250 MW Single Train CFB Cogeneration Facility

**Annual Report
October 1993 - September 1994**

**RECEIVED
OCT 15 1996
OSTI**

February 1995

Work Performed Under Contract No.: DE-FC21-91MC27403

For
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fossil Energy
Morgantown Energy Technology Center
Morgantown, West Virginia

By
York County Energy Partners, L.P.
25 South Main Street
Spring Grove, Pennsylvania 17362

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED
DLC

Disclaimer

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

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

250 MW Single Train CFB Cogeneration Facility

**Annual Report
October 1993 - September 1994**

Work Performed Under Contract No.: DE-FC21-91MC27403

For
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fossil Energy
Morgantown Energy Technology Center
P.O. Box 880
Morgantown, West Virginia 26507-0880

By
York County Energy Partners, L.P.
25 South Main Street
Spring Grove, Pennsylvania 17362

February 1995

TECHNICAL PROGRESS REPORT

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Purpose of Report.....	1
B. Overview Description of Facility.....	1
C. Outline of Report	1
II. GENERAL YCEP DESCRIPTION.....	2
A. General Description.....	2
B. Technology Description	3
C. Buildings and Structures.....	3
D. Major Equipment List	4
III. PROJECT SITE	5
A. Site Location.....	5
B. Facility Description.....	5
C. P. H. Glatfelter Company	6
D. Specific Site Parameters (North Codorus Township).....	7
E. Plant Equipment Overview.....	8
F. Detailed Equipment Descriptions	11
1. Circulating Fluidized Bed Boiler Design.....	11
2. Boiler Pilot Plant Tests.....	22
3. Coal Handling and Storage.....	30
4. Ash Handling and Storage.....	36
5. Chemical Handling and Storage	37
6. Limestone Handling and Storage.....	37
7. Turbine	38
8. Draft System.....	43
H. Pollution Control.....	44
I. Facility Water Usage.....	45
J. Facility Wastewater.....	46
K. Air Emissions.....	48
IV. PROGRESS SINCE LAST REPORT	50
A. Foster Wheeler Preliminary Design Work	50
B. Baghouse.....	51
C. Fuel Handling.....	51
D. Balance of Plant	51
E. Geotechnical Investigations.....	52

TECHNICAL PROGRESS REPORT

(continued)

V. TECHNICAL STUDIES COMPLETED SINCE LAST REPORT	53
A. Addition of Limestone Rail Unloading	53
B. Wastewater Reuse Study	53
C. Main Steam Pipe Material Selection	55
D. Cooling Water Optimization	55
E. Circulating Water Pipe	55
VI. CLOSURE	56

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	- Process Flow Diagram
Figure 2	- Site Location Map
Figure 3	- Artists Rendering
Figure 4	- Site Plan: North Codorus Township
Figure 5	- CFB Boiler Plan & Elevation
Figure 6	- INTREX Layout
Figure 7	- Pilot Plant Process Flow Diagram
Figure 8	- Fuel Handling Schematic
Figure 9	- Water Balance

YORK TECHNICAL PROGRESS REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of Report

This Technical Progress Report (Draft) is submitted pursuant to the Terms and Conditions of Cooperative Agreement No. DE-FC21-90MC27403 between the Department of Energy (Morgantown Energy Technology Center) and York County Energy Partners, L.P. a wholly owned project company of Air Products and Chemicals, Inc. covering the period from January 1994 to the present for the York County Energy Partners CFB Cogeneration Project. The Technical Progress Report summarizes the work performed during the most recent year of the Cooperative Agreement including technical and scientific results.

B. Overview Description of Facility

The Department of Energy, under the Clean Coal Technology program, proposes to provide cost-shared financial assistance for the construction of a utility-scale circulating fluidized bed technology cogeneration facility by York County Energy Partners, L.P (YCEP). YCEP, a project company of Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., would design, construct and operate a 250 megawatt (gross) coal-fired cogeneration facility on a 38-acre parcel in North Codorus Township, York County, Pennsylvania. The facility would be located adjacent to the P. H. Glatfelter Company paper mill, the proposed steam host. Electricity would be delivered to Metropolitan Edison Company.

The facility would demonstrate new technology designed to greatly increase energy efficiency and reduce air pollutant emissions over current generally available commercial technology which utilizes coal fuel. The facility would include a single train circulating fluidized bed boiler, a pollution control train consisting of limestone injection for reducing emissions of sulfur dioxide by greater than 92 percent, selective non-catalytic reduction for reducing emissions of nitrogen oxides, and a fabric filter (baghouse) for reducing emissions of particulates.

C. Outline of Report

The next section of this report (Section II) provides a general description of the facility. Section III describes the site specifics associated with the facility at the proposed site to North Codorus Township. This section of the report also provides detailed descriptions of several key pieces of equipment. The circulating fluidized bed boiler (CFB), its design, scale-up and testing is given particular emphasis. Section IV describes progress since the last report

including preliminary engineering procurement and site related activities. Several key studies performed this past year are described in Section V.

II. GENERAL YCEP DESCRIPTION

A. General Description

The YCEP facility is a coal-fired CFB boiler cogeneration facility producing 250 MWe (gross) or 227 MWe (net). The power island consists of a Foster Wheeler Circulating Fluidized Bed (CFB) boiler and a "utility style" reheater turbine generator. The facility also includes a baghouse, a stack, a cooling tower, coal unloading and storage facilities, limestone unloading and storage facilities, demineralization system, and a gray water treatment facility.

The purpose of this project is to help demonstrate the commercial viability of using a utility-scale circulating fluidized bed technology in a cogeneration facility to generate electric power for a local utility and steam for local host industries. This project is one of a number planned to be conducted pursuant to the Clean Coal Technologies program to demonstrate different approaches and applications of clean coal technologies. Successful future commercial application of circulating fluidized bed technology could result in reductions in air emissions at costs lower than those of conventional pollution control technologies. In addition to the direct economic benefits accruing from the lower cost of producing electric power and the environmental benefits of decreased air pollutant emissions, the future commercial application of circulating fluidized bed technology would also assist in reducing the dependence of the United States upon imported energy.

The proposed facility would also assist in meeting an energy shortfall projected by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission to occur in the region served by Metropolitan Edison Company. To meet this need for electric power in the region, new power generation facilities will be required. In addition, the provision of steam to the steam host enhances the efficiency of energy use at that facility. The proposed cogeneration facility would therefore assist in serving the needs of the community for electrical power and the needs of local industry for steam power, while meeting its primary objective of demonstrating a clean coal technology.

B. Technology Description

The facility will use eastern bituminous coal as its primary fuel in a Foster Wheeler CFB boiler. The steam produced in the boiler will generate 227 MW (net) of electricity in a Westinghouse turbine generator consisting of an opposed flow high pressure - intermediate pressure turbine element and a dual flow low pressure turbine element coupled to a surface condenser. A Process Flow Diagram is shown in Figure 1.

Emissions will be minimized through the use of the CFB boiler technology. Limestone will be injected into the boiler to capture sulfur dioxide ("SO₂"), reducing SO₂ emissions by 92%. Combustion air will be staged, combustion temperatures controlled, and aqueous ammonia or urea will be injected into the cyclones to control nitrogen oxide ("NO_x") emissions. Carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions will be minimized through the efficient combustion process which occurs in a circulating fluidized bed boiler. Particulate emissions will be controlled with a baghouse prior to the flue gas entering the stack.

The major new technology area involves the CFB boiler which will be the largest single train unit in the U.S. For large scale steam generator design, mechanical design requirements such as structural support, tube thickness, material selection, etc. and many process considerations such as steam/water circuitry design for natural circulation and steam superheating have been standard practice for many years. The main areas of scale-up for the subject unit are the processes related to fluidized bed combustion: furnace design, cyclone design, recycle heat exchanger design, and heat recovery area design.

In designing a large scale CFB furnace, the primary area of concern is to provide the conditions for optimum emission control, fuel burn-up, and heat transfer. These conditions can be achieved by providing good fuel, sorbent and air mixing, as well as the proper configuration of heat transfer surface. In designing a utility scale unit furnace, good fuel mixing for uniform fuel burning will be achieved by:

- Limiting the furnace depth so that fuel distance of travel from front to rear wall is minimized and good penetration and mixing of secondary air can be achieved.
- Telescoping the furnace width and adding more fuel, limestone, and secondary air feed points as well as the number of recycled solids return ports which uniformly distribute recycled solids and promote mixing.
- Adding a full division wall that distributes heat transfer surface for uniform heat removal.

C. Buildings and Structures

A main power island building will be constructed which consists of a number of adjacent or interconnected buildings, the largest of which will be the boiler building. This building will house the boiler combustor, cross-over, cyclones, air preheater, fuel day silos, primary air fan, and ash collection

system. The building will be equipped with a freight style elevator to facilitate maintenance.

The next building is the feedwater heater building. This building, which is adjacent to the boiler building contains all facility feedwater heaters. All heaters are arranged in a stacked fashion to facilitate piping and minimize foot print requirements.

The next building is the turbine/generator building. This building is adjacent to the feedwater heater building. This building houses the turbine/generator train and support systems, surface condenser, boiler feedwater pumps, and auxiliary pumps and equipment. This building will be equipped with a maintenance bridge crane for servicing the major machinery within. The building has also been designed to allow direct loading and unloading of flatbed delivery truck by means of a drive-in bay on the first floor of the building.

A control/maintenance/visitor's center building which will house all power island and main operations overseeing functions, offices, showers, restrooms, spare parts storage, and maintenance areas. In addition, a complete visitor's center with conference room and reception area will be included in this building.

Other miscellaneous buildings on the site include the coal unloading building, the ash leading building, and water treatment buildings. All buildings will be constructed with an architectural siding to accomplish a "commercial" look for the facility which will compliment the architecture of the existing P. H. Glatfelter Company structures.

D. Major Equipment List

A list of major equipment include:

- One Foster Wheeler Circulating Fluidized Bed Boiler (CFB)
- One Steam Turbine Generator
- One Single Flue Stack
- Eight Compartment Baghouse & I.D. Fan
- Coal, Ash and Limestone Handling Equipment
- Water Treatment System
- Three Boiler Feed Pumps (electric motor driven)
- Emergency Boiler Feed Pump (steam-turbine driven)
- Eight Cell Cooling Tower
- Condenser
- Power Transformers and Switchyard
- Distributed Control System
- Fire Protection system

Miscellaneous Buildings (administration, maintenance/control, guard and utility)
Railroad Spur and Fuel Unloading System
Seven Feedwater Heaters Plus Deaerator
Primary and Secondary Air Fans
Emergency Diesel Generator
Two Fly Ash, Two Bed Ash, and Two Sorbent (Limestone/Dolomite) Steel Silos
Five 56'-0" Diameter Remote Coal Storage Silos
Four Steel Coal Bunkers

III. PROJECT SITE

A. Site Location

The approximately 38-acre site proposed for the YCEP cogeneration facility is located in North Codorus Township, York County, Pennsylvania (Figure 2). The parcel is bounded on the west by the P. H. Glatfelter Roundwood facility, on the south by Pennsylvania Route 116, and on the east and north by Kessler Pond and the mill pond (an impoundment of the west branch of Codorus Creek) and the west branch of Codorus Creek. The site is situated approximately eight miles southwest of York, Pennsylvania.

Land uses in the vicinity of the site are mixed. The P. H. Glatfelter paper mill is the closest industrial use. Small commercial uses and a cluster of eight residences characterize development along Route 116 south of the site. Agricultural uses exist west and north of the site.

The site is located near major transportation facilities. An existing rail line owned by Yorkrail, with a right-of-way through the P. H. Glatfelter property, is located just to the north of the proposed cogeneration site. Rail access would be provided to the YCEP site by construction of a new rail spur from the existing rail line into the YCEP facility. This new rail spur would provide for efficient coal delivery with minimal impact to the existing community transportation infrastructure. Convenient roadway access is available from Route 116 by way of the existing driveway to the P. H. Glatfelter Company Roundwood facility. Route 116 connects with Route 30, a major east-west arterial roadway, approximately six miles northeast of the site. Interstate 83, approximately 10 miles east of the site, provides regional access from the north and south, through its interchange in York with Route 30.

B. Facility Description

YCEP proposes to construct, own and operate a 227 MW cogeneration facility consisting of one CFB boiler and supporting equipment. The

proposed YCEP facility would be designed to operate continuously (24 hours per day, 365 days per year), with the exception of outages for maintenance purposes. Facility output would vary between 114 and 227 MW, depending on Met-Ed's hourly power requirements. When operating at less than full capacity, coal and limestone use would be decreased. The steam generated in the CFB boiler would be used to drive a steam turbine to produce electricity for sale to Met-Ed. A portion of the high pressure steam exiting the steam turbine would be sold to the P. H. Glatfelter Company for use in its paper mill operations.

As part of this operation, the P. H. Glatfelter Company would be curtailing operation of one of their existing coal-fired boilers. During periods when the YCEP CFB unit is down for maintenance, Power Boiler #4 would operate to provide the steam supply needed for the paper mill operation.

The primary fuel supply for the proposed cogeneration facility would be United States eastern bituminous coal from western Pennsylvania and/or West Virginia. Run-of-mine (coal as produced at the mine) would be washed at the coal mine preparation plant, loaded into rail cars, and delivered to the YCEP site by rail. The washed coal would have a sulfur content of two percent or less. Propane would be used as supplemental fuel under limited circumstances (for example, during facility startup when this supplemental fuel would be needed to operate the start-up burners in the CFB boiler to warm the CFB boiler prior to firing the coal fuel). The propane would be stored on-site in three 30,000-gallon horizontal tanks located north of the boiler baghouse.

An artist's rendering of the proposed YCEP cogeneration facility is provided in Figure 3 and the site plan is presented in Figure 4. These drawings show that project operations would be completely enclosed. Landscaping and berming would be incorporated into the facility design to screen ground level activities from Route 116. The new rail spur would be designed to ensure that rail cars delivering coal to the site are accommodated completely off the main line to eliminate potential impact to rail traffic on the Yorkrail line.

C. P. H. Glatfelter Company

PHG is a manufacturer of printing, writing and specialty papers. PHG operates three paper mills located in Spring Grove, Pennsylvania, Pisgah Forest, North Carolina and Neenah, Wisconsin, respectively. The company is headquartered in Spring Grove which is also the location of its largest mill and near the site of the proposed YCEP facility.

The Spring Grove mill manufactures printing and writing papers. The mill employs 1200, 800 of whom are represented by the United Paperworkers International Union. The facility is electrically self-sufficient, capable of

producing over 1.1 million pounds of steam per hour from three coal-fired boilers and one chemical recovery boiler (which recently replaced two older boilers). One of PHG's coal-fired boilers is a CFB which began operating in 1989. Steam provided by the YCEP facility will obviate the need to continuously operate an existing pulverized coal boiler (called the No. 4 boiler) which has been in use since the 1950's. As a result, overall emissions of sulfur dioxide will be cut in half, and net emissions of nitrogen oxides and particulate matter will be reduced by more than 20%.

D. Specific Site Parameters (North Codorus Township)

For the site, the P. H. Glatfelter key design basis criteria include:

Site Size	38 acres
One Foster Wheeler Circulating Fluidized Bed Boiler:	2,100,000 lb/hr
One Turbine-Generator:	227 MW Net
Start-Up Fuel:	Propane
Auxiliary Boiler Fuel:	None
Coal Delivery:	Rail via Spur
Disposal of Bed and Fly Ash:	Trucks to Offsite Disposal
Voltage:	115 kV
Power Purchaser:	Metropolitan Edison Company
Export Steam Host:	P. H. Glatfelter Company
Steam Flow:	
575 psig/680°F	400,000 lb/hr Maximum 300,000 lb/hr Nominal
Cooling Water Make-Up Source:	P. H. Glatfelter Company Wastewater Treatment Plant
Condensate Return:	100%

E. Plant Equipment Overview

Coal will be delivered to the site via unit trains roughly every 4 to 5 days at full facility capacity. The coal will be unloaded in an enclosed building and conveyed to storage silos for later use. Limestone will be delivered via truck and loaded pneumatically into storage silos for later use.

The boiler will use approximately 98.5 tons per hour of coal and 18.2 tons per hour of limestone to produce 2.1 mm lbs/hr of 2,550 psig steam at 1,005°F. The steam is sent to the "utility style" reheat condensing turbine which has a combined high and intermediate pressure section along with a low pressure section to produce approximately 250 gross MW of electricity. Of that electricity, 227 MW will be sold to Met-Ed under a power sales agreement.

Combustion gas produced by the boiler is sent through a baghouse where the gas is filtered and directed to the stack.

The facility's gray water treatment system consists of a series of clarifiers and mixing tanks which take gray water from the PHG paper making operation and produce water of adequate quality for all uses in the facility with the exception of potable needs.

The demineralization system includes three trains each capable of producing 500 gpm of demin water (total facility need is 1000 gpm). Each train consists of anion, cation, and mixed beds along with all regeneration equipment, regeneration waste neutralization equipment, chemical storage and injection equipment, and a 360,000 gallon storage tank.

The cooling tower will provide more than 100,000 gpm of water to the surface condenser along with additional minor flows to other facility uses.

The facility auxiliary power needs of approximately 21 MW will be met by the turbine/generator when the facility is operating. When the facility is down, Met-Ed can back feed the facility from the main step-up transformer.

Control, monitoring, optimization and load following, billing, guarantee administration and stack emission monitoring of the facility will be accomplished using a state-of-the-art distributed control system ("DCS").

Fire protection of the facility will be provided by an underground piping system which will service hydrant stations and sprinkler systems water will be provided from a fire water pump package taking supply from the Codorus creek adjacent to the facility. The pump package will be located so as to take water supply from the same intake structure as the existing PHG fire water and back-up water supply pumps.

Several off-site features are associated with the proposed YCEP project. These are:

- an electrical interconnection with the existing Met-Ed system;
- a steam line connecting the facility with the P. H. Glatfelter Company;
- a condensate return line from the P. H. Glatfelter Company to the facility;
- connections to and from the P. H. Glatfelter Company's water systems for water supplies and wastewater disposal; and
- a connection to Spring Grove Water Company.

Each is briefly described below.

Electric Interconnection

The YCEP facility will interconnect with Met-Ed's system in two areas. The first electric interconnection proposed would be a single circuit 115 kV line which would interconnect with an existing Met-Ed 115 kV line.

The second area would be a 115 kV double circuit line extending north from the YCEP site across Codorus Creek and would tie into an existing Met-Ed 115 kV line on the P. H. Glatfelter plant site.

During construction, electricity would be provided by Met-Ed through a connection with Met-Ed's existing system. Telephone cables, providing phone service to the on-site construction office, would be strung from lines extending along Route 116.

Steam Line/Condensate Return Line

A 18-inch steam line would be required to transport process steam from the proposed cogeneration facility to the P. H. Glatfelter Company. The insulated steam line would be supported aboveground on piers, with the exception of locations where the line traverses transportation features. The steam line would extend from the proposed YCEP facility in an easterly direction, crossing the breakwater between Kessler Pond and the mill pond before crossing the Codorus Creek on an existing P. H. Glatfelter Company pipe bridge. The condensate return line (eight inch) from the P. H. Glatfelter Company would closely parallel the steam line route.

Water Supply Line

A small portion of the total facility water (primary potable water) need is proposed to be supplied from the Spring Grove Water Company. The interconnection would be via an eight-inch supply line which would interconnect with an existing Spring Grove Water Company line along a private road, owned by P. H. Glatfelter Company, leading to the P. H. Glatfelter Company primary wastewater treatment facility. The line would follow the private road, cross under S.R. 116, cross the P. H. Glatfelter Company truck parking lot, then extend over the breakwater between Kessler Pond and the mill pond to the facility. Process and raw water back-up supplied by P. H. Glatfelter would be met by a six-inch supply line extending across the breakwater, then north across the existing pipe bridge. A temporary interconnection to P. H. Glatfelter Company along this route would also be used to supply water needs during the construction period.

The supply of the P. H. Glatfelter Company treated wastewater to the cogeneration facility for plant cooling would be handled by a 14-inch pipeline constructed from the treatment plant effluent area to the east side of the YCEP facility. This preferred pipeline route would run along corridors which contain existing underground pipelines. This route would cross the breakwater between Kessler Pond and the mill pond, extend through the P. H. Glatfelter parking lot and under Route 116, and continue along a private road to the P. H. Glatfelter Company wastewater treatment plant. A ten-inch firewater line would also be run from the P. H. Glatfelter Company intake structure, across the breakwater to the proposed YCEP facility.

Wastewater Discharge Lines

The proposed YCEP facility wastewater (cooling tower blowdown and treated sanitary wastewater) would be discharged to the P. H. Glatfelter wastewater treatment system equalization basin. The preferred route for the connection to the equalization basin would be a corridor heading east across the breakwater, through the P. H. Glatfelter parking lot, under Route 116, and along a private road to the equalization basin. This route would be the same as the route for cooling water make-up.

In addition, a line would be run from the P. H. Glatfelter equalization basin to the secondary treatment unit to handle additional flow. This line would parallel the route for the cooling water make-up pipeline.

F. Detailed Equipment Descriptions

The following sections provide a detailed description of each of the major equipment groups.

1. Circulating Fluidized Bed Boiler Design

Fuel is fed to the base of the combustor along both the front and back walls and sorbent is fed to the base of the combustor along the front wall. Primary and secondary air flows to the combustor are provided by primary and secondary air fans. Before entering the combustor, these streams are preheated via heat exchange with the flue gases in the air heaters. The heart of the process is a circulating fluidized bed combustor in which the fuel is combusted while simultaneously capturing SO_2 . Selective non-catalytic reduction of NO_x emissions is accomplished through injection of aqueous ammonia or urea at the inlet to the cyclones. Solid particles entrained by the upflowing gas in the combustor exit the top of the combustor into cyclones which efficiently separate the flue gas from the entrained particles. The flue gas discharged from the cyclone is directed to the downstream convective section of the boiler and the captured solids are recycled to the base of the ACFB by means of standpipes, J-valves, and an INTREXTM fluidized bed Integrated Recycle Heat Exchanger. The J-valves provide a seal between the positive pressure in the lower furnace where the recycle solids are fed and the near ambient pressure in the cyclones. Refer to Figure 5 for an elevation of the CFB boiler.

Coarse ash material (bed ash) accumulating in the ACFB is removed from the bed using a specially designed directional grid and a fluidized bed stripper cooler. The bed ash is cooled by the fluidizing air flow to the stripper cooler. This heated air stream flows to the combustor along with the fines that are stripped out. The cooled bed ash will be conveyed to a bed ash silo. Fly ash collected in the air heaters, economizer, and baghouse hoppers will be pneumatically conveyed to the fly ash storage silo. Depending on the beneficial use for the by-product ash, the bed and fly ash streams may require additional processing to condition the ash.

Boiler feedwater is preheated in the economizer located in the convection heat recovery area. The preheated feedwater is then routed to the steam drum. From the steam drum, the pressurized water flows by natural circulation through the waterwall sections of the ACFB combustor and the INTREXTM heat exchanger. Steam generated in the waterwall boiling circuits is routed to the cyclone enclosure walls, the convection heat recovery area enclosure walls, the primary superheater, and then on to the intermediate and finishing steam coils located in the

INTREX™ heat exchanger. This superheated steam flow is expanded through a high pressure steam turbine. A portion of the steam exiting the high pressure turbine flows through a reheater located in the convective heat recovery area. The reheated steam is expanded through an intermediate pressure steam turbine to extract additional power.

A description of the major components which comprise the coal-fired ACFB cogeneration plant is given below.

Circulating Fluidized Bed Combustor

Coal and sorbent, such as limestone, are fed into the lower, refractory-lined portion of the atmospheric circulating fluidized bed where these feedstock materials are mixed with the bed material and initial combustion occurs. To support combustion of the coal, a substoichiometric amount of air is fed to the base of the unit and additional air is injected at two different elevations above the primary air feed location. The total air flow is approximately 20% in excess of stoichiometric requirements. Primary air enters through a specially designed air distribution grid. This process of staging the air flow to the combustor minimizes the formation of NO_x within the unit. In addition, the relatively low operating temperature of the ACFB combustor of 1550-1650°F also minimizes NO_x formation. The sorbent is fed to the bed to capture SO₂ formed by the combustion of sulfur-containing fuel. Calcium carbonate is calcined to calcium oxide *in-situ* which subsequently reacts with SO₂ and O₂ to stabilize the sulfur in the form of calcium sulfate. Maintaining the bed temperature at approximately 1600°F is also necessary for effective sulfur capture and to minimize sorbent consumption.

The upflowing combustion gases entrain the fine ash, char, and sorbent particles producing a net flow of solids up through the combustor. The combustor temperature is maintained by efficient transfer of heat from the gas-solid suspension to the waterwall tubes. Solids entrained from the bed, including unburned char and unreacted sorbent particles, are captured by hot cyclones and returned to the ACFB combustor. This promotes improved combustion and sorbent utilization efficiency. The recycled solids are also cooled upon passing through the steam-cooled cyclones and the INTREX™ heat exchanger. A side elevation drawing of the INTREX™ unit is given in Figure 6. The cooled recycle solids stream also helps to moderate the temperatures within the combustor. Coarse ash particles are removed from the bottom of the combustor as bed ash. Additional heat is recovered from flue gas and fine ash particles escaping the cyclones within the convective section of the boiler. The fly ash is captured in a baghouse before the cooled flue gas is exhausted through a stack.

Spent Bed Material Cooling System

Coarse coal ash, spent sorbent, and calcium sulfate must be removed from the bottom of the ACFB boiler to control solids inventory in the lower region of the boiler. Directional air distributor nozzles are used on the furnace floor to direct coarse material to the drain openings on each furnace sidewall. The solid flow pattern along the base of the combustor causes the bed ash material to drain to the stripper cooler and also maximizes the residence time of the large fuel particles in the combustor to reduce unburned carbon levels in the bed ash. Four (4) 50% capacity fluidized bed stripper/coolers are designed to selectively remove oversized bed material and return fine material back into the furnaces to increase the solids residence time. The stripper/cooler is a refractory lined box with three fluidized compartments; one stripper zone and two cooling zones. A fraction of combustion air is used to strip and cool the spent bed material to an acceptable temperature level for disposal. Sensible heat in the spent bed material is recovered by injecting the stripping and cooling air back to the furnace as part of the secondary air for combustion.

Water Steam Circuitry

The circulating fluid bed design is comprised of four distinct sections: the furnace, the hot cyclones, the INTREX™ heat exchanger, and the heat recovery area (HRA). All four sections are top supported and are comprised of water or steam cooled enclosures. Use of integrally welded steam generating walls as the enclosure is in accordance with modern design practice and provides both the required cooling and the structural support. The steam circuitry is designed for natural circulation and includes a single drum located above the furnace and between the furnace and cyclones. The boiler is designed to turn down to 40 percent of MCR capacity without firing auxiliary fuel and to have a steam temperature control range between 75% and 100% MCR load.

Boiler feedwater enters the unit at the inlet to the bare tube economizer located in the convection heat recovery area. Water flows through the banks of horizontal coils countercurrent to the flue gas, exiting at the outlet header. Feedwater is then routed to the steam drum. Steam generated in the boiling circuits is separated by the steam drum internals. The steam drum internals are designed to efficiently separate the steam/water mixture, and to insure that the steam leaving the drum is moisture free and of high purity. In addition, the drum internals distribute the flow of incoming water and steam throughout the drum to maintain even drum metal temperatures. The internals consist of

horizontal centrifugal separators located along the side of the drum and unit Chevron drier assemblies arranged along the top of the drum.

Steam leaving the drum through the Chevron dryers is routed to the cyclone circular enclosure walls, HRA enclosure walls, the HRA primary superheater, and then on to the intermediate and finishing superheater coils located in the INTREXTM heat exchanger. Two spray type atomizers are provided, located between the primary and the intermediate superheaters and between the intermediate and finishing superheaters to provide control of the final steam temperature. This type of atomization will afford excellent control flexibility and will not adversely affect steam purity.

Reheat steam enters the unit at the reheater inlet header located in the parallel pass HRA. Steam flows through the reheater banks of horizontal coils countercurrent to the flue gas flow, exiting at the outlet header. Reheat temperature control is achieved through simple flue gas flow proportioning thereby eliminating the need for spray-type atomizers.

Thermal DeNOx System

Low level emissions of NOx generated by the oxidation of fuel nitrogen within the ACFB combustor will be further reduced by decomposing NOx into N₂, O₂, and H₂O using non-catalytic reduction with ammonia. Aqueous ammonia or urea will be injected directly into the flue gas in the (4) ducts connecting the cyclones to the combustor. At this location, the temperature of the flue gas at 100% MCR will be approximately 1630°F. At this temperature the NOx reduction reactions proceed at a sufficient rate to achieve a NOx reduction level of 50%. Since staged combustion and low combustion temperatures already contribute to significantly lower NOx emissions than achieved with conventional pulverized coal boilers, extremely low NOx emissions will be achieved by combining the two technologies.

Technical Challenges in Scale Up of ACFB Design

Evolution of ACFB Technology in U.S.

The size of the YCEP ACFB combustor represents a significant increase in scale over existing ACFB combustors. Currently, the largest single ACFB boilers are the 150 MWe Texas-New Mexico ACFB and the 165 MWe Pt. Aconi Nova Scotia, ACFB. However, when the YCEP project is started up in late 1997, it will become the largest ACFB combustor, capable of generating 227 MWe of net electrical power and

electrical power and up to 400,000 lb/hr of export steam. This scale will be most representative for potential utility-scale ACFB applications.

A significant challenge in the design of the single combustor ACFB for the YCEP project was to anticipate the influence that the scale of the combustor would have on its design and performance. The following sections will discuss several important considerations in designing a 227 MWe ACFB combustor having maximum certainty of successful operation. The major design features to be discussed include:

- Flexibility of Thermal Design
- Solids Mixing/Feed Distribution
- Cyclone Separator Design/Configuration

Design of ACFB Waterwall Surface

In scaling up the design of ACFB combustors, proper thermal design is important to control the temperature within the combustor. A properly designed ACFB combustor will operate at uniform 1,600-1,650°F temperatures, which will permit combustion to take place below the ash fusion temperature while providing optimal SO₂ capture with calcium-based sorbents and reduced NO_x formation. This is achieved by balancing the heat released by the combustion process with the heat absorbed within the boiler. Heat absorption is achieved by withdrawing heat from the gas-solid suspension within the boiler, the cyclones, and INTREX™ heat exchanger. Adequate temperature control and solids distribution/mixing are essential to attaining high combustion efficiencies and minimal gaseous emission rates.

Since the fluidizing velocity of ACFB's is held constant, the cross-sectional area of the combustor increases proportionately with the firing rate. However, as the bed cross section increases, the ratio of bed volume per unit of wall heat transfer surface area increases. As the cross-sectional area increases for a unit of a given height, the amount of heat that can be removed through the waterwalls becomes a smaller fraction of the firing rate.

One method of obtaining the total required heat transfer surface is to increase the combustor height; however, the heat transfer surface that is introduced with added height is least effective at removing heat. This occurs because the rate of heat transfer varies with the solid suspension density and the solid suspension density in the YCEP combustor decreases rapidly with height until reaching a constant value in the upper furnace. This results in a more predictable heat absorption in the upper furnace. Furthermore, a lower density in the upper furnace results

up to 400,000 lb/hr of export steam. This scale will be most representative for potential utility-scale ACFB applications.

A significant challenge in the design of the single combustor ACFB for the YCEP project was to anticipate the influence that the scale of the combustor would have on its design and performance. The following sections will discuss several important considerations in designing a 227 MWe ACFB combustor having maximum certainty of successful operation. The major design features to be discussed include:

- Flexibility of Thermal Design
- Solids Mixing/Feed Distribution
- Cyclone Separator Design/Configuration

Design of ACFB Waterwall Surface

In scaling up the design of ACFB combustors, proper thermal design is important to control the temperature within the combustor. A properly designed ACFB combustor will operate at uniform 1,600-1,650°F temperatures, which will permit combustion to take place below the ash fusion temperature while providing optimal SO₂ capture with calcium-based sorbents and reduced NO_x formation. This is achieved by balancing the heat released by the combustion process with the heat absorbed within the boiler. Heat absorption is achieved by withdrawing heat from the gas-solid suspension within the boiler, the cyclones, and INTREX™ heat exchanger. Adequate temperature control and solids distribution/mixing are essential to attaining high combustion efficiencies and minimal gaseous emission rates.

Since the fluidizing velocity of ACFB's is held constant, the cross-sectional area of the combustor increases proportionately with the firing rate. However, as the bed cross section increases, the ratio of bed volume per unit of wall heat transfer surface area increases. As the cross-sectional area increases for a unit of a given height, the amount of heat that can be removed through the waterwalls becomes a smaller fraction of the firing rate.

One method of obtaining the total required heat transfer surface is to increase the combustor height; however, the heat transfer surface that is introduced with added height is least effective at removing heat. This occurs because the rate of heat transfer varies with the solid suspension density and the solid suspension density in the YCEP combustor decreases rapidly with height until reaching a constant value in the upper furnace. This results in a more predictable heat absorption in the upper furnace. Furthermore, a lower density in the upper furnace results

in less heat release, which is consistent with the lower heat absorption in the upper furnace.

In the YCEP ACFB design, the required amount of heat is removed through addition of a water-cooled, full division wall extending along the entire height of the combustor. This development introduces additional heat transfer surface throughout the entire furnace height. The division wall reduces the ratio of bed volume to the heat transfer surface area to a value that is typical of existing, smaller ACFB combustors.

Other advantages of the full division wall include:

- *More uniform temperature distribution in the ACFB.* In comparison with a single chamber design, the division wall will help to produce more uniform temperatures across the ACFB due to the more even distribution of heat transfer surface throughout the combustor cross section.
- *Lower unit height.* A full division wall will allow combustor height to be constrained to that required for the cyclones rather than that required to achieve the necessary waterwall surface. Capital cost savings result by eliminating the need for additional structural steel, platforms and building enclosures. Reduced combustor height will also typically result in a lower stack height.

Special design features included in the proposed furnace division wall include:

- *Pressure Equalization Openings*

From the furnace floor to a height of about 12 ft., the fins between adjacent division wall tubes are removed. This allows the tubes to be bumped sideways, in-plane, to form multiple openings. Additional openings are also provided in the upper furnace over a 12 ft. span beneath the cyclone inlet. The openings in the upper furnace are located beneath the cyclone inlets to minimize lateral cross-flow of solids through the openings. The division wall openings function to equalize the pressure on both sides of the division wall.

The pressure equalization openings eliminate differential forces on the division wall, which simplifies the mechanical design. Also, a uniform air flow can be maintained across the width of the unit. Excess oxygen in the flue gas can be monitored at a common location at the heat recovery area exit and secondary air flow can be

modulated to maintain the desired excess air level. Independent monitoring and modulating controls for each side of the division wall are not required.

- *Wear Resistant Design*

At the pressure equalization openings the division wall tubing is protected with the same high conductivity, erosion resistant refractory used on the lower furnace enclosure walls, roof, cyclone inlet walls, and the cyclones. The phosphate-bonded, high-alumina refractory which contains stainless steel reinforcing fibers is mounted on a high density stud pattern to a thickness of 1/2 inch. All the tubes are kept in plan so as not to protrude into the gas/solids flow stream for direct impingement. In this manner, the division wall will be no different from the water cooled enclosure walls which also have openings for solids cooler drains and fuel, limestone, and secondary air feeds.

- *Differential Thermal Growth*

The division wall is welded where it penetrates the air distributor and is held in tension by springs fixed at the top of the unit. A gap is provided between the division wall and the front and rear walls of the furnace. Since the division wall is heated on both sides while the enclosure walls are heated only on one side, the average division wall tube temperature will be slightly hotter than that of the enclosure walls. The support arrangement with no mechanical attachment to the enclosure walls allows both the division wall and the enclosure walls to independently grow downward at their respective rates. Foster Wheeler has designed numerous steam-cooled full division walls on pulverized coal fired steam generators. Steam cooled division walls have more stringent design requirements for differential thermal growth than do water-cooled division walls.

Solids Mixing/Feed Distribution

Solid mixing plays an important role in determining the performance of ACFB combustors. As the combustor scale increases, changes in several design parameters can affect how well the fuel and sorbent are distributed in the combustor. Data taken from other commercial ACFB plants will be presented to show that poor solid mixing can result in inefficient plant operation and higher plant operating costs.

The factors which are thought to influence the degree of solid mixing in the lower region of ACFB's are placed in three categories: (a) mixing

due to external solid recirculation, (b) mixing due to internal solid recirculation, (c) mixing limitations caused by solids feeder configuration and boiler dimensions.

Impact of Poor Solid Distribution

Nonuniform fuel distribution results in increased consumption of sorbent to achieve the same SO₂ emission level and may also increase the NO_x generation rate. With increased NO_x generation, NH₃ consumption increases to achieve the same level of NO_x emissions and the NH₃ slip (flow of unreacted NH₃) also increases. When burning coals containing chlorine, greater NH₃ slip increases the potential for NH₄Cl formation. Poor fuel distribution will also lead to a reduction in combustion efficiency through increased hydrocarbon and CO emissions, and increased calcination heat losses. Nonuniform fuel distribution may lead to oxygen deficient reducing zones that cause bed agglomeration and slagging problems, and may produce local hot spots within the combustor.

Factors Affecting Sorbent Utilization

The factors which are thought to influence sorbent utilization include: sorbent and fuel properties, solid mixing, combustor temperature, fuel and sorbent distribution, and cyclone grade efficiency. Important sorbent properties include the reactivity, friability, and feed size distribution. These properties will help determine how long the sorbent stays in the ACFB, how it is distributed between the lower and upper furnace, the extent to which the particle breaks apart to expose fresh CaO, and the reaction rate. Important fuel properties include: volatile content, reactivity, sulfur content and forms (organic, pyritic, sulfatic), and feed size distribution. The firing rate per fuel feeder will determine the local concentration of fuel at the feeder outlet. Increasing the firing rate per feeder will (for more volatile and reactive fuels) increase the reaction rate within this region, which will result in zones of low O₂ and high SO₂ gaseous concentrations and elevated local temperatures. Combustor temperature plays an important role due to the strong dependence of the sulfur capture reactions and combustion reactions on temperature. Sorbent distribution is also important to ensure a uniform concentration of unreacted CaO in the ACFB at the location where the SO₂ is released. The extent of solid mixing in the ACFB will help determine how well the fuel and sorbent are distributed. Finally, a cyclone with high capture efficiency for fines will retain the fine unreacted sorbent particles in the ACFB longer to react more completely. It should be noted that the YCEP ACFB boiler has a relatively short mixing zone, a distinct lower furnace bed that uses

relatively coarse fuel and sorbent, as well as air swept fuel distributors, which promote more effective mixing in the furnace.

Cyclone Separator Design and Configuration

Another design issue important to the successful scale up of ACFB combustors is the design of the cyclone gas-solid separation system. As the size of the combustor increases, the mass flow of gas and solids exiting the top of the combustor to the cyclones increases proportionally (given same particle size, combustor height, etc.). One method of performing this separation with the increased flow of particle-laden gas is to increase the size of the cyclone. Unfortunately, as the cyclone size (diameter) increases the centrifugal force field is reduced (at the same gas inlet velocity) and the particle collection efficiency deteriorates. In the absence of high solids collection efficiency, smaller sorbent, carbon, and ash particles escape through the cyclone rather than being recycled to the combustor with the cyclone underflow. This would result in inefficient fuel and sorbent utilization and a reduction in inventory of particles capable of circulating and transferring heat. Another drawback of increased cyclone size is that the increased cyclone height may dictate increased combustor height for the solids recirculation system to function properly.

To enable high gas-solid separation efficiency with the YCEP ACFB boiler design the size of the cyclones was held similar to that utilized in smaller units. However, to accommodate the increased gas flow rate the number of cyclones was increased.

The cyclone separator designs features steam cooling and is an integral part of the steam superheat circuit. Steam cooling of the cyclones offers the following advantages:

- Faster unit start-up
- Reduced heat losses
- Reduced requirements for high-temperature refractory ductwork and expansion joints

Technical Innovation

The following section describes several innovative features of the ACFB system design:

INTREX™ Integrated Recycle Heat Exchanger

The INTREX™ heat exchanger is simply an unfired fluidized bed heat exchanger with a non-mechanical means for diverting solids. It will

take advantage of the high heat transfer coefficients for tubes immersed in bubbling fluidized beds and will also operate advantageously with fine (200 micron) particles. Due to the fine recycle solids and the low fluidizing velocities (0.5 to 1.5 ft/s), tube erosion will not be a concern. The INTREX™ heat exchanger allows for part of the heat released in the combustor to be removed outside of the combustor. This method of heat removal will eliminate the need for excessively tall combustors or the need to install furnace panels which protrude into the erosive flow in the combustor and are subject to excessive wear.

The INTREX™ heat exchanger will be enclosed by the same water-cooled membrane construction used in the furnace. The integrated configuration will allow it to grow downward with the rest of the boiler steam/water pressure parts, minimizing differential thermal movement. Placement of serpentine superheater coils within the recirculated solids flow path enables the entire reheater to be located in a conventional parallel pass heat recovery area. Final main steam temperature will be controlled by spray water attemperation, while reheat steam temperature will be controlled by gas flow proportioning in the heat recovery area.

FWEC has extensive experience in the design of atmospheric bubbling fluidized bed (BFB) heat exchangers from the 46 BFB steam generators that it has designed and put into operation. Scale up of the INTREX™ BFB is not an issue since the main cell in the 130-MW Northern States Power Black Dog unit is about four times greater in plan area than the largest INTREX cell in the YCEP ACFB. The INTREX™ heat exchanger will be divided into four cells.

DOE Clean Coal Demonstration Tests

This demonstration program is designed to provide the following important information:

- Demonstrate unit start up and shut down capabilities and provide data and experience on ACFB boiler operation during these transients.
- Demonstrate ACFB boiler dispatching capabilities and constraints.
- Demonstrate ACFB boiler operation at full-load conditions for extended periods and continuous operation at part-load conditions.
- Provide quantitative results from a systematic study on the effects of important operating parameters and fuel characteristics on boiler performance which will aid in the optimum economic design and operation of future units.

- Identify constraints governing fuel selection based on test results from four different fuels.
- Provide guidelines for inspection and maintenance along with information on maintenance costs.

Included in the test program are specific operating tests to evaluate the effects of the following operating parameters on ACFB performance:

- Fuel size and quality
- Sorbent size and quality
- Fuel and sorbent rates
- Combustor temperature
- Excess air
- Primary/secondary air ratio

Specific boiler performance parameters to be quantified include:

- Boiler thermal efficiency
- Steam/Electrical Generation Capacity
- Ability to control steam temperature and pressure
- Ash production and quality
- Bed ash/fly ash split
- Unburned carbon losses in bed and fly ash
- Stack emissions: NO_x, SO₂, CO, VOC and particulate
- Power consumption of auxiliary equipment
- Percent SO₂ capture and Ca/S ratio
- Control of bed inventory
- Combustor temperature profile

Tests are proposed for four different coals: the design coal (basis for combustor design) and three test coals having different properties from the design coal. The purpose of performing tests with coals having properties which differ from the design coal is to determine what range of coal properties can be utilized and the impact of fuel characteristics on the performance and operating economics of the ACFB. Different sorbent materials would likely be used during the tests.

In addition to performing tests at 100% maximum continuous rating (MCR), tests would be performed to demonstrate operation of the boiler and other ACFB system components during start-up, shutdown, and dispatch of the facility. To demonstrate the capability of the system, a 30-day test with the boiler operating at a minimum of 96% MCR is proposed.

2. Boiler Pilot Plant Tests

a. Introduction and Summary

A pilot plant test burn was conducted by Foster Wheeler Development Corporation at their Livingston, New Jersey facility.

The objective of the test burn was to evaluate certain coals and limestones for possible use in the project. The test burn took on more importance after a series of bench scale and pilot plant screening tests showed that certain limestones had potential attrition problems. Accordingly, the test protocol was set up to first evaluate the attrition problems. Accordingly, the test protocol was set up to first evaluate the attrition potential of the limestone and then generate performance and emission data.

b. Pilot Plant Test Facility

The circulating fluidized bed combustion pilot plant and laboratory facilities located at Foster Wheeler Development Corporation in Livingston, New Jersey, were utilized for the test program. These facilities are described below:

Circulating Fluidized Bed Pilot Plant

The new test unit, which has a capacity of approximately 2,000 lb/h of superheated steam, is capable of operation in either the bubbling or circulating bed mode. The unit is dedicated to the advancement of the technology and incorporates the latest design features including a welded waterwall furnace enclosure, a castable refractory-lined cyclone, and provisions for heat transfer surface adjustment in both the furnace and heat recovery area. A schematic of the CFB pilot unit is shown in Figure 7.

The fluidized bed test module is constructed of monowall and consists of a 48-ft-high combustion chamber, monowall-monowall-enclosed integral cyclone separator, and downflow heat recovery area. The 14-in. x 26-in. combustion chamber has a heat release capacity of 2 to 4 million Btu/h depending upon configuration. Heat transfer to the combustion chamber walls is limited by a 3-in. layer of medium-weight castable refractory.

Fluidizing air enters the combustor through a distribution grid mounted at the centerline of the lower waterwall headers.

Directional nozzles introduce the fluidized air. Thermocouple wells mounted through the distribution plate permit the monitoring of bed temperatures.

Air is supplied to the distribution plate plenum, start-up gas burners, fuel feed line, and overfire air ports by a positive displacement compressor rated at 1,000 aft^3/min and 18 psig. All air flows are metered by orifice plates fitted with electronic flow transmitters.

The freeboard space of the test module is fitted with adjustable levels of overfire air ports. Gas sampling, and thermocouple ports are provided on 1-ft vertical centers throughout the bed and freeboard zones.

The combustion gas-solids mixture exits the combustor and passes through the integral hot cyclone separator which has a corner volute inlet. The water wall enclosed separator is constructed of erosion resistant/castable refractory lining. The hot solids are separated from the gas and fall by gravity into a 6-in. standpipe which runs adjacent to the combustor along its outer wall. The solids are recycled back to the combustor by use of an aerated J-valve. Sample connections, pressure, and temperature ports are provided on the standpipe and J-valve.

The hot gas stream exits the cyclone and enters the heat recovery area where it is cooled. The cooled gas stream leaves the heat recovery area and passes through one of two parallel baghouses to remove particulates and ash.

A variable-speed I.D. fan is used to pull the gas through the system and discharge the gas from the pilot plant through a stack.

Sample ports for both batch sampling of solids and gases and continuous monitoring are provided at several levels in the test module. The control gas sampling port (used for both process control and acquisition of the continuous average gas analysis) is located in the heat recovery outlet flue where the gas temperature is approximately 450°F. A real-time gas analysis system provides continuous analyses for oxygen, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and total hydrocarbons.

c. Feedstock Characterization

Representative samples of coal and limestone sorbent were analyzed using standard physical, chemical and thermal techniques. Results

of these analyses provided the basis for stoichiometry calculations and the selection of pilot plant operating parameters.

Coal

Proximate, ultimate, heating value, and ash fusion results for the test coal are presented in the accompanying table. One coal was a high volatile bituminous coal from western Pennsylvania which has been cleaned to lower the ash and sulfur contents (5.9 percent and 1.4 percent, respectively). The ash fusion temperatures were moderately low in both reducing and oxidizing atmospheres. The ash was relatively high in iron (13.0 percent Fe_2O_3), which can form eutectics at temperatures above those encountered during normal CFB operation. The coal contained only a minor amount of fine material, with only 3 percent less than 200 mesh.

Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) was also performed on the coal utilizing a DuPont TA analyzer. The coal was first devolatilized under a nitrogen atmosphere at a heating rate of $36^\circ\text{F}/\text{min}$ to a final temperature of $1,832^\circ\text{F}$. The reactivity of the resultant char was then evaluated in the TGA by burning it in air at a heating rate of $18^\circ\text{F}/\text{min}$. Compared to the other coal chars, the char appeared to have a relatively low reactivity and a high burnout temperature ($1,380^\circ\text{F}$). Other tested coals had a relatively low char burnout temperature ($1,200^\circ\text{F}$) in the TGA and CFB pilot plant carbon combustion efficiency as high as 96 percent. Based upon this TGA data, complete carbon burnout for the coal may be difficult to obtain in the pilot plant, especially due the relatively short gas residence time (2 seconds).

Limestone

Characterization of the limestone was achieved through elemental, size and thermal analyses. While the techniques for elemental and size analyses are well known, the TGA sorption test is equipment dependent and, therefore, has been summarized below.

Table - Coal Analysis

Sample Description: Coal-92-8-76					
Air Dry Loss, 3.86%			Equilibrium Moisture, %		
	As Received	Dry			
Proximate Analysis, wt%			Reactivity Index, °C		
Fixed Carbon	53.74	57.01	Activation Energy, cal/g-mol		
Volatile Matter	34.62	36.72	Hardgrove Index		
Ash	5.91	6.27	Free Swelling Index		
Moisture	5.73	---	Specific Gravity		
Total	100.00	100.00	Viscosity		
Ultimate Analysis, wt%			Ash Fusion Temperature, °F		
Carbon	75.25	79.83		Red.	Oxid.
Hydrogen	4.77	5.06	Initial Deform.	2220	2186
Oxygen	5.23	5.54	Soft. Temp. Sph.	2259	2190
Nitrogen	1.69	1.79	Soft. Temp. Hem.	2269	2198
Sulfur	1.42	1.51	Fluid Temp.	2272	2207
Ash	5.91	6.27			
Moisture	5.73	---			
Total	100.00	100.00			
HHV, Btu/lb	13,438	14,255			
Sulfitic S	---	---			
Pyritic S	---	---			
Organic S	---	---			
Remarks: Dulong's = 14,381 Btu/lb					

The general procedure used for limestone reactivity measurements is as follows: The sample was first ground and screened to -100 mesh +200 mesh. This size cut was chosen because the specific surface area contained provides good weight response over a wide range of stone activities. Then using a specially modified TGA, the sample was calcined under nitrogen and immediately sulfated isothermally at 1,550°F under an artificial atmosphere. The synthesized gas contained 5 percent oxygen, 2,000 ppm sulfur dioxide and the balance nitrogen. Changes in weight of the stone sample during sulfation were recorded versus time to provide data related to reaction rate and extent of reaction.

The limestone was fairly low in calcium and the ASTM ash yielded 79.7 percent CaO. TGA sorption results indicated that the stone had a moderate reactivity. Based upon the limestone analysis and the TGA sulfation weight gain, one limestone had a 37.3 percent calcium utilization in the TGA. The TGA calcium utilization is usually greater than 50 percent for high reactivity stones and less than 30 percent for poor reactivity stones.

A Rosin-Rammler plot indicates that the limestone size distribution contains a considerable amount of fines (21.5 percent less than 200 mesh), even though the D₅₀ is about 600 microns.

The hardness of this limestone was qualitatively assessed using the Hardgrove test. The limestone would be classified as moderately soft because it had an HI of 80. The change in sorbent particle size after calcination was also evaluated in a static bench-scale test. The limestone was first screened to obtain a 16 x 20 mesh size fraction, then calcined in a muffle furnace at 1,600°F for one hour. After calcination the limestone was screened again to assess the extent of decrepitation. This limestone showed only minor breakdown upon calcination and about 5 percent of the calcine passed a 20 mesh screen.

d. Test Results

Many of the issues to be resolved by the pilot plant test burn required extended periods of exposure, concentration of species or development of equilibrium conditions. To meet these varied needs, a 100-hour continuous test was opted for instead of several shorter duration tests. The first 24 hours of the run were used for stabilization of the unit, while the final 76 hours were used for performance evaluation. Conditions selected for initial operation were chosen on the basis of experience gained from other fuels. During the course of the run, the primary operating parameters of

temperature and air split were varied to document their effect on unit performance and operation.

Data collection for the run was performed periodically according to the following schedule. Solids samples of fuel, bed and baghouse ash were taken hourly and coincided with the manually determined baghouse ash flow rate. Limestone sorbent samples were taken at four-hour intervals. Feed rate, flow, temperature, pressure and flue gas composition data were logged at one-minute intervals by the data-acquisition system. Hourly operator log sheets supplemented the data acquisition system and provided an independent check.

At the conclusion of the run, all test data were reviewed and analyzed for stability. Representative test periods were then selected for performance evaluation. Following chemical analysis of the solids samples from these periods, mass balance and efficiency calculations were made. The hourly quart fuel samples taken from the coal silo were found to be consistent in both carbon and sulfur content (average 76.2 and 1.37 percent, respectively).

The coal rate for this test was held between 300 and 340 lb/h, corresponding to a heat input of up to 4.5×10^6 Btu/h. The bed temperature was varied from 1,550°F to 1,650°F in order to assess its effect on unit performance. Primary air stoichiometry was maintained at between 60 and 75 percent for the test run. The total air rate (coal feed air, primary air and secondary air) was set to achieve a superficial gas velocity in the freeboard of about 20 ft/s. The target sulfur capture was 92 percent for the entire test run.

Combustion Efficiency

Carbon combustion efficiency data values were computed using a carbon balance which excluded carbon monoxide in the flue gas. The carbon content of the coal was very consistent throughout the test run (75.2 to 77.3 percent) and an average value of 76.2 percent was used for efficiency calculations. The carbon loss from the system was computed from the organic carbon content in the hourly baghouse ash samples and a baghouse ash rate averaged for an eight-hour period around the set point.

The carbon combustion efficiencies ranged from about 88 to 93 percent. Combustor temperature was found to have a significant effect on carbon conversion. The average combustor temperature was obtained from thermocouples placed at about 10-ft intervals along the height of the combustor. A maximum combustion efficiency of about 92 to 93 percent was obtained at an average

combustor temperature of between 1,600°F and 1,625°F. A significant increasing carbon conversion should be obtained in a commercial-scale CFB compared to the pilot unit due to the longer gas residence time (5 vs. 2 seconds). For example, 5 to 6 percent higher combustion efficiencies have been obtained in commercial-scale units compared to the pilot plant when firing the same bituminous coals.

Gaseous Emissions

Average CO, NO_x, N₂O and SO₂ emissions for the test intervals in both the molar concentrations and their equivalent emissions in lb/10⁶ Btu have been corrected back to 39 percent O₂. This correction corresponds to 22 percent excess air (excluding unburned carbon) and was made to compensate for significant in-leakage which occurred during the test.

Carbon monoxide emissions ranged from about 0.12 to 0.26 lb/10⁶ Btu and were strongly dependent upon combustor temperature. The CO emissions were reduced by about 50 percent as the combustor temperature was increased from 1,525°F and 1,625°F. The relatively low carbon monoxide emissions (at higher temperatures) tend to indicate that carbon loss was not a result of combustion-related problems such as poor mixing within the combustor. Instead, the carbon loss was probably a result of fine char which could not be completely burned in the relatively short residence time and elutriated from the cyclone.

The target sulfur capture for the test run was 92 percent. The sulfur capture ranged from 89 to 95 percent at Ca/S ratios ranging from 2.5 to 3.8. An average coal sulfur content of 1.37 percent was used in these calculations. At bed temperatures greater than 1,625°F, a Ca/S ratio in excess of 3.5 was required to obtain sulfur capture levels greater than 90 percent. Significantly lower Ca/S ratios were required at lower bed temperatures to obtain in excess of 90 percent sulfur capture. For bed temperatures between 1,600°F and 1,625°F a Ca/S ratio of about 2.8 was required to obtain sulfur capture levels between 91 and 93 percent. This relatively high Ca/S ratio was probably due to the moderate reactivity of the limestone, coupled with the relative low sulfur content of the coal (1.37 percent).

Nitrogen oxide emissions (NO_x) ranged from 0.10 to 0.21 lb/10⁶ Btu and were strongly dependent upon combustor temperature. The NO_x emissions increased substantially as the average combustor temperature was increased from about 1,525°F and 1,625°F. Nitrous oxide emissions (N₂O) were observed to decrease by almost a factor

of two over the same temperature range. The conversion of fuel nitrogen to nitrogen oxide and nitrous oxide as a function of combustor temperature is consistent with previous pilot plant data obtained with bituminous coals. The nitrogen and nitrous oxide emissions are for set point periods with primary air stoichiometries ranging from 60 to 74 percent. Over this primary stoichiometry range, NO_x emissions increase with higher stoichiometries, while N₂O emissions remain essentially constant.

Ash Analysis and Control of Bed Inventory

No bed drains were required during the test run to maintain solids inventory, although several bed samples were taken for analysis. Essentially all of the carbon loss from the system occurred from carbon elutriated from the cyclone.

Although no bed drains were required to maintain solids inventory, substantial build-up of bed was observed during certain portions of the test run. However, the bed level fluctuated considerably due to changes in set point temperatures and primary air flows. The bed level was observed to decrease considerably as the bed temperature was increased to 1,650°F due to the decomposition of sulfated sorbent. Extended operation at lower bed temperatures and primary air flows would probably have required continual bed drains to maintain a specified bed level.

Analyses were performed on bed and baghouse samples to determine leachable components by the Toxic Characteristics Leaching Procedures (TCLP). This procedure is used to simulate the leaching which a waste would undergo if disposed in a sanitary landfill. The procedure involved extracting the ground ash samples with dilute acetic acid (0.5N) for 24 hours. The extract from the ash was then analyzed by inductively coupled plasma (ICP) analysis for the following elements: As, Se, Hg, Cr, Cd, Pb, Ag and Ba. None of these elements were observed in the extract from the bed and baghouse ash samples.

The pH of the bed and baghouse ash samples in deionized water (5 percent ash/95 percent water) was also measured. The baghouse ash had a slightly higher pH than the bed ash (12.3 vs. 11.3). Based on the carbon-free compositions of the bed and baghouse ash samples analyses, the bed and baghouse ash samples contained 39.2 and 32.1 percent free CaO, respectively.

c. Conclusions

The pilot plant test program has demonstrated the feasibility of using certain coals and limestones. The following conclusions are provided to summarize the findings of the test program:

- Carbon combustion efficiencies of 89-93 percent were attained at operating temperatures between 1,520 and 1,620°F. Higher efficiencies can be expected in the commercial plant because of its increased furnace residence time.
- Bed inventory was maintained using limestone alone, however, little or no bed drain was required over the course of the test. Trends observed during the test suggest that the commercial unit will require some bed drain during operation.
- The sulfur capture target of 92 percent is readily achievable as evidenced by SO₂ captures in excess of 93 percent in eight of the fifteen test set points. Ca/S ratios of 2.4 to almost 4 were required due primarily to the less than average stone reactivity and the friable nature of the stone.
- NO_x and CO emissions should not present any permitting problems.
- No operational problems were encountered, i.e., bed agglomeration back and fouling.

3. Coal Handling and Storage

Washed coal would be delivered to the proposed facility via rail car. The rail cars would be unloaded inside the coal unloading building (a completely enclosed structure) where the coal would then be conveyed to storage silos. All coal transfer would occur via enclosed conveyors to minimize noise, dust, and exposure to rainfall. A 30,000-ton (approximately 12-day) supply of coal would be maintained in five 56 ft diameter enclosed storage silos. From the storage silos, the coal would be transferred by enclosed conveyance to the boiler house. Use of an enclosed conveyance and storage system would minimize the potential for fugitive dust emissions and solids discharge in stormwater runoff. Refer to Figure 8 for a fuel handling process flow diagram.

Fuel and Sorbent Preparation and Feed System

Bituminous coal is delivered to the site by rail and is stored in five 56 ft diameter coal storage silos with a 14 day storage capacity. The 2" x 0

size raw coal is then conveyed to crushers to be crushed to 1/2" x 0 size and stored in 4 in-plant coal silos. The crushed coal is extracted from the silos at variable rates, as required by the ACFB boiler, by gravimetric feeders and fed to both front and rear walls of the boiler.

Rotary Car Dumper System consists of:

- a. One rotary car dumper complete with platen, platen hooks, and rings, mechanical car clamps and tower, spill truss, rear truss, trunnions, trunnion support beams, 2 speed drive motor, drive chains, speed reducer, gear boxes, and car position sensors.
- b. One traveling hammermill complete with drive motors, shafts, and couplings, coupling guards, speed reducers, traversing rails, steel support frame, hammer shaft, and hammers.
- c. Limit switches, clamp position sensing and/or indicting devices, solenoids, speed switches, slow down switches, over-travel switches, stop switches, equipment space heaters, etc., necessary for the operation of the rotary car dumper and traveling hammermill.
- d. Proximity detectors or other devices required to sense, detect, or indicate the position and presence of cars on or in proximity to the rotary car dumper.
- e. A minimum of four mushroom-head pushbutton emergency stop switches.
- f. Electrically operated brakes as an integral part of motor.
- g. An alarm horn and flashing beacon lights.
- h. Design criteria for rotary car dumper.
 - 1) Dumper thrust wedges shall be designed for longitudinal thrust from an accelerating or decelerating locomotive up to 150,000 pounds.
 - 2) The rotary car dumper shall be designed for the following train loads.
 - a) Fully loaded, 4-axle, rotary coupled railcar:
125 to 150 tons (maximum gross weight on rail:
286,000 lbs.)
 - b) Fully loaded, 4-axle, random railcar:

75 to 150 tons

c) Main line locomotive with 6 axles:
up to 195 tons

- 3) Dumper shall be designed to make it as reliable and trouble-free as possible. It shall be constructed such that all parts subject to renewal or repair are easily accessible.
- 4) The dumper shall accommodate the dumping of coal into the dumper hopper by 25 ton dump trucks as shown on the reference drawings. This may require moving the end rings in toward the center of the dumper.
- 5) The dumper shall have a side wall that extends from 2'-9" above the top of the rail to a minimum of 13'-0" above the top of the rail and is a minimum of 50'-0" long. It shall support a loaded car on its side and distribute the load uniformly along the side of the car. Each end of the side wall plate shall have a car deflector to correct minor misalignment of cars.

Locomotive and Railcar Data:

- a. Coal will be delivered to the site via unit trains which consist of 80-100 open top, rotary-coupled railcars. The unit train will be separated into 20-car sections which will be maneuvered onto the rotary car dumper with a main line locomotive.
- b. Dumper design shall accommodate the following range of dimensions for the railcars and locomotives:
 - 1) Fully loaded, 4-axle, rotary coupled railcar:
 - height of box above rail: 13'-0"
 - height, top of rail to center of rotation of couplers: 2'-9"
 - maximum overall width: 10'-7"
 - length of box: 47'-10" to 48'-4"
 - pulling face to pulling face of couplers: 43'-1"
 - 2) Main line locomotive with 6 axles:
 - height from top of rail: up to 15'-9"
 - width (when trimmer): up to 10'-8"

3) Fully loaded, 4-axle, random railcars:

- height from top of rail: up to 13'-0"
- width: 10'-2" to 10'-7"
- length of box: 40'-0" to 47'-10"

High Angle Conveyors

- a. Three sandwich-type, high angle, silo feed conveyors C-2, C-4, and C-5 including a local control panel, and a steel frame structure for support and enclosure. The steel support structure shall include stairs and access platforms.
- b. One externally mounted, 4-person capacity elevator with open rack and pinion drive arrangement, support steel, and controls. The elevator shall have two entry doors on adjacent sides and will be installed next to conveyor C-2.
- c. Head chute, transition chutework, flop gage, support steel, stairs, and access platforms at the discharge end of conveyor C-2.
- d. All locally mounted control and safety devices such as belt misalignment switches, emergency pull cord switches, underspeed switches, plugged chute detectors, limit switches, etc.

Silo Feed Conveyor C-2

- a. Silo feed conveyor C-2 shall transport coal from the discharge of the chute work at the head end of conveyor C-1 to the transition chute work at the tail end of conveyor C-3A, at a rate of 2,000 TPH, with up to 10 percent frozen lumps sized approximately 12x12"x18", without spillate and without causing damage to any part.
- b. The conveyor shall be capable of stopping and restarting under any loading conditions, i.e., empty, fully loaded, or partially loaded.
- c. Hugging pressure shall be applied to the material along the conveyor path to develop sufficient friction, with an appropriate safety factor, to prevent material slide back. The material cross-section determined shall allow ample belt edge distance to completely contain the material within the belt sandwich. The installed conveyor shall accommodate all associated appurtances such as feeders and discharge chutes.
- d. The conveyor shall convey the coal vertically (90° from the horizontal) without material slippage.

Collection Conveyor C-4

- a. Collection conveyor C-4 shall transport coal from the five belt feeders below the concrete coal storage silos to the surge bins located in the crusher building at a rate of 250 TPH, with up to 10 percent frozen lumps sized approximately 6"x6"x12", without spillage and without causing damage to any part.
- b. The conveyor shall be capable of stopping and restarting under any loading conditions, i.e., empty, fully loaded, or partially loaded.
- c. Hugging pressure shall be applied to the material along the conveyor path to develop sufficient friction, with an appropriate safety factor, to prevent material slide back. The material cross-section determined shall allow ample belt edge distance to completely contain the material within the belt sandwich. The installed conveyor shall accommodate all associated appurtenances such as feeders and discharge chutes.
- d. The conveyor shall convey the coal vertically at a 45° angle of incline without material sliding back on the belts.

Conveyor C-5

- a. Conveyor C-5 shall transport coal from beneath the crusher discharge chutes to drag chain conveyor C-6 located in the conveyor room of the Boiler Building, above the in-plant coal storage silos, at a rate of 250 TPH.
- b. The conveyor shall be capable of stopping and restarting under any loading conditions, i.e., empty, fully loaded, or partially loaded.
- c. Hugging pressure shall be applied to the material along the conveyor path to develop sufficient friction, with an appropriate safety factor, to prevent material slide back. The material cross-section determined shall allow ample belt edge distance to completely contain the material within the belt sandwich. The installed conveyor shall accommodate all associated appurtenances such as feeders and discharge chutes.
- d. The conveyor shall convey the coal at a 45° angle of incline without material sliding back on the belts.

Fuel Handling Area

- a. One car dumper hopper with grizzly and dumper enclosure with control room.
- b. Two drag chain type feeders (DCF-1 and 2).
- c. One car dumper reclaim conveyor (C-1) with belt scale and magnetic separator.
- d. Four cascade conveyors (C-3) including a local control panel, support steel, and controls. The support steel shall include stairs and access platforms.
- e. Five slide gates under the fuel storage silos.
- f. Five belt feeder under the fuel storage silos.
- g. Magnetic separator at the discharge of HAC collection conveyor (C-4).
- h. One 50-ton capacity surge bin with two slide gates.
- i. Two vibrating feeders.
- j. Two 300 rpm cage mill type coal crushers.
- k. One drag chain conveyor (C-6) with discharge gates.
- l. Dust collection systems equipped with pulse jet type fabric filter(s) at car dumper and conveyor transfer points. Vent filters for fuel storage silos and a insertable dust collector at discharge of conveyor C-5
- m. Hoists and trolleys for maintenance purposes at all required locations of the fuel handling system.
- n. Ventilation system.
- o. Heating pads to the outer walls of the rotary car dumper hoppers and storage silos.

The Fuel Handling System shall be designed to meet the following design capacities requirements.

- a. Coal unloading and storage system - 2,000 TPH.

- b. Coal crushing and reclaiming system - 250 TPH.

Storage Area

- a. Five (5) reinforced concrete fuel storage silos complete with concrete roof and stainless steel lined discharge hopper. The cone is mounted on a ring girder system.
- b. A reinforced concrete common mat foundation for support of the five silos including a topping slab with curb and all required excavation, subsurface preparation, and backfill work.

Construction Features:

- a. The silos shall be designed for a fuel storage capacity of 220,000 cubic feet per silo and shall be of cast-in-place concrete construction. A clear space shall be maintained between each silo to allow for independent wall construction by either the slipform or jumpform methods.
- b. Each silo shall be equipped with a combination carbon and stainless steel discharge hopper.
- c. The steel discharge hoppers shall be attached to and supported by a reinforced concrete ring beam at the wall/hopper transition elevation. The concrete ring beam shall be supported independent of the silo walls by reinforced concrete columns extending down to the top of the foundation.

4. Ash Handling and Storage

The CFB combustion process utilizes coal and limestone in the boiler. After combustion, the resulting limestone ash by-product material comes from two areas: bottom ash material from the CFB boiler and fly ash material from the pollution control equipment (boiler baghouse). The bottom ash and fly ash material would be conveyed separately to on-site enclosed storage silos with a total capacity of approximately 3,100 tons. The ash handling system would include ash conditioning equipment located in the ash silo area. The ash conditioning equipment would be used to dampen the ash with water prior to loading it into totally enclosed 25 ton net capacity trucks in order to minimize the potential for fugitive dust emissions during ash handling. The trucks would be used to haul the ash material from the site to a surface mine reclamation site in Schuylkill County.

Baghouse

A multi-compartment baghouse filter system will be used to clean the flue gas exiting the primary and secondary air heaters. The baghouse filter system is designed to remove particulates in the flue gas and maintain particulate emissions below 0.011 lbs/MMBtu. A design air-to-cloth ratio of two is specified with one compartment isolated for cleaning and one compartment out for maintenance. Each baghouse compartment has a hopper which is heat traced and has an 4 to 8-hour storage capacity. The ash collected in the hopper will be discharged to the fly ash removal system.

Ash Disposal System

The cooled bed ash will be conveyed to a bed ash storage silo via a pneumatic transport system. The bed ash collected during the pilot plant tests will be used to test different ash transport systems to determine the most reliable and cost effective transport system for the bed ash. The fly ash is conveyed from air heaters, economizer, and baghouse hoppers by dilute-phase pneumatic transport system to a fly ash storage silo.

5. Chemical Handling and Storage

As part of the proposed cogeneration facility operation, chemicals (for water treatment) and lubricants (for mechanical equipment upkeep) would be used and stored on-site. These materials would include oil and grease, diesel fuel, solvents (for degreasing equipment), caustics and sulfuric acid, water treatment chemicals, and aqueous ammonia.

Aqueous ammonia (29 percent solution) would arrive at the facility by truck at an estimated frequency of one delivery per week. The ammonia storage tank would be located within a fully contained and diked concrete area providing sufficient secondary containment of the storage tank to prevent a release.

6. Limestone Handling and Storage

Pulverized limestone would be delivered to the facility in 20-ton capacity enclosed trucks. YCEP is currently determining the necessary limestone specifications. Suppliers are expected to be generally located within a 50-mile radius of the proposed site, with one potential source located approximately 100 miles from the site. The limestone material would be pneumatically (air blown) transferred from the trucks into a storage silo. The silos would be sized to provide an approximately five-day supply of limestone (1,870 tons). The limestone material would then be pneumatically transferred from the storage silo to the day

bins in the boiler house. From the day bins, the material would be fed directly into the CFB boiler for use in SO₂ emissions control. By transferring the material via enclosed systems the potential for fugitive dust emissions would be minimized.

Depending on the source of the raw limestone and dolomite, the sorbent would be either delivered by pneumatic truck or crushed at an adjacent site and pneumatically conveyed to two sorbent storage silos. Each silo discharges to on (1) 100% capacity gravimetric belt feeder. From the feeders, the sorbent is dropped into a bifurcated discharge hopper where the sorbent is divided into two streams. Four (4) 50% capacity sorbent blowers convey the sorbent to the ACFB boiler pneumatically and inject it to the boiler at the vicinity of coal feed points. The rate of sorbent feed is automatically adjusted if the SO₂ concentration measured at the stack exceeds a predetermined set point.

7. Turbine

The YCEP facility will generate electric power by extracting shaft work from the high pressure superheated steam flow produced by the ACFB steam generation circuits. The turbine generator system includes high, intermediate and low pressure steam turbines connected to a generator. The turbine will be equipped with 8 extraction points to service the feedwater heaters, reheat system, and export steam. Export steam (up to 400,000 lb/hr) at 575 psig and 670°F will be sent to PHG where it will be integrated with their existing steam system.

The steam turbine includes:

Steam Turbine:

Combined HP-IP steam turbine, solid-coupled to LP turbine

Double flow LP steam turbine with bottom down exhaust, solid-coupled to generator

One set of cross-over piping between IP and LP

Electro-pneumatic power-assisted non-return check valves for all extractions, including two parallel NR check valves in the extraction to the first LP heater and two series NR check valves in the extractions to both the 5th and 6th heaters.

Electric motor or electro-pneumatic actuated non-return stop valves for all extractions, including two parallel NR stop valves in the extraction from the first LP heater

Blowdown covers for throttle and reheat stop valves

Protection and control valve systems including:

DCS-based emergency trip system

High pressure (~2,000 psig) hydraulic fluid supply system

Lubricating oil system, supplies oil to turbine and generator bearings

Bypass oil purification/filtration system

Gland sealing system

Motor operated automatic/manual engage/disengage rotor turning gear

Bently Nevada series 3300 proximity probes and proximitors

Duplex thermocouples or RTD's:

Acoustic and appearance enclosure over HP-IP turbine, valving and piping, made of freestanding sections.

Block heat insulating material for upper and lower, HP-IP turbine casings, steam valve bodies and exhaust casing.

Rotor grounding device

Generator:

285 MVA @ 0.90 PF, 22,000 volt hydrogen inner-cooled generator with gas cooled stator winding

Hydrogen coolers include 70-30 CuNi tubes and Muntz metal tube sheets

Six high voltage bushings

Fifteen bushing current transformers with provisions for three additional transformers

Hydrogen seal oil system with required pumps, coolers and instrumentation

Hydrogen and carbon dioxide gas control system

Generator auxiliaries logic control system

Duplex RTD's

Neutral grounding transformer and resistor assembly

Brushless Excitation System:

Permanent magnet pilot exciter

AC exciter with rotating armature and stationary field

Rotating rectifier assembly with silicon diodes, indicating fuses and other required components

Necessary electrical interconnections

Fabricated steel baseplate

Air/water heat exchangers with 70-30 CuNi tubes

Bearing pedestal with terminal for testing insulation

Temperature measuring elements:

TEWAC enclosure mounted on the exciter base

Exciter base ground connection

WTA-300B Voltage Regulator:

Fully assembled low voltage metal enclosed excitation switchgear structures

Section number 1 enclosure with:

- One ac isolation transducer module

- One ac voltage error detector and reactive

- Droop compensation module

- One excitation system stabilizer module

- One signal mixer module

- One dc voltage error detector module

- Two +/- 24 volt power supply modules with auctioneering circuit

- Two transformer modules

- Two firing circuit modules

- One minimum excitation limiter (MEL) module
- One maximum excitation limiter (MXL) module
- One volts/hertz limiter module
- One volts/hertz protection module
- One over excitation protection (OXP) module
- One forcing alarm module
- One loss of sensing module
- One power system stabilizer (with option to delete)

One digital manual dc regulator adjuster with follower

One digital ac regulator adjuster with follower

Section number 2 enclosure with:

Two draw-out thyristor power amplifier drawers of suitable rating, three-phase full converter bridge assemblies including one operating spare unit. Power drawer protection RC snubber circuits, thermal sensor and blown fuse detector included

Two set of exciter field shunts

Two dc-dc isolation transducers

One type DS breaker 600V, three-pole electrically operated with suitable auxiliary interlocks One set of fuses for control power

One starting resistor assembly

One set three-phase voltraps for thyristor protection

Site Specific Data

Site location:	York Co., Pennsylvania
Site altitude:	461 feet above mean sea level
Ambient temperature:	
Average Daily Mean	53°F
Ambient relative humidity:	
Average	65%

Electrical Characteristics:

Transmission Line	115KV, 3 phase, 60 Hz
Generator Rating	22,000V, 0.90 PF
Motors >500 HP	4 KV
Motors <300 HP	460 V
(Voltage of 300 to 500 HP motors to be defined later as function of site loading requirements)	
Miscellaneous	460 V and 120 V/1 phase

Cooling water characteristics:

Source	Cooling tower		
	Winter	Average	Summer
Supply	64°F	78°F	93°F
Return	86°F	100°F	115°F

Condenser characteristics:

	Winter	Average	Summer
Pressure, inHgA	1.47	2.24	3.45
(Minimum achievable concurrent with above cooling water temperatures)			

Seismic Zone 1

Steam Turbine-Generator Performance Requirements

The steam turbine-generator performance shall be optimized around the average conditions listed below and it shall be guaranteed to deliver 248 MW within the variations (and any combinations) as shown as well as within the variations of site design conditions listed above.

Main Throttle Steam:

Psia 2415
°F 1000

Reheat Steam:

Turbine Outlet Psia 555
Turbine Return Psia 500
Turbine Return °F 1000

HP Process Extraction Steam:

psia 690
°F 725
lb/hr average - 340,000
minimum - zero
maximum - 400,000
Condensate return 100% @ 200°F

Turbine Exhaust Pressure:

psia 1.10 (average) 1.69 (summer)
InHgA 2.24 (average) 3.45 (summer)
Deaerator psia 134.3 psi

Leaving Feedwater:

Temp. °F

539

Attemperating Spray Water

Flow from the BFW pump discharge to the primary and secondary HP superheaters shall be scaled from the following data:

main steam flow

lb/hr

1,725,000

1,293,750

862,500

attemperating flow

lb/hr

78,223

42,010

0

Boiler Blowdown

0.50% of main steam flow directed to 200 psia flash drum; 0.29 % of main steam flow returns to deaerator saturated and 0.21% is drained.

Feedwater Heater TTD's:

Top heaters, °F

- 3

LP heaters, °F

+ 5

Drain Cooler Approaches:

All FW Heaters, °F

+10

Pressure drop to FW heaters

6%

No. of closed FW heaters

7

8. Draft System

The ACFB boiler is equipped with one (1) 100% capacity centrifugal primary air fan, one (1) 100% capacity centrifugal secondary air fan, two (2) 100% capacity centrifugal INTREX[®] heat exchanger blowers, two (2) 100% capacity positive displacement J-valve blowers, four (4) 50% capacity positive displacement sorbent blowers. The primary air and the secondary air are heated by the flue gas in two heaters arranged in parallel with multiple air and flue gas passes. With flue gas flowing on the inside of the vertical tube, the gas side cleanliness is maintained without steam soot blowing. Balance furnace draft is maintained by one (1) 100% capacity centrifugal induced draft fan. Part of the primary air bypasses the primary air heater and is used to fluidize the stripper/coolers and provide seal and sweep air for the fuel feeders part of the high pressure air from the J-valve blowers is injected into the

transfer lines from the combustor to the stripper/coolers to assist solids movement into the stripper/cooler.

H. Pollution Control

The proposed facility includes a single coal-fired CFB boiler equipped with state-of-the-art air pollution control equipment. Since the facility would be subject to Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) regulations, the regulated level for these air pollution controls would be determined through a Best Available Control technology (BACT) analysis. In addition, the YCEP site is located in the Northeast Ozone Transport Region established by the CAAA and would therefore be required to offset any NOx emissions at a ratio of 1.15 to 1. The facility also would be required to complete a Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) performance test to demonstrate whether the proposed facility can meet a lower NOx emission level. Both the BACT analysis and the NOx offset plan approvals would be conducted as part of the facility's PSD air quality permit application process with the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources (PADER).

The proposed air pollution control equipment would include the following:

- A minimum of 92 percent SO₂ emissions control would be achieved through the design of the CFB boiler system. The inert limestone in the boiler combustion chamber would interact with the SO₂ emitted in the coal burning process to control the SO₂ emissions level.
- Aqueous ammonia injection technology known as selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR) would be employed to minimize NOx emissions. In this process, aqueous ammonia or urea is injected into the boiler exhaust gas to convert NOx into nitrogen and water. The NOx emissions reduction level being proposed would be guaranteed by the boiler manufacturer to achieve a 50 percent or greater reduction in NOx emissions.
- A fabric filter collection system (baghouse) would be used to control particulate emissions to 0.011 pounds per million Btu (lbs/MMBtu). The baghouse would remove the fine particles in the boiler exhaust stream prior to release of the exhaust gas into the atmosphere.
- The facility would also be equipped with a continuous emissions monitoring (CEM) system located in the stack, downstream of the pollution control equipment. The CEM would monitor exhaust gas flow, SO₂, NOx, opacity, and either carbon dioxide (CO₂) or oxygen (O₂). This CEM system would be used to assure that the facility is in constant compliance with the air quality permit approval.

In addition, the facility would be designed to minimize fugitive emissions associated with coal, ash by-product, and limestone materials handling through the maximum use of enclosures.

I. Facility Water Usage

The proposed cogeneration facility would have several different uses for water within the facility. During facility construction, the projected water use is expected to range from 5,000 to 15,000 gallons per day (gpd). The facility water balance shown on Figure 9 provides a breakdown of water usage during normal facility operation. It is proposed that YCEP's external water needs would be satisfied primarily from the P. H. Glatfelter Company and Spring Grove Water Company. Further details with regard to facility water supply are provided below.

Process Water

The proposed YCEP facility would supply up to 400,000 pounds per hour of high pressure steam to the P. H. Glatfelter Company; therefore, the process water make-up for the steam system (i.e., boiler water make-up) would be provided from the P. H. Glatfelter Company's boiler feed water or condensate systems which would be returned to the proposed cogeneration facility. For every pound of steam supplied to the P. H. Glatfelter Company, one pound of condensate and/or boiler feed water would be returned to the YCEP facility. Since the returned condensate and boiler feed water would be of lower quality (i.e., higher in dissolved minerals and impurities) than is required for make-up into the cogeneration facility steam system, the returned stream would require treatment through a demineralization treatment process to remove the impurities prior to reuse in the CFB boiler system. Process water losses from the steam system, water treatment and boiler blowdown (i.e., discharge) would be compensated for by using water supplied from the P. H. Glatfelter process water system. Periodic blowdown of the boiler would be required to control and minimize the potential for scale formation. The average flow would be approximately 200,000 gpd of additional water transferred from the P. H. Glatfelter Company's process water system to make up for these operating losses.

Cooling Water

Cooling water system make-up requirements for the proposed YCEP facility would be supplied from the P. H. Glatfelter wastewater treatment plant secondary effluent discharge located on the eastern side of the paper mill's property. Consumption of this water would vary based upon ambient conditions, plant production levels and cooling water quality. The average consumption would be approximately 2.5 mgd; the maximum consumption would be approximately 2.9 mgd. The P. H. Glatfelter wastewater treatment

system currently discharges an average of 12.6 mgd of secondary effluent to Codorus Creek.

A pilot plant program was used to determine the water treatment program which would be needed to allow for the reuse of the P. H. Glatfelter secondary treatment plant effluent stream in the cooling tower. Based on the pilot plant operation, as well as available data and information on other similar water treatment programs, the proposed YCEP water treatment program would be limited to a disinfectant, a chemical dispersant, and sulfuric acid. A material such as bromine, chlorine gas, or hypochlorite (liquid bleach) would be used as a disinfectant to prevent build-up of algae in the recirculation water; the chemical dispersant would be used to limit scale formation on the cooling water system components (heat exchangers, piping, pumps); and sulfuric acid would be added to assist in controlling corrosion and scaling on cooling water system components and maintain the water pH within acceptable limits for discharge to the P. H. Glatfelter secondary treatment plant. This water treatment program would be placed directly in the cooling tower recirculation water system.

As shown on Figure 9, the expected usage of secondary treatment plant effluent for cooling tower incoming water would be 4.1 mgd. This expected usage is during the periods when maximum evaporation is taking place in the YCEP cooling tower. Of this incoming water, 2.5 mgd would be evaporated in the cooling tower operation and 1.6 mgd would be returned to the P. H. Glatfelter secondary treatment plant as cooling tower blowdown. This blowdown stream would be at a cooler temperature than the secondary effluent incoming water stream due to the cooling effect in the cooling tower operation. This cooler would be discharged back into the P. H. Glatfelter secondary treatment plant.

J. Facility Wastewater

The proposed facility would be designed to minimize wastewater discharge facility through the efficient recirculation and reuse of water within the facility. Average discharge from all sources, including cooling tower blowdown, would be approximately 1.7 mgd. Facility wastewater not reused would be discharged to the P. H. Glatfelter Company's wastewater treatment system equalization basin via a 10-inch pipeline (force main). Flows to be discharged in this manner include utility and process streams such as cooling tower blowdown, and facility sanitary wastewater after treatment in the on-site package treatment facility. Water quality constituents in this discharge would consist primarily of naturally occurring minerals (e.g., calcium, magnesium, sulfate) contained in the make-up water which have been concentrated due to evaporation of water in the steam and cooling water systems.

The P. H. Glatfelter wastewater treatment system currently operates under an NPDES Industrial Wastewater Discharge Permit. This existing permit would be modified as required by the regulatory agency.

Stormwater runoff from potential high-dust areas (i.e., suspended solids from on-site materials such as coal, ash by-products or limestone) would, after a residence period in an on-site collection basin to remove some of the suspended solids, be directed to the cooling water pretreatment system, or used as ash quench. Stormwater runoff from clean areas of the facility would be discharged to the existing on-site detention basin. A NPDES Stormwater General or Individual Permit would be required for the YCEP facility stormwater management arrangements.

Wastewater Treatment

Process wastewater from the proposed facility would originate from three primary sources: cooling tower blowdown, stormwater runoff, and sanitary wastes. Process waste stream characteristics and proposed disposal methods are outlined below. Stormwater management for the proposed facility is discussed later in this section.

Cooling Tower Blowdown

A conventional wet cooling tower system would be used to dissipate process heat. The system would operate on a continuous basis using mechanical draft cooling units. Water would serve as the heat transfer medium.

While cooling tower blowdown would be minimized, some blowdown is required to prevent excessive build-up of dissolved solids. The blowdown volume would vary depending on the allowable cycles of concentration, i.e. the factor by which influent constituent concentrations are increased due to evaporative effects. Based on available make-up water quality characteristics, the system will operate at approximately 2.5 cycles of concentration.

Based on available data and information, routine cooling water treatment chemical additives would be limited to bromine, chlorine gas or hypochlorite (liquid bleach) to prevent biofouling, a chemical dispersant to limit scale formation, and sulfuric acid to maintain pH within acceptable limits for discharge and to assist in controlling corrosion and scaling rates for system components. Periodic maintenance may also require the addition of a commercially available biocide or slimeicide to control fouling of the condenser and cooling tower.

Sanitary Waste

Sanitary wastes from the facility would be combined with sanitary wastewater from P. H. Glatfelter's Roundwood facility, and treated in an on-site package treatment system. Following treatment, the discharge would be combined with the other industrial water and pumped to the P. H. Glatfelter waste equalization basin.

K. Air Emissions

Regulatory requirements and topographic features in the general vicinity of the project site were evaluated in order to select the appropriate air quality dispersion models to perform the impact analysis. In addition, existing air quality background data were reviewed and compared to applicable federal and state air quality standards. These background levels, as measured at a network of air quality monitoring sites, were evaluated with respect to the attainment status for each of the regulated pollutants. With the exception of ozone, the concentrations of all regulated pollutants are in attainment with their respective standards. The area in which the York County Energy Partners, L.P., cogeneration facility is proposed to be located has been designated as a marginal non-attainment area for ozone, due to its inclusion in the Northeast Ozone Transport Region.

The air emissions control technology which would be demonstrated by the project would result in the generation of significantly less air pollutant emissions as compared to a conventional coal fired facility of comparable power rating. Application of stringent combustion and post-combustion control technologies, and a fully enclosed fuel handling system would minimize emissions of pollutants at this facility. The project would comply with all applicable standards to protect the ambient air quality of the region. By providing steam to the P. H. Glatfelter Company, the operation of their existing Power Boiler #4 would be curtailed resulting in a net reduction in sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, and particulate emissions.

The chart below shows that, based on estimated actual emissions, the project results in a net reduction of 4.5 million pounds per year of SO₂, NO_x, and PM.

**York County Energy Partners, L.P.
Emission Reductions Summary**

Based on PHG Actual and YCEP Expected Actual Emissions (pounds per year)
--

	<u>SO₂</u>	<u>NO_x</u>	<u>Part.</u>
PHG No. 4 Boiler	(7,436,000)	(2,028,000)	(286,222)
No. 4 Boiler - 15 Days	310,696	84,735	11,959
Other NO _x Reductions		(1,226,000)	
YCEP	<u>3,820,163</u>	<u>1,995,840</u>	<u>219,240</u>
Net Change	(3,305,141)	(1,173,425)	(55,023)
Total Emissions Reduction		(4,533,589)	

Figures in "()" indicate reductions

Notes:

1. PHG data is from 1992 PEDS submitted to PaDER.
2. YCEP data is based on the YCEP air permit application and operating factors.
3. Other NO_x reductions will occur in York County in conjunction with this project.

IV. PROGRESS SINCE LAST REPORT

A. Foster Wheeler Preliminary Design Work

Foster Wheeler Energy Corp (FWEC) has been released to provide preliminary design work in support of the project. The work has included the following:

- Preparation of heat and material balances and summary performance information based on detailed designs. Previous work had been done to support the proposal and was therefore, preliminary in nature. Engineering work included detailing flowrates, pressure, and temperature for all major systems including water, steam, ash, and air.
- Performed detailed circulation and design calculations of the furnace to firm up the water and steam circuitry. The furnace and steam drum were sized and materials were selected. The number, size and location of major risers and downcomers were determined. Drain locations were preliminarily selected.
- Prepared data sheets and process specifications for major auxiliary equipment including the ID fan, PA fan, SA fan, fuel feeders, Intrex blowers, tubular air heater, and the bed material stripper coolers.
- Issued the initial issue of the boiler general arrangements showing boiler layout, terminal point elevations, clearance lines, column locations. These drawings are based on preliminary pressure part sizing including area requirements for economizers, reheaters, superheaters and steam circuits.
- Developed more detailed design information on the division wall. Specifically, refined the design of the upper wall openings, tube spacing and refractory specification to ensure proper circulation and gas and solids communication while minimizing the potential for erosion. FWEC also performed a detailed vibration analysis to provide information on the design of the division wall supports and structure.
- Developed an alternative design for the air heater using an enhanced heat transfer design. This design was analyzed for both fouling and heat transfer performance capability. Foster Wheeler also performed some testing of the enhanced tube in one of their operating units.
- Developed relief valve setting criteria and values for the relief valves on the drum, reheater and superheater.
- Prepared equipment specifications and received quotations for the ID, PA and SA fans, as well as the coal feeders.

B. Baghouse

Based on competitively bid quotations, the project selected Research Cottrel as the baghouse vendor. The design will be based on the state of the art, low pressure/high volume Howden Technology pulse jet design. The fabric filter will consist of 8 separate, isolatable compartments, arranged in two rows of four compartments. Each compartment will have approximately 1,000 oval bags, each 25 ft long with a nominal equivalent bag diameter of 5 inches. The resulting air to cloth ratio in the gross condition is approximately 3.4:1. The baghouse will use on line cleaning. Bags will be made from 18 oz/yd² Ryton for maximum filtration efficiency and extended bag life and will be supported by 2 case cages utilizing 9 gauge wire. The cleaning system involves a pulse air cleaning manifold which continuously rotates at 1 rpm above the tubesheet. The bags are arranged in a circular bundles. No venturis are employed. A full flow model will be conducted to minimize pressure loss.

C. Fuel Handling

Based on competitively bid proposals, Heyl and Patterson has been selected as the vendor for the rotary car dumper. During the project year, YCEP developed specifications and bid package, evaluated all bids, negotiated terms and conditions and placed the order. All technical issues were resolved.

Continental Conveyor and Equipment Co has been selected to provide the three high angle conveyors. During the project year, YCEP developed specifications and bid package, evaluated all bids, negotiated terms and conditions and placed the order. All technical issues were resolved.

During the project year, YCEP developed specifications and bid package, evaluated all bids, and shortlisted vendors for supply of the fuel handling system and concrete silos. Technical and commercial issues are currently being resolved so that the final vendor selection can be made.

D. Balance of Plant

All major design criteria, P&ID's and general arrangements have been developed and reviewed. Typically, design criteria includes material selection, redundancy requirements, design flowrates, pressures and temperatures and critical dimensions. The following design criteria have been established in the electrical area: main generator, bus duct, auxiliary transformer, step up transformer, switchgear, emergency generator, UPS, batteries, relay protection, lighting, metering, medium voltage bus voltage level, cable sizing, grounding, switchyard, and transmission line. The

following design criteria have been established in the controls area: control philosophy, Distributed control system, Continuous emission monitoring system, tagging, design requirements for control valves, flow , pressure, temperature, and level instrumentation, instrument air line and mounting. The following design criteria have been established in the mechanical area: steam generator, baghouse, limestone handling, stack, ash systems, turbine and auxiliaries, high energy systems, boiler feedwater pumps, feedwater heaters, feedwater piping, condensate piping, condensate pumps, deaerator, condensate storage, heater vents and drain, condenser, vacuum pumps, cooling tower, circulating water pumps and pipe, closed water exchanger, water treatment. The following design criteria have been established in the structural area all foundations, codes and standards, boiler building, coal silos, stack shell, turbine building, cranes and hoists.

The P&IDs that have been issued include: main steam, reheat steam, high pressure extraction steam, low pressure extraction steam condensate, feedwater, high pressure vents and drains, boiler vents and drains, low pressure vents and drains, turbine vents and drains, flue gas, raw water, circulating water, water treatment, cooling tower chemical treatment, plant drains, compressed air, condenser air removal, process export steam, ash handling. P&ID's typically show line sizes, control logic, equipment and piping configuration.

Mechanical specifications for the following equipment have been developed: boiler feedwater pumps, condensate pumps, condenser, deaerator, feedwater heaters, stack, cir water pumps, cooling towers, ash silos, bottom ash system, fly ash system, fuel day bins, step up transformer, bridge crane, cooling water piping, limestone silos, hot lime cooler, HP valves, several service valves, demineralizer.

E. Geotechnical Investigations

The proposed site of the cogeneration plant has undergone two major site investigation phases. Initial studies were conducted in the spring of 1993, and included the drilling of 35 borings. A more comprehensive study commenced in June, 1994, and is still in progress. To date, over 100 additional borings have been drilled. The work also has included cone penetration testing and laboratory testing of soil and rock samples.

The scope of the geotechnical investigations have been more extensive than normally would be performed for a facility of this type. This is due to the geologically complex and variable nature of the site. Bedrock at the site consists of Cambrian Period sediments (predominantly shales) and carbonates (limestone and dolomites). These strata have been subjected to significant structural deformation as a result of past tectonic activity. Overlying the bedrock is a relatively thin layer of silty to clayey alluvial

soils. These deposits have been overlain by a layer of dredged fill from the adjacent Codorus Creek. This deposit ranges in thickness from zero feet at the southern end of the site to up to twenty feet at the northern end.

The depth to bedrock is highly variable, ranging from less than 10 feet below existing grade to over 100 feet. This change can occur over short distances and is hard to predict. The quality of the bedrock also is highly variable and can be extremely weathered and soft, or relatively unweathered and hard. Another complicating factor is the presence of occasional voids in the limestone.

The unfavorable subsurface conditions require that most heavy and settlement-sensitive facilities be founded on drilled caissons. The caissons will be founded on competent bedrock and will range in depth from less than 40 feet to over 180 feet below grade. Foundations currently planned for caisson support are the boiler and turbine buildings, turbine-generator pedestal, ash storage silo, and a portion of the coal silos. The remaining facilities will be supported on conventional shallow spread footing or mat foundations. In some cases, however, some remedial measures such as removal of soft soils and replacement with compacted structural fill will precede foundation construction.

V. TECHNICAL STUDIES COMPLETED SINCE LAST REPORT

A. Addition of Limestone Rail Unloading

The facility will now have the capability to receive limestone via rail. This requires an additional siding through the facility as well as additional unloading facilities. This will add flexibility in the procurement of limestone.

B. Wastewater Reuse Study

As previously reported, the facility will use effluent from the adjacent PHG paper mill as cooling tower make up water. The water is high in colloidal organics, hardness and chloride. YCEP performed a series of tests and studies to determine the most effective way to handle this water. One approach would be reduce the containment levels in a treatment plant to allow greater cycles before blowdown. An alternative approach would be use the water directly in the cooling tower and increase the blowdown rates. This is the method selected by YCEP. Note that this is the same water that is currently discharged into the North Codorus Creek.

To determine the feasibility of both options, pilot plant tests were conducted. A two stage clarification process was tested: the first stage was used for colloidal organic solids removal. The pilot plant utilized a 10 ft diameter by

15 ft high clarifier with a rated capacity of 65 gpm. The second stage was a softening step to reduce the water hardness. In the first clarifier, aluminum sulfate was added as a flocculant just upstream of the clarifier. In addition, a high molecular weight polymeric material was added in the clarifier to coagulate solids. The coagulated solids form a sludge which settles at the bottom of the clarifier. Caustic is also added to adjust the water pH to minimize the formation of soluble aluminum. Finally, a small amount of sodium hypochlorite was also added for bacteriological control. The second clarifier was 6 ft diameter by 8 ft high. Soda ash was added to the second clarifier as a softening agent. Caustic was also added to adjust pH. The addition of a high molecular weight polymer improved the reaction. The water from the clarifiers was sent to a cooling tower simulator. Sulfuric acid was added at this point to neutralize the water and a biocide was added to control biological growth. A polymeric dispersant was also added to keep the ionic species in solution and prevent fouling.

Effluent quality from the first clarifier was a function of the specific alum/polymer chemical used as well as pH level. Data on the effluent's color, turbidity and pH were taken. Sludge settling characteristics and blowdown were also noted. A floc barrier was required in the primary clarifier to obtain acceptable performance. The design criteria derived for the primary clarifier was 0.5 gpm/ft²; this would have resulted in the commercial primary clarifier sized at 90 ft diameter. The secondary clarifier design rise rate was determined to be 1.0 gpm/ft², resulting in a 60 ft diameter commercial scale.

A high pressure pilot filter press using either recessed or membrane filter plates was used. The pilot press had a one cubic foot capacity with 7 nominal 470 mm plates. Both sludge and polymer feed systems used a positive displacement pump. Both an alum sludge cake from the primary clarifier and a calcium carbonate sludge cake from the secondary clarifier could be successfully formed.

The cooling tower simulator consisted of two paralleled one cell cooling tower systems which could be run simultaneously for side by side comparisons. The single cell towers were of the mechanical draft type and included an induced draft fan. A heat flux of 10,000 Btu/hr ft², a water velocity of 6 ft/s and bulk fluid temp of 100°F and a pH of 7.2 was used. The basic parameter measured was the maximum achievable cycles with various types of water treatment. By using the PHG waster water directly, a maximum cooling tower cycle of 2.8 was achievable. The limiting factor was calcium sulfate concentration. By using water pretreated by the clarifiers, the tower could be cycled up to 7 times. Again, the limiting factor was calcium sulfate. This option, however, utilized greater level of polymer dispersant and pH adjustment.

The additional capital and operating costs associated with the clarifier option compared unfavorably to the costs of using PHG effluent directly in the cooling tower.

C. Main Steam Pipe Material Selection

The piping between the boiler and the steam turbine both on throttle steam and hot reheat will be ASTM A335 Grade P91 in lieu of the Grade P22 as previously specified. Grade P22 is the piping typically specified for domestic 2,500 psi/1,000°F systems. The P91 Grade offers greater tensile strength and therefore offers the opportunity to reduce the number of expansion loops as well as the pipe wall thickness. These two factors result in a lower evaluated installed cost for the P91 system. P91 has been used extensively in European power plant construction, but requires particular attention to weld quality control (heat treatment) to avoid stress induced cracking. The P91 pipe has been used by some domestic refineries and on some domestic power plant retrofits.

D. Cooling Water Optimization

By optimizing the condenser and cooling tower design parameters, a better heat rate for the facility can be obtained. A study performed by YCEP confirmed that by changing the condenser approach temperature to 20°F range from 22°F and by changing the cooling tower approach temperature to 12°F from 14°F, the facility would operate more efficiently. The study was based on an average annual wet bulb temperature of 51°F as well as the summer high wet bulb of 76°F. The study concluded that approximately 0.5% improvement in heat rate can be expected.

E. Circulating Water Pipe

During the past year, YCEP also evaluated material selection for the circulating water system. Due to the high chlorides content of the water, fiberglass was originally specified. The study concluded that prestressed concrete cylinder pipe should be used in lieu of fiberglass to reduce cost and improve reliability. The pipe consists of a steel cylinder embedded in a concrete core which is wrapped with tensioned wire and coated with an external layer of mortar. The piping will have bell and spigot joints with double O-rings for field leak testing the joint. Restrained joints would also be utilized to prevent separation due to pressure thrust. The pipe would be purchased in accordance with AWWA C301. The study also evaluated carbon steel pipe with internal rubber lining and carbon steel pipe with internal coating. Neither of these systems was judged cost competitive.

VI. CLOSURE

This report has documented the progress of the York County Energy Partners 250 MW circulating fluidized bed project over the past year. YCEP has performed extensive boiler pilot tests which has confirmed scale-up issues and fuel and limestone selection. YCEP has defined the scope of the boiler, turbine and fuel handling areas in detail, as documented in this report. Since the previous report, YCEP has performed preliminary engineering on the boiler, completed some work on the balance of plant including selection of baghouse and fuel handling vendors, completion of major design criteria, P&ID's and general arrangements. In addition, YCEP has studied the use of wastewater air cooling tower make-up, limestone unloading performed detailed geotechnical study of the site, analyzed material selection for main steam and cooling water piping and optimized the cooling system.

In the time since the Cooperative Agreement has been signed, YCEP has made significant progress in both understanding the technical issues of a new technology as well as in moving toward successful project development. In the next year, YCEP anticipates detailed engineering to support specific construction packages.

FIGURE 1 . Process Flow Diagram for YCEP Cogen Facility.

SOURCE:
U.S.G.S. 7.5 minute series topographic quads of
West York, Seven Valleys, Hanover and Abbottstown Pennsylvania

Site Boundary

Scale in Miles

Scale in Kilometers

FIGURE 2
Site Location Map

York County Energy Partners
Proposed Cogeneration Facility

FIGURE 3

Rowland & Grubic Inc.
 Consulting Engineers
 Surveyors
 Landscape Architects
 Planners
 1000 E. 12th St.
 Suite 200
 York, PA 17403
 (717) 338-1111

Site Plan: North Codorus Township
FIGURE 4

FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN - EAST
 FOR
 P.H. CLATFELTER COMPANY & YORK COUNTY ENERGY PARTNERS
 ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY PROJECT
 NORTH CODORUS TOWNSHIP
 YORK COUNTY PENNSYLVANIA

DATE: SEPTEMBER 1994
 SCALE: 1" = 100'
 PROJECT NO: 2 936 019
 SHEET NO: 7 OF 14

NOTARY PUBLIC
 State of Pennsylvania
 I, _____, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears in my records.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL THIS DAY AND DATE ABOVE WRITTEN
 Robert S. Ward
 Notary Public
 DAY: 29th
 MONTH: Sep
 YEAR: 94

APPROVED BY TOWNSHIP ENGINEER
 DATE: _____
 APPROVED BY NORTH CODORUS BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 DATE: _____
 APPROVED BY NORTH CODORUS TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
 DATE: _____
 REVIEWED BY YORK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
 DATE: _____
 OWNER SUBMITTER
 DATE: _____

APPROVALS/CERTIFICATES

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE
1	OWNER APPROVAL	
2	DEED RECORDATION	
3	DEED RECORDATION	
4	DEED RECORDATION	
5	DEED RECORDATION	
6	DEED RECORDATION	
7	DEED RECORDATION	
8	DEED RECORDATION	
9	DEED RECORDATION	
10	DEED RECORDATION	
11	DEED RECORDATION	
12	DEED RECORDATION	
13	DEED RECORDATION	
14	DEED RECORDATION	
15	DEED RECORDATION	
16	DEED RECORDATION	
17	DEED RECORDATION	
18	DEED RECORDATION	
19	DEED RECORDATION	
20	DEED RECORDATION	
21	DEED RECORDATION	
22	DEED RECORDATION	

SETBACK LEGEND AND BUILDING, STRUCTURE AND

YORK COUNTY ENERGY PARTNERS PROJECT

FIGURE 5A

YORK COUNTY ENERGY PARTNERS PROJECT

YCRK16

FIGURE 5B

FIGURE 6

INTREX.

FIGURE 7

Process Diagram for CPFC
Pilot Plant

FIGURE 8 CONCEPTUAL
FOR BIDDING PURPOSE
ONLY

NOTES:

1. LOCATION OF THE DUST PICK-UP POINTS AND THE DUST COLLECTION ARE NOT SHOWN ON THIS FLOW DIAGRAM.
2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE A DUST COLLECTION AND VENTILATION SYSTEM AT ALL TRANSFER LOCATIONS CONFORMING TO THE PROJECT SPECIFICATION.

YORK COUNTY ENERGY PARTNERS 250 MW COGENERATION FACILITY	
FUEL HANDLING SYSTEM FLOW DIAGRAM	

INITIAL ISSUE	PROJECT NO.	03-2-8050	AIR PRODUCTS
	DATE		
	REVISIONS		
	BY		
REVISED	17.40.10-1001

FIGURE 9
YCEP Facility
Water Balance

STREAM	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
DAILY AVERAGE 000 GALS/DAY	4,081.4	4,164.8	1,837.6	57.6	1,440	151,200	2,469.6	1,695.2	3.4	1,718.8
DAILY MAXIMUM 000 GALS/DAY	5,433.2	5,688.1	2,796.8	57.6	1,440	151,200	2,833.7	2,854.4	6.0	2,906.2
MAX INSTANTANEOUS (GPM)	5,000.	5,000	3,000	3,000	1,000	105,000	1,960	3,000	40	3,000

STREAM	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
DAILY AVERAGE 000 GALS/DAY	199.9	186.1	1,118.8	33.6	1,085.2	7.2	6.0	0	979.2	979.2
DAILY MAXIMUM 000 GALS/DAY	384.0	357.1	1,535.0	46.1	1,489.0	14.4	12.0	108.5	1,152.0	1,152.0
MAX INSTANTANEOUS (GPM)	850	450	1,070	—	1,035	10	50	80	800	800