baseline design and several alternative designs for the indirect liquefaction of Illinois No. 6 coal from the Burning Star Mine and a Wyoming Powder River Basin coal. In 1995, this contract was modified to consider the Fischer-Tropsch conversion of natural gas to liquid transportation fuels. In 1996 a second natural gas conversion case was added to develop a once-through, slurry-bed, Fischer-Tropsch (F-T) plant design with power co-production using technology from Syncrude Technology, Incorporated. ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation (PFS) models were developed for all of the coal liquefaction cases. A slightly less comprehensive ASPEN Plus PFS model was developed for the first natural gas case. In addition, a LOTUS spreadsheet discounted, cash-flow economics model also was developed.

During this contract, the following eight conceptual designs were developed.

1. Baseline design for Illinois No. 6 coal using conventional petroleum refining technology for product upgrading
2. An second Illinois No. 6 coal case with an alternate product upgrading scheme based on upgrading the vapor stream from the slurry-bed F-T reactor with ZSM-5 catalyst
3. A design using Wyoming Powder River Basin coal with conventional petroleum refining technology for product upgrading
4. A second Wyoming Powder River Basin coal design with an alternate product upgrading scheme based on upgrading the vapor stream from the slurry-bed F-T reactor with ZSM-5 catalyst
5. An third Illinois No. 6 coal case with an alternate product upgrading scheme using wax fluid catalytic cracking with a beta zeolite catalyst instead of mild hydrocracking
6. A fourth Illinois No. 6 coal case with an alternate product upgrading scheme using wax fluid catalytic cracking with equilibrium USY catalyst instead of mild hydrocracking
7. A design for the F-T liquefaction of natural gas using conventional petroleum refining technology for product upgrading
8. A design for the once through F-T liquefaction of natural gas with power co-production using the slurry-bed F-T technology of Syncrude Technology, Incorporated with minimal product upgrading.

After the designs for the first three cases were developed, the ASPEN/SP process simulation model was converted to ASPEN Plus and revised to include more components in the F-T wax product to improve the vapor-liquid calculations around the slurry-bed F-T reactor (TR-6).^{*} Consequently, the results for the first three cases were revised using this new, improved model, and these revised results will be presented in this report. These results are only slightly different than those described in the corresponding Topical Report (TR-1, TR-2 and TR-3).

Cases 4 through 7 were developed by creating ASPEN Plus PFS models for the new plants based on conceptual designs, and combining these new models with the existing ASPEN Plus plant models to calculate the material balances and costs for these cases. A complete ASPEN Plus model for Case 8, the once-through, natural gas case using STI technology, was not developed. An ASPEN Plus model PFS model only was developed for the F-T synthesis reactor and downstream units.

^{*} Designates a specific reference in Appendix A: CN refers to Conference Notes, LR refers to Letter Report, QR refers to Quarterly Report, and TR refers to Topical Report.

2.1 Case 1 -- Baseline Design Case

Figure 2.1 is a block flow diagram showing the overall process configuration of the Baseline design. The Baseline design case (for Illinois No. 6 coal using conventional petroleum refining technology for product upgrading) consists of three ISBL (Inside Battery Limits) process areas and offsites plants. The three ISBL process areas are:

1. Area 100 -- Syngas Production
2. Area 200 -- Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Loop
3. Area 300 -- Product Upgrading and Refining

Simplified block flow diagrams of the above ISBL plants are shown in Figure 2.2 to 2.4 respectively. Table 2.1 lists the various plants inside each of the three ISBL process areas and the offsites plants for the Baseline design case. Detailed descriptions of these plants are contained in Topical Report, Volume I, *Process Design - Illinois No. 6 Coal Case with Conventional Refining* (reference TR-1).

This plant, as well as all the other Illinois No. 6 coal cases, is located at a generic southern Illinois mine-mouth site.

Table 2.2 shows the overall material balance and installed plant cost for the Baseline design case. This is the Management Summary Report generated by the ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation (PFS) model for the Baseline design case. These results are essentially identical to those of the actual design. This report is shown here because it concisely presents the overall plant summary for the Baseline case on a single page.

The plant produces 48,629 bbls/day of gasoline and distillate blending stocks and 1922 bbls/day of LPG from 18,575 tons/day of moisture free Illinois No. 6 coal and 3110 bbls/day of normal butane. The plant also consumes about 54.3 MW of purchased electric power. This power consumption is in addition to the 66.6 MW of power that are produced in Plant 31 from the byproduct steam and fuel gas.

The lower half of Table 2.2 shows the ISBL field cost and total installed cost of each plant as well as the number of dedicated operators required to run it.* The total installed cost of each plant consists of the ISBL field cost, an apportioned allotment for the OSBL plants, an amount for home office, engineering and fees, and a contingency allotment. As shown at the bottom of the second cost column, the total cost of the Baseline case in mid-1993 dollars at the southern Illinois site is 2964 MM\$. The annual catalyst and chemicals cost is 31.1 MM\$.

Three hundred and seventy five operators are required to run the ISBL plants in this design. An additional 713 operating and maintenance personnel are required for

* For computer modeling purposes, Plant 202 has been divided into two sections. Plant 202A is the amine adsorption section, and Plant 202B is the amine regeneration section.

Figure 2.1

**INDIRECT COAL LIQUEFACTION BASELINE DESIGN
OVERALL PROCESS CONFIGURATION**

2-4

Figure 2.2

Block Flow Diagram - Baseline Design Area 100 (Syngas Production)

Figure 2.3

Block Flow Diagram - Area 200 (F-T Synthesis Loop)

Figure 2.4

Block Flow Diagram - Area 300 (Product Upgrading and Refining)

Table 2.1
Process Plants of the Baseline Design Case

Area 100 – Syngas Production

- 101 Coal Receiving and Storage
- 102 Coal Drying and Grinding
- 103 Shell Gasification
- 104 Syngas Treating and Cooling
- 105 Sour Water Stripper
- 106 Acid gas Removal
- 107 Sulfur Recovery and Tailgas Treating
- 108 Sulfur Polishing
- 109 Syngas Wet Scrubbing
- 110 Air Separation

Area 200 – Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Loop

- 201 Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis
- 202 Carbon Dioxide Removal
- 203 Recycle Gas Compression and Dehydration
- 204 Hydrocarbons Recovery
- 205 Hydrogen Recovery
- 206 Autothermal Reformer

Area 300 – Product Upgrading and Refining

- 301 Wax Hydrocracking
- 302 Distillate Hydrotreating
- 303 Naphtha Hydrotreating
- 304 Catalytic Reforming
- 305 C4 Isomerization
- 306 C5/C6 Isomerization
- 307 Alkylation
- 308 Saturated Gas Plant and Product Blending

Offsites Plants

- 19 Relief and Blowdown
- 20 Tankage
- 21 Interconnecting Piping
- 22 Product Shipping
- 23 Tank Car/tank Truck Loading
- 24 Coal Ash Disposal
- 25 Catalyst and Chemical Handling
- 30 Electrical Distribution System
- 31 Steam and Power Generation
- 32 Raw, Cooling and Potable Water
- 33 Fire Protection system
- 34 Sewage and Effluent Water Treatment
- 35 Instrument and Plant Air Facilities
- 36 Purge and Flush Oil System
- 37 Solid Waste Management
- 40 General Site Preparation
- 41 Buildings
- 42 Telecommunications System
- 43 Distributed Control System and Software

Table 2.2
Baseline Design Case

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT

MAJOR INPUT AND OUTPUT STREAMS

INPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	
ROM COAL*	1547.933	18575.	
METHANOL	0.000	0.	
NATURAL GAS, MM SCF/HR			0.000
ELECTRIC POWER, MEGA-WH/SD			1303.792
RAW WATER MAKE-UP, MM GAL/SD			14.460
OUTPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	BBL/DAY
PROPANE	14.231	171.	1922.
BUTANES	-26.423	-317.	-3110.
GASOLINE	251.753	3021.	23943.
DIESEL	278.556	3343.	24686.
REFUSE*	0.000	0.	
SLAG*	187.033	2244.	
SULFUR	46.689	560.	
TOTAL	751.839	9022.	47441.

* THESE STREAM FLOW RATES ARE ON A DRY BASIS.
NEGATIVE PRODUCT FLOWS DESIGNATE PURCHASED MATERIAL.

ISBL FIELD AND TOTAL INSTALLED COSTS (INCLUDING OSBL COSTS)

PLANT	NUMBER OF PLANTS		PLANT COST, MM\$,		DEDICATED OPERATORS
	OPERATING	SPARES	ISBL	TOTAL	
101	1	0	41.997	63.539	12
102	5	1	101.271	153.217	17
103	8	1	702.888	1063.426	183
104	8	0	37.968	57.443	8
105	1	0	3.213	4.861	0
106	4	0	18.654	28.223	9
107	2	1	43.367	65.612	13
108	8	0	23.731	35.904	0
109	8	0	7.543	11.412	8
110	8	0	326.754	494.358	8
201	8	0	220.197	333.145	43
202A	8	0	16.788	25.400	0
202B	8	0	124.698	188.661	8
203	4	0	17.830	26.975	4
204	4	0	53.662	81.188	4
205	4	0	44.361	67.115	4
206	4	0	21.921	33.166	4
301	1	0	43.564	65.909	10
302	1	0	13.994	21.172	4
303	1	0	6.595	9.977	4
304	1	0	31.365	47.453	10
305	1	0	6.731	10.184	4
306	1	0	7.275	11.006	4
307	1	0	37.061	56.071	10
308	1	0	5.549	8.395	4
TOTAL			1958.977	2963.809	375

CATALYST AND CHEMICALS, MM\$/YEAR 31.074

DEDICATED PLANT OPERATORS 375
EXTRA OPERATORS, FOREMEN
AND MAINTENANCE WORKERS 713
TOTAL 1088

operating the OSBL facilities, extra and spare operators, maintenance, and laboratory personnel making a total labor requirement of 1088 people without management supervision.

Both the primary liquid hydrocarbon products are nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen free. The gasoline blending component has a 90.9 RON and a 86.1 MON. It has a low Reid vapor pressure of 5.0 psi, contains a small amount of benzene (0.3 wt%), contains an insignificant amount of olefins (0.02 wt%), and contains a significant amount of aromatics (28.1 wt%). The diesel blending component has an exceptionally high cetane index of about 74 and a pour point of about -28 °F. This is a superior diesel fuel blending component.

2.2 Case 2 – Illinois No. 6 Coal with Alternate ZSM-5 Product Upgrading Case

The first alternative case involves upgrading the vapor stream leaving the slurry bed F-T reactor by passing it through a reactor containing Mobil's ZSM-5 oligomerization catalyst. The ZSM-5 catalyst converts the entering straight chain paraffins, olefins and oxygenates to a mixture of isoparaffins, isoolefins, naphthenes and aromatics. All of the oxygen atoms in the oxygenates are converted to water. This case is documented in Topical Report, Volume II, *Process Design - Illinois No. 6 Coal Case with ZSM-5 Upgrading* (reference TR-2).

As in the Baseline design case, the ISBL processing area is divided into three main processing areas and an offsites area. Simplified ISBL block flow diagrams for this alternate ZSM-5 product upgrading case are shown in Figures 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 respectively for the three main processing area of 100, 200 and 300. Since this case also processes the same Illinois No. 6 coal as the Baseline case, Area 100 is identical to that of the Baseline case.

Area 200, the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Loop for the alternative ZSM-5 upgrading case, consists of seven plants. Area 200 is configured very similar to the Baseline design case except that Plant 207, the ZSM-5 Upgrading Plant, has been added essentially in the middle of Plant 201 to process the vapors leaving the F-T slurry bed reactors. Plant 207, the ZSM-5 Upgrading Plant, takes the vapor stream leaving the F-T slurry bed reactor and passes it through a reactor containing Mobil's ZSM-5 oligomerization catalyst.

In addition, some design changes were made to the distribution of the liquid hydrocarbon products leaving Plant 204. The naphtha now goes directly to the gasoline pool, and all the C11 and heavier hydrocarbons go to the wax hydrocracker since the naphtha and distillate hydrotreaters have been eliminated from Area 300.

Area 300, the Product Upgrading and Refining Area, now consists of only four plants for this ZSM-5 upgrading case. These are Plants 301, 305, 307 and 308. Plants 302, 303, 304 and 305 have been eliminated. Besides the F-T wax, the feed to Plant 301, the Wax Hydrocracking Plant, now includes all the C11+ F-T products (distillate and wax) which are hydrocracked to produce more valuable products which are essentially oxygen free because all the oxygen in the feed is converted to water. The distillate product goes to the distillate blending pool. The C5+ naphtha product goes directly to the gasoline pool. The C4- light ends are sent to Plant 308, the Saturated Gas Plant, for further propane recovery. Plant 305, Plant 307, and Plant 308 function exactly the same as their counterparts in the Baseline design case.

The offsites area for this case is essentially the same as that for the Baseline case.

Table 2.3 shows the overall plant summary and the installed plant cost for the alternative ZSM-5 upgrading case with Illinois No. 6 coal. Again, this is the Management Summary Report generated by the ASPEN Plus process flowsheet

Figure 2.5**Block Flow Diagram - ZSM-5 Case Area 100 (Syngas Production)**

Figure 2.6

Block Flow Diagram - ZSM-5 Case Area 200 (F-T Synthesis Loop)

Figure 2.7

Block Flow Diagram - ZSM-5 Case Area 300 (Product Upgrading and Refining)

Table 2.3

ZSM-5 Alternate Upgrading Case with Illinois No. 6 Coal

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT

MAJOR INPUT AND OUTPUT STREAMS

INPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	
ROM COAL*	1547.933	18575.	
METHANOL	0.000	0.	
NATURAL GAS, MM SCF/HR			0.000
ELECTRIC POWER, MEGA-WH/SD			1262.004
RAW WATER MAKE-UP, MM GAL/SD			14.436
OUTPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	BBL/DAY
PROPANE	19.420	233.	2623.
BUTANES	8.481	102.	998.
GASOLINE	325.338	3904.	31255.
DIESEL	180.165	2162.	15858.
REFUSE*	0.000	0.	
SLAG*	187.033	2244.	
SULFUR	46.689	560.	
TOTAL	767.126	9206.	50734.

* THESE STREAM FLOW RATES ARE ON A DRY BASIS.
 NEGATIVE PRODUCT FLOWS DESIGNATE PURCHASED MATERIAL.

ISBL FIELD AND TOTAL INSTALLED COSTS (INCLUDING OSBL COSTS)

PLANT	NUMBER OF PLANT'S		PLANT COST, MM\$.		DEDICATED OPERATORS
	OPERATING	SPARES	ISBL	TOTAL	
101	1	0	41.997	63.814	12
102	5	1	101.271	153.879	17
103	8	1	702.888	1068.024	183
104	8	0	37.968	57.692	8
105	1	0	3.213	4.882	0
106	4	0	18.654	28.345	9
107	2	1	43.367	65.895	13
108	8	0	23.731	36.059	0
109	8	0	7.543	11.461	8
110	8	0	326.410	495.973	8
201	8	0	215.817	327.930	43
202A	8	0	16.845	25.596	0
202B	8	0	124.712	189.498	8
203	4	0	17.881	27.170	4
204	4	0	53.318	81.016	4
205	4	0	33.795	51.350	4
206	4	0	21.239	32.272	4
207	8	0	23.320	35.434	0
301	1	0	42.604	64.736	10
305	1	0	3.186	4.841	4
307	1	0	41.845	63.583	10
308	1	0	5.080	7.719	4
TOTAL			1906.685	2897.168	353

CATALYST AND CHEMICALS, MM\$/YEAR 31.442

DEDICATED PLANT OPERATORS 353
 EXTRA OPERATORS, FOREMEN
 AND MAINTENANCE WORKERS 671
 TOTAL 1024

simulation (PFS) model for this case. This report is shown here because it concisely presents the principal results for the alternative ZSM-5 upgrading case with Illinois No. 6 coal on a single page.

The plant produces 47,113 bbls/day of gasoline and distillate blending stocks, 998 bbls/day of mixed butanes, and 2623 bbls/day of LPG from 18,575 tons/day of moisture free Illinois No. 6 coal. The plant also consumes about 52.6 MW of purchased electric power. This power consumption is in addition to the 67.2 MW of power that are produced in Plant 31 from the byproduct steam and fuel gas.

The lower half of Table 2.3 shows the ISBL field cost and total installed cost of each plant as well as the number of dedicated operators required to run it. The total installed cost of each plant consists of the ISBL field cost, an apportioned allotment for the OSBL plants, an amount for home office, engineering and fees, and a contingency allotment. As shown at the bottom of the second cost column, the total cost of the Baseline case in mid-1993 dollars at the southern Illinois site is 2897 MM\$. The annual catalyst and chemicals cost is 31.4 MM\$.

An estimated three hundred and fifty three operators are required to run the ISBL plants in this design. An additional 671 operating and maintenance personnel are required for operating the OSBL facilities, extra and spare operators, maintenance, and laboratory personnel making a total labor requirement estimate of 1024 people without management supervision.

Both the primary liquid hydrocarbon products are nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen free. The gasoline blending component is of lower quality than the Baseline design case. It has a 75.5 RON, a 72.4 MON, and a Reid vapor pressure of 6.0 psi. It contains some benzene (0.6 wt%), contains some olefins (6.5 wt%), and contains some aromatics (16.3 wt%). The diesel blending component has an exceptionally high cetane index of about 73 and a pour point of about -19 °F. This is a excellent diesel fuel blending component.

2.3 Case 3 – Wyoming Powder River Basin Coal with Conventional Refining Case

This second alternative case involves using a Western coal from the Powder River Basin area of Wyoming instead of the Illinois No. 6 coal which was used in the Baseline design case. This is a mine-mouth plant located near Gillette, Wyoming. This case is documented in Topical Report, Volume III, *Process Design - Western Coal Case with Conventional Refining* (reference TR-3).

As in the Baseline design case, the ISBL processing area is divided into three main processing areas. Simplified ISBL block flow diagrams for this alternate Western coal case are shown in Figures 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10 respectively for the three main processing area of 100, 200 and 300. Because this case uses Wyoming Powder River Basin coal instead of Illinois No. 6 coal, Area 100 is significantly different than that of the Baseline design case. In addition, the offsites area has been modified from that of the Baseline case to include a zero-discharge water treatment system to minimize fresh water consumption by maximizing water reuse because of the high water costs in Wyoming.

The Western coal Area 100 consists of nine plants; Plants 101, 102, 103 and 105 through 110. Plant 104, the Syngas Treating and Cooling Plant, has been eliminated and Plant 106 has been redesigned because the Wyoming coal has a much lower sulfur content than Illinois No. 6 coal.

Because of the high $\text{CO}_2/\text{H}_2\text{S}$ ratio in the syngas, Plant 106 was redesigned to use a physical absorption process rather than a chemical one for selective removal of H_2S . It was changed to use a Rectisol wash system, licensed either by Linde AG or Lurgi Corporation, instead of the UOP Amine Guard FS process which was used for the Illinois No. 6 coal cases.

Area 200, the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Loop, and Area 300, the Product Upgrading and Refining Area, are identical to those of the Baseline design case.

Table 2.4 shows the overall plant summary and the installed plant cost for the Western coal with conventional refining case. Again, this is the Management Summary Report generated by the ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation (PFS) model for this case.

The plant produces 48,222 bbls/day of gasoline and distillate blending stocks and 1907 bbls/day of LPG from 19,789 tons/day of moisture free Wyoming Powder River Basin coal and 3101 bbls/day of butanes. The plant also consumes about 88.0 MW of purchased electric power. This power consumption is in addition to the 64.5 MW of power that are produced in Plant 31 from the byproduct steam and fuel gas.

The lower half of Table 2.4 shows the ISBL field cost and total installed cost of each plant as well as the estimated number of dedicated operators required to run it. The

Figure 2.8

Block Flow Diagram - Western Coal Case Area 100 (Syngas Production)

Figure 2.9

Block Flow Diagram - Area 200 (F-T Synthesis Loop)

2-19

Figure 2.10

Block Flow Diagram - Area 300 (Product Upgrading and Refining)

2-20

Table 2.4

Wyoming Powder River Basin Coal with Conventional Refining Case

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT

MAJOR INPUT AND OUTPUT STREAMS

INPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	
ROM COAL*	1649.072	19789.	
METHANOL	0.000	0.	
NATURAL GAS, MM SCF/HR			0.000
ELECTRIC POWER, MEGA-WH/SD			2111.658
RAW WATER MAKE-UP, MM GAL/SD			9.803
OUTPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	BBL/DAY
PROPANE	14.122	169.	1907.
BUTANES	-26.348	-316.	-3101.
GASOLINE	249.784	2997.	23756.
DIESEL	276.074	3313.	24466.
REFUSE*	0.000	0.	
SLAG*	145.584	1747.	
SULFUR	9.029	108.	
TOTAL	668.246	8019.	47028.

* THESE STREAM FLOW RATES ARE ON A DRY BASIS.

NEGATIVE PRODUCT FLOWS DESIGNATE PURCHASED MATERIAL.

ISBL FIELD AND TOTAL INSTALLED COSTS (INCLUDING OSBL COSTS)

PLANT	NUMBER OF PLANTS		PLANT COST, MM\$,		DEDICATED OPERATORS
	OPERATING	SPARES	ISBL	TOTAL	
101	1	0	47.690	73.888	12
102	6	1	128.980	199.835	20
103	9	1	735.660	1139.792	205
105	1	0	5.370	8.320	0
106	4	0	166.003	257.196	25
107	2	1	14.980	23.209	13
108	8	0	21.610	33.481	0
109	9	0	6.620	10.257	9
110	9	0	306.553	474.957	9
201	8	0	204.990	317.600	43
202A	8	0	17.305	26.811	0
202B	8	0	111.229	172.332	8
203	4	0	15.887	24.615	4
204	4	0	47.857	74.148	4
205	4	0	42.205	65.390	4
206	4	0	18.960	29.375	4
301	1	0	40.464	62.692	10
302	1	0	13.101	20.299	4
303	1	0	6.081	9.422	4
304	1	0	29.434	45.604	10
305	1	0	6.164	9.550	4
306	1	0	6.691	10.367	4
307	1	0	33.483	51.877	10
308	1	0	5.180	8.025	4
TOTAL			2032.497	3149.041	410

CATALYST AND CHEMICALS, MM\$/YEAR 21.321

DEDICATED PLANT OPERATORS 410
 EXTRA OPERATORS, FOREMEN
 AND MAINTENANCE WORKERS 780
 TOTAL 1190

total installed cost of each plant consists of the ISBL field cost, an apportioned allotment for the OSBL plants, an amount for home office, engineering and fees, and a contingency allotment. As shown at the bottom of the second cost column, the total cost of the

Western coal with conventional refining case in mid-1993 dollars at the Gillette, Wyoming site is 3149 MM\$. The annual catalyst and chemicals cost is 21.3 MM\$.

Four hundred and ten operators are required to run the ISBL plants in this design. An additional 780 operating and maintenance personnel are required for operating the OSBL facilities, extra and spare operators, maintenance, and laboratory personnel making a total labor requirement of 1190 people without management supervision.

The product properties for this case (Wyoming Powder River Basin coal with conventional refining case) are essentially the same as those for the Baseline design case. Again, both the primary liquid hydrocarbon products are nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen free. The naphtha has a 90.9 RON, a 86.1 MON, and a Reid vapor pressure of 5.0 psi, and it contains a small amount of benzene (0.3 wt%), contains an insignificant amount of olefins (0.02 wt%), and contains a significant amount of aromatics (28.1 wt%). The diesel blending component also has about the same properties as that from the Baseline case. It has an exceptionally high cetane index of about 74 and a pour point of about -28 °F. This is a superior diesel fuel blending component.

2.4 Case 4 – Wyoming Powder River Basin Coal with Alternate ZSM-5 Product Upgrading Case

The Wyoming Powder River Basin Coal with Alternate ZSM-5 Product Upgrading Case is a combination of the two previous cases. This case uses the Case 2 ZSM-5 alternate upgrading scheme for processing the products produced by F-T synthesis from a syngas generated from Wyoming Powder River Basin coal in Case 3. As in the previous case, this is a mine-mouth plant located near Gillette, Wyoming. This case is documented in Quarterly Reports of April-September 1995 and October-December 1995.

As in all the previous cases, the ISBL processing area is divided into three main processing areas. Simplified ISBL block flow diagrams for this alternate Western coal with ZSM-5 product upgrading case are shown in Figures 2.11, 2.12 and 2.13 respectively for the three main processing area of 100, 200 and 300. Area 100, the Syngas Production Area, is the same as that used in Case 3, and Areas 200 and 300, the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Loop and Product Upgrading and Refining Area, are the same as that of Case 2. The offsites are the same as that of Case 3. Again, this plant is a zero discharge plant which minimizes fresh water consumption by maximizing water reuse because of the high water costs in Wyoming.

Table 2.5 shows the overall plant summary and the installed plant cost for the alternative ZSM-5 upgrading case with Wyoming Powder River Basin coal. Again, this is the Management Summary Report generated by the ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation (PFS) model for this case.

The plant produces 46,798 bbls/day of gasoline and distillate blending stocks, 980 bbls/day of mixed butanes, and 2613 bbls/day of LPG from 19,789 tons/day of moisture free Wyoming Powder River Basin coal. The plant also consumes about 91.6 MW of purchased electric power. This power consumption is in addition to the 59.6 MW of power that are produced in Plant 31 from the byproduct steam and fuel gas.

The lower half of Table 2.5 shows the ISBL field cost and total installed cost of each plant as well as the number of dedicated operators required to run it. The total installed cost of each plant consists of the ISBL field cost, an apportioned allotment for the OSBL plants, an amount for home office, engineering and fees, and a contingency allotment. As shown at the bottom of the second cost column, the total cost of the Western coal with conventional refining case in mid-1993 dollars at the Gillette, Wyoming site is 3075 MM\$. The annual catalyst and chemicals cost is 21.5 MM\$.

Three hundred and eighty eight operators are required to run the ISBL plants in this design. An additional 738 operating and maintenance personnel are required for operating the OSBL facilities, extra and spare operators, maintenance, and laboratory

Figure 2.11

Block Flow Diagram - Western Coal\ZSM-5 Case Area 100 (Syngas Production)

2-24

Figure 2.12

Block Flow Diagram - Western Coal/ZSM-5 Case Area 200 (F-T Synthesis Loop)

2-25

Figure 2.13

Block Flow Diagram - Western Coal/ZSM-5 Case Area 300 (Product Upgrading and Refining)

Table 2.5

**Wyoming Powder River Basin Coal
with Alternate ZSM-5 Product Upgrading Case**

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT

MAJOR INPUT AND OUTPUT STREAMS

INPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	
ROM COAL*	1649.072	19789.	
METHANOL	0.000	0.	
NATURAL GAS, MM SCF/HR			0.000
ELECTRIC POWER, MEGA-WH/SD			2198.419
RAW WATER MAKE-UP, MM GAL/SD			9.573
OUTPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	BBL/DAY
PROPANE	19.349	232.	2613.
BUTANES	8.325	100.	980.
GASOLINE	322.930	3875.	31026.
DIESEL	179.193	2150.	15772.
REFUSE*	0.000	0.	
SLAG*	145.584	1747.	
SULFUR	9.029	108.	
TOTAL	684.411	8213.	50391.

* THESE STREAM FLOW RATES ARE ON A DRY BASIS.
NEGATIVE PRODUCT FLOWS DESIGNATE PURCHASED MATERIAL.

ISBL FIELD AND TOTAL INSTALLED COSTS (INCLUDING OSBL COSTS)

PLANT	NUMBER OF PLANTS		PLANT COST, MM\$,		DEDICATED OPERATORS
	OPERATING	SPARES	ISBL	TOTAL	
101	1	0	47.690	74.153	12
102	6	1	128.980	200.551	20
103	9	1	735.660	1143.878	205
105	1	0	5.370	8.350	0
106	4	0	166.003	258.118	25
107	2	1	14.980	23.292	13
108	8	0	21.610	33.601	0
109	9	0	6.620	10.293	9
110	9	0	305.677	475.297	9
201	8	0	199.928	310.869	43
202A	8	0	17.114	26.611	0
202B	8	0	111.713	173.702	8
203	4	0	15.203	23.640	4
204	4	0	45.629	70.949	4
205	4	0	32.002	49.759	4
206	4	0	17.064	26.532	4
207	8	0	21.254	33.048	0
301	1	0	39.649	61.650	10
305	1	0	2.927	4.551	4
307	1	0	37.781	58.745	10
308	1	0	4.763	7.405	4
TOTAL			1977.617	3074.995	388

CATALYST AND CHEMICALS, MM\$/YEAR 21.523

DEDICATED PLANT OPERATORS 388
EXTRA OPERATORS, FOREMEN
AND MAINTENANCE WORKERS 738
TOTAL 1126

personnel making a total labor requirement of 1126 people without management supervision.

The properties of the products from this Wyoming Powder River Basin coal with ZSM-5 upgrading case are about the same as those from the alternative ZSM-5 upgrading case with Illinois No. 6 coal. Again., both the primary liquid hydrocarbon products are nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen free. The gasoline blending component has a 75.5 RON and a 72.4 MON; both of which are significantly lower than those from the conventional refining cases. In addition, the gasoline has a Reid vapor pressure of 6.0 psi, contains some benzene (0.6 wt%), contains some olefins (6.5 wt%), and contains some aromatics (16.3 wt%). The diesel blending component has an exceptionally high cetane index of about 73 and a pour point of about -19 °F. This is a excellent diesel fuel blending component.

2.5 Case 5 -- Illinois No. 6 Coal with FCC Wax Upgrading with Beta Zeolite Catalyst Case

This and the following alternative case consider Fluid Catalytic Cracking (FCC) as the means of upgrading the F-T wax instead of hydrocracking it which was done in the four previous cases. In this case a beta zeolite FCC catalyst is used, and in the following case, an equilibrium USY catalyst is used. The FCC yields for these two cases were developed from pilot plant data obtained by Amoco Oil.¹ Although the beta zeolite FCC cracking catalyst used in this design is not widely used commercially, it was selected because it produces large amounts of C4, C5 and C6 olefins which can be converted to ethers, and previous economics have shown large incentives for ether production. The equilibrium USY catalyst used in the following case is a commercial FCC catalyst in wide use. Both of these FCC upgrading cases use Illinois No. 6 coal with the plant located in southern Illinois. This case is documented in Quarterly Reports of April-September 1995 and October-December 1995, as well as in a paper presented at the ACS National Meeting, Orlando, FL on August 25-29, 1996.

As in the Baseline design case, the ISBL processing area is divided into three main processing areas and an offsites area. Simplified ISBL block flow diagrams for this alternate Eastern coal with FCC wax upgrading case are shown in Figures 2.14, 2.15 and 2.16 respectively for the three main processing area of 100, 200 and 300. Since this case also processes the same Illinois No. 6 coal as the Baseline case, Area 100 is identical to that of the Baseline case. Also, Area 200, the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Loop, is identical to that of the Baseline design case.

Area 300, the Product Upgrading and Refining Area, for the FCC upgrading cases is different than those for the previous cases. It contains ten plants; Plants 302 through 311. In this case, Plant 301, the Wax Hydrocracking Plant, has been replaced by three new plants, Plant 309, 310 and 311. Plant 309, the FCC Plant, is a direct replacement for the wax hydrocracker. Plants 310 and 311 were added to convert the olefins produced in the FCC plant to ethers. Plant 310 converts isobutylene to MTBE (methyl tertiary-butyl ether). Plant 311, the NExTAME Ethers Plant, converts the C5, C6 and C7 reactive olefins to amyl, hexyl and heptyl ethers. These ethers are high octane oxygenated gasoline blending components.

In this case, Plants 302 through 308 are identical to those in the Baseline design case as described in Section 3.1.1. However, some have different capacities.

Plant 309, the Fluid Catalytic Cracking Plant, catalytically cracks the F-T wax over a beta zeolite catalyst to produce distillate, cat cracked naphtha, C4s, C3 olefins and fuel

¹ M. M. Schwartz et al (Amoco Oil), The Selective Catalytic Cracking of Fischer-Tropsch Liquids to High Value Transportation Fuels, DOE Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90057, *Final Report*, August, 1994.

Figure 2.14

Block Flow Diagram - Eastern Coal\FCC Area 100 (Syngas Production)

Figure 2.15

Block Flow Diagram - Eastern Coal/FCC Area 200 (F-T Synthesis Loop)

Figure 2.16

Block Flow Diagram - Eastern Coal/FCC Area 300 (Product Upgrading and Refining)

gas. This FCC plant design includes an unsaturated gas plant which produces a polymer grade propylene stream for sale. No heavy distillate (decanted oil) product is made because all that is produced is burned in the regenerator to supplement the coke production and maintain the unit heat balance.

The design FCC yields for this case are the average yields from two Amoco pilot plant runs, runs 940-1 and 940-2.6. This beta zeolite catalyst produces large amounts of light olefins (13.8 wt % propylene and 22.35 wt% butylenes) and little heavy material (4.7 wt% 430+ °F and coke). About 3.5 wt% of the entering feed has to be consumed as fuel in the regenerator in order for this design to maintain heat balance. This is significantly more than the 1.1 wt% coke deposited on the beta zeolite catalyst. Consequently, the shortfall is made up of all the 650+ °F distillate and some of the 430-650 °F cycle oil. The C7+ naphtha has a 85.4 RON and a 76.4 MON.

Also included in this FCC unit design is an unsaturated gas plant which separates the light gases into a C2- fuel gas stream, a propylene product stream and a butane/butenes stream that is sent to the MTBE plant.

Plant 310, the MTBE Plant, converts the isobutylene produced in the FCC plant to MTBE, methyl tertiary-butyl ether, by reacting it with methanol. This plant also contains a selective hydrogenation unit to hydrogenate any diolefins in the feed because they will polymerize, plug and deactivate the etherification catalyst. Some isomerization of the butylenes also occurs in the hydrogenation reactor producing additional isobutylene. The unreacted normal butene and butanes from Plant 310 are sent to Plant 307 for alkylation.

Plant 311, the NExTAME Ethers Plant, converts the C5, C6 and C7 reactive olefins to amyl, hexyl and heptyl ethers by reacting them with methanol. This plant also contains a NExTSELECT selective hydrogenation unit to hydrogenate any diolefins in the feed because they will polymerize, plug and deactivate the etherification catalyst. Some isomerization of the C5, C6 and C7 olefins also occurs in the hydrogenation reactor to produce additional amounts of reactive tertiary olefins. The design of these two units was provided by Neste Engineering in Finland. The NExTAME etherification unit and its integration into a petroleum refinery has been described in two recent papers.^{2,3}

The NExTAME etherified product is a high octane oxygenated gasoline blending component having a 97.0 RON and a 85.2 MON.

The offsites area, which contains the ancillary plants and equipment that is required and does not belong in one of the three main processing areas such as tankage, interconnecting piping, buildings and product shipping, is very similar to that of the Baseline design case.

² Jakkula, J. J., Ignatius, J. and H. Jarvelin, *Increase Oxygenates and Lower Olefins in Gasoline*, Fuel Reformulation 5 (1), 46-54 (January/February 1995).

³ Tamminen, E. et al, *The Cost of Producing Oxygenates from FCC Gasoline via Two Processing Scemes*, 1995 NPRA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, Paper NPRA AM-95-49, March 19-21, 1995.

Table 2.6 shows the overall material balance and installed plant cost for the FCC wax upgrading with beta zeolite catalyst case with Illinois No. 6 coal. Again, this is the Management Summary Report generated by the ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation (PFS) model for this case. This report is shown here because it concisely presents the principal results for the alternate beta zeolite FCC wax upgrading case with Illinois No. 6 coal on a single page.

The plant produces 49,486 bbls/day of gasoline and distillate blending stocks, 5060 bbls/day of propylene, and 1573 bbls/day of LPG from 18,575 tons/day of moisture free Illinois No. 6 coal, 321 tons/day of methanol, and 5204 bbls/day of butanes. The plant also consumes about 58.1 MW of purchased electric power. This power consumption is in addition to the 66.6 MW of power that are produced in Plant 31 from the byproduct steam and fuel gas.

The lower half of Table 2.5 shows the estimated ISBL field cost and total installed cost of each plant as well as the number of dedicated operators required to run it. The total installed cost of each plant consists of the ISBL field cost, an apportioned allotment for the OSBL plants, an amount for home office, engineering and fees, and a contingency allotment. As shown at the bottom of the second cost column, the total cost of the alternate FCC wax upgrading with beta zeolite catalyst case with Illinois No. 6 coal in mid-1993 dollars at the southern Illinois site is 2987 MM\$. The annual catalyst and chemicals cost is 37.0 MM\$.

Three hundred and eighty three operators are required to run the ISBL plants in this design. An additional 728 operating and maintenance personnel are required for operating the OSBL facilities, extra and spare operators, maintenance, and laboratory personnel making a total labor requirement of 1111 people without management supervision.

As in the previous cases, both the primary liquid hydrocarbon products are nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen free. This case produces significantly more gasoline (39,722 vs. 23,943 bbls/day) and less distillate (9764 vs. 24,686 bbls/day) than the Baseline design case. Also, the gasoline properties from this alternate beta zeolite FCC wax upgrading with Illinois No. 6 coal are different than those of the Baseline case. The gasoline has a 96.8 RON and a 88.9 MON; both of which are significantly higher than those from the previous cases. In addition, the gasoline has a lower Reid vapor pressure of 4.7 psi, contains less benzene (0.1 wt%) and contains less aromatics (11.0 wt%) than any of the previously described cases. However, it contains more olefins (12.7 wt%). The diesel blending component has an exceptionally high cetane index of about 74 and a pour point of about -40 °F. This is a superior diesel fuel blending component.

Table 2.6
FCC Wax Upgrading with Beta Zeolite Catalyst Case

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT

MAJOR INPUT AND OUTPUT STREAMS

INPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	
ROM COAL*	1547.933	18575.	
METHANOL	26.789	321.	
NATURAL GAS, MM SCF/HR			0.000
ELECTRIC POWER, MEGA-WH/SD			1395.863
RAW WATER MAKE-UP, MM GAL/SD			15.685
OUTPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	BBL/DAY
PROPYLENE	38.371	460.	5060.
PROPANE	11.647	140.	1573.
BUTANES	-44.213	-531.	-5204.
GASOLINE	415.704	4988.	39722.
DIESEL	108.525	1302.	9764.
REFUSE*	0.000	0.	
SLAG*	187.033	2244.	
SULFUR	46.689	560.	
TOTAL	763.756	9165.	50916.

* THESE STREAM FLOW RATES ARE ON A DRY BASIS.
NEGATIVE PRODUCT FLOWS DESIGNATE PURCHASED MATERIAL.

ISBL FIELD AND TOTAL INSTALLED COSTS (INCLUDING OSBL COSTS)

PLANT	NUMBER OF PLANTS		PLANT COST, MM\$,		DEDICATED OPERATORS
	OPERATING	SPARES	ISBL	TOTAL	
101	1	0	41.997	63.526	12
102	5	1	101.271	153.186	17
103	8	1	702.888	1063.214	183
104	8	0	37.968	57.432	8
105	1	0	3.213	4.860	0
106	4	0	18.654	28.217	9
107	2	1	43.367	65.599	13
108	8	0	23.731	35.897	0
109	8	0	7.543	11.410	8
110	8	0	326.770	494.284	8
201	8	0	220.380	333.354	43
202A	8	0	16.794	25.403	0
202B	8	0	124.744	188.693	8
203	4	0	17.835	26.977	4
204	4	0	53.675	81.191	4
205	2	0	19.353	29.274	2
206	4	0	21.977	33.243	4
302	1	0	14.001	21.179	4
303	1	0	6.599	9.981	4
304	1	0	22.320	33.762	10
305	1	0	7.805	11.806	4
306	1	0	4.372	6.614	4
307	1	0	52.013	78.677	10
308	1	0	4.801	7.262	4
309	1	0	53.436	80.829	12
310	1	0	14.734	22.288	4
311	1	0	12.168	18.406	4
TOTAL			1974.410	2986.564	383

CATALYST AND CHEMICALS, MM\$/YEAR 37.051

DEDICATED PLANT OPERATORS 383
EXTRA OPERATORS, FOREMEN
AND MAINTENANCE WORKERS 728
TOTAL 1111

2.6 Case 6 -- Illinois No. 6 Coal with FCC Wax Upgrading with Equilibrium USY Catalyst Case

This and the previous alternative case consider Fluid Catalytic Cracking (FCC) as the means of upgrading the F-T wax instead of hydrocracking. In this case an, equilibrium USY FCC catalyst is used. The FCC yields for these two cases were developed from pilot plant data obtained by Amoco Oil.¹ The equilibrium USY catalyst used in this case is widely used commercially. It does not produce as much C4, C5 and C6 olefins which can be converted to ethers as the beta zeolite catalyst which was used in the previous case. Like the previous FCC upgrading case, this design uses Illinois No. 6 coal with the plant located in southern Illinois. This case is documented in Quarterly Reports of April-September 1995 and October-December 1995, as well as in a paper presented at the ACS National Meeting, Orlando, FL on August 25-29, 1996.

As in the Baseline design case, the ISBL processing area is divided into three main processing areas and an offsites area. Simplified ISBL block flow diagrams for this case are the same as those for the previous case, as shown in Figures 2.14 to 2.16. Since this case also processes the same Illinois No. 6 coal as the Baseline case, Area 100 is identical to that of the Baseline case. Also, Area 200, the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Loop, is identical to that of the Baseline design case.

Area 300, the Product Upgrading and Refining Area, for the FCC upgrading cases is the same as the previous FCC upgrading case as described in Section 2.5. It contains ten plants; Plants 302 through 311. In this case, Plant 301, the Wax Hydrocracking Plant, has been replaced by three new plants, Plant 309, 310 and 311. Plant 309, the FCC Plant, is a direct replacement for the wax hydrocracker.

Plant 309, the Fluid Catalytic Cracking Plant, catalytically cracks the F-T wax over an equilibrium USY catalyst to produce distillate, cat cracked naphtha, C4s, C3 olefins and fuel gas. This FCC plant design includes an unsaturated gas plant which produces a polymer grade propylene stream for sale. No heavy distillate (decanted oil) product is made because all that is produced is burned in the regenerator to supplement the coke production and maintain the unit heat balance.

The design FCC yields for the case are the average yields from two Amoco pilot plant runs, runs 939-1 and 940-2.6. This equilibrium USY catalyst does not produce as much light olefins as the beta zeolite catalyst. About 3.8 wt% of the entering feed has to be consumed as fuel in the regenerator in order for this design to maintain heat balance. This is significantly more than the 2.2 wt% coke deposited on the equilibrium USY catalyst. Consequently, the shortfall is made up of all the 650+ °F distillate and some of the 430-650 °F cycle oil. The C7+ naphtha has slightly higher octanes than those of the beta zeolite catalyst case of 86.1 RON and a 77.5 MON.

Also included in this FCC unit design is an unsaturated gas plant which separates the light gases into a C2- fuel gas stream, a propylene product stream and a butane/butenes stream that is sent to the MTBE plant.

The offsites area, which contains the ancillary plants and equipment that is required and does not belong in one of the three main processing areas such as tankage, interconnecting piping, buildings and product shipping, is very similar to that of the Baseline design case.

Table 2.7 shows the overall plant summary and installed plant cost for the FCC wax upgrading with equilibrium USY catalyst case with Illinois No. 6 coal. The plant produces 49,297 bbls/day of gasoline and distillate blending stocks, 3215 bbls/day of propylene, and 1584 bbls/day of LPG from 18,575 tons/day of moisture free Illinois No. 6 coal, 209 tons/day of methanol, and 4327 bbls/day of butanes. The plant also consumes about 56.4 MW of purchased electric power. This power consumption is in addition to the 66.6 MW of power that are produced in Plant 31 from the byproduct steam and fuel gas.

The lower half of Table 3.5 shows the ISBL field cost and total installed cost of each plant as well as the number of dedicated operators required to run it. The total installed cost of each plant consists of the ISBL field cost, an apportioned allotment for the OSBL plants, an amount for home office, engineering and fees, and a contingency allotment. As shown at the bottom of the second cost column, the total cost of the alternate FCC wax upgrading with beta zeolite catalyst case with Illinois No. 6 coal in mid-1993 dollars at the southern Illinois site is 2977 MM\$. The annual catalyst and chemicals cost is 34.8 MM\$.

Three hundred and eighty three operators are required to run the ISBL plants in this design. An additional 728 operating and maintenance personnel are required for operating the OSBL facilities, extra and spare operators, maintenance, and laboratory personnel making a total labor requirement of 1111 people without management supervision.

This case produces significantly more gasoline (39,950 vs. 23,943 bbls/day) and less distillate (9347 vs. 24,686 bbls/day) than the Baseline design case. Again, both the primary liquid hydrocarbon products are nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen free. Also, the gasoline properties from this alternate FCC wax upgrading with equilibrium USY catalyst case with Illinois No. 6 coal are different than those of the Baseline case. The gasoline has a 95.8 RON and a 87.8 MON; both of which are significantly higher than those from the conventional refining cases but less than the beta zeolite FCC case. In addition, the gasoline has a Reid vapor pressure of 4.8 psi, contains less benzene (0.1 wt%) and contains less aromatics (13.9 wt%) than any of the conventional refining cases. However, it contains more olefins (15.5 wt%). The diesel blending component has the same properties as that from the beta zeolite FCC case. It has an exceptionally high cetane index of about 74 and a pour point of about -40 °F. This is a superior diesel fuel blending component.

Table 2.7
FCC Wax Upgrading with Equilibrium USY Catalyst Case

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT

MAJOR INPUT AND OUTPUT STREAMS

INPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	
ROM COAL*	1547.933	18575.	
METHANOL	17.425	209.	
NATURAL GAS, MM SCF/HR			0.000
ELECTRIC POWER, MEGA-WH/SD			1354.201
RAW WATER MAKE-UP, MM GAL/SD			15.579
OUTPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	BBL/DAY
PROPYLENE	24.375	293.	3215.
PROPANE	11.728	141.	1584.
BUTANES	-36.759	-441.	-4327.
GASOLINE	418.549	5023.	39950.
DIESEL	104.957	1259.	9347.
REFUSE*	0.000	0.	
SLAG*	187.033	2244.	
SULFUR	46.689	560.	
TOTAL	756.573	9079.	49769.

* THESE STREAM FLOW RATES ARE ON A DRY BASIS.
NEGATIVE PRODUCT FLOWS DESIGNATE PURCHASED MATERIAL.

ISBL FIELD AND TOTAL INSTALLED COSTS (INCLUDING OSBL COSTS)

PLANT	NUMBER OF PLANTS		PLANT COST, MM\$,		DEDICATED OPERATORS
	OPERATING	SPARES	ISBL	TOTAL	
101	1	0	41.997	63.531	12
102	5	1	101.271	153.198	17
103	8	1	702.888	1063.294	183
104	8	0	37.968	57.436	8
105	1	0	3.213	4.860	0
106	4	0	18.654	28.219	9
107	2	1	43.367	65.604	13
108	8	0	23.731	35.899	0
109	8	0	7.543	11.411	8
110	8	0	326.863	494.462	8
201	8	0	221.463	335.018	43
202A	8	0	16.828	25.457	0
202B	8	0	124.993	189.083	8
203	4	0	17.872	27.036	4
204	4	0	53.772	81.344	4
205	2	0	19.416	29.372	2
206	4	0	22.302	33.737	4
302	1	0	14.046	21.249	4
303	1	0	6.622	10.017	4
304	1	0	22.392	33.873	10
305	1	0	7.092	10.728	4
306	1	0	4.387	6.636	4
307	1	0	47.953	72.541	10
308	1	0	5.153	7.795	4
309	1	0	52.222	78.999	12
310	1	0	10.556	15.969	4
311	1	0	13.791	20.862	4
TOTAL			1968.355	2977.630	383

CATALYST AND CHEMICALS, MM\$/YEAR 34.838

DEDICATED PLANT OPERATORS 383
EXTRA OPERATORS, FOREMEN
AND MAINTENANCE WORKERS 728
TOTAL 1111

2.7 Case 7 -- Fischer-Tropsch Liquefaction of Natural Gas Case

Figure 2.17 is a block flow diagram showing the overall process configuration of this natural gas Baseline F-T design. In this Fischer-Tropsch liquefaction of natural gas case, the syngas is prepared from natural gas in contrast to all the previous cases where it was prepared by gasification of coal. A combination of the partial oxidation (POX) and steam reforming processes are used to generate the syngas for the F-T synthesis. Furthermore, like the previous Illinois No. 6 coal cases, the plant is located in southern Illinois. This case is documented in Topical Report VI, *Natural Gas Fischer-Tropsch Case*, Volume I, *Summary Report*, and Volume II, *Plant Design and ASPEN Process Simulation Model* (references TR-8 and TR-9).

As in all the previous cases, the ISBL processing area is divided into three main processing areas. In addition there is a offsites area which contains the ancillary plants and equipment that is required and does not belong in one of the three main processing areas such as tankage, interconnecting piping, buildings and product shipping. Simplified ISBL block flow diagrams for this natural gas Baseline F-T design are shown in Figures 2.18, 2.19 and 2.20 respectively for the three main processing area of 100, 200 and 300.

Area 100, the syngas production area is entirely different for this natural gas case. It consists of only three plants, Plants 110, 111 and 112.

Plant 110, the Air Separation Plant, primarily provides the required oxygen for Plant 111, the Partial Oxidation Plant. Plant 110 consists of six parallel trains each producing 2100 stpd of 99.5 mole% oxygen. No spare trains are provided. However, the design includes a backup system consisting of a liquid oxygen storage facility with a capacity of one full days production and a gaseous oxygen storage facility with a capacity of 40 minutes of production from a single train.

Plant 111, the Syngas Production by Partial Oxidation (POX) Plant, consumes about 97.8 % of the natural gas feed and produces 45.3 MMSCF/hr of syngas. Plant 111 consists of 24 POX reactor trains, each producing about 1.9 MMSCF/hr of syngas with a molar H_2/CO ratio of about 1.79/1. Plant 111 is divided into three sections. The first section, 111A, consists of two CoMo/ZnO reactors per train to remove any sulfur present in the natural gas feed. Section 111A is similar to Plant 108 except that it treats the natural gas feed rather than the syngas product. The cleaned natural gas is mixed with oxygen and 600 psig steam and sent to the non-catalytic POX reactors in section 111B. The syngas leaves the POX reactors at about 400 psig and 2550 °F. The syngas is cooled in section 111C by generating 600 psig steam, washed and dehumidified by cooling to 150 °F before being reheated and sent to the F-T synthesis loop.

Plant 112, the Syngas Production by Steam Reforming Plant, consumes about 3.2 % of the natural gas feed and produces 2.4 MMSCF/hr of syngas with a molar H_2/CO ratio of about 5.89/1. It contains only a single train. As is the case with Plant 111, Plant 112

Figure 2.17
NATURAL GAS F-T BASELINE DESIGN
OVERALL PROCESS CONFIGURATION

2-40

Figure 2.18

Block Flow Diagram - Natural Gas Baseline Design Area 100 (Syngas Production)

Figure 2.19

Block Flow Diagram - Natural Gas Baseline Design Area 200 (F-T Synthesis)

2-42

Figure 2.20

Block Flow Diagram - Natural Gas Baseline Design Area 300 (Upgrading and Refining)

also consists of three sections. The first section, 112A, consists of two CoMo/ZnO reactors per train to remove any sulfur present in the natural gas feed. Section 112A is similar to Plant 108 except that it treats the natural gas feed rather than the syngas product. The cleaned natural gas is mixed with 600 psig steam and sent to the catalytic steam reforming reactors in section 112. The syngas leaves the POX reactors at about 400 psig and 1650 °F. The syngas is cooled in section 112C by generating 600 psig steam, washed and dehumidified by cooling to 150 °F before being reheated and sent to the F-T synthesis loop.

The combined syngas from Plants 111 and 112 entering Area 200 has a molar H_2/CO ratio of 1.87/1.

Area 200, the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Loop, consists of five plants. This area is significantly different from the corresponding Area 200 of the Baseline design case for Illinois No. 6 coal which consists of six plants; whereas, in this natural gas case, it consists of only five plants. Plant 201, the F-T Synthesis Plant, is different because it uses a cobalt based F-T synthesis catalyst rather than an iron based one. In the Baseline case, hydrogen is recovered from only a portion of the unconverted syngas which contrasts with this natural gas case where hydrogen is recovered from all the unconverted syngas. Furthermore, in the Baseline case, only a portion of the unconverted syngas is used for fuel; whereas, in this case, all of the unconverted syngas after hydrogen recovery is used for fuel. In effect the unconverted syngas recycle stream in all the previous cases is now an essentially pure hydrogen recycle stream. Consequently, Plant 206, the Autothermal Reforming Plant, is eliminated.

In this natural gas case, Plant 201, the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Plant, uses a cobalt based F-T synthesis catalyst in contrast to all the other cases which use an iron based catalyst. Cobalt based F-T synthesis catalyst was selected for this case because it has negligible activity for the water-gas shift reaction compared to iron based catalyst, and thus, it requires a syngas with a molar H_2/CO ratio near the stoichiometric value of 2.0/1. Since methane, the principal component in natural gas, has a molar H_2/CO ratio of 2.0/1, syngas produced from it has similar H_2/CO ratio. Also, for iron based catalyst with a high water-gas shift activity, CO_2 is the primary byproduct from the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis. With cobalt catalyst, water is the primary byproduct because the cobalt catalyst only has slight activity for the water-gas shift reaction which converts CO and H_2O to CO_2 and H_2 .

The first-stage F-T slurry bed reactor operates at 428 °F and 335 psig, and the second-stage reactor operates at 428 °F and 290 psig. Excess heat is removed by the generation of 150 psig from tubes within the reactor. By comparison, the iron based catalyst cases generate 440 °F, 360 psig steam because the reactors operate at 488 °F.

In order to prevent the formation of a liquid water phase within the F-T reactors, the raw syngas entering Area 200 is dried by cooling it to 150 °F to condense and remove water. With cobalt based F-T catalyst, the reactor configuration also has been changed.

For iron based catalyst, each train contains three parallel slurry reactors. In this case, the unconverted syngas leaving the two parallel first-stage reactors is cooled to 150 °F to condense and remove water before being fed a single second-stage reactor. In the first-stage reactor, the CO conversion/pass is 56 %, and it is 59 % in the second-stage reactor resulting in an overall CO conversion/pass of about 82 %. An unconverted syngas recycle stream around Plant 201 increases the CO conversion to about 91 %. In the Baseline design, the CO conversion/pass is 86.9 %.

Area 300, the Product Upgrading and Refining Area, for this Fischer-Tropsch liquefaction of natural gas case is identical to that of the Baseline design.

The offsites area for this case is somewhat different than that of the Baseline design case. It consists of eighteen plants. These plants are similar to those which were developed for the Baseline coal liquefaction case with minor modifications as required for this natural gas case. The most notable changes involved:

1. The removal of the facilities for handling a liquid sulfur product from Plants 20 and 23 since this case does not produce liquid sulfur.
2. The removal of Plant 24, Coal Ash Disposal.
3. The interconnecting piping system of Plant 24 was modified to remove the 900 and 360 psig steam headers and to add a 150 psig steam header.
4. Plant 31, Steam and Power Generation, and Plant 32, Raw, Cooling and Potable Water, were redesigned to match the requirements for this case.

Table 2.8 shows the overall material balance and installed plant cost for the Fischer-Tropsch liquefaction of natural gas case. Again, this is the Management Summary Report generated by the ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation (PFS) model for this case. This report is shown here because it concisely presents the principal results for this natural gas case on a single page.

The plant produces 43,238 bbls/day of gasoline and distillate blending stocks and 1704 bbls/day of LPG from 412 MMSCF/day of natural gas and 340 bbls/day of butanes. The plant also produces about 24.7 MW of surplus electric power for sale.

The lower half of Table 2.8 shows the ISBL field cost and total installed cost of each plant as well as the number of dedicated operators required to run it. The total installed cost of each plant consists of the ISBL field cost, an apportioned allotment for the OSBL plants, an amount for home office, engineering and fees, and a contingency allotment. As shown at the bottom of the second cost column, the total cost of the Fischer-Tropsch liquefaction of natural gas case in mid-1993 dollars at the southern Illinois site is 1842 MM\$. The annual catalyst and chemicals cost is 21.8 MM\$.

Two hundred and six operators are required to run the ISBL plants in this design. An additional 780 operating and maintenance personnel are required for operating the OSBL facilities, extra and spare operators, maintenance, and laboratory personnel making a total labor requirement of 598 people without management supervision.

Table 2.8

Fischer-Tropsch Liquefaction of Natural Gas Case

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT

MAJOR INPUT AND OUTPUT STREAMS

INPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	
ROM COAL*	0.000	0.	
METHANOL	0.000	0.	
NATURAL GAS, MM SCF/HR			17.163
RAW WATER MAKE-UP, MM GAL/SD			20.980
OUTPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	BBL/DAY
PROPANE	12.618	151.	1704.
BUTANES	-2.891	-35.	-340.
GASOLINE	179.404	2153.	17027.
DIESEL	295.184	3542.	26211.
REFUSE*	0.000	0.	
SLAG*	0.000	0.	
SULFUR	0.000	0.	
TOTAL	484.315	5812.	44602.

ELECTRIC POWER, MEGA-WH/SD 591.973

* THESE STREAM FLOW RATES ARE ON A DRY BASIS.
 NEGATIVE PRODUCT FLOWS DESIGNATE PURCHASED MATERIAL.

NATURAL GAS TO P111 & P112 17.163 MM SCF/HR 17797.7 MM BTUS/HR

ISBL FIELD AND TOTAL INSTALLED COSTS (INCLUDING OSBL COSTS)

PLANT	NUMBER OF PLANTS		PLANT COST, MM\$,		DEDICATED OPERATORS
	OPERATING	SPARES	ISBL	TOTAL	
110	6	0	247.269	427.689	6
111	24	0	438.766	758.913	96
112	1	0	20.961	36.255	4
200	8	0	159.960	276.675	43
202A	2	0	4.130	7.143	0
202B	1	0	14.624	25.295	1
203	2	0	8.196	14.177	2
204	2	0	25.011	43.261	2
205	2	0	14.310	24.751	2
301	1	0	41.323	71.474	10
302	1	0	16.812	29.079	4
303	1	0	5.651	9.774	4
304	1	0	28.477	49.256	10
305	1	0	4.139	7.158	4
306	1	0	6.493	11.230	4
307	1	0	23.833	41.224	10
308	1	0	5.300	9.168	4
TOTAL			1065.255	1842.521	206

CATALYST AND CHEMICALS, MM\$/YEAR 21.858

DEDICATED PLANT OPERATORS 206
 EXTRA OPERATORS, FOREMEN
 AND MAINTENANCE WORKERS 392
 TOTAL 598

Both the primary liquid hydrocarbon products are nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen free. The gasoline blending component has similar properties as those for the Baseline design case. It has a 90.6 RON, a 85.2 MON, and a Reid vapor pressure of 5.6 psi, and it contains a small amount of benzene (0.4 wt%), contains an insignificant amount of olefins (0.01 wt%), and contains a significant amount of aromatics (33.5 wt%). The diesel blending component also has about the same properties as that from the Baseline case. It has an exceptionally high cetane index of about 75 and a pour point of about -31 °F. This is a superior diesel fuel blending component.

2.8 Case 8 -- Once Through F-T Liquefaction of Natural Gas with Power Co-Production Case

Figure 2.21 is a block flow diagram showing the overall process configuration of this once through Fischer-Tropsch design with power co-production. In this F-T liquefaction of natural gas case, the syngas is prepared from natural gas as in the previous case. However, in this case it is prepared by autothermal reforming using enriched air containing 40% oxygen. Furthermore, this is a once-through design to reduce cost. Also, minimal product upgrading is used only to produce a shippable syncrude instead of the gasoline and diesel blending components which were produced in the previous cases. This case is documented in Topical Report VII, *Natural Gas Fischer-Tropsch Design with Power Coproduction*, (reference TR-10)

In contrast to the previous cases, the ISBL processing area is divided into two main processing areas. Because power coproduction is a key component of this plant design, the combined-cycle power plant is considered an ISBL plant and located in Area 200. In addition there is a offsites area which contains the ancillary plants and equipment that is required and does not belong in one of the two main processing areas.

Because this case is so different from all the previous cases, the ISBL processing plants have been renumbered. Thus, the plant numbers for this case do not correspond to the plant numbers used for all the previous cases

Area 100, the syngas production area is different for this once-through natural gas case from the previous natural gas case. It consists of the following three plants

Plant 101	Air Separation Plant
Plant 102	Autothermal Reforming Plant
Plant 103	CO ₂ Removal and Recycle Plant

Plant 101, the Air Separation Plant, also contains an air compressor. The air separation section of Plant 101 produces a 95 mole % oxygen stream which when blended with the output from the air compressor produces an enriched air stream containing 40 mole % oxygen that is sent to Plant 102, the Autothermal Reforming Plant.

Plant 102, the Autothermal Reforming Plant, first removes trace amounts of sulfur containing compounds from the natural gas by reaction with zinc oxide. The desulfurized natural gas then is mixed with the enriched air, recycle CO₂ and steam before entering the autothermal reformer reactor where it is converted to syngas. The hot syngas product stream is cooled by feed/effluent heat exchange, steam generation, and exchange with ambient air. It is then flashed to condensed and remove water before going on to Plant 103, the CO₂ Removal and Recycle Plant.

Figure 2-21
Once-Through Fischer-Tropsch (F-T) Design With Power Coproduction
(Overall Process Configuration)

2-49

Plant 103, the CO₂ Removal and Recycle Plant, is a standard MDEA absorption plant which removes CO₂ from a portion of the cooled syngas stream leaving Plant 102 and recycles it back to Plant 102 to control the CO₂ production within the autothermal reformer reactor. The lean syngas after CO₂ removal is mixed with that bypassing Plant 103 to produce a combined synthesis gas stream having a molar H₂/CO ratio of 2.01 which is to Plant 201, the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Plant.

In this once-through natural gas case, Area 200 is a combination of the previous Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Loop and the Product Upgrading and Refining Areas with the addition of the Combined-Cycle Power Plant. It consists of the following five plants:

Plant 201	Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Plant
Plant 202	Hydrogen Recovery Plant
Plant 203	Hydrocarbon Recovery Plant
Plant 204	Wax Hydrocracking Plant
Plant 31	Combined-Cycle Power Plant

This Area 200 is significantly different from the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis areas in all the previous cases. In each of the other two cases, a recycle design was used to obtain maximum liquids yields. Thus, the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis area contained a CO₂ removal plant and a recycle compression and dehydration plant preceding the hydrocarbon recovery plant which, using refrigeration, recovered LPG in addition to all the heavier hydrocarbons. The removal of these materials from the F-T synthesis loop is necessary in order to minimize the amount of unconverted syngas being recycled and both equipment and operating cost associated with the recycle loops.

In this once-through design, the F-T products are recovered in Plant 203 immediately after they are produced in Plant 201. All unconverted syngas is used for power production in the combined-cycle power Plant.

Plant 201, the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Plant, contains a two-stage reactor section with interstage cooling and withdrawal of condensed liquids. Because this case uses an enriched air-blown autothermal reformer for syngas generation, the unconverted syngas leaving the second-stage, F-T synthesis reactor contains a significant amount of nitrogen which essentially precludes a recycle design and makes recovery of the C₃ and C₄ hydrocarbons from the unconverted syngas both more difficult and more expensive. Thus, a less comprehensive hydrocarbon recovery plant, Plant 203, is used which does not recover LPG. However, a LiBr absorption chiller is used to recover additional hydrocarbons from the unconverted syngas leaving the Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Plant before it becomes high pressure fuel gas.

Plant 203, the Hydrogen Recovery Plant, supplies the hydrogen needs of the wax hydrocracking plant by recovering hydrogen from only a small portion of the syngas generated in the syngas preparation area. In contrast to the other designs, the feed to the hydrogen recovery plant is fresh syngas from Area 100 instead of the unconverted syngas leaving the hydrocarbon recovery plant. This design change was required

because the hydrogen concentration in the unconverted syngas is insufficient for effective, economic hydrogen recovery.

Plant 204, the small wax hydrocracking plant is the only product upgrading step included in this design. In the previous cases, the wax hydrocracking plant was part of a separate and more extensive product upgrading and refining area which produced high quality gasoline and distillate blending components. In this case, the objective is only to produce a stable, shippable product which can be upgraded to liquid transportation fuels elsewhere, such as in a conventional petroleum refinery.

Plant 31, the Combined-Cycle Power Plant, is included in the ISBL plants of Area 200 because it is such an important plant in this design. It consumes the C4- fuel gas produced in the rest of the plant as well as the excess 635 psig steam from Plant 102 and the excess 150 psig stream from Plant 201 to produce electric power, compress the inlet air to Plant 101 to 665 psia, and produce 50 psig steam for use within the process area. The fuel gas is burned in a General Electric (GE) Frame 7 gas turbine which drives the air compressors and an electric power generator. The hot exhaust gases from the air compressor and the inlet steams from Plant 102 and 201 go to the HRSG (Heat Recovery Steam Generation) section where superheated three levels of steam are generated and sent to the three-stage steam turbine which drives another power generator. 50 psig steam is withdrawn from the low pressure turbine for use in other parts of the plant.

Plant 31 supplies the complete electric power needs for the entire complex as well as producing an extra 84 MW for sale.

The offsites area for this case is similar to that of the previous natural gas case except that it does not contain the power plant. It consists of fourteen plants. These plants are similar to those which were developed for the Baseline coal liquefaction case with minor modifications as required for this once-through natural gas case.

Table 2.9 shows the overall material balance and installed plant cost for this once-through, natural gas Fischer-Tropsch case. This report is presented in the same style as the previous reports even though this case was not completely modeled in the ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation (PFS) program.

The plant produces 8815 bbls/day of synthetic crude and 84 MW of surplus electric power for sale. Approximately 146 bbls/day are butanes, 2933 bbl/day are in the naphtha boiling range, and 5736 bbls/day are in the distillate boiling range.

The lower half of Table 2.9 shows the plant description, total installed cost of each plant as well as the number of dedicated operators required to run it. As shown at the bottom of the second cost column, the total cost of this once-through, natural gas

Table 2.9

Once Through F-T Liquefaction of Natural Gas with Power Co-Production

MAJOR INPUT AND OUTPUT STREAMS

INPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	
NATURAL GAS, MM SCF/HR			4.167
RAW WATER MAKE-UP, MM GAL/SD			5.3
OUTPUT	MLBS/HR	TONS/DAY	BBL/DAY
PROPANE	0.0	0.	0.
BUTANES	1.220	15.	146.
NAPHTHA	30.295	364.	2933.
DIISTILLATE	64.603	775.	5736.
SULFUR	0.000	0.	
TOTAL	96.118	1154.	8815.
ELECTRIC POWER, MEGA-WH/SD			2018.4

TOTAL INSTALLED COSTS (INCLUDING OSBL COSTS)

PLANT	DESCRIPTION	TOTAL PLANT COST, MM\$	DEDICATED OPERATORS
101	AIR SEPARATION (40% O ₂)	70.42	2
102	AUTOTHERMAL REFORMING	22.82	6
103	CO ₂ REMOVAL AND RECYCLE	13.42	1
201	FISCHER-TROPSCH SYNTHESIS	35.75	6
202	HYDROGEN RECOVERY	3.63	1
203	PRODUCT FRACTIONATION	3.19	1
204	WAX HYDROCRACKING	11.83	3
31	COMBINED CYCLE PLANT	120.32	*
	OTHER OFFSITES	25.19	*
	SUBTOTAL	335.89	
	HOME OFFICE AND FEES	25.19	
	CONTINGENCY	54.16	
TOTAL		415.25	20

CATALYST AND CHEMICALS, MM\$/YEAR	6.05
-----------------------------------	------

NOTE: THE ABOVE PLANT NUMBERS DO NOT CORRESPOND WITH THE PLANT NUMBERS
USED IN THE PREVIOUS CASES.

DEDICATED PLANT OPERATORS	20
EXTRA OPERATORS, FOREMEN AND MAINTENANCE WORKERS	40
TOTAL	60

* OPERATORS ARE INCLUDED IN THE EXTRA OPERATORS CLASSIFICATION.

Fischer-Tropsch liquefaction plant in mid-1993 dollars at a hypothetical U. S. Gulf Coast site is 415 MM\$. The annual catalyst and chemicals cost is 6.05 MM\$.

Twenty operators are required to run the ISBL plants in this design. An additional forty operating and maintenance personnel are required for operating the combined-cycle power plant and OSBL facilities, extra and spare operators, maintenance, and laboratory personnel making a total labor requirement of sixty people without management supervision.

The syncrude produced by this once-through design is nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen free. Because they are not finished gasoline and diesel blending components, the properties of the naphtha and distillate portions of the syncrude product were not estimated. However, the distillate portion should be similar to the previous distillates because it basically has undergone the same processing. The naphtha has a lower octane than the previous cases because it has not undergone any upgrading.

2.9 The ASPEN Plus Process Flowsheet Simulation Models

ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation (PFS) models for all the Fischer-Tropsch, indirect coal liquefaction cases were developed as part of this project. All of the model algorithms, computer code, and training necessary to operate and modify them were provided under this contract. The models were originally developed using ASPEN/SP. Documentation of the original ASPEN/SP models development is given in Topical Report, Volume IV, *ASPEN Flowsheet (PFS) Models* (reference TR-4). Documentation for the use of the various ASPEN PFS coal liquefaction models is given in the training session report, *ASPEN Process Flowsheet Simulation Model – Training Session Report* (reference TR-5).

All the models were later converted to ASPEN Plus code. Documentation of the various ASPEN Plus models is given in Topical Report, Volume V, *ASPEN PLUS Process Simulation Models for Fischer-Tropsch Indirect Coal Liquefaction* (reference TR-6). The use of these ASPEN models requires the ASPEN Plus process simulation program which is available from ASPEN Technology, Inc., Cambridge, MA.

These ASPEN Plus PFS models, along with the LOTUS spreadsheet economic model (discussed in Section 2.10), were developed as a tool with which DOE can use to plan, guide and evaluate its future research and commercialization programs. These models are not intended as detailed process design tools. They were developed based on the various coal liquefaction designs that were discussed in the previous sections of this report. The models are expandable and changeable on a block substitution basis. All contain an enhanced version of the detailed Fischer-Tropsch slurry reactor model that Bechtel developed under the previous Slurry Reactor Design Studies project (DOE-DE-AC22-89PC89867). Besides being responsive to a variety of processing conditions, this reactor model sizes the slurry bed reactors, calculates their weight, and estimates their ISBL field cost.

These models generate and report complete material and utility balances for all the individual plants, and for the entire coal liquefaction complex. Included are utility requirements and capital costs for all the major processing plants (ISBL plants). Major equipment lists and specifications outlines may be generated only for the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis plant. The outside battery limits (OSBL) plants, including the power generation plant, are modeled for utilities generation and operating expense calculations only.

The ASPEN Plus PFS model for the natural gas conversion case is documented in Topical Report VI, *Natural-Gas Fischer-Tropsch Case, Volume II, Plant Design and ASPEN Process Simulation model* (reference TR-9). This ASPEN Plus model is not a fully integrated model and it is not a deliverable to DOE as specified in the contract scope of work.

2.10 The LOTUS Spreadsheet Economics Model

A LOTUS 2.2 spreadsheet economics model was developed to analyze the economics of various coal liquefaction process scenarios using the results generated by the ASPEN Plus PFS model. This spreadsheet economics model does detailed discounted-cash-flow calculations using the flowrates, utilities, labor, and total capital information generated by the ASPEN Plus PFS model to allow the user to study the economic sensitivities of the economic and technical parameters discussed below.

The LOTUS economics model is a two-dimensional spreadsheet into which the user can import an ASCII file generated by the ASPEN Plus PFS model. The ASPEN model output file thus becomes an input for the LOTUS spreadsheet economics model, and along with other user controlled input parameters, drives the calculation of operating costs, capital costs, and revenues. These parameters are escalated as specified by user input economic parameters to generate a cash flow summary including the calculations of revenues, expenses, capital costs, depreciation, taxes, cash flows, internal rate of return, and net present value. The model also reports a Crude Oil Equivalent (COE) price. These results allow the user to perform manual iterations by varying the economic parameters, feedstock cost, product values or other items to achieve, for example, a required rate of return, COE, or to check the sensitivities of various parameters on the project economics. Highlights of the cash flow summary also are reported.

User supplied product values are entered in terms of a premium value for the naphtha and distillate blending stocks relative to crude oil. These premium values were determined by an linear program (LP) model study using an average PADD II refinery (see publication number 4 in Appendix B).

The LOTUS spreadsheet economics model is documented in Part 6 of Topical Report, IV, *Process Flowsheet (PFS) Models, LOTUS Spreadsheet Economics Model (Restricted Addendum)* (reference TR-4, part 6). This report provides the only documentation available for the spreadsheet economics model. Users should be knowledgeable in process economics, particularly in F-T technology and process economics.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Conclusions

Conceptual plant designs and economics have been developed for Fischer-Tropsch liquefaction plants producing high quality, liquid transportation fuels from synthesis gas produced either from coal or natural gas. Using these designs as the bases, various ASPEN Plus process flowsheet simulation models also were developed, along with a LOTUS spreadsheet economics model. These models provide DOE/FETC with a tool to explore, evaluate and identify additional promising areas for future research in the production of liquid transportation fuels via Fischer-Tropsch synthesis.

A 45,000 bbl/day indirect liquefaction plant at a mine-mouth location processing 20,320 TPD of Illinois No. 6 coal can produce liquid transportation fuels that will be competitive with those made from crude oil priced at 32.4 to 35.4 \$/bbl. The Crude Oil Equivalent (COE) price range depends upon the product upgrading option selected. The products from a similar plant located near Gillette, Wyoming processing Powder River Basin coal can be competitive with those from crude oil priced a 29.1 to 31.9 \$/bbl depending upon the product upgrading option selected. The cost of these plants were estimated to be in the vicinity of 3.0 billion mid-1993 dollars with some variation due to the upgrading option and plant location.

A similar sized indirect natural gas liquefaction plant located at southern Illinois processing about 410 MMSCF/day of natural gas can produce high quality liquid transportation fuels at a COE price of 32.8 \$/bbl from gas costing 2.0 \$/MMBTU. With 0.50 \$/MMBTU gas, the COE price drops to 19.7 \$/bbl. The cost of this plant was estimated to be about 1.8 billion mid-1993 dollars. The Illinois site was chosen for the natural gas design for the purpose of expediting the work and making comparison. It is not a good location for natural gas liquefaction, but it shows that the economics can be favorable with low cost gas. At remote sites with low cost gas, construction costs generally are higher because of a lack of infrastructure, an inadequate labor force, and/or a harsh climate. However, there are opportunities to reduce the plant cost by applying developing technologies, design changes, and producing only a pumpable liquid (syncrude) for upgrading with crude oil at a conventional petroleum refinery. These options should be explored.

The naphtha and distillate products from the above plants are sulfur, nitrogen and oxygen free. The distillate is a superior diesel fuel blending component with a cetane number above 70. When upgraded by the processes used in this study, the naphtha is a good gasoline blending component.

A design for a smaller once-through, natural gas Fischer-Tropsch liquefaction plant was developed employing the F-T synthesis technology of Syncrude Technology Incorporated. This plant processed 100 MMscf/day of natural gas and produced about 8815 bbls/day of a sulfur, nitrogen and oxygen free syncrude. It also produced about 84 MW of surplus electric power for sale. With low cost natural gas, a reasonable power selling price, and construction costs similar to those on the U. S. Gulf Coast, this syncrude can be competitive with conventional crude oil assuming a reasonable premium because of its superior property.

3.2 Recommendations for Future Work

During the course of this study, several areas for future investigation became apparent which could reduce the cost of preparing high quality liquid transportation fuels from carbon sources other than crude oil.

3.2.1 General Indirect Liquefaction Processes

The following recommendations apply equally well to a F-T indirect liquefaction plant processing syngas produced either from coal or natural gas.

- Investigate and incorporate advanced processes for oxygen production and syngas generation. Currently, the syngas generation area accounts for a major portion of the total plant cost. Promising technologies are on the horizon such as combined autothermal reforming, fluid-bed autothermal reforming, and ceramic membranes oxidation (e.g., DOE Contract No. DE-AC22-92PC92113), which can significantly improve the overall economics.
- Develop an effective design and up-to-date cost for larger diameter F-T slurry reactors. Advanced slurry F-T reactor design is the core of the overall process design, and the F-T synthesis plant represents 15% of the total plant cost. The original design was based on the premise that the reactor diameter must not exceed 16 feet for transportation reasons. The current designs have 24 slurry F-T reactors, each about 16 feet in diameter. Development of larger slurry F-T reactors should be possible, and this will significantly reduce the cost of the F-T synthesis plant where water transportation to the site is available.
- Develop a cost effective scheme for minimal upgrading of the F-T wax into a shippable product which can be upgraded elsewhere into liquid transportation fuels.
- Obtain better experimental data on the coprocessing of F-T liquefaction products in a conventional refinery and on the quality of the products that

are produced.

- Perform additional linear programming (LP) studies to better define the F-T product values, as a part of the current Coal Liquids End Use Study (DOE Contract No. DE-AC22-93PC91029), using experimentally determined F-T liquid properties as input parameters to the model. Fischer-Tropsch synthesis produces a very high quality diesel (high cetane; no sulfur, nitrogen and aromatics; low smoke point, etc.) It is likely that the quality of this diesel is not adequately represented by the 7.19 \$/bbl margin above the crude oil price used in this study. Furthermore, elimination of upgrading at the remote site and processing the F-T syncrude in the refinery along with crude oil may be a more economical overall operation.
- Develop a design for a once-through F-T liquefaction plant in conjunction with an IGCC plant. This plant can use either coal, natural gas, biomass, land-fill gases, waste material or a mixture thereof as the primary carbon source. In this design, the F-T recycle loop is eliminated and the large cost of the gasifier is distributed between the two products, power and the F-T liquids. The liquids only will be upgraded to produce a shippable material which will be converted to finished liquid transportation fuels elsewhere.

3.2.2 Coal Based Indirect Liquefaction Processes

The following recommendation principally applies to a coal based Fischer-Tropsch indirect liquefaction plant.

- Develop a improved iron based F-T liquefaction catalyst. Iron based catalysts are preferred for coal based designs because their high water-gas shift activity is required to produce sufficient hydrogen for the F-T synthesis reaction. The current design uses a ROSE supercritical solvent extraction unit to separate the catalyst from the wax product because the current iron catalyst particles quickly disintegrate to very fine material. This is expensive both in cost and utilities consumption. A more durable, longer lasting catalyst would allow the use of low cost filters, and furthermore, could reduce cost.

3.2.3 Natural Gas Based Liquefaction Processes

The following recommendations principally apply to a natural gas based Fischer-Tropsch indirect liquefaction plant.

- Design a natural gas F-T liquefaction plant to be located at a remote site of interest (e.g., Prudhoe Bay, Alaska) where low cost gas is available and incorporate into the design:
 - a) Site-specific construction and operating costs
 - b) Site-specific utility requirements and overall plant balance
 - c) Minimal product upgrading
 - d) Site and product specific transportation and storage requirements, and
 - e) If applicable, a once-through power coproduction scheme to take advantage of the synergistic economic benefits of coproduction.
- Design a smaller, potentially barge-mounted, natural gas F-T plant of about 10,000 BPD capacity using a simplified, but possibly less efficient, design with minimal product upgrading. This plant will be different from the current design not only in terms of size, but also in construction. It will be designed specifically for gas reserves in remote areas of the U. S., including offshore discoveries along the U. S. Gulf Coast.
- Obtain additional and more detailed cobalt based catalyst data. The yield and kinetic data which were used to design the F-T slurry reactors are based on a single source (i.e., Satterfield et. al.) and are somewhat limited in scope. Additional, larger scale data are needed to confirm the kinetics and better define the F-T synthesis yields. Catalyst life is another variable which needs to be examined in a pilot plant scale facility.

APPENDIX A

MAJOR PROJECT REPORTS

APPENDIX A

MAJOR PROJECT REPORTS

This appendix contains a listing of the major project reports containing significant technical information that were prepared during the course of this DOE contract, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology." Monthly status reports are not included in the listing because, in general, they did not contain any significant technical information, and if they did, it was only of a preliminary nature, and it was repeated in more detail in the quarterly report covering that period.

This appendix is divided into four sections:

- A1 Topical Reports
- A2 Quarterly Reports
- A3 Technical Progress Meeting Conference Notes
- A4 Letter Reports

Topical reports were issued to document the final results from a portion or task of this study.

Quarterly reports were issued every three months. They contain technical data, and document the progress of the study to that point.

Technical progress meetings with DOE/FETC personnel were held periodically as needed. Following the meeting, conference notes were issued documenting the discussion and the action items.

Letter reports were issued sporadically, as needed, containing some technical information which were best transmitted by letter. Selected letters of transmittal for the project management plan, conference notes, etc. are included in this section to provide a reference to the transmitted items. Letters of transmittal for publications are not included because the publications are reprinted in Appendix B. For completeness, letters from either the DOE or Burns and Roe which fit in this category and are related to this contract are included in the listing. Again, letters not containing any significant technical information are not included in the listing.

All reports are listed chronologically in each of the four sections.

A1 Topical Reports

1. Topical Report, Volume I, *Process Design - Illinois No. 6 Coal Case with Conventional Refining*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, October, 1994.
2. Topical Report, Volume II, *Process Design - Illinois No. 6 Coal Case with ZSM-5 Upgrading*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, October, 1994.
3. Topical Report, Volume III, *Process Design - Western Coal Case with Conventional Refining*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, October, 1994.
4. Topical Report, Volume IV, *Process Flowsheet (PFS) Models*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA.,
Part 1, October, 1994
Part 2, Appendices - Part I (1 of 2), October, 1994.
Part 3, Appendices - Part I (2 of 2), October, 1994.
Part 3, Appendices - Part I (2 of 2), October, 1994.
Part 4, Appendices - Part II (1 of 2), October, 1994.
Part 5, Appendices - Part II (2 of 2), October, 1994.
Part 6, LOTUS Spreadsheet Economics Model (Restricted Addendum), March, 1996.
5. Training Session Report, *ASPEN Process Flowsheet Simulation Model - Training Session Report*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, October, 1994.
6. Topical Report, Volume V (1 of 2), *ASPEN PLUS Process Simulation Models for Fischer-Tropsch Indirect Coal Liquefaction*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, November, 1994.

7. Topical Report, Volume V (2 of 2), *ASPEN PLUS Process Simulation Models for Direct Coal Liquefaction*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, November, 1994.
8. Topical Report VI, *Natural Gas Fischer-Tropsch Case, Volume I, Summary Report*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, August, 1996.
9. Topical Report VI, *Natural Gas Fischer-Tropsch Case, Volume II, Plant Design and Aspen Process Simulation Model*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, August, 1996.
10. Topical Report VII, *Natural Gas Based Once-Through Fischer-Tropsch Design with Power Coproduction*, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, March, 1998.

A2 Quarterly Reports

1. Quarterly Report, October - December 1991, Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, April, 1992.
2. Quarterly Report, January - March 1992, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, June, 1992.
3. Quarterly Report, April - June 1992, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, August, 1992.
4. Quarterly Report, July - September 1992, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, January, 1993.
5. Quarterly Report, October - December 1992, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, March, 1993.
6. Quarterly Report, January - March 1993, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, June, 1994.
7. Quarterly Report, April - June 1993, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, June, 1994.
8. Quarterly Report, July - September 1993, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, June, 1994.
9. Quarterly Report, October - December 1993, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, August, 1994.
10. Quarterly Report, January - March 1994, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, August, 1994.

11. Quarterly Report, April - June 1994, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, October, 1994.
12. Quarterly Report, July - September 1994, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, December, 1994.
13. Quarterly Report, October - December 1994, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, February, 1995.
14. Quarterly Report, January - March 1995, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, November 1995.
15. Quarterly Report, April - June 1995, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, March, 1996.
16. Quarterly Report, July - September 1995, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, March, 1996.
17. Quarterly Report, October - December 1995, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, Pittsburgh, PA, April, 1996.

A3 Technical Progress Meeting Conference Notes

1. October 21, 1991 Kickoff Meeting - conference note issued November 4, 1991.
2. February 26, 1992 Progress Meeting - conference note issued March 16, 1992.
3. August 5, 1992 Progress Meeting - conference note issued August 14, 1992.
4. March 4, 1993 Progress Meeting - conference note issued March 10, 1993.
5. June 17, 1993 Progress Meeting - conference note issued August 24, 1993.
6. February 2, 1994 Progress Meeting - conference note issued March 16, 1994.
7. July 1, 1994 Progress Meeting - conference notes issued July 12, 1994.
8. November 9, 1994 Project Meeting on 'Crude Oil Equivalent (COE)' Coal Liquefaction Economics - conference note issued February 22, 1995.
9. February 14, 1995 Progress Meeting on Coal Liquefaction Economics - conference note issued February 28, 1995.
10. February 16, 1995 Progress Meeting - conference note issued March 13, 1995.
11. November 16, 1995 Progress Meeting - conference note issued November 29, 1995.
12. February 20, 1996 Progress Meeting - conference note issued February 28, 1996.
13. December 4, 1996 Progress Meeting - conference note issued December 14, 1996.
14. June 12, 1997 Progress Meeting - conference note issued June 19, 1997.

A4 Letter Reports

1. Letter from Samuel S. Tam to Shelby Rogers, subject "Final Project Management Plan," March 6, 1992.
2. Letter from Gerald N. Choi to Gary Stiegel, subject "Syncrude Technology F-T Design Based on Natural Gas," September 8, 1995.
3. Letter from Gerald N. Choi to Shelby Rogers, subject "Revised Fischer-Tropsch Slurry Reactor Kinetic Model," March 25, 1996.
4. Letter from Donald P. Daley (Burns and Roe Services Corporation) to R. Huco, subject "Delivery of a Paper and Presentation Material for the Society of Petroleum Engineers Meeting," May 21, 1996.
5. Letter from Gerald N. Choi to Dr. Normal L. Carr, subject "Once-Through Fischer-Tropsch Design with Power Coproduction: Flow Drawings, H&M Balances and Preliminary Cost Estimate," March 3, 1997.
6. Fax from Gerald N. Choi to Dr. Ram Srivastava, [subject "Preliminary STI Study Results"], May 1, 1997.

APPENDIX B

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

APPENDIX B

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

This appendix reprints of all the publications and presentations that were prepared during the course of this DOE contract, Contract No. DE-AC22-91PC90027, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology." Following is a chronological list of these presentations.

1. Tam, S. S., Cheng, Y. L., Degen, B. D., Fox, J. M. III, Schachtschneider, A. B., and S. J. Kramer, "Indirect Liquefaction Baseline Design," DOE Liquefaction Contractors' Review Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, September 22-24, 1992.
2. Choi, G. N., Tam, S. S., Fox, J. M. III, Kramer, S. J. and J. J. Marano, "Baseline Design/Economics for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology," DOE Coal Liquefaction and Gas Conversion Contractors' Review Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, September 27-29, 1993.
3. Choi, G. N., Tam, S. S., Fox, J. M. III, Kramer, S. J. and S. Rogers "Process Simulation Model for Indirect Coal Liquefaction Using Slurry Reactor Fischer-Tropsch Technology," Symposium on "Alternative Routes for the Production of Fuels," A. C. S. National Meeting, Washington, D. C., August 21-26, 1994.
4. Marano, J. J., Rogers, S., Choi, G. N. and S. J. Kramer, "Product Valuation of Fischer-Tropsch Derived Fuels," Symposium on "Alternative Routes for the Production of Fuels," A. C. S. National Meeting, Washington, D. C., August 21-26, 1994.
5. Choi, G. N., Tam, S. S., Fox, J. M. III, Kramer, S. J. and J. J. Marano, "Process Design/Simulation Models for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology," DOE Coal Liquefaction and Gas Conversion Contractors' Review Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, September 7-8, 1994.
6. Choi, G. N., Kramer, S. J., Tam, S. S. and J. M. Fox. III, "Simulation Models and Designs for Advanced Fischer-Tropsch Technology," Proceedings of the DOE Coal Liquefaction and Gas Conversion Contractors Review Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, August 29-31, 1995.

7. Choi, G. N., Kramer, S. J. and S. S. Tam, "Effect of Product Upgrading on F-T Indirect Coal Liquefaction Economics," 12th Annual International Pittsburgh Coal Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, September 11-15, 1995.
8. Choi, G. N., Kramer, S. J., Tam, S. S., Srivastava, R. D. and G. J. Stiegel, "Natural-Gas Based Fischer-Tropsch to Liquid Fuels: Economics," Society of Petroleum Engineers 66th Western Regional Meeting, Anchorage, AK, May 22-24, 1966.
9. Choi, G. N., Kramer, S. J., Tam, S. S. and J. M. Fox. III, "Economics of a Natural Gas Based Fischer-Tropsch Plant," First Joint Power and Fuel Systems Contractors Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, July 9-11, 1996.
10. Choi, G. N., Kramer, S. J., Tam, S. S., Fox, J. M. III and W. J. Reagan, "Fischer-Tropsch Indirect Coal Liquefaction Economics - Mild Hydrocracking vs. Fluid Catalytic Cracking," Symposium on "Coal Liquefaction/Coprocessing," A. C. S. National Meeting, Orlando, FL, August 25-29, 1996.
11. Choi, G. N., Kramer, S. J., Tam, S. S. and J. M. Fox III, "Design/Economics of a Natural Gas Based Fischer-Tropsch Plant," American Institute of Chemical Engineers Spring National Meeting, Houston, TX, paper 28d, March 10-13, 1997.
12. Choi, G. N., Kramer, S. J., Tam, S. S. and J. M. Fox III, "Design and Economics of a Fischer-Tropsch Plant for Converting Natural Gas to Liquid Transportation Fuels," Symposium on Clean Fuels, A. C. S. National Meeting, San Francisco, CA, April 13-17, 1997.
13. Choi, G. N., Kramer, S. J., Tam, S. S., Fox III, J. M., Carr, N. L. and Wilson, G. R., "Design/Economics of a Once-Through Natural Gas Fischer-Tropsch Plant with Power Co-Production," Coal Liquefaction and Solid Fuel Contractors Review Meeting, Pittsburgh, PA, Sept. 3-4, 1997.