SEBESTA BLOMBERG

BIOMASS-TO-ENERGY

FEASIBILITY STUDY

Final Report
Reporting Period Start Date: 10/15/01
Reporting Period End Date: 5/30/02
Principle Authors: Sebesta Blomberg & Associates, Inc.
Date Issued: September 3rd, 2002
DOE Award Number: DE-FC26-01NT41352

Submitting Organization: Sebesta Blomberg
2381 Rosegate
Roseville, MN 55113
Subcontractor: Primenergy L.L.C.
3172 North Toledo 74115
Post Office Box 581742
Tulsa, OK 74158

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."

Table of Contents

Section 1 Introduction	1-1
How to Use this Report.....	1-1
Project Team Members.....	1-2
Project Objectives	1-3
Section 2 Executive Summary	2-1
Purpose and Perspective	2-1
Technical Assessment:.....	2-2
Environmental Effects:	2-4
Economics:	2-4
1 Alstom Typhoon Turbine:	2-5
Conclusions and Recommendations:.....	2-7
Section 3 Technical	3-1
Drawings and Flowsheets	3-1
Discussion.....	3-1
Performance Characteristics of the Plant.....	3-2
Acceptable Fuels/Fuel Flexibility.....	3-3
Areas of Uncertainty.....	3-4
Section 4 Environmental Assessment.....	4-1
Air Emissions.....	4-2
Environmental Summary	4-7
Section 5 Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria	5-1
Model for Success.....	5-1
Economic Considerations	5-2
Biomass Availability	5-2
Operational Considerations	5-3
Minnesota Biomass Supply Assessment	5-4
United States Biomass Supply Assessment.....	5-13

Table of Contents

Section 6 Economics.....	6-19
Assumptions	6-22
Comparison of Economics.....	6-23
Rahr Plant Economics (1 Alstom Typhoon Turbine)	6-29
Sensitivity Analysis	6-35
Section 7 Minnesota and United States Benefits.....	7-1
Improved Strategic Security and Balance of Payment for Minnesota.....	7-1
Improved Security and Balance of Payments for the United States.....	7-6
Healthier Rural Economies.....	7-8
Improved Environmental Quality	7-9
Technology Export	7-10
Sustainable Resource Supply.....	7-10
Specific Industries Benefits	7-11
Section 8 References.....	8-1
Section 9 Appendices	9-1

Section 1

Introduction

This report examines the feasibility of biomass-to-energy projects. It is designed to examine and analyze options available, and feasibility of, a variety of biomass-to-energy plant options. This section identifies the project team, the project objectives, and the project schedule.

How to Use this Report

There are four ways to find information in this report:

1. The Table of Contents lists the sections of the report.
2. The first page of each section includes a section table of contents.
3. The header at the top of every left-hand page contains the report name and the name of the section to which the report is opened.
4. The footer at the bottom of every page contains the page number, the project number, and the revision date.

Introduction

Project Team Members

The following personnel make up the Biomass-to-Energy project team.

Sebesta Blomberg & Associates, Inc

- John Carlson Principal
- Ed Snouwaert Division Leader
- David Boyles Energy Specialist
- Ann Curnow Environmental Group Leader
- Manny Day Electrical Group Leader
- Cecil Massie Process Development Group Leader
- Tom Schubbe Energy & Utility Group Leader
- Amit Shukla Biochemical Project Engineer
- Gene Skenandore Project Manager
- Karen Murri Senior Technical Writer

Primenergy, Inc

- Bill Scott President
- Kevin McQuigg Director of Process & Application Engineering
- Michael Sharon Senior Project Manager

Rahr Malting Co.

- Gary V. Lee President
- Paul Kramer Vice President of Malt Operations
- Dale Lundquist Manager of Engineering and Process Design

Project Objectives

The following list defines the project objectives.

- Define commercial equipment for gasification of Rahr Malting Co. by-products.
- Identify commercially available spark ignited engine generators (SIEG) and combustion turbines (CT) capable of running on 150 BTU synthesis gas (syngas).
- Define equipment requirements to co-generate electricity and heat and to distribute the heat and power as required.
- Determine the emission characteristics and regulatory issues related to the proposed co-generation systems.
- Complete 20-year economic analysis for each co-generation scenario.
- Analyze the technical and economic tradeoffs of steam turbines versus combustion turbines for generation of power.
- Determine the regional and national market characteristics of biomass co-generation.

Section 2

Executive Summary

This section contains an executive summary of the Biomass-to-Energy Feasibility Study.

Purpose and Perspective

The purpose of this study was to assess the economic and technical feasibility of producing electricity and thermal energy from biomass by gasification. For an economic model we chose a large barley malting facility operated by Rahr Malting Co. in Shakopee, Minnesota. This plant provides an excellent backdrop for this study because it has both large electrical loads and thermal loads that allowed us to consider a wide range of sizes and technical options. In the end, eleven scenarios were considered ranging from 3.1 megawatts (MWe) to 19.8 MWe.

By locating the gasification and generation at an agricultural product processing plant with large electrical and thermal loads, the expectation was that some of the limitations of stand-alone biomass power plants would be overcome. In addition, since the process itself created significant volumes of low value biomass, the hope was that most of the biomass gathering and transport issues would be handled as well.

The development of low-BTU gas turbines is expected to fill a niche between the upper limit of multiple spark ignited engine set systems around 5 MWe and the minimum reasonable scale for steam turbine systems around 10 MWe.

Executive Summary

At the time of the proposal in June 2001, there were no commercially available combustion turbines capable of operating on the low BTU gas produced by the gasifier in the 5 to 10 MWe range. Our expectation was that the conclusion of our study would be that a follow-on project to develop such a turbine would be recommended. In the actual event, Alstom debuted a modified Typhoon turbine designed to use low BTU synthesis gas generating 3.1 MWe of power and has a demonstration plant in operation in England. Alstom has also announced plans to build an 11 MWe version of this design. In addition, Siemens has announced construction of a 0.4-MWe thermal input pilot plant in Germany running on a clean air turbine design. A 2.2-MWe prototype is being advertised for this technology. Therefore, we conclude that the private sector, albeit foreign, has taken up the challenge to provide low-BTU fired combustion turbines. The expected outcome of this study being overtaken by developments in the marketplace, this study has been tailored to provide the reader with a roadmap to evaluate the options and benchmark new technologies against current ones.

Technical Assessment:

Four processes for power production from biomass are technically feasible. They include: spark ignited engines, combustion turbines, steam turbines and clean air turbine or CAT technology. Each has advantages and disadvantages but the economics clearly favor the spark-ignited engines up to the 5-MWe level.

The combustion turbine manufacturer, Alstom, has demonstrated the benefits of using a standard design as the starting point by making relatively minor modifications to the combustion chamber and firing systems. Indeed, by using a “bolt-on” approach Alstom has shown how to reduce the technical risk of the project to manageable dimensions. Even so, the low-BTU gas version costs about \$3 million, \$1 million more than the same turbine running natural gas, and owing to the higher parasitic load produces much less power. New turbines being built today have the conversion feature built into them and in the long run this should reduce or eliminate the premium for the synthesis gas capable turbine.

Engine sets burning low BTU gas are a proven technology and there is very little, if any, technical risk associated with them. A number of plants operating on engine sets exist around the world. These engine sets are a mainstay of landfill gas recovery and other low value fuel supplies. Plants now in operation or under construction will provide real-world operating experience on which to base funding decisions. In the area of low-BTU engine sets, Primenergy has a number of installations that are ready to proceed to commercialization.

Serious concerns remain, however, in areas other than the turbine or engine set. While Primenergy has demonstrated a successful gas cleaning technology, the worrisome co-product is a water and tar mixture whose ultimate fate is unclear. In addition, there is no operating history to suggest the lifetime effects of low BTU gas on performance.

For conceptual simplicity the clean air turbine is the clear winner. It requires no synthesis gas conditioning technology because the products of combustion do not come in contact with either a turbine or an engine set. Instead, heat is transferred via a heat exchanger to a compressed air stream, which then passes through a turbine. During our study we considered the clean air turbine but dismissed it as economically and technically suspect. The design of a heat exchanger capable of handling the corrosion and fouling issues was considered too difficult and likely to fail.

During the study, however, Siemens announced development of the SiPeb® clean air turbine technology including a demonstration plant in Sulzbach-Rosenberg, Germany. The claimed improvement in this technology is the use of regenerative heating to alternately absorb heat from the combustion gases and transmit heat to the clean, compressed air. The unit has been in operation since October of 2001 at a capacity of 440-kWth inputs. In our opinion this technology warrants further evaluation but was announced too late to be included in this study.

Executive Summary

Environmental Effects:

Environmentally speaking, the biomass /combustion turbine system is a relatively poor performer. Uncontrolled emissions of criteria pollutants carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic carbon (VOC), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) are higher from the biomass plant than from natural gas per kilowatt-hour of power produced. Biomass power production is on a par with natural gas in NO_x emissions. A clear advantage emerges, however, from co-generation on site when compared to current practice. Under this circumstance the biomass firing replaces coal emissions from the power plant and the natural gas emissions from a boiler. NO_x, carbon monoxide, and VOC emissions are notably reduced. Sulfur dioxide emissions would remain higher.

The uncontrolled emission levels from the turbine are probably unacceptable because they are so high relative to other options. A key development would be a process for recovering NO_x and SO_x in a form suitable for fertilizer. Since our focus is on agricultural residues, returning these nutrients to the farm may be a highly desirable resolution. Of particular interest is the emerging technology being promoted by EnviroScrub of Bloomington, Minnesota. EnviroScrub claims to achieve nearly complete recovery of both NO_x and SO_x emissions in usable form. Pollution control options, however, were not included in the economic analysis.

Economics:

Eleven scenarios were evaluated. Economic return was determined based on avoided cost of purchased natural gas and electricity. Prices for natural gas, electricity, and biomass were escalated according to Office of Management and Budget estimates over the twenty-year life of the project. Projects were depreciated over a 7-year schedule on a straight line. Financing was assumed to be 20 years with 5% interest. Using these values and operating and capital cost estimates for each case, the internal rate of return for each case was estimated.

None of the cases showed an attractive return. All, but one, are negative and the best case showed only low single digit returns over the twenty year life. The one positive return was a spark ignited engine option.

A sensitivity analysis shows that this project would be attractive under any of the following scenarios:

- a. Biomass is free or has negative value
- b. Natural gas prices escalate sharply
- c. Purchased electricity costs increase two fold

Interestingly, reducing the capital cost by 50% would not be enough to make these projects attractive to ordinary investors. In any event we do not predict significant (greater than 20%) capital reductions are possible since most of the elements of each process are fully developed technologies.

1 Alstom Typhoon Turbine:

The objective under solicitation DE-PS26-01NT41130 was to facilitate the development of advanced biomass power generation systems that offer significant improvements in thermal efficiency and environmental performance. These systems were to be predominantly based on advanced biomass gasification technologies and could incorporate advanced turbine and stationary fuel cell technology for production of electricity from biomass. The project team decided to investigate the advanced combustion turbine option while at the same time considering other pertinent technologies including spark-ignited engine sets, steam turbines, and clean air turbines (CAT) for Rahr Malting Co.

Executive Summary

At the start of the project our objective was to generate 12 MWe peak electrical power and recover the heat for Rahr's process. The fuel for the gasifier is byproducts from the malting operation and other agricultural residues. We found that it was not economical to generate more than the base-load of about 4.5 MWe for Rahr. In addition, after review of available technologies, we found the only low-BTU combustion turbine available was a 4.7 MWe Typhoon combustion turbine from Alstom Power Co. After parasitic loads are factored in, this turbine generates a net power output of 3.1 MWe, less than the 5-MWe program objective. Using the Typhoon turbine, the overall thermal efficiency would be 55% as compared to the program objective of 60%. The program power production efficiency objective was 35% and the Typhoon turbine provides 20%. Our overall thermal efficiency objective was 60% and the typhoon turbine affords 55%. We achieved our objective of using more than 95% synthesis gas as fuel since the Typhoon turbine technology in association with Primenergy's gasifier can use 100% synthesis gas as fuel. The projected cost of electricity would be about \$0.07/kWh. After a seven-year depreciation period, the production costs would be \$0.030/kWh, competitive with coal-based electricity

In the 1 Alstom Scenario, the biomass cogeneration plant consumes 51,000 tons of biomass per year to produce 3.1MWe of power and 32 MMBTU/hr heat. In addition, Rahr has a supplemental heating requirement on top of the heat recovered from the cogeneration plant. This supplemental heat will be provided by gasifying about 18,000 tons /yr of biomass for a total biomass consumption of 69,000 tons/ year. Rahr produces 60,000 tons of biomass byproduct from its own process and has confirmed access to 120,000 tons/yr from nearby sources. Based only on the Rahr cogeneration plant, and not the supplemental heating plant, there is enough corn stover left in the U.S. to build approximately 3,800 plants with the same biomass tonnage usage as Rahr's. These biomass plants could fulfill 3.0% of the nation's electricity and 4.6% of natural gas usage per year.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

Biomass based power production will be attractive under certain specific circumstances but will not become generally attractive until energy prices increase significantly and disproportionately relative to biomass energy. There is some hope that this will occur as the most significant biomass supply, corn stover, is available for the cost of harvest.

The technology to implement any of the options considered in this study is feasible and ready for implementation pending resolution of environmental issues

Section 3

Technical

Eleven different scenarios were considered for Rahr ranging in size from 3.1 MWe to 19.8 MWe cogeneration systems (see Section 6 on page 6-19). However, based on the fact that advanced turbines are the focus of the NETL solicitation and that the Alstom low BTU Typhoon turbine is closest to commercialization, a 3.1 MWe cogeneration system was chosen for Rahr. The following discussion covers the plant efficiency and acceptable biomass fuels of the 3.1 MWe combustion turbine cogeneration plant.

Drawings and Flowsheets

See Appendix A on page 9-3 and Appendix G on page 17 for details of the layout and mass and energy balance of the 3.1 MWe cogeneration biomass plant.

Discussion

The four major equipment systems in the energy plant are the gasifier, gas clean-up and conditioning, combustion turbine, and heat recovery. Please refer to the gasifier process flow diagram, Appendix A on page 83, for additional details regarding the gasifier system discussion below. Biomass is fed to the gasifier from a bucket elevator and ash is collected at the bottom of the gasifier. The synthesis gas contains tars generated during the gasification process and fly ash. The hot synthesis gas from the gasifier is sent to the cyclone filters to remove most of the ash. The gas is then cooled in an indirect heat exchanger to approximately 500°F. In the heat exchanger, synthesis gas is on the tube side and water on the shell side.

From the heat exchanger, the synthesis gas goes to a direct contact spray scrubber, which utilizes a hydrocarbon medium (refined oil) to cool the gas below its water dew point and scrub out condensed moisture, tar, and particulate. The liquid blow-down (wastewater) is then removed from the system. The sub-cooled, water-saturated synthesis gas transfers from the direct contact scrubber at approximately 105°F and flows to two Particulate and Aerosol Removers (PARs) in series. The PARs utilize motor-enhanced centrifugal force to accelerate the synthesis gas tangentially to over 300 mph. This propels the remaining particulate and tar into the walls of the PARs.

Technical

The accumulated tar/particulate flows into the PAR sumps. From the PARs, the gas flows to the variable-frequency-controlled ID Fan. A pressure transmitter on the gasifier controlling the gasifier pressure controls the speed of the fan. The synthesis gas exits the ID Fan through a cooling water-jacketed duct. The cooling water-jacketed duct removes the energy imparted by the ID Fan, cooling the synthesis gas. A chevron style mist eliminator at the end of the water-jacketed duct removes moisture and entrained oil/tar. The above steps yield a synthesis gas at approximately 105°F to 110°F (depending on cooling water supply temperature). The synthesis gas is accumulated in a surge tank and then flows to the combustion turbine via the synthesis gas compressor.

The Alstom Typhoon turbine uses diesel fuel to start-up and then transfers to synthesis gas after steady state is reached. Therefore, a supply of diesel fuel will be required for start-up and for back-up in case there are problems with the biomass plant. Furthermore, the Alstom turbine is capable of running on natural gas when the combustor of the turbine is replaced. Thus, the unit is modular and capable of functioning even when the biomass plant malfunctions. Rahr has access to natural gas pipeline but does not have easy access to diesel fuel. Because the turbine can be modified to run on natural gas, Rahr will find this feature convenient in case the biomass plant fails.

Performance Characteristics of the Plant

The overall thermal efficiency of the cogeneration plant is 55%, which is calculated by adding the energy output in the form of electricity and heat and dividing by the biomass fuel input. The heat that is recovered is from the turbine exhaust and the indirect contact gas cooler-scrubber. This heat is directly recovered by linking Rahr's glycol system to these heat sources. There are other smaller heat sources but it was determined that the heat from these sources could not be economically recovered. By linking the Rahr glycol heater to the biomass plant, we increase efficiency and save money that would have been used to design and install such a heat recovery system. The total power output is 3.12 MWe and the recoverable heat is 32 MMBTU/hr.

When natural gas is burned, the Alstom Typhoon turbine generates 4.7 MWe of power. However, when synthesis gas is used the total power output drops to 3.4 MWe. This output loss is mainly due to the synthesis gas compressor, which consumes 1.3 MWe. The gasifier itself uses about 0.3 MWe leading to an overall power output of 3.1 MWe.

Acceptable Fuels/Fuel Flexibility

Estimates conclude that in order to generate 3.1 MWe-Year of electricity and 32 MMBTU/hr of heat from the co-generation process, Rahr Malting will use approximately 51,000 tons of biomass per year. In order to produce the remaining heat necessary to run the malting plant, Rahr must burn an additional 18,000 tons of biomass per year. Rahr has confirmed access to 160,000 tons/year of biomass, both as by-products from its own process, and from other agricultural processing plants and local corn farms (see Table 3-1). Rahr produces about 60,000 tons of malting by-products per year in its malting process, and intends to use this waste stream as biomass fuel. Based on availability and pricing, Rahr intends to use oat hulls, corn stover and switch grass for additional fuel (see Table 3-1) when the economics favor using these alternate fuels.

Rahr's by-product consists of several different biomasses, depending on which part of the malting process the biomass comes from, including: malt sprouts, barley needles, wheaty barley, and dust chaff. Pictures of these by-products are included in Appendix H on page 19. An elemental lab analysis was performed on these by-products, corn stover, and oat hulls. Moisture content, BTU value, and ash content of all biomasses are listed in Appendix H on page 19. Based on the projected ratio of biomasses and individual lab results, Primenergy performed mass and energy balances and sizing of the process equipment.

Table 3-1: Available Biomass at Rahr Malting Co.

Biomass Option	Price (\$/ton)	Volume (tons/yr)
Rahr By-Products	20-30	60,000
Oat Hulls	20-30	60,000
Corn Stover	40-50	30,000
Switch Grass	30-40	10,000

Technical

Areas of Uncertainty

As the project progresses, a pair of issues would need to be addressed. Firstly, about 1 tanker truck per day of wastewater will be generated as part of the proposed biomass plant. This wastewater is produced in the Particulate and Aerosol Removal part of the process (see Appendix A on page 9-3). The cost and method of disposal still needs to be resolved. Secondly, the synthesis gas produced from Primenergy's biomass plant has not been shown to work with Alstom's Typhoon turbine. Alstom has a commercial low BTU Typhoon turbine at an installation in Yorkshire, England where wood chips are used in a biomass gasification combined cycle 10-MWe power plant (<http://www.arbre.co.uk/index.htm>). Yet the Primenergy gasifier is a different technology and, it will be the first time that Alstom will try to use this new turbine in connection with Primenergy's gasifier. With DOE funding, we hope that the perceived risk associated with this integration aspect of the project will be overcome and a demonstration plant built.

Section 4

Environmental Assessment

This study included a review of the environmental implications of gasifying a biomass and combusting the resulting synthesis gas. For a technology to be viable it has to be able to obtain the necessary environmental approvals. Beyond viability, an environmentally superior technology is one that has less of an impact on the environment than the technology it replaces in terms of air emissions, water usage, waste generation, and demand of non-renewable resources such as fossil fuels.

To evaluate the environmental impact from biomass gasification/combustion the following items were reviewed.

- Expected air emissions from the biomass gasification/combustion process,
- Comparison of emissions from the combustion of synthesis gas against traditional fuel sources,
- Anticipated advantages of reducing the reliance on a coal fired power plant, and
- Additional environmental consideration such as water requirements and ash disposal.

This study is limited to reviewing environmental considerations for the installation of an Alstom Typhoon turbine, designed to run on synthesis gas and produce net 3.1 megawatts of electricity. This environmental study is restricted to the co-generation plant and does not take into account the emissions from the gasification of the biomass to supply Rahr's supplemental heating needs. Other engine manufacturers and engine sizes were considered for operational feasibility (discussed in other chapters of this report), but Alstom turbine is the focus of this environmental study since it is the only combustion turbine found to be closest to commercialization.

The report sections that follow present the environmental review completed as part of this biomass gasification study.

Environmental

Air Emissions

One of the primary environmental impact indicators is the type and amount of air emissions that are expected from a process. The type and amount of emissions will determine what type of air permitting will be required. Permitting requirements for the most part are related to the emissions of criteria pollutants. Criteria pollutants have been defined by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to be Nitrogen Oxide (NO_x), Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂), Particulate Matter (PM), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), and Lead (Pb).

In order to assess the environmental performance, it is necessary to compare potential emissions from a turbine operating on synthesis gas to potential emissions generated from a same size turbine operating on conventional fuels i.e. diesel and natural gas. Another piece of the environmental performance puzzle is to understand the benefit of generating electricity on-site. On-site generation eliminates transmission losses and displaces the need to purchase electricity generated from coal combustion. Additionally, thermal energy produced by the turbine can be utilized to displace thermal requirements at the facility that are currently satisfied by natural gas combustion.

Potential Emissions from Synthesis Gas

The process that is being reviewed has one emission point, the turbine exhaust. In order to understand what is being emitted and why, a brief explanation of the process follows. Please see Appendix A on page 9-3 for a schematic of the process.

Biomass is combusted in a gasifier to produce synthesis gas. The synthesis gas passes through a series of cooling and cleaning mechanisms before being mixed with outside air to fire the Alstom turbine. The turbine is designed to produce net 3.1 MWe of power, as well as, approximately 32 million BTU per hour of recoverable heat from the turbine and cleaning steps.

Air emissions data is not available from actual applications. Alstom Power provided emission rates for its turbine operating on synthesis gas, based on its experience using conventional fuels and the expected constituents in synthesis gas. The data is considered “best estimates based on available information” and is conservative. Alstom Power does not guarantee the emission rates provided as part of this study.

The emission rates are presented as potential emissions. Potential emissions are determined by assuming the process is operated at maximum capacity 24 hours a day, 365 days a year (8,760 hours). Table 4-1 presents the emissions from the biomass gasification/combustion process. Alstom Power was not able to provide emission rates for VOC or PM from synthesis gas. However, it was able to provide the VOC emission rates for its turbine operating on natural gas. VOC emissions from natural gas and synthesis gas are expected to be similar, so the VOC rate for natural gas was used. Alstom Power did not have enough data to provide an estimate for PM.

When the Typhoon combustion turbine is operated on natural gas or diesel fuel, the net power output is much higher (4.7 MWe) compared to when it is operated on synthesis gas (3.1 MWe). This lower net power output when the combustion turbine operates on synthesis gas is caused by the higher energy consumption required to compress the synthesis gas before it goes into the turbine. This compression is not required when the turbine operates on natural gas. In order to compare emissions from fossil fuels and synthesis gas, the total annual emissions have been normalized per megawatt-year.

Table 4-1: Potential Emissions From Synthesis Gas per Megawatt-Year

Criteria Pollutant Emissions					
NO _x Tons/yr	CO Tons/yr	SO ₂ Tons/yr	PM ₁₀ Tons/yr	Lead Tons/yr	VOC Tons/yr
22.61	19.78	16.95	Not available	0	0.283

In addition to emissions from the products of combustion, the process to generate synthesis gas from biomass will generate emissions of particulate matter from handling the biomass. The amount of particulate matter emissions from the material handling process has not been quantified as part of this review process. Emissions generated from material handling would have to be included to obtain regulatory approval for construction and operation.

Environmental**Comparison of Emissions**

The emissions from the Alstom combustion turbine operating on synthesis gas were compared to potential emissions from the same size turbine operating on natural gas and diesel fuel. The comparison was made to determine if operating a turbine on synthesis gas, as opposed to fossil fuels, would result in lower or higher emissions of any of the criteria pollutants.

The emissions for turbines operating on natural gas and diesel were calculated using emission factors presented in USEPA AP42 Emission Factors, Chapter 3.1, Stationary Gas Turbines. The following tables present the emissions from a turbine comparable to the Alstom turbine, operating on different fuel types.

Table 4-2: Potential Emissions of Turbine Operating on Natural Gas per MWe-Yr

Criteria Pollutant Emissions					
NO _x Tons/yr	CO Tons/yr	SO ₂ Tons/yr	PM ₁₀ Tons/yr	Lead Tons/yr	VOC Tons/yr
22.87	5.86	3.36	0.468	Not Determined	0.151

Table 4-3: Potential Emissions of Turbine Operating on Diesel (No. 2 Fuel Oil) per MWe-Yr

Criteria Pollutant Emissions					
NO _x Tons/yr	CO Tons/yr	SO ₂ Tons/yr	PM ₁₀ Tons/yr	Lead Tons/yr	VOC Tons/yr
62.90	0.24	3.61	6.857	0	0.030

Please note that all emission calculations are estimated as the worst-case scenario without control equipment. Figure 4-1 graphically presents the comparison of the fuel types. Lead and PM have been purposely left out of this comparison.

Figure 4-1*Comparison of Emissions.*

Environmental

The NO_x graph depicts levels for synthesis gas comparable to fossil fuel levels. As for the remaining criteria pollutants, preliminary figures show synthesis gas at higher concentrations than fossil fuels. Preliminary figures may be misleading due to the lack of actual test information from the combustion of synthesis gas.

Emission Reductions from Displacement of Electrical/Thermal Demand

In order to better understand the benefits of an alternative fuel source, the evaluation of environmental impacts should consider the advantages of displacing electrical and thermal demands that are being satisfied by conventional fuel sources.

Rahr Malting (Rahr), the host facility for the biomass study, purchases electricity from a centrally located coal fired power plant. The process of generating and transmitting electricity to Rahr from a central plant is less efficient than if electricity was generated on-site. About half of the electricity produced at a central power plant is lost due to the inefficiencies inherent with transmission lines. Not only is transmission an inefficient process, but also coal fired electrical generating plants are about 33 to 40 percent efficient at generating electricity. For example, to deliver 5 MWe of energy, a power plant would need to actually produce 25 MWe. Overall process efficiency at a coal power plant is often recognized in the 20 percent range. The proposed biomass project is expected to be approximately 55 percent efficient.

Not only is Rahr Malting a consumer of electricity, but it also has thermal demands that are currently satisfied by on-site natural gas combustion. The biomass combustion project would not only supply Rahr with 3.1 MWe of net power but also meet 32 MM BTU of Rahr's thermal load.

In order to compare the emissions resulting from the Rahr biomass co-generation plant to an equivalent fossil fuel plant, the emissions from a 15.5 MWe coal fired power plant with 40% fuel efficiency and 50% transmission loss were added to the emissions from a boiler firing at 40 MM BTU per hour with 80% efficiency. In other words, taking the efficiencies into account, the coal power plant delivers 3.1 MWe power and the boiler provides 32 MMBTU/hr heat. This combined figure is then weighted against the emissions from the biomass plant (see Table 2-4).

Table 4-4: Combined Power & Heat Emissions (Tons/MWe-Yr)

Criteria Pollutant Emissions						
	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	Lead	VOC
Current *	32.6	21.64	4.21	0.87	0.001	0.47
Syn Gas	22.61	19.78	16.95	NA	0	0.28

* Combined emissions from a coal power plant that delivers 3.1 MWe and a boiler that supplies 32 MMBTU/Hr.

Process efficiency relates directly to the environment. If less fuel is required to generate electricity or produce heat then less products of combustion are created.

Environmental Summary

In addition to air emissions, the biomass gasification process will have other environmental impacts that will need to be considered such as.

- Water usage
- Ash disposal, and
- Material handling

Some of these items may even trigger additional permitting requirements and or environmental review requirements. At the time of this study, not enough information was available to evaluate these issues in detail.

Not enough data is currently available to thoroughly review the environmental advantages of synthesis gas. However, it appears that the advantages may range from potentially lower emissions to providing solutions to the expected future shortfalls in fossil fuels.

Section 5

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria

There are various sources of biomass that can be used as fuel to produce energy. However, the selection of the biomass is critical for the success of any biomass to energy project. This success hinges on biomass availability and pricing. This section provides a description of the biomass supply criteria necessary for a successful biomass to energy project both in Minnesota and across the nation.

Model for Success

The Rahr site is an excellent model for successful biomass co-generation that has potential for replication across the United States. Many agricultural processing and ethanol plants fit the characteristics of this model. Plants fitting the model have several features that make them attractive: high-energy consumption, on-site biomass availability, and proximity to alternative biomass supplies. First, these plants consume enormous amounts of electricity and heat in the processes through pumps, fans, dryers, kilns, etc. Secondly, a large percentage of required biomass is available on-site. These plants produce by-products that are currently disposed of, or sold as low-value animal feed. The low-value byproduct could alternatively be used as fuel to power and heat their processes, thereby reducing natural gas and electrical expenses. Finally, additional biomass is available near the plants so that the total biomass expense is minimized. Agricultural processing and ethanol plants are typically located near farms where agricultural residues can be obtained inexpensively. Proximity to farms and other agricultural processing plants, and the fact that much of the biomass is available on site, reduces transportation costs, making the economics of biomass co-generation more attractive.

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria

Economic Considerations

The Rahr case highlights critical cost considerations for any economic evaluation of biomass energy production. First, the cost per BTU of biomass supplied to the energy plant must be compared with that of natural gas or other existing fuel cost. In the case of Rahr, natural gas is used for comparisons. If the biomass cost is low compared with that of natural gas, then the plant is a good candidate for biomass energy production. A second consideration is the transportation cost for delivery of biomass. Lower transportation cost makes it economically feasible to collect biomass from a larger geographic area. Third, the biomass supply pricing structure should be stable over time. Unstable prices create market volatility, problems in obtaining sufficient quantities, and overall cost fluctuations for the energy plant. Finally, availability of sufficient biomass in the market place for all of the competing biomass users is another important factor that can affect seasonal price and availability. A biomass-to-energy plant designed to use a wide variety of fuels reduces the negative effects of price spikes and/or seasonal price variations.

Biomass Availability

Assuming a sufficient amount of biomass is not available on-site, additional biomass must be obtained off-site. There are a variety of options for additional biomass. For example, biomass is usually available at generators such as soybean processing plants that produce soybean hulls. Otherwise, biomass such as corn stover may be available from corn farms. By obtaining biomass directly from the biomass generators, biomass may be available at lower prices, bypassing distribution channels. Alternately, biomass can be obtained from brokers, traders, or other commercial distribution channels. An advantage of working with a broker or trader is that the brokers have multiple sources and a wider range of biomass fuels and pricing/delivery options. Furthermore, since the brokers deal with buying and selling biomass on a daily basis, they can manage market volatility and may be able to obtain more stable, long-term supply prices. (For more information about biomass availability in Minnesota, see Section 3.5)

Operational Considerations

A facility considering a biomass energy plant must have the capability to obtain and handle enormous amounts of biomass and have the ability to store it under the right conditions. If these considerations are overlooked, a facility will risk losing money on the project. The following issues must be considered, both technically and economically: on-site biomass storage, biomass availability and pricing, and biomass quality control.

On-Site Biomass Storage

The proposed facility must have sufficient on-site storage capacity to handle the enormous volumes of biomass for processing. Storage silos, conveyor belts, and other material handling equipment must be sized and priced.

Biomass Availability and Pricing

Market price fluctuations, transportation scheduling, and other similar availability factors can affect biomass purchasing and delivery. Therefore, the facility should be able to stockpile biomass. For example, a company using oat hulls as fuel, when the price of oat hulls increases should have the capability to interrupt this supply and switch to another less costly fuel. This switch might create material storage problems and delivery volume changes.

Biomass Quality Control

Biomass humidity and moisture content are important considerations. Biomass with less moisture allows a more efficient gasification process and yields more energy for the same mass of input material.

Also, in cases where the biomass is wet, it might be necessary to dry biomass coming into the plant and provide humidity controlled storage facilities. Some examples of biomass that might need to be dried are wet distillers grains from ethanol fermentation process. In addition, the facility must define quality of the biomass going into the plant and specify any grinding or chopping equipment necessary to prepare the biomass for gasification. It is also necessary to control dust and odors during biomass preparation.

Finally, a proposed facility must manage biomass shelf life to avoid degradation during storage. Biomass degradation represents financial and energy loss.

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria

Minnesota Biomass Supply Assessment

Minnesota produces several different types of low-value biomass for possible use in a biomass-to-energy plant. Also, Minnesota supports a large number of farms and agricultural processing facilities. Therefore, currently, there is no shortage of biomass volume. Biomass types include farming residues such as corn stover, agricultural processing outputs such as malting by-products, and energy crops such as switch grass. Each of these biomasses has advantages and disadvantages.

Corn Stover—Price and Availability

In Minnesota, corn stover is one of the most attractive fuels for biomass-to-energy projects because of low cost and high availability. Currently, corn stover is available for about \$45/ton, which is essentially the cost to collect and transport the material. This price is lower than most other forms of biomass currently available in the market. Corn stover is available at these low prices because the main source of farming revenue usually comes from corn sales. Stover is not normally relied upon for significant income. Therefore, production costs associated with the land and farming equipment are not generally included in the selling price of stover. This existing pricing structure for growing and harvesting stover will tend to keep the price low. Currently, most corn stover is not harvested because there is no demand for it. As the biomass market for corn stover grows, more farmers will harvest stover. This increase in harvest of stover will create significant new income for farmers.

There is an abundant supply of corn stover in Minnesota. In 2000, approximately 27-million tons of corn stover was available in Minnesota (see Figure 5-1), a vast majority of which was left on the field. This estimate was determined by assuming that the weight of corn stover is about 50% of the weight of corn that is harvested. The data for the amount of corn harvested was found from the USDA web site¹. Assuming 30% of this available stover is left on the fields for soil erosion control, and the remaining 70% is harvested, 19-million tons of stover is potentially available as a fuel source².

As discussed above, the Rahr co-generation plant (not including the supplemental biomass plant) will consume about 51,000 tons per year of biomass to generate 280-billion BTU of heat and 27-million kWh of electricity. Assuming all the harvested corn stover in Minnesota is utilized as fuel, over 370 plants with similar tonnage requirements as Rahr's could operate on corn stover alone. The 370 plants could supply over 103-trillion BTU of heat and 10-billion kWh of electricity annually. The 103-trillion BTU of energy per year equates to approximately the same amount of energy (BTU) produced by burning 103-billion cubic feet of natural gas.

In 2000, Minnesota consumed a total of about 60-billion kWh of electricity and 333-billion cubic feet of natural gas (see Figure 5-2 and Figure 5-3)³. Therefore, the corn stover that is currently left on the fields in Minnesota could supply approximately 17% of the electricity requirements and 31% of the natural gas requirements for the entire State.

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria

Figure 5-1

Corn Stover Produced in Minnesota

Figure 5-2

Sales to Consumers from Electrical Utilities in Minnesota

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria

Figure 5-3

Total Deliveries to Consumers in MN (MMcf)

Corn Stover—Economic Considerations

If corn stover is collected for use as fuel, it will eventually require some level of size reduction or grinding prior to gasification. There are advantages to grinding the stover at the farm, if possible, prior to shipment to the energy plant. Grinding stover at the farm increases its density, which means more mass of stover can be transported per truck. Thus, the transportation and material handling costs would be reduced. Finally, grinding at the farm avoids regulatory dust control and permitting problems that could exist if the grinding had to be completed at the energy plant site.

Agricultural By-Products—Price and Availability

“Feedstuffs” is a weekly publication that publishes the prices for a wide variety of feed ingredients that are potential biomass candidates for energy production. According to Feedstuffs, many agricultural by-products exist as potential fuel sources for a gasification project. Normally, these by-products are sold as animal feed ingredients to feed companies. The by-products are created as part of agricultural processes such as soybean conversion into soybean oil where soybean hulls become the by-product.

It is also important to bear in mind that some materials are not reasonable for this type of gasification based on either high prices or technical problems. For example, most animal by-products are not ideal fuel sources for this particular gasification project. Animal byproducts are not ideal for this application based on high capital costs necessary to meet emission standards. Soybean meal, which costs \$179 per ton, is an unreasonable fuel because it is a high feed value byproduct. For this analysis, a ceiling price of \$100/ton is used to define economic viability for biomass based on the current market prices. The biomasses selected for this project are listed in Table 5-1: Recommended Biomass For Rahr Malting Co.

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria**Table 5-1: Recommended Biomass For Rahr Malting Co.**

Biomass Option	Price (\$/ton)	Volume (tons/yr)
Rahr By-Products	20-30	60,000
Oat Hulls	20-30	60,000
Corn Stover	40-50	30,000
Switch Grass	30-40	10,000

Choosing a single source for fuel based on pricing can create problems as illustrated in the following example. In Figure 5-4, re-ground oat feed is shown as the cheapest source of biomass ranging in price from \$20-30/ton. Re-ground oat feed is a by-product of oat processing. Last year, in Minnesota, the estimated amount produced was only 100,000 tons (see Figure 5-5)³. This re-ground oat hull estimate is determined by assuming that the hull represents 30% by weight of the oats harvested. Assuming that all the oats in Minnesota are harvested, the resulting oat hulls are sufficient to satisfy Rahr's annual requirements. Based on Rahr's annual consumption of 51,000 tons/year of biomass for the cogeneration plant (does not include Rahr's supplemental heating), at most one additional plant the size of Rahr could operate in Minnesota because the two plants would consume the State's entire supply of oat hulls. Also, this example illustrates that the supply of oat hulls is limited and dropping sharply (see Figure 5-5). Therefore even a slight increase in consumption demand could result in a large price increase and a negative effect on plant economics. This example reinforces the need for alternate sources of biomass for any biomass-to-energy plant.

Figure 5-4

Minneapolis Feed Ingredient Prices (Feedstuffs Magazine)

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria

Figure 5-5

Maximum Estimated Oat Hull Production in Minnesota (Tons)

Agricultural By-Products—Economic Considerations

Low biomass costs can be easily achieved if local resources are available and used efficiently. However, prices and availability of agricultural byproducts will be subject to seasonal fluctuations. Additionally, since these agricultural by-products are sources of animal feed, there will be competition for limited resources. Competition will also affect pricing and availability of biomass.

NOTE: Basing a biomass-to-energy plant design on a portfolio of biomass sources is the most prudent approach.

Switch Grass—Availability and Economic Considerations

Switch grass, a perennial warm season grass native to the North American prairie from the Gulf of Mexico to Canada, is another biomass candidate. The advantage of using switch grass is that it is a perennial plant that requires no fertilizer for growth. Furthermore, switch grass has excellent gasification characteristics.

Unlike other biomasses, such as corn stover that is harvested only once a year, switch grass can be grown and harvested repeatedly over much of the year, thereby offering greater flexibility. Also, since switch grass does not require fertilizer, the total farming cost is reduced resulting in lower biomass costs.

One important economic consideration for switch grass is that it is not normally an agricultural byproduct. Therefore, the land and equipment costs associated with harvesting switch grass must be factored into the total cost. Since there is no, existing, large scale example of switch grass production, the actual economics of using switch grass as a biomass fuel is difficult to determine conclusively.

United States Biomass Supply Assessment

The biomass availability in the United States reflects that in Minnesota. As discussed below, the corn stover production is approximately 10 times the production in Minnesota. The following is a breakdown of various biomass supplies in the United States and their prices.

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria

Corn Stover—Price and Availability

Just as in Minnesota, there is an abundant supply of corn stover across much of the United States. In 2000, 279,674,024 tons of corn stover was produced in the U.S. (see Figure 5-6)⁵. If 70% (195,771,817 tons) could be harvested, then over 3,800 biomass energy plants, equivalent in size to Rahr's could be supplied with biomass. The electricity generated from these plants would be approximately 104-billion kWh, and the heat recovered would amount to 1.06-quadrillion BTU per year. The 1.06-quadrillion BTU equates to 1.06-trillion cubic feet of natural gas per year. In the year 2000, approximately 3,412,766 MMkWh of electricity and 23-trillion cubic feet of natural gas were consumed in the U.S. (see Figure 5-7 and Figure 5-8)⁶. Therefore, approximately 3.0% of the nation's electricity and 4.6% of the country's natural gas needs can be fulfilled by biomass power plants that run on corn stover alone.

Figure 5-6

Corn Stover Production in the United States

Figure 5-7

Historical Energy Consumption in the United States

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria

Figure 5-8

Natural Gas Consumption in the United States

Agricultural By-Products—Price and Availability

As discussed above, according to *Feedstuffs*, re-ground oat feed, at \$20 to \$30 per ton, is one of the lowest cost sources of biomass available in the United States. Other biomasses range in price from \$30 to \$100 per ton, and the actual delivered price is dependent on transportation costs.

Based on oat harvest numbers from 2000, the estimated volume of oat hulls that were generated from America's oat fields was 716,000 tons annually (see Figure 5-9). Given that 100% of the oat hulls available in the entire US could be collected, this would be sufficient to supply fuel for only fourteen plants, equivalent in size to Rahr's. As discussed above, basing a biomass plant solely on oat hulls is not recommended. The US supply (similar to the Minnesota supply) of oat hulls is limited and dropping sharply (see Figure 5-9). The limited and declining supply means that even a slight increase in demand could create supply and pricing problems. Hence, even on a national scale, basing a biomass energy plant on a portfolio of biomass sources would be the recommended approach.

Biomass Supply Feasibility Criteria

Figure 5-9

Oat Hull Production in the United States

Section 6

Economics

Several different scenarios were considered during the economic evaluation of this project. We studied a vast majority of combinations and permutations possible at Rahr Malting Co. Combinations of diverse technologies including combustion turbines, spark-ignited engine sets, indirect turbine, mixed-air turbines, and steam turbines were considered (see Table 6-1).

Rahr's electrical and thermal demands vary with time (see Figure 6-1). Rahr has a peak electrical demand of about 12 MWe and a base load of approximately 4 MWe. Depending on the scenario, each scenario satisfies a portion of the electrical and thermal demand of Rahr.

Table 6-1: Description of the Various Scenarios*

Scenario	Technology	Manufacturer
1.1**	1 combustion turbine	Alstom
1.2**	1 direct fired custom combustion turbine	Primenergy
2.1	3 combustion turbines	Alstom
2.2	2 combustion turbines, 2 engine sets	Alstom, Jenbacher
2.3	2 custom turbines	Primenergy
2.4	2 mixed air & syngas custom turbines	Primenergy
2.5	2 indirect turbines	Primenergy
2.6	4 engine sets	Jenbacher
2.7**	2 engine sets	Jenbacher
3.1	6 combustion turbines	Alstom
4**	1 steam turbine	Primenergy

* See Appendices A-F for the process flow diagrams.

** Single train.

Economics

Figure 6-1

Plant Load Duration & Performance of On-Site Generation

In most of the scenarios described above, biomass is gasified in Primenergy's gasifier(s) and the synthesis gas is cleaned and conditioned. The clean low BTU synthesis gas is then fed to combustion turbine(s) and/or spark-ignited engine set(s) to generate electricity. The exceptions to this scheme are Scenarios 2.5 and 4. In Scenario 2.5, the gas cleanup system is not as rigorous. Instead, the synthesis gas is removed of particulates and is combusted in a combustor. The heat generated is recovered to drive a hot air turbine (see process flow diagram, Appendix E). Scenario 4 is similar to 2.5 in the sense that the recovered heat is used to make steam, which, in turn, drives a steam turbine to generate electricity (see process flow diagram, Appendix F). The heat off all these processes is recovered in Rahr Malting's glycol heaters enabling each scenario to be as economically efficient as possible.

In all of the combustion turbine cases, except Scenario 2.4, synthesis gas and air are compressed separately. In most cases, synthesis gas is compressed in a compressor and then sent to the combustion turbine where it blends with the atmospheric air and combusts to create electricity. In Scenario 2.4, however, synthesis gas and air are compressed together in the same compressor and then processed by the combustion turbines. Having one compressor instead of two saves on the compressor cost but may come as a compromise to safety. For the sake of the study, it was assumed that Scenario 2.4 would be possible even though safety would be an issue.

All the scenarios listed above use proven technologies, except Scenarios 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5. In these special cases, Primenergy proposes to modify second-hand Solar turbine(s) to burn synthesis gas and make electricity. During normal operation, these Solar turbines combust natural gas to generate electricity. Even though the Solar turbines are altered to use synthesis gas, they will still have to rely on some natural gas. In Table 6-3, please refer to "Cogeneration" row under "%Biomass." This notation shows what percentage of the total fuel going into the cogeneration plant is biomass and what is natural gas. For example, for Scenario 1.2, 84.4% of the fuel going into this particular plant is biomass and the rest is natural gas

Economics

Assumptions

In order to analyze and compare the above scenarios, a computer model was created. Several assumptions were made to construct this model. These assumptions are listed below:

- It was assumed that Rahr's annual consumption of utility services is constant, even though its electrical and thermal demands vary on a daily and seasonal basis. Rahr's electrical demand was determined by looking at its 15-minute interval demand data and utility billings. This data was averaged out for the entire year.
- Thermal requirements and price were found by looking at the thermal load evaluation of Rahr's process and by studying its heating bills. In most scenarios, electrical load following was assumed. When load following is assumed, Rahr has a thermal requirement above the heat recovery capacity of the respective scenario. It was assumed that this supplemental fuel requirement is supplied by either biomass or natural gas, depending on the scenario. This parameter is referred to as "Conventional Boilers" and is denoted by "% biomass" (see Table 6-3).
- The whole economic model was based on the assumption that the energy prices would rise in the future. This escalation in energy prices information was taken from the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) general inflation and price trend projections from the Annual Energy Outlook (see the Figure 6-2).
- The biomass combustion turbine operation was adjusted for parasitic load. The Alstom turbines were rated as 4.7 MWe when they run on natural gas. However, when the turbines burn synthesis gas, an air compressor has to be introduced to compress the synthesis gas to Alstom's specification. The compressor uses up to 1.3 MWe of power and the remaining 0.3 MWe is consumed by the gasifier system. Hence, for example, in Scenario 1.1, the net power output is 3.12 MWe even though the Alstom turbine is rated higher.
- Not all turbines in the scenarios discussed above operate on 100% synthesis gas. For instance, in Scenario 1.2, 84.4 % of the fuel going into the turbine is synthesis gas (see Table 6-3). The rest of the fuel comes from natural gas. The fuel mix of combustion turbine (biomass vs. natural gas) was taken from manufacturers' recommendations.
- The biomass fuel stock input to gasifier and water requirements to the process were taken from process mass balance sheets of Primenergy.
- The maintenance of the cogeneration process is assumed to be \$0.0045/kWh. This price escalates with non-salary general inflation.
- The stand-by electrical service charges were assumed to be \$2.20/kW-month.
- The discount rate of 6% was assigned for the net present value calculations.
- A 7-year straight-line depreciation was allocated to all equipment.
- A financing structure of 20-years at 5% was chosen for each scenario.

Figure 6-2*Energy Price Forecast*

Comparison of Economics

In this section, the economics of the different scenarios will be compared (see Table 6-2). In order to understand the following discussion, it is important to understand what costs were assumed for the different fuels. These costs are mainly in the form of fuel prices and are described in the following table:

Table 6-2: Description of Fuel Prices

Fuel	Cost
Biomass	\$25/ton
Natural Gas	\$4.00/MMBTU
Electricity	\$0.045/kWh

Economics

Based on the above fuel costs, the best payback of all the cases happens to be Scenario 2.6. In Scenario 2.6, four spark-ignited engine sets, built by Jenbacher, are used to generate electricity. The heat produced from this process is recovered as Rahr Malting's process heat (see Appendix B for details of the process flow diagram) via its glycol heaters. Based on this scenario, if Rahr invests \$15,300,632 to install the biomass plant, it will avoid total energy expenses of \$34,053,292 over 20 years. The internal rate of return is 2.3 % (see Table 6-3) without any grant subsidies or tax breaks.

The engine sets scenarios have better economics than combustion turbine cases for two reasons. The Jenbacher engine sets have a low capital investment of \$860/kW, much lower than the combustion turbine cases (see Table 6-3). The Jenbacher engine set costs about \$1.2 million per unit and produces 1.3 MWe when it uses synthesis gas. In addition, it does not require a compressor as in the case of the combustion turbines. In the combustion turbine scenarios, the synthesis gas compressor costs \$1.2 million, and uses 1.3 MWe of power. These two factors combined yield higher electrical generation costs for combustion turbines than for the engine sets.

Both the engine sets and combustion turbine processes yield a thermal efficiency of 54% to 55% as compared to the steam cycle, which yields only 30%. This lower efficiency in the steam cycle is due to the fact that the heat of vaporization of water is lost through the cooling tower because it is low-grade heat, which cannot be recovered. This heat of vaporization amounts to a significant loss of any energy process. Since the steam cycle has a lower thermal efficiency, in Scenario 4, more biomass has to be consumed than where engine sets and combustion turbines are used to yield the same amount of useable energy. This higher biomass usage leads to elevated operating costs, negatively impacts economics, and causes the steam cycle to be a less attractive option than engine sets.

Rahr has a heating demand in addition to the heat recovered from the biomass cogeneration process. This supplemental heating load can either be supplied by gasification of biomass or by natural gas. In all the scenarios, except Scenarios 1.1, 2.7, and 4, the best economics occur when the supplemental fuel requirement is fulfilled by natural gas, not biomass. In these scenarios, the supplemental fuel requirement is much too low to justify investment in additional gasifier system(s). However, in Scenarios 1.1, 2.7, and 4, the supplemental fuel requirement is large enough to validate the investment in an additional gasifier (see Appendix I). In Scenarios 1.1, 2.7, and 4, the savings in natural gas cost as compared to the added equipment cost justifies this added investment.

As can be seen from the Table 6-3, the economics is better for smaller plants than larger ones. The chief reason for this is because much of the equipment is unutilized in larger plants and the heat produced from these processes is not always recovered. As mentioned earlier, Rahr's base electrical load is about 4 MWe. Therefore, plants that are designed specifically to meet this base load will be more utilized than plants that are planned to meet higher loads. Furthermore, the heat from plants designed for higher loads cannot always be recovered. In larger plants where more electricity is generated, the extra heat produced must be wasted to the environment because Rahr does not have a use for it. This wastage of heat decreases the thermal efficiency of the plant and negatively impacts economics. On the other hand, in plants designed to meet just the base electrical load, the equipment is used almost 100% of the time and the heat produced can be fully utilized by Rahr. In these Scenarios efficiency increases, and positively affects economy. These are some of the reasons why Scenarios 1.1, 1.2, 2.6, 2.7, and 4 have a higher payback than others.

Table 6-3: Variables and Summary of Economics

Equipment Cost Reduction Factor

1

1

Fuel	Natural Gas	\$ 4.00 /MMBTU	Biomass	Annual Procurement	100%	\$ 25.00 /Ton	13.21 MMBTU/Ton		IPP Merchant Sales	\$ 0.0750 /kWh	
Scenario:	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	3.1	4
	New Turbine	Direct Fired Turbine	New Turbine	Turbine & SIEG	Direct Fired Turbine	Mixed Air & SynGas	Indirect Turbine	SIEG	SIEG	New Turbine, IPP	Steam
	One Alstom	One Custom Turbine	Three Alstom	Two Altsom, Two Jenbacher	Two Custom Turbines	Two Custom Turbines	Two Solar	Four Jenbacher	Two Jenbacher	Six Alstom	Turbine
Unit Capacity, Net	3,120	4,992	9,900	9,296	9,984	9,725	9,334	5,392	2,696	19,800	4,718
HRSG	32,000,000 BTU	87,760,000	96,000,000 BTU	87,344,211 BTU	175,520,000 BTU	103,820,000 BTU	169,340,000 BTU	47,520,000 BTU	23,760,000 BTU	192,000,000 BTU	14,150,000 BTU
%-Biomass											
Cogeneration	100% Biomass	84.4% Biomass	100% Biomass	100% Biomass	84.6% Biomass	84.4% Biomass	88.0% Biomass	100% Biomass	100% Biomass	100% Biomass	100% Biomass
Conventional Boilers	100% Biomass	0% Biomass	0% Biomass	0% Biomass	0% Biomass	0% Biomass	0% Biomass	0% Biomass	100% Biomass	0% Biomass	100% Biomass
Project Cost											
Turbine	\$ 1,934 /kW	\$ 1,708 /kW	\$ 1,934 /kW	\$ 1,612 /kW	\$ 1,691 /kW	\$ 626 /kW	\$ 696 /kW	\$ 860 /kW	\$ 860 /kW	\$ 1,934 /kW	\$ 182 /kW
	\$ 6,034,080	\$ 8,526,336	\$ 19,146,600	\$ 14,983,293	\$ 16,882,944	\$ 6,087,850	\$ 6,496,464	\$ 4,637,120	\$ 2,318,560	\$ 38,293,200	\$ 858,676
Auxiliary Systems	\$ 135 /kW	\$ 89 /kW	\$ 125 /kW	\$ 125 /kW	\$ 64 /kW	\$ 66 /kW	\$ 45.00 /kW	\$ 125 /kW	\$ 125 /kW	\$ 100 /kW	\$ 120 /kW
	\$ 421,200	\$ 444,288	\$ 1,237,500	\$ 1,162,000	\$ 640,973	\$ 643,795	\$ 420,030	\$ 674,000	\$ 337,000	\$ 1,980,000	\$ 566,160
Gasifier	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 4,030,000	\$ 7,780,000	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 8,060,000	\$ 6,670,000	\$ 7,220,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 8,200,000	\$ 15,860,000	\$ 7,849,196
Thermal Connection	\$ 147,897	\$ 147,897	\$ 147,897	\$ 629,732	\$ 419,821	\$ 301,393	\$ 412,963	\$ 412,963	\$ 412,963	\$ 412,963	\$ 1,617,410
Electrical Interconnection	\$ 446,302	\$ 477,958	\$ 1,062,129	\$ 1,327,661	\$ 1,062,129	\$ 732,092	\$ 729,793	\$ 729,793	\$ 328,407	\$ 3,186,387	\$ 448,823
Plant Improvements											
Thermal Connection	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000
Electrical	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Subtotal	\$ 14,049,479	\$ 13,626,479	\$ 29,374,126	\$ 25,602,686	\$ 27,065,867	\$ 14,435,130	\$ 15,279,250	\$ 9,953,876	\$ 11,596,930	\$ 59,732,550	\$ 11,340,265
7.1% Mechanical Installation	\$ 997,513	\$ 967,480	\$ 2,085,563	\$ 1,817,791	\$ 1,921,677	\$ 1,024,894	\$ 1,084,827	\$ 706,725	\$ 823,382	\$ 4,241,011	\$ 805,159
12.1% Electric Installation	\$ 1,699,987	\$ 1,648,804	\$ 3,554,269	\$ 3,097,925	\$ 3,274,970	\$ 1,746,651	\$ 1,848,789	\$ 1,204,419	\$ 1,403,229	\$ 7,227,639	\$ 1,372,172
Civil/Site Work	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 3,600,000	\$ 250,000
Subtotal	\$ 16,996,979	\$ 16,492,763	\$ 35,763,958	\$ 31,018,401	\$ 32,762,513	\$ 17,706,675	\$ 18,712,866	\$ 12,365,020	\$ 14,323,540	\$ 74,801,200	\$ 13,767,596
7.5% Eng. & Design	\$ 1,274,773	\$ 1,236,957	\$ 2,682,297	\$ 2,326,380	\$ 2,457,188	\$ 1,328,001	\$ 1,403,465	\$ 927,377	\$ 1,074,266	\$ 5,610,090	\$ 1,032,570
Permits	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 150,000
1.5% Construction Svc.	\$ 254,955	\$ 247,391	\$ 536,459	\$ 465,276	\$ 491,438	\$ 265,600	\$ 280,693	\$ 185,475	\$ 214,853	\$ 1,122,018	\$ 206,514
Subtotal	\$ 18,676,707	\$ 18,127,112	\$ 39,132,714	\$ 33,960,057	\$ 35,861,139	\$ 19,450,276	\$ 20,547,024	\$ 13,627,872	\$ 15,762,659	\$ 82,033,308	\$ 15,156,680
7.5% Contingency	\$ 1,400,753	\$ 1,359,533	\$ 2,934,954	\$ 2,547,004	\$ 2,689,585	\$ 1,458,771	\$ 1,541,027	\$ 1,022,090	\$ 1,182,199	\$ 6,152,498	\$ 1,136,751
TOTAL w/o Plant Improvements	\$ 20,077,460	\$ 19,486,645	\$ 42,067,668	\$ 36,507,062	\$ 38,550,725	\$ 20,909,046	\$ 22,088,051	\$ 14,649,962	\$ 16,944,858	\$ 88,185,806	\$ 16,293,430
TOTAL with Plant Improvements	\$ 20,728,130	\$ 20,137,315	\$ 42,718,338	\$ 37,157,732	\$ 39,201,395	\$ 21,559,716	\$ 22,738,721	\$ 15,300,632	\$ 17,595,528	\$ 88,836,476	\$ 16,944,100
Financing	5% Interest Rate	20 Year Term	S-L Depreciation	7 Years	Discount Rate	6%	DOE Demo Grant	50%	Maximum Grant	\$ -	
DOE Demonstration Grant	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Annual Payment	\$ 1,611,067	\$ 1,563,659	\$ 3,375,619	\$ 2,929,421	\$ 3,093,410	\$ 1,677,796	\$ 1,772,402	\$ 1,175,551	\$ 1,359,699	\$ 7,076,257	\$1,307,427
Present Value, 20-Year											
Avoided Expenses	\$ 28,439,838	\$ 24,609,121	\$ 28,215,702	\$ 30,340,047	\$ 18,989,059	\$ 34,707,841	\$ 27,363,214	\$ 34,053,292	\$ 31,475,617	\$ 41,209,361	\$ 24,689,328
After Tax Cash Flow	\$ 3,550,013	\$ 1,349,144	\$ (15,395,282)	\$ (9,054,097)	\$ (19,094,221)	\$ 7,695,738	\$ 1,178,568	\$ 12,452,547	\$ 8,500,110	\$ (45,158,058)	\$ 3,982,341
Internal Rate of Return	-9.3%	-16.2%	NA*	NA*	NA*	-4.8%	-19.0%	2.3%	-0.8%	NA*	-6.7%

* Indicates that Rahr would lose money every year if it installed this system.

Rahr Plant Economics (1 Alstom Typhoon Turbine)

The focus of the DOE solicitation is the feasibility of using advanced turbines to generate energy. Therefore, we propose using 1 Alstom Typhoon combustion turbine for Rahr Malting Co. The economics of multiple Typhoon turbines are not as good as 1 Typhoon, and the implementation of multiple turbines is not proposed for Rahr (see “Comparison of Emissions”). This low BTU combustion turbine is currently available in the market, and Alstom is confident about the performance of its turbine based on Primenergy’s synthesis gas specifications. Consequently, the risk associated with developing a low BTU turbine will be minimized. This reduced risk is another reason we are proposing using the Typhoon turbine (Scenario 1.1) at Rahr. The following discussion will be for Scenario 1.1, the 1 Typhoon case.

The projected economic return from this biomass cogeneration process would not be attractive at current energy prices even if the capital costs were reduced by about 50% (see “Sensitivity Analysis” on page 6-35). Even with this reduction, the payback is positive but the internal rate of return is negative.

At present, without capital cost sharing, the projected cost of electricity would be about \$0.07/kWh. After a seven-year depreciation period, the production costs would be \$0.030/kWh, competitive with coal-based electricity (see Figure 6-3). With DOE cost sharing, the cost of electricity would be competitive at today’s prices. In like manner, with DOE funding, thermal energy would cost approximately \$5.5/MMBTU until depreciation ends, after which, it would be less than \$4/MMBTU (see Figure 6-4).

Economics

Figure 6-3

Biomass Cogeneration: 1 Alstom Typhoon, Comparison of Electric Costs

Figure 6-4

Biomass Cogeneration: One Alstom Turbine, Comparison of Process Heating Costs

Capital Costs

The total equipment cost of the plant is \$20,007,460 and it includes the 1 Alstom Typhoon turbine, electrical generation equipment, Primenergy gasifier, gas-cleanup, material-handling equipment, installation, and contingency costs, (see Table 6-4). This price does not include any upgrades that Rahr would have to make to integrate this biomass cogeneration plant into its malting process. Including upgrades, we estimate the total biomass plant cost to be \$20,728,130. The breakdown of the various costs is shown below. A detailed breakdown of the different costs is shown in Table 6-5.

Table 6-4: Breakdown of 1 Alstom Typhoon Turbine Plant at Rahr

Turbines	\$6,034,080
Auxiliary Systems	\$421,200
Gasifier	\$7,000,000
Thermal Connection	\$147,897
Electrical Interconnection	\$446,302
Subtotal	\$14,049,479
Mechanical Installation	\$997,513
Electrical Installation	\$1,699,987
Civil/Site Work	\$250,000
Subtotal	\$16,996,979
Engineering & Design	\$1,274,773
Permits	\$150,000
Construction Services	\$254,955
Subtotal	\$18,676,707
Contingency	\$1,400,753
Total	\$20,007,460

Economics

Operating Costs

The Rahr cogeneration plant will use 51,000 tons/yr of biomass to generate 3.12 MWe of power and 32 MMBTU/hr (280,320 MMBTU/yr) of process heat. The Rahr malting process requires additional heat and electricity on top of what the cogeneration plant could supply. It is assumed in this study, for Scenario 1.1, that the additional electricity will be purchased from the grid. The heat will be supplied by gasifying additional biomass since it was found that burning biomass yielded better economics than combusting natural gas. In Table 6-5, under the “Conventional Boilers” row, the “100% Biomass” denotes that the supplemental fuel requirement of Rahr will be provided by biomass. In a similar fashion, “0% Biomass” means the supplemental fuel will be full-filled by natural gas, not biomass. Consequently, for the one Alstom Typhoon case, 100% of the supplemental fuel will be supplied by biomass, requiring an additional gasifier to burn it. An additional 18,000 tons/year of biomass must be burned to produce the remaining 88 MMBTU/hr (770,880 MMBTU/yr) of heat. Hence, Rahr will consume a total of 69,000 tons/year of biomass.

The various operating costs associated with the plant are shown in Table 6-5. The energy costs were projected to twenty years based on inflation and energy price fluctuations with time. As can be seen from the table, based on electricity and natural gas prices of \$0.0450/kWh and 4.00/MMBTU (see Unit Expenses in the Table 6-5) respectively, the total cost of running the Rahr plant for the first year on fossil fuels is projected to be \$5,091,364. If Rahr switches to 100% biomass, the total energy cost is expected to be \$3,558,841, leading to a savings of \$1,532,523. When Rahr will operate on biomass, the above total cost of \$3,558,841 includes the expenditure for residual electric service. Rahr will have to purchase this residual electricity from the grid since the Typhoon turbine will only provide net 3.1-MWe power to the Rahr plant. This residual service amounts to \$1,628,549 for the first year. In addition to the residual service, the Rahr biomass cogeneration plant will have to be maintained. A total maintenance cost of \$122,988 is added to total expenses of the cogeneration plant. Over 20 years, the savings due to the biomass cogeneration plant accumulates to \$28,439,838 based on today’s dollar (see NPV, Avoided Expense in Table 6-5). Therefore, if Rahr invests \$20,728,130 to build the Alstom based biomass plant today, it will avoid costs of \$28,439,838 over 20 years generating an internal rate of return of –9.3% (see Table 6-3).

Table 6-5: Detailed Economics for Scenario 1.1

[illegible]

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Unit Expenses											
Residual Retail Electric Service											
Demand	\$ 5.78 /kW	\$ 5.82	\$ 5.87	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.10	\$ 6.29	\$ 6.48	\$ 6.66	\$ 6.72	\$ 6.84
Energy	\$ 0.0322 /kWh	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04
Blended Retail	\$ 0.0450 /kWh	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05
Natural Gas	\$ 4.00 /MMBTU	\$ 4.61	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.23	\$ 5.37	\$ 5.50	\$ 5.69	\$ 5.83	\$ 5.99	\$ 6.20	\$ 6.42
Biomass	\$ 1.89 /MMBTU	\$ 1.93	\$ 1.97	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.05	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.13	\$ 2.17	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.26	\$ 2.31
Water	\$ 1.50 /kgal	\$ 1.53	\$ 1.56	\$ 1.59	\$ 1.62	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.69	\$ 1.72	\$ 1.76	\$ 1.79	\$ 1.83
Conventional Operation											
Electricity	62,926,168 kWh	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921 MMBTU	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 2,831,678	\$ 2,851,327	\$ 2,877,847	\$ 2,917,038	\$ 2,937,917	\$ 2,989,414	\$ 3,079,426	\$ 3,172,386	\$ 3,263,479	\$ 3,293,647	\$ 3,350,137
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 2,259,686	\$ 2,606,051	\$ 2,825,169	\$ 2,955,064	\$ 3,031,380	\$ 3,105,071	\$ 3,212,719	\$ 3,292,815	\$ 3,386,486	\$ 3,504,066	\$ 3,626,277
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 5,091,364	\$ 5,457,378	\$ 5,703,016	\$ 5,872,102	\$ 5,969,297	\$ 6,094,485	\$ 6,292,145	\$ 6,465,201	\$ 6,649,965	\$ 6,797,713	\$ 6,976,414
Annual Cogeneration Production											
Electricity	27,330,736 kWh	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	280,315 MMBTU	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	237,676 MMBTU	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676
Residual Electric Load											
Electricity											
Demand, monthly average	6,955 kW	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955
Energy	35,595,432 kWh	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432
Water	2,224 kgal	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224
Cogeneration Fuel	671,881 MMBTU	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881
Fuel Mix											
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental Fuel	237,676 MMBTU	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676
Fuel Mix											
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Expenses											
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 1,271,730	\$ 1,297,165	\$ 1,323,108	\$ 1,349,570	\$ 1,376,562	\$ 1,404,093	\$ 1,432,175	\$ 1,460,818	\$ 1,490,035	\$ 1,519,836	\$ 1,550,232
Supplemental Fuel											
Biomass	\$ 449,870	\$ 458,868	\$ 468,045	\$ 477,406	\$ 486,954	\$ 496,693	\$ 506,627	\$ 516,760	\$ 527,095	\$ 537,637	\$ 548,390
Natural Gas	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Water	\$ 3,336	\$ 3,403	\$ 3,471	\$ 3,540	\$ 3,611	\$ 3,683	\$ 3,757	\$ 3,832	\$ 3,909	\$ 3,987	\$ 4,066
* Indicates that Rahr would lose money every	\$ 122,988	\$ 125,448	\$ 127,957	\$ 130,516	\$ 133,126	\$ 135,789	\$ 138,504	\$ 141,275	\$ 144,100	\$ 146,982	\$ 149,922
Residual Electric Service	\$ 1,628,549	\$ 1,639,849	\$ 1,655,101	\$ 1,677,641	\$ 1,689,649	\$ 1,719,266	\$ 1,771,033	\$ 1,824,496	\$ 1,876,885	\$ 1,894,236	\$ 1,926,724
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 82,368	\$ 82,940	\$ 83,711	\$ 84,851	\$ 85,458	\$ 86,956	\$ 89,575	\$ 92,279	\$ 94,928	\$ 95,806	\$ 97,449
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 3,558,841	\$ 3,607,672	\$ 3,661,392	\$ 3,723,524	\$ 3,775,360	\$ 3,846,480	\$ 3,941,671	\$ 4,039,459	\$ 4,136,952	\$ 4,198,484	\$ 4,276,783
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 1,532,523	\$ 1,849,706	\$ 2,041,624	\$ 2,148,578	\$ 2,193,937	\$ 2,248,005	\$ 2,350,474	\$ 2,425,742	\$ 2,513,013	\$ 2,599,229	\$ 2,699,631
NPV, Avoided Expense	\$ 28,439,838										

Table 6-5: Detailed Economics for Scenario 1.1

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	1.1%	0.7%	1.0%	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.4%	0.1%	-0.9%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass									

Year	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses									
Residual Retail Electric Service									
Demand	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.14	\$ 7.22	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
Blended Retail	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 6.62	\$ 6.79	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.45	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.90	\$ 1.94	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation									
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,429,775	\$ 3,500,315	\$ 3,537,441	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 3,737,039	\$ 3,837,911	\$ 3,952,574	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 7,166,814	\$ 7,338,226	\$ 7,490,015	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production									
Electricity	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736	27,330,736
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315	280,315
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676
Residual Electric Load									
Electricity									
Demand, monthly average	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955	6,955
Energy	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432	35,595,432
Water	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224
Cogeneration Fuel	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881	671,881
Fuel Mix									
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental Fuel	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676	237,676
Fuel Mix									
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Expenses									
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 1,581,237	\$ 1,612,862	\$ 1,645,119	\$ 1,678,021	\$ 1,711,582	\$ 1,745,813	\$ 1,780,730	\$ 1,816,344	\$ 1,852,671
Supplemental Fuel									
Biomass	\$ 559,357	\$ 570,544	\$ 581,955	\$ 593,594	\$ 605,466	\$ 617,576	\$ 629,927	\$ 642,526	\$ 655,376
Natural Gas	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Water	\$ 4,148	\$ 4,231	\$ 4,315	\$ 4,402	\$ 4,490	\$ 4,579	\$ 4,671	\$ 4,764	\$ 4,860
* Indicates that Rahr would lose money every	\$ 152,920	\$ 155,979	\$ 159,098	\$ 162,280	\$ 165,526	\$ 168,836	\$ 172,213	\$ 175,657	\$ 179,170
Residual Electric Service	\$ 1,972,525	\$ 2,013,094	\$ 2,034,446	\$ 2,078,743	\$ 2,127,246	\$ 2,178,578	\$ 2,222,848	\$ 2,275,562	\$ 2,322,544
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 99,765	\$ 101,817	\$ 102,897	\$ 105,138	\$ 107,591	\$ 110,187	\$ 112,426	\$ 115,092	\$ 117,469
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 4,369,952	\$ 4,458,527	\$ 4,527,831	\$ 4,622,177	\$ 4,721,900	\$ 4,825,570	\$ 4,922,815	\$ 5,029,946	\$ 5,132,090
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 2,796,862	\$ 2,879,699	\$ 2,962,184	\$ 3,055,255	\$ 3,156,104	\$ 3,266,115	\$ 3,381,910	\$ 3,517,314	\$ 3,635,945

NPV, Avoided Expense

Sensitivity Analysis

Several variables influence the economics of a biomass cogeneration project. Among these factors are biomass, natural gas, electricity, and equipment costs. It is conceivable that lower biomass and equipment costs and higher fossil fuel prices contribute positively to the economics of biomass cogeneration. In this section, the results of manipulating these variables will be discussed in more detail for Scenario 1.1 and briefly addressed for all the other scenarios.

If biomass price is reduced from \$25/ton to \$0/ton and all the other parameters remain the same, all of the scenarios have a positive cash flow. However, Scenarios 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 yield a negative rate of return and the others produce positive rates of return (see Table 6-6 below). Again, in these scenarios the biomass plant is designed to generate more energy than Rahr needs, which negatively impacts economics. In Scenario 3.1, the project would yield a negative payback for every year and hence produces an economic loss. The N/A in table designates this economic loss.

Scenario 4 would replace 2.6 as having the best economics under the new circumstances. Scenario 4 would produce a net avoided cost of \$57.9 million (today's dollar) over twenty years with an investment of \$16.9 million. These savings translate to an internal rate of return of +12.6 % (see Table 6-6). Similarly, based on this reduced biomass price, in Scenario 1.1, if Rahr invests \$20.7 million to build the biomass cogeneration plant, it will experience a net avoided cost of \$51.5 million in twenty years. This reduced biomass price situation would be applicable where the biomass byproduct does not have a competing market. A given corporation would need to dispose of its biomass byproduct and would not be able to sell it to alternative markets such as the animal feed market. When biomass becomes free, it does not matter how one burns biomass so long as energy is generated from it. Efficiency is not as important in this case since the fuel is so cheap. Therefore, Scenario 4 has the best economics.

Economics

If natural gas cost increases from \$4/MMBTU to \$10/MMBTU, many of the scenarios show improved economics with Scenarios 2.6, 1.1, and 4 still being the best. In Scenario 2.6, an investment of \$15.3 million will lead to a savings of \$80.7 million over twenty years, which translates to an internal rate of return of +15.8 % (see Table 6-6). In a similar fashion, in Scenario 1.1, if Rahr devotes \$20.7 million to build a biomass plant, it will avoid expenses of \$86 million in twenty years producing an internal rate of return of +16.1 %. These savings occur because biomass prices would be low in comparison to natural gas prices and, consequently, lead to lower operating costs. In addition, thermal efficiency would be of utmost importance since heating costs would be so much higher. Consequently, the combustion turbine's economics improves so dramatically because it is more thermally efficient than the competing technologies. It is foreseeable that this increase in natural gas prices might occur when the world's oil reserves become strained and natural gas would become a competing source of fuel with liquid fuels. This enhanced demand for natural gas might boost its price and make biomass fuel more appealing.

Another situation when the scenarios show improved economics is when electricity prices rise. If electricity cost jumps to \$0.10/kWh, Scenario 2.7 shows the best economics. With a \$10.2 million investment, Rahr could save over \$62 million over the course of twenty years, which translates to an internal rate of return of 20.4%. When electricity prices rise, biomass becomes more attractive as fuel and the savings associated with producing electricity on-site is high in comparison to buying it from the electric utility company.

Similarly, in Scenario 1.1, if Rahr invests \$20.7 million to build this biomass plant, it will avoid total expenses of \$73.6 million in twenty years. This leads to an internal rate of return of 13.3%. Once again for this scenario, the engine set is a more attractive option than combustion turbine because the turbine requires a compressor to compress the synthesis gas and the parasitic load to operate the compressor is too great. Engine sets do not require a compressor and the de-rating of the engine sets is not as great as the parasitic loss associated with the compressor. These two reasons combined give a lower overall electrical generation cost and, consequently, lower capital equipment costs for Rahr than the combustion turbine cases. These lower capital equipment costs yield a better rate of return for Rahr.

It is predictable that electricity costs would increase when pollution becomes a major problem and stricter air pollution control equipment are mandated for electrical utility plants.

The added cost of pollution control equipment will add to the price of electricity. Another case when electricity prices might increase is when the U.S. approves the Kyoto Protocol. The cost of reducing carbon dioxide emissions at utility plants would become greater and therefore lead to higher electricity prices. In addition, the government might provide incentives to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in the form of tax breaks or carbon dioxide credits, which might improve the economics of the Rahr biomass plant.

Even when capital equipment costs are cut in half, none of the scenarios show good economics for investors to invest in. The engine sets still offer the best economics with positive internal rates of return while all the other technologies yield negative internal rates of return. Therefore, even when this biomass technology is commercialized and capital equipment costs are considerably reduced; the economics of these technologies are not favorable.

Table 6-6: Sensitivity Analysis Results Showing Internal Rates of Return

Scenario	Biomass = \$0/ton Natural Gas = \$4/MMBTU Electricity = \$0.045/kWh ¹	Biomass = \$25/ton Natural Gas = \$10/MMBTU Electricity = \$0.045/kWh ¹	Biomass = \$25/ton Natural Gas = \$4/MMBTU Electricity = \$0.100/kWh ²	Capital Equipment Cost = Reduced by 50% ¹
1.1	+6.2 %	+16.1 %	+13.3 %	-4.6%
1.2	+4.9 %	+11.4 %	+12.9 %	-8.4%
2.1	-7.3 %	-0.1 %	-3.5 %	N/A ³
2.2	-2.8 %	+4.0 %	+1.1 %	N/A ³
2.3	- 15 %	- 11.0 %	- 5 %	N/A ³
2.4	+7.0 %	+12.6 %	+14.3 %	-0.7 %
2.5	+6.2 %	+10.0 %	+11.2 %	-9.4 %
2.6	+8.1 %	+15.8 %	+15.9 %	+4.4 %
2.7	+5.2 %	+14.9 %	+20.4 %	+1.2 %
3.1	N/A ³	N/A ³	N/A ³	N/A ³
4	+12.6 %	+19.5 %	+19.2 %	-2.7 %

¹ Best economics occur for Scenarios 1.1, 2.7, and 4 when biomass is used for supplemental firing. In all other cases best economics arise when natural gas is utilized for supplemental firing.

² Best economics for all scenarios occur when natural gas, not biomass, is used for supplemental fuel firing.

³ The payback is negative for every year for the last twenty years. The internal rate of return could not be calculated.

Section 7

Minnesota and United States Benefits

When this biomass plant is successfully demonstrated and the technology is replicated across the country, the state of Minnesota and the United States will realize several profound benefits. These benefits range from less dependence on foreign oil and fossil fuels to the development of bio-refineries to rural economic development and healthier environments. This section describes these benefits in more detail.

Improved Strategic Security and Balance of Payment for Minnesota

In the year 2000, Minnesota generated approximately 52,000 MMkWh and consumed 60,000 million-kWh (MMkWh) of electricity, causing an import of about 8,000 MMkWh (see Figure 7-1 and Figure 7-2)⁷. If, as mentioned in Section 5, 370 plants with similar tonnage as Rahr's are built in Minnesota, these plants could supply approximately 10,000 MMkWh of electricity, eliminating the electricity deficit. This reduction in dependence of electricity from other states will keep the resources that are currently going out of the state within the state. During 2000, the average price of electricity paid by Minnesota consumers was 5.81 cents per kWh (see Figure 7-3)⁸. Thus, using this electricity price and the amount of electricity that could potentially be saved when the 370 plants that use corn stover are built, Minnesota could potentially save \$464 million per year on electricity costs.

Minnesota and United States Benefits

Figure 7-1

Retail Sales of Electricity by Utilities to Consumers in MN

Figure 7-2

Net Generation in MN (MMKwh)

Figure 7-3

Average Annual Electricity Cost in MN

Minnesota and United States Benefits

As far as natural gas is concerned, as discussed in Section 5 of the report, the 370 plants could provide 103-trillion BTU of heat, which amounts to 103-billion cubic feet of natural gas per year. In 2000, Minnesota consumed 333-billion cubic feet of natural gas per year⁹. Since Minnesota imports all of its natural gas, the 370 plants would allow the reduction of imported natural gas by 31%, and also reduce the state's dependence on natural gas by the same percentage.

Figure 7-4
Total Deliveries in MN (MMcf)

In 2000, Minnesota consumers (industrial, residential, commercial, and utilities) spent approximately \$2 billion on natural gas (see Figure 7-5)¹⁰. The average cost of natural gas for 2000, was \$6.90 per thousand cubic feet (Mcf) (see Figure 7-6)¹¹. If, as discussed above in Section 5 of the report, 103 billion cubic feet of natural gas could be saved, this would be a savings of about \$0.7 billion per year.

Figure 7-5

Natural Gas Expenditure in MN

Minnesota and United States Benefits

Figure 7-6

Average Natural Gas Price in MN

Improved Security and Balance of Payments for the United States

Today most power plants run on fossil fuels such as natural gas, oil, and coal. To date, the U.S. imports about 60% of its oil needs from foreign countries. This high dependence on foreign fuel means the U.S. is at the mercy of these countries during an economic and political crisis.

Last year, the United States generated approximately 110,000 MMkWh of electricity from petroleum (see Figure 7-7)¹². If, as discussed in Section 5, 3,800 power plants similar to Rahr's could be built that run on biomass, approximately 103,000 MMkWh could be generated from this renewable source. Thus, this generation of electricity based on biomass would reduce the dependence of the United States on oil-based generation by 94 %.

In 2000, the United States consumed about 22.71 trillion cubic feet of natural gas (see Figure 7-8)¹³. If 3,800 plants could be built across the United States, 1.06-quadrillion BTU of heat could be produced from these biomass plants. This heat is equivalent to 1.06 trillion cubic feet of natural gas per year. Therefore, replacing these fuels with biomass will benefit the strategic security of the United States by reducing our dependence on fossil fuels and in particular on imported oil.

Figure 7-7

Net Generation From Petroleum in US (MMkWh)

Minnesota and United States Benefits

Figure 7-8

Natural Gas Consumption in US

Healthier Rural Economies

Since most industries that can expect to benefit from the proposed biomass plant are located near the source of their feed stock, rural farming communities, the proposed biomass plant will promote rural economic development by fostering the development of an abundant, reliable, locally based fuel supply. As mentioned Section 5, the proposed process will utilize these local, untapped fuel sources to generate energy, both for the plants themselves and for the farming communities where they are located. The collection and use of corn stover as energy fuel, using gasification for these industries will create an additional revenue stream for the farmers amounting conservatively to an additional \$45 to \$60 per acre. An additional group of custom farming operations will be expected to grow up for the purpose of harvesting corn stover. These custom operators will hire more workers, purchase more equipment, and stimulate the local economies through increased commerce.

A study done by the state of Wisconsin supports the fact that producing energy based on biomass rather than fossil fuels can lead to healthier rural economies. This study showed that if Wisconsin could utilize \$2 billion worth of energy derived from biomass fuel instead of fossil fuels, the state would create 63,234 job-years of employment, raise mean wages by \$1.2 billion and produce \$4.6 billion more of goods and services over the life of the technology (Page 44 Biomass for Renewable Energy, Fuels, and Chemicals, Donald L. Klass, 1998). This study also demonstrated that the additional capital and commercial activity would create the tax base with which to support public schools, public infrastructure and a more diverse work force and demographic.

Improved Environmental Quality

Biomass power is one of the most attractive options for addressing concerns over carbon dioxide, a major constituent of greenhouse gas. Since, the proposed process consumes biomass and no other fossil fuels, it will not contribute to atmospheric carbon dioxide. When biomass is oxidized, trees and other plants will sequester or capture the atmospheric carbon dioxide, converting it back into biomass, thus leading to no net increase in the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. By contrast, when fossil fuels are burned, the carbon dioxide released adds to the total carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and contributes to global warming.

As far as emissions are concerned, gasification for power production is superior to coal firing in combination with natural gas for heat (see Section 4). Both coal and biomass contain bound sulfur and nitrogen that, when oxidized, can form sulfur oxides (SO_x) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x). Gasification offers the advantage that most sulfur oxides are captured in the ash and consequently do not require much effort to control SO_x emissions. Treatment of the tail gas after the generator has been demonstrated to successfully control NO_x emissions. Air born emissions of combustion turbines using biomass can be comparable to that of natural gas combustion.

Minnesota and United States Benefits

Technology Export

The proposed biomass plant and the engineering expertise associated with it have a high probability of being exported to foreign countries. The development of a successful biomass to electricity process will find widespread applications to regions where fossil fuels are not abundant. For example, in rice producing nations such as Japan, which imports all of its fuels, farms produce rice crops that lead to large amounts of excess rice straw that is frequently burned for disposal. In the proposed process, these rice straws could be burned as precious fuel reducing their dependence on fossil fuels. Other crops such as sugar cane are also logical candidates for the application of this technology.

Since the proposed process relies on very little water, and there is frequently a dearth of potable water in developing nations limiting the use of steam turbines, the combustion turbine technology will find widespread applications in these countries. This export of the technology will lead to more jobs, from engineering to manufacturing to general labor within the U.S.

Sustainable Resource Supply

As discussed above, in the case of Rahr Malting's Shakopee plant, the majority of the biomass required for the biomass plant is produced during the malting process. Any additional biomass will be supplied by corn stover from neighboring farms. Basing the biomass plant on corn stover serves two purposes. First, it assures of a continuing supply of biomass for the plant because there appears to be a limitless amount of corn stover in Minnesota. Second, it benefits the farmers and the local economy when corn stover is used for the cogeneration process. Once this project is successful and the technology is embraced by similar industries across the U.S., it's easy to see that this would improve the economics of crop production across the whole landscape of the United States.

There is ample supply of corn stover in the U.S. In 2000, an estimated 279 million dry tons of stover were produced but less than 1% of that was collected for industrial processing¹⁴. Large-scale demonstration projects (50,000 acres) have shown corn stover can be collected and delivered locally for less than \$45 per dry ton. At Rahr Malting, since much of the biomass comes from the malting process, only a small geographic area is needed to supply the corn stover.

There are four benefits of removing some of the corn stover from farms. Firstly, the farmer saves on the cost of plowing the stover under the earth thereby reducing the cost of growing the next crop. Secondly, the farmer saves on the cost of applying nitrogen to the soil. Farmers must apply more nitrogen fertilizer to compensate for the excess carbon content in the soil. Thirdly, the farmer is assured of good soil quality since the farmer could use low till or no till farming that reduces soil erosion. Fourthly, since the farmer does not have to plow the ground, low till or no till farming leads to lower production costs.

Specific Industries Benefits

The results of this demonstration plant will minimize several technical and economic risks associated with biomass co-generation. By demonstrating the technical and commercial viability of co-generation from biomass, Sebesta and its partners will provide the operational data to show technical and economic viability of this system. The integration of the commercially available components into an operating demonstration plant will help overcome the perceived technical risks and encourage capital investments.

In addition, the proposed technology will improve the economics of corn ethanol plants. The byproduct from ethanol production, dried distiller's grains (DDGS), are dropping in market value as the market is flooded with the byproduct because more and more ethanol plants are coming online. In the mean time, the energy costs for these plants is rising rapidly. If the proposed technology can use DDGS as fuel, the successful demonstration of this technology will remove the risk of investing in an unproven technology, leading to more capital investments and improving the economics of producing ethanol.

A successful demonstration will also lead to the next generation of biorefinery/ethanol plants, as well as improvements and enhancements in other food processing facilities. Sebesta Blomberg is currently designing the next generation of biorefinery/ethanol plants based on processing of genetically modified corns capable of producing enzymes, sweeteners and other high value products. These processes are energy intensive and require substantial thermal and electric service. Ironically, in these plants, the production of ethanol becomes the byproduct and the major income stream is generated from the high value protein and lipid fractions. Our analysis of these facilities has already shown that the byproducts such as distillers' grains of this process will be best used as energy.

Minnesota and United States Benefits

Thus, the proposed process is likely to achieve acceptance in the broad agricultural regions of the United States. Most production plants in agricultural regions, including agricultural commodity and corn ethanol plants have concurrent requirements for electricity and heat. The development of a co-generation process capable of using process byproducts and locally available crop residue, as fuel will dramatically reduce the dependence of these plants on natural gas and oil based standby fuels. Ultimately, as the technology becomes more popular and different industries start adopting it into their processes, the nation will become less dependent on foreign oil and also on natural gas supply which can then be more available for other critical applications such as fertilizer production. Hence, the proposed process will convert a renewable agricultural byproduct into a replacement for natural gas, imported oil and coal based electricity.

Section 8

References

1. USDA, <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/data-sets/crops/96120/track02a.htm>
2. USDA, <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/data-sets/crops/96120/track02a.htm>
3. USDOE, Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/>
4. USDA, <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/data-sets/crops/96120/track02a.htm>
5. USDA, <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/data-sets/crops/96120/track02a.htm>
6. USDOE, Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/>
7. USDOE, Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/>
8. USDOE, Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/>
9. USDOE, Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/>
10. USDOE, Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/>
11. USDOE, Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/>
12. USDOE, Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/>
13. USDOE, Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/>
14. USDA, <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/data-sets/crops/96120/track02a.htm>

Section 9

Appendices

- Appendix A: Process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for one Alstom case
- Appendix B: Two engine set case.
- Appendix C: Process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for two direct fired custom turbine case (separate compressor).
- Appendix D: Process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for two mixed air and syngas custom turbine case (same compressor).
- Appendix E: Process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for two indirect turbine case (clean air turbine).
- Appendix F: Process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for steam turbine case.
- Appendix G: Rahr plant layout.
- Appendix H: Biomass photographs and fuel lab analysis.
- Appendix I: Detailed economics analysis of various scenarios at Rahr.
- Appendix J: Turbine and engine set manufacturer specifications.

Appendix A: One Alstom Case

The following pages contain process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for 1 Alstom Case.

GENERAL NOTES:				
▲				
▲				
▲				
▲				
▲				
DATE	REVISIONS		CHK	BY

GENERAL NOTES:			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			
61			
62			
63			
64			
65			
66			
67			
68			
69			
70			
71			
72			
73			
74			
75			
76			
77			
78			
79			
80			
81			
82			
83			
84			
85			
86			
87			
88			
89			
90			
91			
92			
93			
94			
95			
96			
97			
98			
99			
100			
101			
102			
103			
104			
105			
106			
107			
108			
109			
110			
111			
112			
113			
114			
115			
116			
117			
118			
119			
120			
121			
122			
123			
124			
125			
126			
127			
128			
129			
130			
131			
132			
133			
134			
135			
136			
137			
138			
139			
140			
141			
142			
143			
144			
145			
146			
147			
148			
149			
150			
151			
152			
153			
154			
155			
156			
157			
158			
159			
160			
161			
162			
163			
164			
165			
166			
167			
168			
169			
170			
171			
172			
173			
174			
175			
176			
177			
178			
179			
180			
181			
182			
183			
184			
185			
186			
187			
188			
189			
190			
191			
192			
193			
194			
195			
196			
197			
198			
199			
200			
201			
202			
203			
204			
205			
206			
207			
208			
209			
210			
211			
212			
213			
214			
215			
216			
217			
218			
219			
220			
221			
222			
223			
224			
225			
226			
227			
228			
229			
230			
231			
232			
233			
234			
235			
236			
237			
238			
239			
240			
241			
242			
243			
244			
245			
246			
247			
248			
249			
250			
251			
252			
253			
254			
255			
256			
257			
258			
259			
260			
261			
262			
263			
264			
265			
266			
267			
268			
269			
270			
271			
272			
273			
274			
275			
276			
277			
278			
279			
280			
281			
282			
283			
284			
285			
286			
287			
288			
289			
290			
291			
292			
293			
294			
295			
296			
297			
298			
299			
300			
301			
302			
303			
304			
305			
306			
307			
308			
309			
310			
311			
312			
313			
314			
315			
316			
317			
318			
319			
320			
321			
322			
323			
324			
325			
326			
327			
328			
329			
330			
331			
332			
333			
334			
335			
336			
337			
338			
339			
340			
341			
342			
343			
344			
345			
346			
347			
348			
349			
350			
351			
352			
353			
354			
355			
356			
357			
358			
359			
360			
361			
362			
363			
364			
365			
366			
367			
368			
369			
370			
371			
372			
373			
374			
375			
376			
377			
378			
379			
380			
381			
382			
383			
384			
385			
386			

OPERATING CASE: ALSTOM TURBINE - SYNGAS COMPRESSED SEPARATE

Stream ID			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11A	12A	Q1	11B	12B	Q2	11C	12C
Stream Name			BIOMASS FEED	GASIFIER AIR	GASIFIER BOTTOM ASH	GASIFIER SYNGAS	COOLED SYNGAS	CLEAN SYNGAS	SYNGAS TO AMMONIA SCRUBBER	FRESH OIL MAKEUP	TAR BD TO GASIFIER	GAS CLEANUP LIQUID BD	GASIFIER COOLING WATER SUPPLY	GASIFIER COOLING WATER RETURN	GASIFIER CW THERMAL ENERGY	IND. HEX COOLING WATER SUPPLY	IND. HEX COOLING WATER RETURN	IND. HEX CW THERMAL ENERGY	OIL HEX COOLING WATER SUPPLY	OIL HEX COOLING WATER RETURN
Pressure, psig (*w.c.-g)			----	(22.0)	----	(-3.0)	(-6.0)	(-16.0)	2.0	----	50	----	50	15		40	5		40	5
Temperature, °F			77	77	300	1300	500	105	110	77	115	115	140	170	170 - 140	140	170	170 - 140	85	95
Molecular Weight (lb/lbmole)			---	28.69	20.02	26.06	26.06	27.01	27.01	----	----	----	18.02	18.02		18.02	18.02		18.02	18.02
Component	Formula	mw	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	MMBtu/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	MMBtu/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr
Carbon	C	12.01	4,891		565															
Hydrogen	H	1.01	622																	
Nitrogen	N	14.01	139																	
Oxygen	O	16.00	4,223																	
Sulfur	S	32.06	29																	
Methane	CH4	16.04				882	882	882	882											
Ethane	C2H6	30.07				116	116	116	116											
Ethylene	C2H4	28.05				254	254	254	254											
Propane	C3H8	44.10				6	6	6	6											
Propene	C3H6	42.08				35	35	35	35											
Butane-n	C4H10	58.12				29	29	29	29											
Pentane (gas)	C5H12	72.15				4	4	4	4											
Benzene	C6H6	78.11				179	179	179	179											
Ammonia	NH3	17.09				28	28	28	28											
Fuel Gas	CH4	16.04																		
Carbon Monoxide	CO	28.01				4,235	4,235	4,235	4,235											
Carbon Dioxide	CO2	44.01				4,807	4,807	4,807	4,807											
Hydrogen	H2	2.02				120	120	120	120											
Water (v)	H2O (v)	18.02		177		3,458	3,458	1,342	1,342											
Nitrogen	N2	28.01		14,250		14,366	14,366	14,366	14,366											
Oxygen	O2	32.00		4,314		293	293	293	293											
Sulfur Dioxide	SO2	64.06				58	58	58	58											
Ash	SiO2	60.08	571		565	6	6	6	6											
Sulfuric Acid	H2SO4	98.08																		
Ammonium Sulfate	(NH4)2SO4	132.14																		
Oil	-----	-----								25	13	13								
Tar	-----	-----									13	4								
Water (l)	H2O (l)	18.02	1,139								212	1,905	30,729	30,729		260,484	260,484		584,963	584,963
TOTAL			11,614	18,741	1,130	28,877	28,877	26,761	26,761	25	238	1,922	30,729	30,729		260,484	260,484		584,963	584,963
AVAILABLE ENERGY VALUE (LHV-Hv), Btu/lb			6,604			1,937.5	1,937.5	2,090.7	2,090.7											
AVAILABLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr			76.70			55.95	55.95	55.95	55.95											
SENSIBLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr						11.5	3.7							0.92				7.81		
FLOW RATE, SCFM (GPM)				4,132		7,010	7,010	6,267	6,267	(0.06)	(0.5)	(4.3)	(61)	(61)		(521)	(521)		(1,170)	(1,170)
FLOW RATE, ACFM				4,267		23,726	12,941	6,809	6,869											
ELECTRICAL OUTPUT, Kilowatts																				

CUSTOMER: SEBESTA / NETL

OPERATING CASE: ALSTOM TURBINE - SYNGAS COMPRESSED SEPARATE

Stream ID			13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	Q3	25	26	27
Stream Name			10% SULFURIC ACID	AMMONIA SCRUBBER BD	SYNGAS TO COMPRESS	SYNGAS COMP BD	SYNGAS TO HEAT EXCH	HEATED SYNGAS TO TURBINE	ATMOS AIR TO TURBINE COMP	TURBINE COMP BLEED AIR	COMP AIR TO TURBINE	TURBINE INLET GAS	TURBINE EXHAUST TO HEAT EXCH	TURBINE EXHAUST OUT HEAT EXCH	TURBINE EXHAUST THERMAL ENERGY	GROSS ELECT OUTPUT	AUX LOAD	NET ELECT OUTPUT
Pressure, psig ("w.c.-g)			30	30	1.8	50	237	236	----	207	207	201	0.43	0.36				
Temperature, °F			77	110	110	110	300	490	70	677	677	1935	982	909	960 - 300			
Molecular Weight (lb/lbmole)			19.62	20.30	27.02	18.02	27.70	27.70	28.69	28.69	28.69	29.07	29.07	29.07				
Component	Formula	mw	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	MMBtu/hr	kilowats	kilowats	kilowatts
Carbon	C	12.01																
Hydrogen	H	1.01																
Nitrogen	N	14.01																
Oxy gen	O	16.00																
Sulfur	S	32.06																
Methane	CH4	16.04			882		882	882										
Ethane	C2H6	30.07			116		116	116										
Ethylene	C2H4	28.05			254		254	254										
Propane	C3H8	44.10			6		6	6										
Propene	C3H6	42.08			35		35	35										
Butane-n	C4H10	58.12			29		29	29										
Pentane (gas)	C5H12	72.15			4		4	4										
Benzene	C6H6	78.11			179		179	179										
Ammonia	NH3	17.09																
Fuel Gas	CH4	16.04																
Carbon Monoxide	CO	28.01			4,235		4,235	4,235										
Carbon Dioxide	CO2	44.01			4,807		4,807	4,807				15,851	15,851	15,851				
Hydrogen	H2	2.02			120		120	120										
Water (v)	H2O (v)	18.02			1,342		95	95	1,270	81	1,188	5,102	5,102	5,102				
Nitrogen	N2	28.01			14,366		14,366	14,366	102,491	6,559	95,932	110,298	110,298	110,298				
Oxy gen	O2	32.00			293		293	293	31,027	1,986	29,041	20,332	20,332	20,332				
Sulfur Dioxide	SO2	64.06			58		58	58				58	58	58				
Ash	SiO2	60.08																
Sulfuric Acid	H2SO4	98.08	81															
Ammonium Sulfate	(NH4)2SO4	132.14		110														
Oil	-----	-----																
Tar	-----	-----																
Water (l)	H2O (l)	18.02	733	733		1,247												
TOTAL			814	842	26,727	1,247	25,480	25,480	134,787	8,626	126,161	151,641	151,641	151,641				
AVAILABLE ENERGY VALUE (LHV-Hv), Btu/lb					2,085.0		2,187.0	2,187.0										
AVAILABLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr					55.73		55.7	55.7										
SENSIBLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr							1.59	2.94		1.29	18.85	77.51	35.61	3.01	24.19			
FLOW RATE, SCFM (GPM)			(1.6)	(1.7)	6,256	(2.5)	5,818	5,818	29,720	1,902	27,817	32,998	32,998	32,998				
FLOW RATE, ACFM					6,857		484	607	30,291	276	4,038	10,371	88,873	84,805				
ELECTRICAL OUTPUT, Kilowatts																4,945	1,825	3,120

Appendix B: Two Engine Set Case

The following pages contain process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for 2 engine sets.

GENERAL NOTES:

▲				
▲				
▲				
▲				
MINOR CONNECTIONS	DATE	CW	BY	DATE

PRIMENERGY, L.L.C. 3172 N. TOLEDO TULSA, OKLA. 74115				
JOB NAME:	SEBESTA / NETL	SCALE: N.T.S.	APPROVED BY:	DATE APPROVED:
LOCATION:	MINNESOTA	JOB NUMBER:	0153	000
CONTRACTOR:	SEBESTA	REVISION NO.:	001	▲
DESCRIPTION: PROCESS FLOW DIAGRAM GASIFIER AND GAS CLEAN-UP SYSTEM FOR GAS TUBING

GENERAL NOTES:				
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
REV.	DESCRIPTION	CHK.	BY	DATE
1	PRIMENERGY, L.L.C.			
	3172 N. TOLEDO			
	TULSA, OKLA. 74115			
JOB NAME:	SERBESTA / NETL	DESIGN BY:		
LOCATION:	MINNESOTA	SCALE:	N.T.S.	
CONTRACTOR:	SERBESTA	DATE:	04/11/02	
DESCRIPTION:	PROCESS FLOW DIAGRAM - IC ENGINES	JOB NUMBER:	0153	
	USING SYNGAS AS FUEL	DISCIPLINE:	000	
		SHEET NO.:	002D	
		REV.:		

CUSTOMER: SEBESTA / NETL
OPERATING CASE: TWO JENBACHER IC ENGINES

Stream ID			Q2	11C	12C	13	14	15	15A	15B	16A	16B	17	Q3	18	19	20
Stream Name			IND. HEX CW THERMAL ENERGY	OIL HEX COOLING WATER SUPPLY	OIL HEX COOLING WATER RETURN	10% SULFURIC ACID	AMMONIA SCRUBBER BD	SYNGAS TO ENGINES	SYNGAS TO ENGINE #1	SYNGAS TO ENGINE #2	AIR TO ENGINE #1	AIR TO ENGINE #2	ENGINE EXHAUST GAS	ENGINE EXHAUST THERMAL ENERGY	GROSS ELECT OUTPUT	AUX LOAD	NET ELECT OUTPUT
Pressure, psig ("w.c.-g)				40	5	30	30	1.5	1.5	1.5	----	----	0.43				
Temperature, °F			170 - 140	85	95	77	110	110	100	100	77	77	941	960 - 300			
Molecular Weight (lb/lbmole)				18.02	18.02	19.62	20.30	27.06	27.06	27.06	28.69	28.69	29.08				
Component	Formula	mw	MMBtu/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	MMBtu/hr	kilowats	kilowats	kilowatts
Carbon	C	12.01															
Hydrogen	H	1.01															
Nitrogen	N	14.01															
Oxygen	O	16.00															
Sulfur	S	32.06															
Methane	CH4	16.04						444	222	222							
Ethane	C2H6	30.07						58	29	29							
Ethylene	C2H4	28.05						128	64	64							
Propane	C3H8	44.10						3	2	2							
Propene	C3H6	42.08						17	9	9							
Butane-n	C4H10	58.12						15	7	7							
Pentane (gas)	C5H12	72.15						2	1	1							
Benzene	C6H6	78.11						90	45	45							
Ammonia	NH3	17.09															
Fuel Gas	CH4	16.04															
Carbon Monoxide	CO	28.01						2,107	1,054	1,054							
Carbon Dioxide	CO2	44.01						2,473	1,237	1,237			7,996				
Hydrogen	H2	2.02						60	30	30							
Water (v)	H2O (v)	18.02						676	338	338	153	153	2,904				
Nitrogen	N2	28.01						7,233	3,617	3,617	12,310	12,310	31,853				
Oxygen	O2	32.00						148	74	74	3,727	3,727	3,081				
Sulfur Dioxide	SO2	64.06						29	15	15							
Ash	SiO2	60.08															
Sulfuric Acid	H2SO4	98.08				34											
Ammonium Sulfate	(NH4)2SO4	132.14					46										
Oil	-----	-----															
Tar	-----	-----															
Water (l)	H2O (l)	18.02		293,985	293,985	305	305										
TOTAL				293,985	293,985	339	351	13,485	6,743	6,743	16,189	16,189	45,835				
AVAILABLE ENERGY VALUE (LHV-Hv), Btu/lb								2,073	2,073	2,073							
AVAILABLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr								27.96	13.98	13.98							
SENSIBLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr			3.94										10.55	7.94			
FLOW RATE, scfm (GPM)				(588)	(588)	(0.7)	(0.7)	3,152	1,576	1,576	3,570	3,570	9,970				
FLOW RATE, acfm								3,132	1,539	1,539	3,686	3,686	26,092				
ELECTRICAL OUTPUT, Kilowatts															2,900	204	2,696

Appendix C: Two Direct Fired Custom Turbine Case

The following pages contain process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for direct fired 2 custom turbine case (separate compressor).

GENERAL NOTES:			
▲			
▲			
▲			
▲	MINOR CONNECTIONS	DATE	03/21/08
PRIMENERGY, L.L.C.	3172 N. TOLEDO	TULSA, OKLA. 74115	
JOB NAME:	SEBESTA / NETL	SCALE:	NETL
LOCATION:	MINNESOTA	DATE:	01/07/08
CONTRACTOR:	SEBESTA	DATE:	01/07/08
DESCRIPTION:	PROCESS FLOW DIAGRAM	SCALE:	001
	GASIFIER AND GAS CLEAN-UP SYSTEM	SCALE:	001
	FOR GAS TUBING	SCALE:	001

CUSTOMER: SEBESTA / NETL
OPERATING CASE: DIRECT FIRED TURBINE - SYNGAS AND AIR MIXED

Stream ID			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11A	12A	Q1	11B	12B
Stream Name			BIOMASS FEED	GASIFIER AIR	GASIFIER BOTTOM ASH	GASIFIER SYNGAS	COOLED SYNGAS	CLEAN SYNGAS	SYNGAS TO AMMONIA SCRUBBER	FRESH OIL MAKEUP	TAR BD TO GASIFIER	GAS CLEANUP LIQUID BD	GASIFIER COOLING WATER SUPPLY	GASIFIER COOLING WATER RETURN	GASIFIER CW THERMAL ENERGY	IND. HEX COOLING WATER SUPPLY	IND. HEX COOLING WATER RETURN
Pressure, psig ("w.c.-g)			----	(22.0)	----	(-3.0)	(-6.0)	(-16.0)	2.0	----	50	----	50	15		40	5
Temperature, °F			77	77	300	1300	500	105	110	77	115	115	140	170	170 - 140	140	170
Molecular Weight (lb/lbmole)			---	28.69	20.02	26.09	26.09	27.03	27.03	----	----	----	18.02	18.02		18.02	18.02
Component	Formula	mw	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	MMBtu/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr
Carbon	C	12.01	8,184		945												
Hydrogen	H	1.01	1,034														
Nitrogen	N	14.01	202														
Oxygen	O	16.00	7,067														
Sulfur	S	32.06	49														
Methane	CH4	16.04				1,467	1,467	1,467	1,467								
Ethane	C2H6	30.07				193	193	193	193								
Ethylene	C2H4	28.05				423	423	423	423								
Propane	C3H8	44.10				10	10	10	10								
Propene	C3H6	42.08				58	58	58	58								
Butane-n	C4H10	58.12				49	49	49	49								
Pentane (gas)	C5H12	72.15				7	7	7	7								
Benzene	C6H6	78.11				298	298	298	298								
Ammonia	NH3	17.09				85	85	85	85								
Fuel Gas	CH4	16.04															
Carbon Monoxide	CO	28.01				7,045	7,045	7,045	7,045								
Carbon Dioxide	CO2	44.01				8,151	8,151	8,151	8,151								
Hydrogen	H2	2.02				200	200	200	200								
Water (v)	H2O (v)	18.02		292		5,673	5,673	2,232	2,232								
Nitrogen	N2	28.01		23,607		23,739	23,739	23,739	23,739								
Oxygen	O2	32.00		7,146		488	488	488	488								
Sulfur Dioxide	SO2	64.06				98	98	98	98								
Ash	SiO2	60.08	955		945	10	10	10	10								
Sulfuric Acid	H2SO4	98.08															
Ammonium Sulfate	(NH4)2SO4	132.14															
Oil	-----	-----								50	25	25					
Tar	-----	-----									22	7					
Water (l)	H2O (l)	18.02	1,905								344	3,096	58,382	58,382		432,950	432,950
TOTAL			19,396	31,046	1,891	47,991	47,991	44,551	44,551	50	391	3,129	58,382	58,382		432,950	432,950
AVAILABLE ENERGY VALUE (LHV-Hv), Btu/lb			6,604			1,945.7	1,945.7	2,096.0	2,096.0								
AVAILABLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr			128.09			93.38	93.38	93.38	93.38								

CUSTOMER: SEBESTA / NETL

OPERATING CASE: DIRECT FIRED TURBINE - SYNGAS AND AIR MIXED

Stream ID			Q2	11C	12C	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Q3	21	22	23
Stream Name			IND. HEX CW THERMAL ENERGY	OIL HEX COOLING WATER SUPPLY	OIL HEX COOLING WATER RETURN	10% SULFURIC ACID	AMMONIA SCRUBBER BD	SYNGAS TO COMPRESS	ATMOS AIR TO TURBINE COMP	COMP SYNGAS AND AIR MIX	NATURAL GAS	TURBINE INLET GAS	TURBINE EXHAUST GAS	TURBINE EXHAUST THERMAL ENERGY	GROSS ELECT OUTPUT	AUX LOAD	NET ELECT OUTPUT
Pressure, psig ("w.c.-g)				40	5	30	30	1.8	---	155	258	154	0.43				
Temperature, °F			170 - 140	85	95	77	110	110	77	602	77	1829	960	960 - 300			
Molecular Weight (lb/lbmole)				18.02	18.02	19.62	20.30	27.06	28.69	28.46	16.04	28.80	28.80				
Component	Formula	mw	MMBtu/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	MMBtu/hr	kilowats	kilowats	kilowatts
Carbon	C	12.01															
Hydrogen	H	1.01															
Nitrogen	N	14.01															
Oxygen	O	16.00															
Sulfur	S	32.06															
Methane	CH4	16.04						1,467		1,467							
Ethane	C2H6	30.07						193		193							
Ethylene	C2H4	28.05						423		423							
Propane	C3H8	44.10						10		10							
Propene	C3H6	42.08						58		58							
Butane-n	C4H10	58.12						49		49							
Pentane (gas)	C5H12	72.15						7		7							
Benzene	C6H6	78.11						298		298							
Ammonia	NH3	17.09															
Fuel Gas	CH4	16.04									1,101						
Carbon Monoxide	CO	28.01						7,045		7,045							
Carbon Dioxide	CO2	44.01						8,151		8,151		29,545	29,545				
Hydrogen	H2	2.02						200		200							
Water (v)	H2O (v)	18.02						2,232	2,711	4,944		13,770	13,770				
Nitrogen	N2	28.01						23,739	218,847	242,585		242,585	242,585				
Oxygen	O2	32.00						488	66,251	66,738		47,368	47,368				
Sulfur Dioxide	SO2	64.06						98		98		98	98				
Ash	SiO2	60.08															
Sulfuric Acid	H2SO4	98.08				245											
Ammonium Sulfate	(NH4)2SO4	132.14					330										
Oil	-----	-----															
Tar	-----	-----															
Water (l)	H2O (l)	18.02		962,994	962,994	2,207	2,207										
TOTAL				962,994	962,994	2,452	2,537	44,456	287,809	332,265	1,101	333,366	333,366				
AVAILABLE ENERGY VALUE (LHV-Hv), Btu/lb								2,085.3			21,500						
AVAILABLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr								92.70			23.68						
SENSIBLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr			12.99									160.70	57.57	38.92			
FLOW RATE, SCFM (GPM)				(1,926)	(1,926)	(4.9)	(5.1)	10,393	63,459	73,852	434	73,225	73,225				
FLOW RATE, ACFM								11,392	65,534	13,097	24	28,081	194,237				
ELECTRICAL OUTPUT, Kilowatts															10,226	501	9,725

Appendix D: Two Mixed Air and Syngas Custom Turbine Case

The following pages contain process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for two mixed air and syngas custom turbine case (same compressor).

GENERAL NOTES:			
▲			
▲			
▲			
▲	MINOR CORRECTIONS	DATE	03/01/08
PRIMENERGY, L.L.C.	3172 N. TOLEDO	TULSA, OKLA. 74115	
JOB NAME:	SEBESTA / NETL	SCALE: N.T.S.	APPROVED BY:
LOCATION:	MINNESOTA	DATE: 01/07/08	DATE APPROVED:
CONTRACTOR:	SEBESTA		
DESCRIPTION:	PROCESS FLOW DIAGRAM		
	GASIFIER AND GAS CLEAN-UP SYSTEM		
	FOR GAS TUBING		
JOB NUMBER:	0153	DISCIPLINE:	000
REVISION NO.:	001	DATE:

GENERAL NOTES:

△					
△					
△					
△					
△	ADDED AMMONIA SCRUBBER, CORRECTED FOR TURBINE DETAILS	DATE	08/19/02	CHEK	BY
REV.	DESCRIPTION	DATE			
1	ADDED AMMONIA SCRUBBER, CORRECTED FOR TURBINE DETAILS	08/19/02			
PRIMENERGY, L.L.C. 3172 N. TOLEDO TULSA, OKLA. 74115					
JOB NAME:	SEBESTA / NETL	DESIGNER:	DATE:	CHECKED BY:	
LOCATION:	MINNESOTA	SCALE:	N.T.S.	APPROVED BY:	
CONTRACTOR:	SEBESTA	DATE:	01/07/02	DATE APPROVED:	
DESCRIPTION:	PROCESS FLOW DIAGRAM DIRECT FIRED TURBINE SYNGAS COMPRESSED SEPARATELY	JOB NUMBER:	0153	DISCIPLIN:	000
		SHEET NO.:	002A	REV.:	△

OPERATING CASE: DIRECT FIRED TURBINE - SYNGAS COMPRESSED SEPARATE

Stream ID			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11A	12A	Q1	11B	12B	Q2	11C	12C
Stream Name			BIOMASS FEED	GASIFIER AIR	GASIFIER BOTTOM ASH	GASIFIER SYNGAS	COOLED SYNGAS	CLEAN SYNGAS	SYNGAS TO AMMONIA SCRUBBER	FRESH OIL MAKEUP	TAR BD TO GASIFIER	GAS CLEANUP LIQUID BD	GASIFIER COOLING WATER SUPPLY	GASIFIER COOLING WATER RETURN	GASIFIER CW THERMAL ENERGY	IND. HEX COOLING WATER SUPPLY	IND. HEX COOLING WATER RETURN	IND. HEX CW THERMAL ENERGY	OIL HEX COOLING WATER SUPPLY	OIL HEX COOLING WATER RETURN
Pressure, psig ("w.c.-g)			---	(22.0)	---	(-3.0)	(-6.0)	(-16.0)	2.0	---	50	---	50	15		40	5		40	5
Temperature, °F			77	77	300	1300	500	105	110	77	115	115	140	170	170 - 140	140	170	170 - 140	85	95
Molecular Weight (lb/lbmole)			---	28.69	20.02	26.05	26.05	27.00	27.00	---	---	---	18.02	18.02		18.02	18.02		18.02	18.02
Component	Formula	mw	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	MMBtu/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	MMBtu/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr
Carbon	C	12.01	13,006		1,503															
Hydrogen	H	1.01	1,652																	
Nitrogen	N	14.01	362																	
Oxygen	O	16.00	11,230																	
Sulfur	S	32.06	78																	
Methane	CH4	16.04				2,346	2,346	2,346	2,346											
Ethane	C2H6	30.07				308	308	308	308											
Ethylene	C2H4	28.05				677	677	677	677											
Propane	C3H8	44.10				16	16	16	16											
Propene	C3H6	42.08				92	92	92	92											
Butane-n	C4H10	58.12				78	78	78	78											
Pentane (gas)	C5H12	72.15				12	12	12	12											
Benzene	C6H6	78.11				476	476	476	476											
Ammonia	NH3	17.09				85	85	85	85											
Fuel Gas	CH4	16.04																		
Carbon Monoxide	CO	28.01				11,266	11,266	11,266	11,266											
Carbon Dioxide	CO2	44.01				12,768	12,768	12,768	12,768											
Hydrogen	H2	2.02				319	319	319	319											
Water (v)	H2O (v)	18.02		470		9,188	9,188	3,570	3,570											
Nitrogen	N2	28.01		37,927		38,218	38,218	38,218	38,218											
Oxygen	O2	32.00		11,481		780	780	780	780											
Sulfur Dioxide	SO2	64.06				155	155	155	155											
Ash	SiO2	60.08	1,518		1,503	15	15	15	15											
Sulfuric Acid	H2SO4	98.08																		
Ammonium Sulfate	(NH4)2SO4	132.14																		
Oil	-----	-----								50	25	25								
Tar	-----	-----									36	12								
Water (l)	H2O (l)	18.02	3,028								562	5,056	83,558	83,558		692,855	692,855		1,554,568	1,554,568
TOTAL			30,874	49,878	3,005	76,801	76,801	71,183	71,183	50	623	5,093	83,558	83,558		692,855	692,855		1,554,568	1,554,568
AVAILABLE ENERGY VALUE (LHV-Hv), Btu/lb			6,604			1,939.2	1,939.2	2,092.2	2,092.2											
AVAILABLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr			203.90			148.93	148.93	148.93	148.93											
SENSIBLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr						30.6	9.8								2.51			20.79		
FLOW RATE, SCFM (GPM)				10,998		18,645	18,645	16,673	16,673	(0.13)	(1.4)	(11.3)	(167)	(167)		(1,386)	(1,386)		(3,109)	(3,109)
FLOW RATE, ACFM				11,357		63,107	34,422	18,116	18,276											
ELECTRICAL OUTPUT, Kilowatts																				

CUSTOMER: SEBESTA / NETL

OPERATING CASE: DIRECT FIRED TURBINE - SYNGAS COMPRESSED SEPARATE

Stream ID			13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	Q3	26	27	28
Stream Name			10% SULFURIC ACID	AMMONIA SCRUBBER BD	SYNGAS TO COMPRESS	SYNGAS COMP BD	SYNGAS TO HEAT EXCH	ATMOS AIR TO TURBINE COMP	TURBINE COMP BLEED AIR	COOLED COMP BLEED AIR	HEAED SYNGAS TO TURBINE	NAT'L GAS	COMP AIR TO TURBINE	TURBINE INLET GAS	TURBINE EXHAUST GAS	TURBINE EXHAUST THERMAL ENERGY	GROSS ELECT OUT	AUX LOAD	NET ELECT OUT
Pressure, psig ("w.c.-g)			30	30	1.8	50	237	----	207	----	236	258	207	201	0.43				
Temperature, °F			77	110	110	110	300	70	677	413	506	77	677	1789	960	960 - 300			
Molecular Weight (lb/lbmole)			19.62	20.30	27.02	18.02	27.70	28.69	28.69	28.69	27.70	16.04	28.69	28.88	28.88				
Component	Formula	mw	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	lb/hr	MMBtu/hr	kilowats	kilowats	kilowatts
Carbon	C	12.01																	
Hydrogen	H	1.01																	
Nitrogen	N	14.01																	
Oxygen	O	16.00																	
Sulfur	S	32.06																	
Methane	CH4	16.04			2,346		2,346				2,346								
Ethane	C2H6	30.07			308		308				308								
Ethylene	C2H4	28.05			677		677				677								
Propane	C3H8	44.10			16		16				16								
Propene	C3H6	42.08			92		92				92								
Butane-n	C4H10	58.12			78		78				78								
Pentane (gas)	C5H12	72.15			12		12				12								
Benzene	C6H6	78.11			476		476				476								
Ammonia	NH3	17.09																	
Fuel Gas	CH4	16.04										1,729							
Carbon Monoxide	CO	28.01			11,266		11,266				11,266								
Carbon Dioxide	CO2	44.01			12,768		12,768				12,768			46,895	46,895				
Hydrogen	H2	2.02			319		319				319								
Water (v)	H2O (v)	18.02			3,570		253	5,364	573	573	253		4,791	19,088	19,088				
Nitrogen	N2	28.01			38,218		38,218	432,988	46,268	46,268	38,218		386,720	424,938	424,938				
Oxygen	O2	32.00			780		780	131,077	14,007	14,007	780		117,070	87,000	87,000				
Sulfur Dioxide	SO2	64.06			155		155				155			155	155				
Ash	SiO2	60.08																	
Sulfuric Acid	H2SO4	98.08	245																
Ammonium Sulfate	(NH4)2SO4	132.14		330															
Oil	-----	-----																	
Tar	-----	-----																	
Water (l)	H2O (l)	18.02	2,207	2,207		3,317													
TOTAL			2,452	2,537	71,083	3,317	67,766	569,429	60,848	60,848	67,766	1,729	508,581	578,076	578,076				
AVAILABLE ENERGY VALUE (LHV-Hv), Btu/lb					2,085.7		2,187.8				2,187.8	21,500							
AVAILABLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr					148.26		148.3				148.3	37.18							
SENSIBLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr							4.22		9.09	5.09	8.13		76.00	269.58	99.08	66.97			
FLOW RATE, SCFM (GPM)			(4.9)	(5.1)	16,640	(6.6)	15,475	125,554	13,416	13,416	15,475	682	112,138	126,598	126,598				
FLOW RATE, ACFM					18,240		1,287	127,969	1,948	22,524	1,643	38	16,278	37,364	335,813				
ELECTRICAL OUTPUT, Kilowatts																	16,560	6,576	9,984

Appendix E: Indirect Turbine Case

The following pages contain process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for indirect turbine case (clean air turbine).

GENERAL NOTES:			
1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28
29	30	31	32
33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40
41	42	43	44
45	46	47	48
49	50	51	52
53	54	55	56
57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64
65	66	67	68
69	70	71	72
73	74	75	76
77	78	79	80
81	82	83	84
85	86	87	88
89	90	91	92
93	94	95	96
97	98	99	100
101	102	103	104
105	106	107	108
109	110	111	112
113	114	115	116
117	118	119	120
121	122	123	124
125	126	127	128
129	130	131	132
133	134	135	136
137	138	139	140
141	142	143	144
145	146	147	148
149	150	151	152
153	154	155	156
157	158	159	160
161	162	163	164
165	166	167	168
169	170	171	172
173	174	175	176
177	178	179	180
181	182	183	184
185	186	187	188
189	190	191	192
193	194	195	196
197	198	199	200
201	202	203	204
205	206	207	208
209	210	211	212
213	214	215	216
217	218	219	220
221	222	223	224
225	226	227	228
229	230	231	232
233	234	235	236
237	238	239	240
241	242	243	244
245	246	247	248
249	250	251	252
253	254	255	256
257	258	259	260
261	262	263	264
265	266	267	268
269	270	271	272
273	274	275	276
277	278	279	280
281	282	283	284
285	286	287	288
289	290	291	292
293	294	295	296
297	298	299	300
301	302	303	304
305	306	307	308
309	310	311	312
313	314	315	316
317	318	319	320
321	322	323	324
325	326	327	328
329	330	331	332
333	334	335	336
337	338	339	340
341	342	343	344
345	346	347	348
349	350	351	352
353	354	355	356
357	358	359	360
361	362	363	364
365	366	367	368
369	370	371	372
373	374	375	376
377	378	379	380
381	382	383	384
385	386	387	388
389	390	391	392
393	394	395	396
397	398	399	400
401	402	403	404
405	406	407	408
409	410	411	412
413	414	415	416
417	418	419	420
421	422	423	424
425	426	427	428
429	430	431	432
433	434	435	436
437	438	439	440
441	442	443	444
445	446	447	448
449	450	451	452
453	454	455	456
457	458	459	460
461	462	463	464
465	466	467	468
469	470	471	472
473	474	475	476
477	478	479	480
481	482	483	484
485	486	487	488
489	490	491	492
493	494	495	496
497	498	499	500
501	502	503	504
505	506	507	508
509	510	511	512
513	514	515	516
517	518	519	520
521	522	523	524
525	526	527	528
529	530	531	532
533	534	535	536
537	538	539	540
541	542	543	544
545	546	547	548
549	550	551	552
553	554	555	556
557	558	559	560
561	562	563	564
565	566	567	568
569	570	571	572
573	574	575	576
577	578	579	580
581	582	583	584
585	586	587	588
589	590	591	592
593	594	595	596
597	598	599	600
601	602	603	604
605	606	607	608
609	610	611	612
613	614	615	616
617	618	619	620
621	622	623	624
625	626	627	628
629	630	631	632
633	634	635	636
637	638	639	640
641	642	643	644
645	646	647	648
649	650	651	652
653	654	655	656
657	658	659	660
661	662	663	664
665	666	667	668
669	670	671	672
673	674	675	676
677	678	679	680
681	682	683	684
685	686	687	688
689	690	691	692
693	694	695	696
697	698	699	700
701	702	703	704
705	706	707	708
709	710	711	712
713	714	715	716
717	718	719	720
721	722	723	724
725	726	727	728
729	730	731	732
733	734	735	736
737	738	739	740
741	742	743	744
745	746	747	748
749	750	751	752
753	754	755	756
757	758	759	760
761	762	763	764
765	766	767	768
769	770	771	772
773	774	775	776
777	778	779	780
781	782	783	784
785	786	787	788
789	790	791	792
793	794	795	796
797	798	799	800
801	802	803	804
805	806	807	808
809	810	811	812
813	814	815	816
817	818	819	820
821	822	823	824
825	826	827	828
829	830	831	832
833	834	835	836
837	838	839	840
841	842	843	844
845	846	847	848
849	850	851	852
853	854	855	856
857	858	859	860
861	862	863	864
865	866	867	868
869	870	871	872
873	874	875	876
877	878	879	880
881	882	883	884
885	886	887	888
889	890	891	892
893	894	895	896
897	898	899	900
901	902	903	904
905	906	907	908
909	910	911	912
913	914	915	916
917	918	919	920
921	922	923	924
925	926	927	928
929	930	931	932
933	934	935	936
937	938	939	940
941	942	943	944
945	946	947	948
949	950	951	952
953	954	955	956
957	958	959	960
961	962	963	964
965	966	967	968
969	970	971	972
973	974	975	976
977	978	979	980
981	982	983	984
985	986	987	988
989	990	991	992
993	994	995	996
997	998	999	1000

OPERATING CASE: INDIRECT FIRED TURBINE

[illegible]

Stream ID			Q2	12	13	14	15	16	17	Q3	18	19	20
Stream Name			HEATER EXHAUST THERMAL ENERGY	COMB AIR TO TURBINE COMP	COMB AIR TO AIR HEATER	HEATED COMB AIR TO TURBINE	NATURAL GAS	TURBINE INLET GAS	TURBINE EXHAUST	TURBINE EXHAUST THERMAL ENERGY	GROSS ELECT OUTPUT	AUX LOAD	NET ELECT OUTPUT
Pressure, psig ("w.c.-g)				----	160	156	256	154	0.40				
Temperature, °F			736 - 300	77	602	1595	77	1829	917	917 - 300			
Molecular Weight (lb/lbmole)				28.69	28.69	28.69	16.04	28.61	28.61				
Component	Formula	mw	MMBtu/hr	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	MMBtu/hr	kW	kW	kW
Carbon	C	12.01											
Hydrogen	H	1.01											
Nitrogen	N	14.01											
Oxygen	O	16.00											
Sulfur	S	32.06											
Chlorine	Cl	35.45											
Fuel Gas	CH4	16.04					1,101.4						
Carbon Monoxide	CO	28.01											
Carbon Dioxide	CO2	44.01						3,021.4	3,021.4				
Hydrogen	H2	2.02											
Water (v)	H2O (v)	18.02		3,089	3,089	3,089		5,562	5,562				
Nitrogen	N2	28.01		249,301	249,301	249,301		249,301	249,301				
Oxygen	O2	32.00		75,470	75,470	75,470		71,076	71,076				
Sulfur Dioxide	SO2	64.06											
Hydrogen Chloride	HCl	36.46											
Ash	SiO2	60.08											
Lime	CaCO3	100.09											
Water (l)	H2O (l)	18.02											
TOTAL				327,860	327,860	327,860	1,101.4	328,961	328,961				
AVAILABLE ENERGY VALUE (LHV-Hv), Btu/lb							21,500						
AVAILABLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr							23.68						
SENSIBLE HEAT, MMBtu/hr			33.09		21.37	65.22		154.11	70.22	51.58			
FLOW RATE, scfm (gpm)				72,291	72,291	72,291	434	72,725	72,725				
FLOW RATE, acfm				74,654	12,428	24,603	24	27,889	187,472				
ELECTRICAL RATE, kilowatts											10,091	756	9,334

Appendix F: Steam Turbine Case

The following pages contain process flow diagrams and mass and energy balance sheets for steam turbine case.

OPERATING CASE: 5 MW STEAM TURBINE & GLYCOL HEATING

[illegible]

CUSTOMER : SEBESTA / NETL

OPERATING CASE: 5 MW STEAM TURBINE & GLYCOL HEATING

Stream ID			8B	9B	10B	11B	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Stream Name			OVERFIRE SYNGAS TO BOILER	BOILER REOX AIR	COMB PROD TO BOILER	ECON EXHAUST	FLY ASH	STACK EXHAUST	BOILER FW	BOILER BD	HIGH PRES STEAM	COND RETURN	GROSS ELECT OUTPUT	AUX LOAD	NET ELECT OUTPUT
Pressure, psig ("w.c.-g)			(-4.0)	(8.0)	(-5.0)	(-13.0)	----	----	645	600	600	(-366.4)			
Temperature, °F			2400	77	2489	340	250	331	250	489	750	115			
Molecular Weight (lb/lbmole)			26.02	28.68	28.76	28.76	60.08	28.75	18.02	18.02	18.02	18.02			
Component	Formula	mw	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	lb/h	kW	kW	kW
Carbon	C	12.01													
Hydrogen	H	1.01													
Nitrogen	N	14.01													
Oxygen	O	16.00													
Sulfur	S	32.06													
Chlorine	Cl	35.45													
Fuel Gas	CH4	16.04													
Carbon Monoxide	CO	28.01	3,061												
Carbon Dioxide	CO2	44.01	11,984		16,793	16,793		20,601							
Hydrogen	H2	2.02	454												
Water (v)	H2O (v)	18.02	3,449	500	8,011	8,011		9,876			52,500				
Nitrogen	N2	28.01	25,497	39,062	64,559	64,559		82,976							
Oxygen	O2	32.00		11,825	6,470	6,470		9,080							
Sulfur Dioxide	SO2	64.06	17		17	17		21							
Hydrogen Chloride	HCl	36.46													
Ash	SiO2	60.08	1		1	1	1								
Lime	CaCO3	100.09													
Water (l)	H2O (l)	18.02							52,762	52,762		52,500			
TOTAL			44,463	51,387	95,850	95,850	1	122,555	52,762	52,762	52,500	52,500			
AVAILABLE ENERGY VALUE (LHV-Hv), Btu			832												
AVAILABLE ENERGY, MMBtu/hr			36.99												
SENSIBLE HEAT, MMBtu/hr			34.19		68.78	6.54		8.17							
FLOW RATE, scfm (gpm)			10,809	11,333	21,083	21,083		26,960	(105.5)	(105.5)	18,432	(105.0)			
FLOW RATE, acfm			59,448	11,703	119,577	32,435		41,025							
ELECTRICAL RATE, kilowatts													5,000	282	4,718

Appendix G: Rahr Plant Layout

The following page contains the Rahr plant layout.

RAHR PLANT LAYOUT

Appendix H: Biomass Photographs and Fuel Lab Analysis

The following pages contain biomass photographs and fuel lab analysis.

Biomass Photographs

The following illustrations show various biomasses.

Figure 9-1

Oat hulls for use as biomass.

Appendix H: Biomass Photographs and Fuel Lab Analysis

Figure 9-2

Rahr by-products for use as biomass.

Biomass Summary Analysis Data

The following tables contain data from the Hazen Research Laboratory obtained from biomass testing.

Table 9-1: Ground Oat Hull Summary Analysis

Hazen Research Report No. L74 / 01-1: Dated 11 December 2001

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
PROXIMATE (%)		
Moisture	7.95%	0.00%
Ash	5.45%	5.92%
Volatile	71.53%	77.71%
Fixed C	15.07%	16.37%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Sulfur	0.09%	0.10%
BTU/lb (HHV)	7193	7814
MMF BTU/lb	7642	8347
MAF BTU/lb		8306
ULTIMATE (%)		
Moisture	7.95%	0.00%
Carbon	42.77%	46.46%
Hydrogen	5.56%	6.04%
Nitrogen	0.54%	0.59%
Sulfur	0.09%	0.10%
Ash	5.45%	5.92%
Oxygen	37.64%	40.89%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Chlorine**	0.13%	0.14%

Appendix H: Biomass Photographs and Fuel Lab Analysis

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
ELEMENTAL ANALYSIS OF ASH (%)		
SiO ₂	71.26%	
Al ₂ O ₃	0.07%	
TiO ₂	0.16%	
Fe ₂ O ₃	0.22%	
CaO	2.15%	
MgO	2.55%	
Na ₂ O	1.14%	
K ₂ O	9.29%	
P ₂ O ₅	5.21%	
SO ₃	1.38%	
Cl	0.86%	
CO ₂	0.15%	
Total	94.44%	
ASH FUSION TEMPERATURE (°F)		
	Oxidizing Atmosphere	Reducing Atmosphere
Initial	2700+	2676
Softening		2700+
Hemispherical		
Fluid		

** Chlorine not usually reported as part of the ultimate analysis

Table 9-2: Barley Dust and Chaff Summary Analysis**Hazen Research Report No. L74 / 01-2: Dated 11 December 2001**

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
PROXIMATE (%)		
Moisture	9.78%	0.00%
Ash	8.04%	8.91%
Volatile	68.41%	75.83%
Fixed C	13.77%	15.26%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Sulfur	0.16%	0.18%
BTU/lb (HHV)	6910	7659
MMF BTU/lb	7566	8474
MAF BTU/lb		8409
ULTIMATE (%)		
Moisture	9.78%	0.00%
Carbon	40.47%	44.86%
Hydrogen	5.28%	5.85%
Nitrogen	1.58%	1.75%
Sulfur	0.16%	0.18%
Ash	8.04%	8.91%
Oxygen	34.69%	38.45%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Chlorine**	0.17%	0.19%

Appendix H: Biomass Photographs and Fuel Lab Analysis

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
ELEMENTAL ANALYSIS OF ASH (%)		
SiO ₂	60.09%	
Al ₂ O ₃	1.70%	
TiO ₂	0.11%	
Fe ₂ O ₃	1.10%	
CaO	3.90%	
MgO	3.20%	
Na ₂ O	1.16%	
K ₂ O	12.50%	
P ₂ O ₅	9.78%	
SO ₃	1.51%	
Cl	1.64%	
CO ₂	0.50%	
Total	97.19%	
ASH FUSION TEMPERATURE (°F)		
	Oxidizing Atmosphere	Reducing Atmosphere
Initial	2362	2286
Softening	2528	2522
Hemispherical	2576	2560
Fluid	2581	2590

** Chlorine not usually reported as part of the ultimate analysis

Table 9-3: Wheaty Barley Summary Analysis**Hazen Research Report No. L74 / 01-3: Dated 11 December 2001**

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
PROXIMATE (%)		
Moisture	11.05%	0.00%
Ash	2.25%	2.53%
Volatile	70.56%	79.33%
Fixed C	16.14%	18.14%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Sulfur	0.20%	0.22%
BTU/lb (HHV)	7108	7991
MMF BTU/lb	7283	8215
MAF BTU/lb		8199
ULTIMATE (%)		
Moisture	11.05%	0.00%
Carbon	41.39%	46.53%
Hydrogen	5.58%	6.28%
Nitrogen	1.93%	2.17%
Sulfur	0.20%	0.22%
Ash	2.25%	2.53%
Oxygen	37.60%	42.27%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Chlorine**	0.08%	0.09%

Appendix H: Biomass Photographs and Fuel Lab Analysis

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
ELEMENTAL ANALYSIS OF ASH (%)		
SiO ₂	23.84%	
Al ₂ O ₃	0.94%	
TiO ₂	0.13%	
Fe ₂ O ₃	0.96%	
CaO	3.51%	
MgO	9.33%	
Na ₂ O	0.69%	
K ₂ O	22.20%	
P ₂ O ₅	38.55%	
SO ₃	0.71%	
Cl	<0.01%	
CO ₂	0.19%	
Total	101.05%	
ASH FUSION TEMPERATURE (°F)		
	Oxidizing Atmosphere	Reducing Atmosphere
Initial	2341	2270
Softening	2368	2400
Hemispherical	2383	2422
Fluid	2390	2442

** Chlorine not usually reported as part of the ultimate analysis

Table 9-4: Barley Needles Summary Analysis**Hazen Research Report No. L74 / 01-4: Dated 11 December 2001**

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
PROXIMATE (%)		
Moisture	11.25%	0.00%
Ash	2.46%	2.77%
Volatile	71.18%	80.20%
Fixed C	15.11%	17.03%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Sulfur	0.18%	0.20%
BTU/lb (HHV)	7755	8738
MMF BTU/lb	7965	9007
MAF BTU/lb		8987
ULTIMATE (%)		
Moisture	11.25%	0.00%
Carbon	41.52%	46.78%
Hydrogen	5.56%	6.27%
Nitrogen	4.11%	4.63%
Sulfur	0.18%	0.20%
Ash	2.46%	2.77%
Oxygen	34.92%	39.35%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Chlorine**	0.11%	0.12%

Appendix H: Biomass Photographs and Fuel Lab Analysis

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
ELEMENTAL ANALYSIS OF ASH (%)		
SiO ₂	32.38%	
Al ₂ O ₃	<0.01	
TiO ₂	0.93%	
Fe ₂ O ₃	0.74%	
CaO	2.86%	
MgO	7.45%	
Na ₂ O	0.78%	
K ₂ O	22.20%	
P ₂ O ₅	32.55%	
SO ₃	1.31%	
Cl	0.21%	
CO ₂	0.08%	
Total	101.49%	
ASH FUSION TEMPERATURE (°F)		
	Oxidizing Atmosphere	Reducing Atmosphere
Initial	2435	2408
Softening	2438	2453
Hemispherical	2439	2455
Fluid	2455	2472

** Chlorine not usually reported as part of the ultimate analysis

Table 9-5: Malt Sprouts Summary Analysis**Hazen Research Report No. L74 / 01-5: Dated 11 December 2001**

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
PROXIMATE (%)		
Moisture	4.95%	0.00%
Ash	5.45%	5.73%
Volatile	74.65%	78.54%
Fixed C	14.95%	15.73%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Sulfur	0.36%	0.38%
BTU/lb (HHV)	7760	8165
MMF BTU/lb	8244	8703
MAF BTU/lb		8661
ULTIMATE (%)		
Moisture	4.95%	0.00%
Carbon	44.21%	46.51%
Hydrogen	5.86%	6.16%
Nitrogen	0.69%	0.73%
Sulfur	0.36%	0.38%
Ash	5.45%	5.73%
Oxygen	38.48%	40.49%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Chlorine**	0.26%	0.27%

Appendix H: Biomass Photographs and Fuel Lab Analysis

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
Elemental ANALYSIS OF ASH (%)		
SiO ₂	29.76%	
Al ₂ O ₃	<0.01	
TiO ₂	0.86%	
Fe ₂ O ₃	0.23%	
CaO	3.70%	
MgO	4.43%	
Na ₂ O	0.60%	
K ₂ O	23.90%	
P ₂ O ₅	24.57%	
SO ₃	2.47%	
Cl	3.15%	
CO ₂	0.07%	
Total	93.74%	
ASH FUSION TEMPERATURE (°F)		
	Oxidizing Atmosphere	Reducing Atmosphere
Initial	2432	2301
Softening	2528	2460
Hemispherical	2630	2490
Fluid	2537	2550

** Chlorine not usually reported as part of the ultimate analysis

Table 9-6: Corn Stover Summary Analysis**Hazen Research Report No. L74 / 01-6: Dated 11 December 2001**

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
PROXIMATE (%)		
Moisture	11.75%	0.00%
Ash	4.63%	5.25%
Volatile	69.72%	79.00%
Fixed C	13.90%	15.75%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Sulfur	0.09%	0.10%
BTU/lb (HHV)	7069	8010
MMF BTU/lb	7440	8491
MAF BTU/lb		8454
ULTIMATE (%)		
Moisture	11.75%	0.00%
Carbon	42.37%	48.01%
Hydrogen	4.83%	5.47%
Nitrogen	1.93%	2.19%
Sulfur	0.09%	0.10%
Ash	4.63%	5.25%
Oxygen	34.40%	38.98%
Total	100.00%	100.00%
Chlorine**	0.03%	0.03%

Appendix H: Biomass Photographs and Fuel Lab Analysis

Reporting Basis	As Rec'd	Dry
ELEMENTAL ANALYSIS OF ASH (%)		
SiO ₂	53.71%	
Al ₂ O ₃	4.15%	
TiO ₂	0.27%	
Fe ₂ O ₃	1.27%	
CaO	6.28%	
MgO	3.84%	
Na ₂ O	0.87%	
K ₂ O	17.10%	
P ₂ O ₅	3.79%	
SO ₃	2.08%	
Cl	0.27%	
CO ₂	2.13%	
Total	95.76%	
ASH FUSION TEMPERATURE (°F)		
	Oxidizing Atmosphere	Reducing Atmosphere
Initial	1920	1850
Softening	2058	2030
Hemispherical	2226	2150
Fluid	2383	2312

** Chlorine not usually reported as part of the ultimate analysis

Appendix I: Detailed Economics Analysis of Various Scenarios at Rahr

The following pages contain detailed economic analysis of various scenarios at Rahr.

Detailed Economics for Scenario 1.2

[illegible]

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Unit Expenses																
Residual Retail Electric Service																
Demand	\$ 5.78 /kW	\$ 5.82	\$ 5.87	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.10	\$ 6.29	\$ 6.48	\$ 6.66	\$ 6.72	\$ 6.84	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.14	\$ 7.22	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55
Energy	\$ 0.0322 /kWh	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04
Blended Retail	\$ 0.0450 /kWh	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 4.00 /MMBTU	\$ 4.61	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.23	\$ 5.37	\$ 5.50	\$ 5.69	\$ 5.83	\$ 5.99	\$ 6.20	\$ 6.42	\$ 6.62	\$ 6.79	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40
Biomass	\$ 1.89 /MMBTU	\$ 1.93	\$ 1.97	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.05	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.13	\$ 2.17	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.26	\$ 2.31	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.45	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55
Water	\$ 1.50 /kgal	\$ 1.53	\$ 1.56	\$ 1.59	\$ 1.62	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.69	\$ 1.72	\$ 1.76	\$ 1.79	\$ 1.83	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.90	\$ 1.94	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02
Conventional Operation																
Electricity	62,926,168 kWh	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921 MMBTU	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 2,831,678	\$ 2,851,327	\$ 2,877,847	\$ 2,917,038	\$ 2,937,917	\$ 2,989,414	\$ 3,079,426	\$ 3,172,386	\$ 3,263,479	\$ 3,293,647	\$ 3,350,137	\$ 3,429,775	\$ 3,500,315	\$ 3,537,441	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 2,259,686	\$ 2,606,051	\$ 2,825,169	\$ 2,955,064	\$ 3,031,380	\$ 3,105,071	\$ 3,212,719	\$ 3,292,815	\$ 3,386,486	\$ 3,504,066	\$ 3,626,277	\$ 3,737,039	\$ 3,837,911	\$ 3,952,574	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 5,091,364	\$ 5,457,378	\$ 5,703,016	\$ 5,872,102	\$ 5,969,297	\$ 6,094,485	\$ 6,292,145	\$ 6,465,201	\$ 6,649,965	\$ 6,797,713	\$ 6,976,414	\$ 7,166,814	\$ 7,338,226	\$ 7,490,015	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004
Annual Cogeneration Production																
Electricity	43,348,780 kWh	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	573,183 MMBTU	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	146 MMBTU	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
Residual Electric Load																
Electricity																
Demand, monthly average	5,083 kW	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083
Energy	19,577,388 kWh	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388
Water	10,049 kgal	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049
Cogeneration Fuel	1,046,743 MMBTU	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743
Fuel Mix																
Natural Gas	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%
Biomass	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%
Supplemental Fuel	146 MMBTU	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
Fuel Mix																
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses																
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 2,325,357	\$ 2,458,918	\$ 2,556,368	\$ 2,628,709	\$ 2,686,259	\$ 2,743,760	\$ 2,811,801	\$ 2,872,616	\$ 2,938,108	\$ 3,011,280	\$ 3,086,574	\$ 3,159,358	\$ 3,230,098	\$ 3,305,656	\$ 3,380,829	\$ 3,458,556
Supplemental Fuel																
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 584	\$ 674	\$ 730	\$ 764	\$ 783	\$ 802	\$ 830	\$ 851	\$ 875	\$ 906	\$ 937	\$ 966	\$ 992	\$ 1,022	\$ 1,050	\$ 1,080
Water	\$ 15,073	\$ 15,375	\$ 15,682	\$ 15,996	\$ 16,316	\$ 16,642	\$ 16,975	\$ 17,314	\$ 17,661	\$ 18,014	\$ 18,374	\$ 18,742	\$ 19,116	\$ 19,499	\$ 19,889	\$ 20,286
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 195,070	\$ 198,971	\$ 202,951	\$ 207,010	\$ 211,150	\$ 215,373	\$ 219,681	\$ 224,074	\$ 228,556	\$ 233,127	\$ 237,789	\$ 242,545	\$ 247,396	\$ 252,344	\$ 257,391	\$ 262,539
Residual Electric Service	\$ 982,926	\$ 989,746	\$ 998,952	\$ 1,012,556	\$ 1,019,803	\$ 1,037,679	\$ 1,068,924	\$ 1,101,192	\$ 1,132,812	\$ 1,143,284	\$ 1,162,892	\$ 1,190,536	\$ 1,215,021	\$ 1,227,909	\$ 1,254,645	\$ 1,283,919
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 131,789	\$ 132,703	\$ 133,938	\$ 135,762	\$ 136,733	\$ 139,130	\$ 143,319	\$ 147,646	\$ 151,885	\$ 153,289	\$ 155,918	\$ 159,625	\$ 162,908	\$ 164,636	\$ 168,220	\$ 172,145
Sub-total, Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 3,650,799	\$ 3,796,387	\$ 3,908,620	\$ 4,000,796	\$ 4,071,044	\$ 4,153,386	\$ 4,261,529	\$ 4,363,693	\$ 4,469,896	\$ 4,559,900	\$ 4,662,485	\$ 4,771,771	\$ 4,875,531	\$ 4,971,065	\$ 5,082,024	\$ 5,198,525
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 1,440,565	\$ 1,660,991	\$ 1,794,396	\$ 1,871,306	\$ 1,898,253	\$ 1,941,099	\$ 2,030,616	\$ 2,101,508	\$ 2,180,069	\$ 2,237,813	\$ 2,313,929	\$ 2,395,043	\$ 2,462,695	\$ 2,518,950	\$ 2,595,408	\$ 2,679,479
NPV, Avoided Expesne	\$ 24,609,121															

Detailed Economics for Scenario 1.2

Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass				

Year	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses				
Residual Retail Electric Service				
Demand	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
Blended Retail	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation				
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production				
Electricity	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780	43,348,780
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	573,183	573,183	573,183	573,183
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	146	146	146	146
Residual Electric Load				
Electricity				
Demand, monthly average	5,083	5,083	5,083	5,083
Energy	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388	19,577,388
Water	10,049	10,049	10,049	10,049
Cogeneration Fuel	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743	1,046,743
Fuel Mix				
Natural Gas	16%	16%	16%	16%
Biomass	84%	84%	84%	84%
Supplemental Fuel	146	146	146	146
Fuel Mix				
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses				
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 3,539,532	\$ 3,624,774	\$ 3,715,214	\$ 3,803,183
Supplemental Fuel				
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 1,112	\$ 1,147	\$ 1,186	\$ 1,222
Water	\$ 20,692	\$ 21,106	\$ 21,528	\$ 21,959
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 267,789	\$ 273,145	\$ 278,608	\$ 284,180
Residual Electric Service	\$ 1,314,901	\$ 1,341,620	\$ 1,373,436	\$ 1,401,793
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 176,299	\$ 179,882	\$ 184,148	\$ 187,950
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 5,320,326	\$ 5,441,674	\$ 5,574,120	\$ 5,700,287
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 2,771,359	\$ 2,863,051	\$ 2,973,140	\$ 3,067,748

NPV, Avoided Expesne

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.1

[illegible]

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Unit Expenses														
Residual Retail Electric Service														
Demand	\$ 5.78 /kW	\$ 5.82	\$ 5.87	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.10	\$ 6.29	\$ 6.48	\$ 6.66	\$ 6.72	\$ 6.84	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.14	\$ 7.22
Energy	\$ 0.0322 /kWh	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04
Blended Retail	\$ 0.0450 /kWh	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 4.00 /MMBTU	\$ 4.61	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.23	\$ 5.37	\$ 5.50	\$ 5.69	\$ 5.83	\$ 5.99	\$ 6.20	\$ 6.42	\$ 6.62	\$ 6.79	\$ 7.00
Biomass	\$ 1.89 /MMBTU	\$ 1.93	\$ 1.97	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.05	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.13	\$ 2.17	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.26	\$ 2.31	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.45
Water	\$ 1.50 /kgal	\$ 1.53	\$ 1.56	\$ 1.59	\$ 1.62	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.69	\$ 1.72	\$ 1.76	\$ 1.79	\$ 1.83	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.90	\$ 1.94
Conventional Operation														
Electricity	62,926,168 kWh	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921 MMBTU	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 2,831,678	\$ 2,851,327	\$ 2,877,847	\$ 2,917,038	\$ 2,937,917	\$ 2,989,414	\$ 3,079,426	\$ 3,172,386	\$ 3,263,479	\$ 3,293,647	\$ 3,350,137	\$ 3,429,775	\$ 3,500,315	\$ 3,537,441
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 2,259,686	\$ 2,606,051	\$ 2,825,169	\$ 2,955,064	\$ 3,031,380	\$ 3,105,071	\$ 3,212,719	\$ 3,292,815	\$ 3,386,486	\$ 3,504,066	\$ 3,626,277	\$ 3,737,039	\$ 3,837,911	\$ 3,952,574
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 5,091,364	\$ 5,457,378	\$ 5,703,016	\$ 5,872,102	\$ 5,969,297	\$ 6,094,485	\$ 6,292,145	\$ 6,465,201	\$ 6,649,965	\$ 6,797,713	\$ 6,976,414	\$ 7,166,814	\$ 7,338,226	\$ 7,490,015
Annual Cogeneration Production														
Electricity	62,560,849 kWh	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	512,605 MMBTU	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	33,227 MMBTU	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227
Residual Electric Load														
Electricity														
Demand, monthly average	660 kW	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	660
Energy	365,319 kWh	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319
Water	13,944 kgal	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944
Cogeneration Fuel	1,452,475 MMBTU	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475
Fuel Mix														
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental Fuel	33,227 MMBTU	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227
Fuel Mix														
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses														
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 2,749,234	\$ 2,804,219	\$ 2,860,303	\$ 2,917,509	\$ 2,975,859	\$ 3,035,376	\$ 3,096,084	\$ 3,158,006	\$ 3,221,166	\$ 3,285,589	\$ 3,351,301	\$ 3,418,327	\$ 3,486,693	\$ 3,556,427
Supplemental Fuel														
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 132,908	\$ 153,280	\$ 166,168	\$ 173,808	\$ 178,297	\$ 182,631	\$ 188,963	\$ 193,674	\$ 199,183	\$ 206,099	\$ 213,287	\$ 219,802	\$ 225,735	\$ 232,479
Water	\$ 20,916	\$ 21,334	\$ 21,761	\$ 22,196	\$ 22,640	\$ 23,093	\$ 23,554	\$ 24,025	\$ 24,506	\$ 24,996	\$ 25,496	\$ 26,006	\$ 26,526	\$ 27,057
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 281,524	\$ 287,154	\$ 292,898	\$ 298,756	\$ 304,731	\$ 310,825	\$ 317,042	\$ 323,383	\$ 329,850	\$ 336,447	\$ 343,176	\$ 350,040	\$ 357,041	\$ 364,181
Residual Electric Service	\$ 57,564	\$ 57,963	\$ 58,503	\$ 59,299	\$ 59,724	\$ 60,771	\$ 62,600	\$ 64,490	\$ 66,342	\$ 66,955	\$ 68,104	\$ 69,722	\$ 71,156	\$ 71,911
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 261,360	\$ 263,174	\$ 265,621	\$ 269,239	\$ 271,166	\$ 275,919	\$ 284,227	\$ 292,807	\$ 301,215	\$ 303,999	\$ 309,213	\$ 316,564	\$ 323,074	\$ 326,501
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 3,503,506	\$ 3,587,124	\$ 3,665,254	\$ 3,740,806	\$ 3,812,416	\$ 3,888,615	\$ 3,972,470	\$ 4,056,385	\$ 4,142,262	\$ 4,224,086	\$ 4,310,577	\$ 4,400,460	\$ 4,490,225	\$ 4,578,556
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 1,587,858	\$ 1,870,254	\$ 2,037,762	\$ 2,131,296	\$ 2,156,881	\$ 2,205,870	\$ 2,319,675	\$ 2,408,816	\$ 2,507,703	\$ 2,573,627	\$ 2,665,837	\$ 2,766,354	\$ 2,848,001	\$ 2,911,459
NPV, Avoided Expesne	\$ 28,215,702													

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.1

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass						

Year	15	16	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses						
Residual Retail Electric Service						
Demand	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
Blended Retail	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation						
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production						
Electricity	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849	62,560,849
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605	512,605
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227
Residual Electric Load						
Electricity						
Demand, monthly average	660	660	660	660	660	660
Energy	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319	365,319
Water	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944	13,944
Cogeneration Fuel	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475	1,452,475
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental Fuel	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227	33,227
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses						
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 3,627,556	\$ 3,700,107	\$ 3,774,109	\$ 3,849,591	\$ 3,926,583	\$ 4,005,115
Supplemental Fuel						
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 238,972	\$ 245,808	\$ 253,127	\$ 261,130	\$ 270,004	\$ 278,184
Water	\$ 27,598	\$ 28,150	\$ 28,713	\$ 29,287	\$ 29,873	\$ 30,470
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 371,465	\$ 378,894	\$ 386,472	\$ 394,202	\$ 402,086	\$ 410,127
Residual Electric Service	\$ 73,477	\$ 75,191	\$ 77,006	\$ 78,571	\$ 80,434	\$ 82,095
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 333,610	\$ 341,394	\$ 349,632	\$ 356,737	\$ 365,197	\$ 372,737
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 4,672,678	\$ 4,769,544	\$ 4,869,059	\$ 4,969,517	\$ 5,074,176	\$ 5,178,728
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 3,004,754	\$ 3,108,460	\$ 3,222,626	\$ 3,335,208	\$ 3,473,084	\$ 3,589,307

NPV, Avoided Expesne

[illegible][illegible]

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.2

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass						

Year	15	16	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses						
Residual Retail Electric Service						
Demand	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
Blended Retail	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation						
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production						
Electricity	62,112,612	62,112,612	62,112,612	62,112,612	62,112,612	62,112,612
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	541,184	541,184	541,184	541,184	541,184	541,184
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	14,354	14,354	14,354	14,354	14,354	14,354
Residual Electric Load						
Electricity						
Demand, monthly average	944	944	944	944	944	944
Energy	813,556	813,556	813,556	813,556	813,556	813,556
Water	13,184	13,184	13,184	13,184	13,184	13,184
Cogeneration Fuel	1,373,297	1,373,297	1,373,297	1,373,297	1,373,297	1,373,297
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental Fuel	14,354	14,354	14,354	14,354	14,354	14,354
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses						
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 3,533,043	\$ 3,604,592	\$ 3,677,722	\$ 3,752,547	\$ 3,829,175	\$ 3,906,960
Supplemental Fuel						
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 103,235	\$ 106,189	\$ 109,350	\$ 112,808	\$ 116,641	\$ 120,175
Water	\$ 26,093	\$ 26,615	\$ 27,147	\$ 27,690	\$ 28,244	\$ 28,809
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 368,804	\$ 376,180	\$ 383,703	\$ 391,377	\$ 399,205	\$ 407,189
Residual Electric Service	\$ 117,014	\$ 119,744	\$ 122,634	\$ 125,126	\$ 128,093	\$ 130,738
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 313,256	\$ 320,566	\$ 328,301	\$ 334,972	\$ 342,916	\$ 349,996
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 4,461,445	\$ 4,553,885	\$ 4,648,858	\$ 4,744,521	\$ 4,844,274	\$ 4,943,867
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 3,215,987	\$ 3,324,119	\$ 3,442,827	\$ 3,560,204	\$ 3,702,986	\$ 3,824,168

NPV, Avoided Expense

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.3

[illegible][illegible]

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.3

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass						

Year	15	16	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses						
Residual Retail Electric Service						
Demand	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
Blended Retail	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation						
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production						
Electricity	62,606,612	62,606,612	62,606,612	62,606,612	62,606,612	62,606,612
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	584,593	584,593	584,593	584,593	584,593	584,593
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	146	146	146	146	146	146
Residual Electric Load						
Electricity						
Demand, monthly average	625	625	625	625	625	625
Energy	319,556	319,556	319,556	319,556	319,556	319,556
Water	14,513	14,513	14,513	14,513	14,513	14,513
Cogeneration Fuel	1,511,762	1,511,762	1,511,762	1,511,762	1,511,762	1,511,762
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%
Biomass	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%
Supplemental Fuel	146	146	146	146	146	146
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses						
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 4,868,579	\$ 4,980,365	\$ 5,096,803	\$ 5,219,343	\$ 5,349,314	\$ 5,475,783
Supplemental Fuel						
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 1,050	\$ 1,080	\$ 1,112	\$ 1,147	\$ 1,186	\$ 1,222
Water	\$ 28,724	\$ 29,299	\$ 29,885	\$ 30,482	\$ 31,092	\$ 31,714
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 371,737	\$ 379,171	\$ 386,755	\$ 394,490	\$ 402,380	\$ 410,427
Residual Electric Service	\$ 68,497	\$ 70,096	\$ 71,787	\$ 73,246	\$ 74,983	\$ 76,531
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 336,441	\$ 344,291	\$ 352,599	\$ 359,764	\$ 368,295	\$ 375,899
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 5,675,028	\$ 5,804,302	\$ 5,938,940	\$ 6,078,472	\$ 6,227,250	\$ 6,371,577
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 2,002,404	\$ 2,073,702	\$ 2,152,745	\$ 2,226,253	\$ 2,320,010	\$ 2,396,458

NPV, Avoided Expesne

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.4

[illegible]

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Unit Expenses														
Residual Retail Electric Service														
Demand	\$ 5.78 /kW	\$ 5.82	\$ 5.87	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.10	\$ 6.29	\$ 6.48	\$ 6.66	\$ 6.72	\$ 6.84	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.14	\$ 7.22
Energy	\$ 0.0322 /kWh	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04
Blended Retail	\$ 0.0450 /kWh	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 4.00 /MMBTU	\$ 4.61	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.23	\$ 5.37	\$ 5.50	\$ 5.69	\$ 5.83	\$ 5.99	\$ 6.20	\$ 6.42	\$ 6.62	\$ 6.79	\$ 7.00
Biomass	\$ 1.89 /MMBTU	\$ 1.93	\$ 1.97	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.05	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.13	\$ 2.17	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.26	\$ 2.31	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.45
Water	\$ 1.50 /kgal	\$ 1.53	\$ 1.56	\$ 1.59	\$ 1.62	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.69	\$ 1.72	\$ 1.76	\$ 1.79	\$ 1.83	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.90	\$ 1.94
Conventional Operation														
Electricity	62,926,168 kWh	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921 MMBTU	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 2,831,678	\$ 2,851,327	\$ 2,877,847	\$ 2,917,038	\$ 2,937,917	\$ 2,989,414	\$ 3,079,426	\$ 3,172,386	\$ 3,263,479	\$ 3,293,647	\$ 3,350,137	\$ 3,429,775	\$ 3,500,315	\$ 3,537,441
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 2,259,686	\$ 2,606,051	\$ 2,825,169	\$ 2,955,064	\$ 3,031,380	\$ 3,105,071	\$ 3,212,719	\$ 3,292,815	\$ 3,386,486	\$ 3,504,066	\$ 3,626,277	\$ 3,737,039	\$ 3,837,911	\$ 3,952,574
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 5,091,364	\$ 5,457,378	\$ 5,703,016	\$ 5,872,102	\$ 5,969,297	\$ 6,094,485	\$ 6,292,145	\$ 6,465,201	\$ 6,649,965	\$ 6,797,713	\$ 6,976,414	\$ 7,166,814	\$ 7,338,226	\$ 7,490,015
Annual Cogeneration Production														
Electricity	62,452,911 kWh	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	532,600 MMBTU	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	21,178 MMBTU	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178
Residual Electric Load														
Electricity														
Demand, monthly average	733 kW	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733
Energy	473,257 kWh	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257
Water	8,869 kgal	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869
Cogeneration Fuel	974,640 MMBTU	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640
Fuel Mix														
Natural Gas	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%
Biomass	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%
Supplemental Fuel	21,178 MMBTU	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178
Fuel Mix														
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses														
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 2,165,179	\$ 2,289,541	\$ 2,380,277	\$ 2,447,636	\$ 2,501,221	\$ 2,554,762	\$ 2,618,115	\$ 2,674,741	\$ 2,735,722	\$ 2,803,854	\$ 2,873,961	\$ 2,941,731	\$ 3,007,599	\$ 3,077,953
Supplemental Fuel														
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 84,712	\$ 97,697	\$ 105,911	\$ 110,781	\$ 113,642	\$ 116,404	\$ 120,440	\$ 123,442	\$ 126,954	\$ 131,362	\$ 135,943	\$ 140,096	\$ 143,877	\$ 148,176
Water	\$ 13,304	\$ 13,570	\$ 13,841	\$ 14,118	\$ 14,401	\$ 14,689	\$ 14,982	\$ 15,282	\$ 15,588	\$ 15,899	\$ 16,217	\$ 16,542	\$ 16,872	\$ 17,210
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 281,038	\$ 286,659	\$ 292,392	\$ 298,240	\$ 304,205	\$ 310,289	\$ 316,494	\$ 322,824	\$ 329,281	\$ 335,866	\$ 342,584	\$ 349,435	\$ 356,424	\$ 363,553
Residual Electric Service	\$ 66,097	\$ 66,556	\$ 67,175	\$ 68,090	\$ 68,577	\$ 69,779	\$ 71,880	\$ 74,050	\$ 76,176	\$ 76,880	\$ 78,199	\$ 80,058	\$ 81,704	\$ 82,571
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 256,740	\$ 258,522	\$ 260,926	\$ 264,479	\$ 266,372	\$ 271,041	\$ 279,203	\$ 287,631	\$ 295,890	\$ 298,625	\$ 303,747	\$ 310,968	\$ 317,363	\$ 320,730
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 2,867,070	\$ 3,012,544	\$ 3,120,522	\$ 3,203,344	\$ 3,268,417	\$ 3,336,964	\$ 3,421,114	\$ 3,497,970	\$ 3,579,611	\$ 3,662,487	\$ 3,750,651	\$ 3,838,830	\$ 3,923,840	\$ 4,010,192
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 2,224,294	\$ 2,444,834	\$ 2,582,494	\$ 2,668,758	\$ 2,700,880	\$ 2,757,521	\$ 2,871,031	\$ 2,967,231	\$ 3,070,354	\$ 3,135,226	\$ 3,225,763	\$ 3,327,984	\$ 3,414,386	\$ 3,479,823
NPV, Avoided Expesne	\$ 34,707,841													

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.4

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass						

Year	15	16	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses						
Residual Retail Electric Service						
Demand	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
Blended Retail	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation						
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production						
Electricity	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911	62,452,911
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600	532,600
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178
Residual Electric Load						
Electricity						
Demand, monthly average	733	733	733	733	733	733
Energy	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257	473,257
Water	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869	8,869
Cogeneration Fuel	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640	974,640
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%
Biomass	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%
Supplemental Fuel	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178	21,178
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses						
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 3,147,947	\$ 3,220,320	\$ 3,295,718	\$ 3,375,088	\$ 3,459,299	\$ 3,541,208
Supplemental Fuel						
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 152,314	\$ 156,672	\$ 161,336	\$ 166,437	\$ 172,093	\$ 177,307
Water	\$ 17,554	\$ 17,905	\$ 18,263	\$ 18,629	\$ 19,001	\$ 19,381
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 370,824	\$ 378,240	\$ 385,805	\$ 393,521	\$ 401,391	\$ 409,419
Residual Electric Service	\$ 84,369	\$ 86,337	\$ 88,421	\$ 90,218	\$ 92,357	\$ 94,264
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 327,713	\$ 335,359	\$ 343,452	\$ 350,431	\$ 358,741	\$ 366,148
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 4,100,721	\$ 4,194,834	\$ 4,292,995	\$ 4,394,324	\$ 4,502,883	\$ 4,607,728
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 3,576,711	\$ 3,683,170	\$ 3,798,690	\$ 3,910,401	\$ 4,044,377	\$ 4,160,307

NPV, Avoided Expesne

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.5

[illegible]

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Unit Expenses												
Residual Retail Electric Service												
Demand	\$ 5.78 /kW	\$ 5.82	\$ 5.87	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.10	\$ 6.29	\$ 6.48	\$ 6.66	\$ 6.72	\$ 6.84	\$ 7.00
Energy	\$ 0.0322 /kWh	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04
Blended Retail	\$ 0.0450 /kWh	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05
Natural Gas	\$ 4.00 /MMBTU	\$ 4.61	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.23	\$ 5.37	\$ 5.50	\$ 5.69	\$ 5.83	\$ 5.99	\$ 6.20	\$ 6.42	\$ 6.62
Biomass	\$ 1.89 /MMBTU	\$ 1.93	\$ 1.97	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.05	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.13	\$ 2.17	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.26	\$ 2.31	\$ 2.35
Water	\$ 1.50 /kgal	\$ 1.53	\$ 1.56	\$ 1.59	\$ 1.62	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.69	\$ 1.72	\$ 1.76	\$ 1.79	\$ 1.83	\$ 1.87
Conventional Operation												
Electricity	62,926,168 kWh	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921 MMBTU	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 2,831,678	\$ 2,851,327	\$ 2,877,847	\$ 2,917,038	\$ 2,937,917	\$ 2,989,414	\$ 3,079,426	\$ 3,172,386	\$ 3,263,479	\$ 3,293,647	\$ 3,350,137	\$ 3,429,775
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 2,259,686	\$ 2,606,051	\$ 2,825,169	\$ 2,955,064	\$ 3,031,380	\$ 3,105,071	\$ 3,212,719	\$ 3,292,815	\$ 3,386,486	\$ 3,504,066	\$ 3,626,277	\$ 3,737,039
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 5,091,364	\$ 5,457,378	\$ 5,703,016	\$ 5,872,102	\$ 5,969,297	\$ 6,094,485	\$ 6,292,145	\$ 6,465,201	\$ 6,649,965	\$ 6,797,713	\$ 6,976,414	\$ 7,166,814
Annual Cogeneration Production												
Electricity	62,147,183 kWh	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	585,399 MMBTU	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	95 MMBTU	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Residual Electric Load												
Electricity												
Demand, monthly average	922 kW	922	922	922	922	922	922	922	922	922	922	922
Energy	778,985 kWh	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985
Water	2,321 kgal	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321
Cogeneration Fuel	1,311,057 MMBTU	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057
Fuel Mix												
Natural Gas	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%
Biomass	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%
Supplemental Fuel	95 MMBTU	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Fuel Mix												
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses												
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 2,813,079	\$ 2,953,215	\$ 3,058,787	\$ 3,140,401	\$ 3,208,003	\$ 3,275,802	\$ 3,354,002	\$ 3,425,494	\$ 3,501,750	\$ 3,585,668	\$ 3,671,899	\$ 3,755,986
Supplemental Fuel												
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 380	\$ 438	\$ 475	\$ 497	\$ 510	\$ 522	\$ 540	\$ 554	\$ 569	\$ 589	\$ 610	\$ 628
Water	\$ 3,481	\$ 3,550	\$ 3,621	\$ 3,694	\$ 3,768	\$ 3,843	\$ 3,920	\$ 3,998	\$ 4,078	\$ 4,160	\$ 4,243	\$ 4,328
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 279,662	\$ 285,255	\$ 290,960	\$ 296,780	\$ 302,715	\$ 308,769	\$ 314,945	\$ 321,244	\$ 327,669	\$ 334,222	\$ 340,906	\$ 347,725
Residual Electric Service	\$ 89,022	\$ 89,639	\$ 90,473	\$ 91,705	\$ 92,362	\$ 93,981	\$ 96,810	\$ 99,733	\$ 102,597	\$ 103,545	\$ 105,321	\$ 107,825
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 246,418	\$ 248,128	\$ 250,435	\$ 253,846	\$ 255,663	\$ 260,144	\$ 267,977	\$ 276,067	\$ 283,994	\$ 286,619	\$ 291,535	\$ 298,465
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 3,432,041	\$ 3,580,225	\$ 3,694,752	\$ 3,786,922	\$ 3,863,021	\$ 3,943,062	\$ 4,038,194	\$ 4,127,090	\$ 4,220,657	\$ 4,314,803	\$ 4,414,514	\$ 4,514,957
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 1,659,323	\$ 1,877,153	\$ 2,008,264	\$ 2,085,180	\$ 2,106,276	\$ 2,151,423	\$ 2,253,951	\$ 2,338,111	\$ 2,429,308	\$ 2,482,910	\$ 2,561,900	\$ 2,651,857
NPV, Avoided Expesne	\$ 27,363,214											

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.5

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	0.7%	1.0%	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.1%	-0.9%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass								

Year	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses								
Residual Retail Electric Service								
Demand	\$ 7.14	\$ 7.22	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
Blended Retail	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 6.79	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.45	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 1.90	\$ 1.94	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation								
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,500,315	\$ 3,537,441	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 3,837,911	\$ 3,952,574	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 7,338,226	\$ 7,490,015	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production								
Electricity	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183	62,147,183
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399	585,399
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Residual Electric Load								
Electricity								
Demand, monthly average	922	922	922	922	922	922	922	922
Energy	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985	778,985
Water	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321	2,321
Cogeneration Fuel	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057	1,311,057
Fuel Mix								
Natural Gas	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%
Biomass	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%
Supplemental Fuel	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Fuel Mix								
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses								
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 3,838,383	\$ 3,925,707	\$ 4,012,950	\$ 4,102,950	\$ 4,196,382	\$ 4,294,233	\$ 4,397,407	\$ 4,498,521
Supplemental Fuel								
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 645	\$ 665	\$ 683	\$ 703	\$ 724	\$ 747	\$ 772	\$ 795
Water	\$ 4,415	\$ 4,503	\$ 4,593	\$ 4,685	\$ 4,778	\$ 4,874	\$ 4,972	\$ 5,071
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 354,679	\$ 361,773	\$ 369,008	\$ 376,388	\$ 383,916	\$ 391,594	\$ 399,426	\$ 407,415
Residual Electric Service	\$ 110,042	\$ 111,209	\$ 113,631	\$ 116,282	\$ 119,088	\$ 121,508	\$ 124,389	\$ 126,958
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 304,604	\$ 307,834	\$ 314,537	\$ 321,876	\$ 329,643	\$ 336,342	\$ 344,318	\$ 351,427
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 4,612,767	\$ 4,711,691	\$ 4,815,402	\$ 4,922,884	\$ 5,034,532	\$ 5,149,298	\$ 5,271,284	\$ 5,390,187
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 2,725,459	\$ 2,778,324	\$ 2,862,030	\$ 2,955,120	\$ 3,057,153	\$ 3,155,427	\$ 3,275,976	\$ 3,377,848

NPV, Avoided Expesne

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.6

[illegible][illegible]

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.6

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass						

Year	15	16	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses						
Residual Retail Electric Service						
Demand	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.0411	\$ 0.0421	\$ 0.0431	\$ 0.0440	\$ 0.0450	\$ 0.0459
Blended Retail	\$ 0.0574	\$ 0.0588	\$ 0.0602	\$ 0.0614	\$ 0.0629	\$ 0.0642
Natural Gas	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation						
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production						
Electricity	46,455,272	46,455,272	46,455,272	46,455,272	46,455,272	46,455,272
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	403,147	403,147	403,147	403,147	403,147	403,147
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	109,391	109,391	109,391	109,391	109,391	109,391
Residual Electric Load						
Electricity						
Demand, monthly average	4,683	4,683	4,683	4,683	4,683	4,683
Energy	16,470,896	16,470,896	16,470,896	16,470,896	16,470,896	16,470,896
Water	2,193	2,193	2,193	2,193	2,193	2,193
Total Fuel	776,396	776,396	776,396	776,396	776,396	776,396
Fuel, Engine Generators	667,005	667,005	667,005	667,005	667,005	667,005
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental, Conventional Boilers	109,391	109,391	109,391	109,391	109,391	109,391
Fuel Mix						
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses						
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 1,665,844	\$ 1,699,161	\$ 1,733,144	\$ 1,767,807	\$ 1,803,163	\$ 1,839,226
Supplemental Fuel						
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ 786,751	\$ 809,258	\$ 833,352	\$ 859,700	\$ 888,915	\$ 915,848
Water	\$ 4,340	\$ 4,427	\$ 4,516	\$ 4,606	\$ 4,698	\$ 4,792
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 398,428	\$ 406,397	\$ 414,525	\$ 422,815	\$ 431,272	\$ 439,897
Residual Electric Service	\$ 1,091,550	\$ 1,117,019	\$ 1,143,974	\$ 1,167,220	\$ 1,194,900	\$ 1,219,570
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 181,700	\$ 185,939	\$ 190,426	\$ 194,296	\$ 198,903	\$ 203,010
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 4,128,613	\$ 4,222,201	\$ 4,319,937	\$ 4,416,444	\$ 4,521,851	\$ 4,622,343
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 3,548,819	\$ 3,655,803	\$ 3,771,748	\$ 3,888,281	\$ 4,025,409	\$ 4,145,692
Present Value, Avoided Expense						

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.7

[illegible]

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Unit Expenses													
Residual Retail Electric Service													
Demand	\$ 5.78 /kW	\$ 5.82	\$ 5.87	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.10	\$ 6.29	\$ 6.48	\$ 6.66	\$ 6.72	\$ 6.84	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.14
Energy	\$ 0.0322 /kWh	\$ 0.0324	\$ 0.0327	\$ 0.0332	\$ 0.0334	\$ 0.0340	\$ 0.0350	\$ 0.0361	\$ 0.0371	\$ 0.0375	\$ 0.0381	\$ 0.0390	\$ 0.0398
Blended Retail	\$ 0.0450 /kWh	\$ 0.0453	\$ 0.0457	\$ 0.0464	\$ 0.0467	\$ 0.0475	\$ 0.0489	\$ 0.0504	\$ 0.0519	\$ 0.0523	\$ 0.0532	\$ 0.0545	\$ 0.0556
Natural Gas	\$ 4.00 /MMBTU	\$ 4.61	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.23	\$ 5.37	\$ 5.50	\$ 5.69	\$ 5.83	\$ 5.99	\$ 6.20	\$ 6.42	\$ 6.62	\$ 6.79
Biomass	\$ 1.89 /MMBTU	\$ 1.93	\$ 1.97	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.05	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.13	\$ 2.17	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.26	\$ 2.31	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.40
Water	\$ 1.50 /kgal	\$ 1.53	\$ 1.56	\$ 1.59	\$ 1.62	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.69	\$ 1.72	\$ 1.76	\$ 1.79	\$ 1.83	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.90
Conventional Operation													
Electricity	62,926,168 kWh	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921 MMBTU	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 2,831,678	\$ 2,851,327	\$ 2,877,847	\$ 2,917,038	\$ 2,937,917	\$ 2,989,414	\$ 3,079,426	\$ 3,172,386	\$ 3,263,479	\$ 3,293,647	\$ 3,350,137	\$ 3,429,775	\$ 3,500,315
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 2,259,686	\$ 2,606,051	\$ 2,825,169	\$ 2,955,064	\$ 3,031,380	\$ 3,105,071	\$ 3,212,719	\$ 3,292,815	\$ 3,386,486	\$ 3,504,066	\$ 3,626,277	\$ 3,737,039	\$ 3,837,911
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 5,091,364	\$ 5,457,378	\$ 5,703,016	\$ 5,872,102	\$ 5,969,297	\$ 6,094,485	\$ 6,292,145	\$ 6,465,201	\$ 6,649,965	\$ 6,797,713	\$ 6,976,414	\$ 7,166,814	\$ 7,338,226
Annual Cogeneration Production													
Electricity	23,616,960 kWh	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	208,138 MMBTU	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	327,260 MMBTU	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260
Residual Electric Load													
Electricity													
Demand, monthly average	7,379 kW	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379
Energy	39,309,208 kWh	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208
Water	2,190 kgal	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190
Total Fuel	666,352 MMBTU	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352
Fuel, Engine Generators	339,092 MMBTU	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092
Fuel Mix													
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental, Conventional Boilers	327,260 MMBTU	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260
Fuel Mix													
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Expenses													
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 641,831	\$ 654,668	\$ 667,761	\$ 681,117	\$ 694,739	\$ 708,634	\$ 722,806	\$ 737,262	\$ 752,008	\$ 767,048	\$ 782,389	\$ 798,037	\$ 813,997
Supplemental Fuel													
Biomass	\$ 619,435	\$ 631,824	\$ 644,460	\$ 657,350	\$ 670,497	\$ 683,907	\$ 697,585	\$ 711,536	\$ 725,767	\$ 740,282	\$ 755,088	\$ 770,190	\$ 785,594
Natural Gas	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Water	\$ 3,285	\$ 3,351	\$ 3,418	\$ 3,486	\$ 3,556	\$ 3,627	\$ 3,699	\$ 3,773	\$ 3,849	\$ 3,926	\$ 4,004	\$ 4,084	\$ 4,166
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 153,510	\$ 156,580	\$ 159,712	\$ 162,906	\$ 166,164	\$ 169,487	\$ 172,877	\$ 176,335	\$ 179,861	\$ 183,459	\$ 187,128	\$ 190,870	\$ 194,688
Residual Electric Service	\$ 1,777,541	\$ 1,789,875	\$ 1,806,523	\$ 1,831,124	\$ 1,844,231	\$ 1,876,557	\$ 1,933,061	\$ 1,991,415	\$ 2,048,597	\$ 2,067,535	\$ 2,102,996	\$ 2,152,987	\$ 2,197,267
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 142,349	\$ 143,337	\$ 144,670	\$ 146,640	\$ 147,689	\$ 150,278	\$ 154,803	\$ 159,476	\$ 164,056	\$ 165,572	\$ 168,412	\$ 172,415	\$ 175,961
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 3,337,951	\$ 3,379,634	\$ 3,426,543	\$ 3,482,623	\$ 3,526,876	\$ 3,592,491	\$ 3,684,832	\$ 3,779,797	\$ 3,874,138	\$ 3,927,822	\$ 4,000,017	\$ 4,088,584	\$ 4,171,673
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 1,753,413	\$ 2,077,744	\$ 2,276,473	\$ 2,389,479	\$ 2,442,421	\$ 2,501,994	\$ 2,607,313	\$ 2,685,404	\$ 2,775,827	\$ 2,869,891	\$ 2,976,397	\$ 3,078,230	\$ 3,166,553
Present Value, Avoided Expense	\$ 31,475,617												

Detailed Economics for Scenario 2.7

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	1.0%	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	-0.9%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass							

Year	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses							
Residual Retail Electric Service							
Demand	\$ 7.22	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.0402	\$ 0.0411	\$ 0.0421	\$ 0.0431	\$ 0.0440	\$ 0.0450	\$ 0.0459
Blended Retail	\$ 0.0562	\$ 0.0574	\$ 0.0588	\$ 0.0602	\$ 0.0614	\$ 0.0629	\$ 0.0642
Natural Gas	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.45	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 1.94	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation							
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,537,441	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 3,952,574	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 7,490,015	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production							
Electricity	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960	23,616,960
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138	208,138
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260
Residual Electric Load							
Electricity							
Demand, monthly average	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379	7,379
Energy	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208	39,309,208
Water	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190	2,190
Total Fuel	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352	666,352
Fuel, Engine Generators	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092	339,092
Fuel Mix							
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental, Conventional Boilers	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260	327,260
Fuel Mix							
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Expenses							
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 830,277	\$ 846,883	\$ 863,820	\$ 881,097	\$ 898,719	\$ 916,693	\$ 935,027
Supplemental Fuel							
Biomass	\$ 801,305	\$ 817,332	\$ 833,678	\$ 850,352	\$ 867,359	\$ 884,706	\$ 902,400
Natural Gas	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Water	\$ 4,249	\$ 4,334	\$ 4,421	\$ 4,510	\$ 4,600	\$ 4,692	\$ 4,786
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 198,582	\$ 202,553	\$ 206,604	\$ 210,736	\$ 214,951	\$ 219,250	\$ 223,635
Residual Electric Service	\$ 2,220,573	\$ 2,268,922	\$ 2,321,863	\$ 2,377,891	\$ 2,426,211	\$ 2,483,747	\$ 2,535,028
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 177,828	\$ 181,700	\$ 185,939	\$ 190,426	\$ 194,296	\$ 198,903	\$ 203,010
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 4,232,814	\$ 4,321,724	\$ 4,416,326	\$ 4,515,012	\$ 4,606,135	\$ 4,707,991	\$ 4,803,886
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 3,257,201	\$ 3,355,708	\$ 3,461,678	\$ 3,576,673	\$ 3,698,590	\$ 3,839,269	\$ 3,964,149
Present Value, Avoided Expense							

Detailed Economics for Scenario 3.1

[illegible][illegible]

Detailed Economics for Scenario 3.1

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Merchant Power Sales	2.4%	2.0%	2.4%	2.1%
Biomass				

Year	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses				
Residual Retail Electric Service				
Demand	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
Blended Retail	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Merchantg Power	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.11
Water	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation				
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production				
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	587,432	587,432	587,432	587,432
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	-	-	-	-
Residual Electric Load				
Electricity				
Demand, monthly average	-	-	-	-
Energy	-	-	-	-
Water	2,586	2,586	2,586	2,586
Cogeneration Fuel	1,460,957	1,460,957	1,460,957	1,460,957
Fuel Mix				
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental Fuel	-	-	-	-
Fuel Mix				
Natural Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	0%	0%	0%	0%
Expenses				
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 3,796,148	\$ 3,872,070	\$ 3,949,512	\$ 4,028,502
Supplemental Fuel				
Biomass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Natural Gas	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Water	\$ 5,325	\$ 5,431	\$ 5,540	\$ 5,651
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 388,729	\$ 396,504	\$ 404,434	\$ 412,522
Residual Electric Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 430,860	\$ 439,615	\$ 450,041	\$ 459,332
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 4,621,062	\$ 4,713,620	\$ 4,809,526	\$ 4,906,007
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 3,470,623	\$ 3,591,105	\$ 3,737,734	\$ 3,862,028
Merchant Power				
Merchant Power Sales	27,630,458	27,630,458	27,630,458	27,630,458
Merchant Power Fuel	641,496	641,496	641,496	641,496
Merchant Power Water	1,135	1,135	1,135	1,135
Fuel Expense	\$ 1,666,863	\$ 1,700,200	\$ 1,734,204	\$ 1,768,888
Water Expense	\$ 2,338	\$ 2,385	\$ 2,433	\$ 2,481
Power Sales Operating Revenue	\$ 2,772,182	\$ 2,828,514	\$ 2,895,591	\$ 2,955,375
Power Sales Operating Income	\$ 1,102,981	\$ 1,125,929	\$ 1,158,954	\$ 1,184,005
Avoided Expense and Power Sales	\$ 4,573,604	\$ 4,717,034	\$ 4,896,688	\$ 5,046,033
NPV, Avoided Expense Cogeneration				

Detailed Economics for Scenario 4.0

[illegible]

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Unit Expenses											
Residual Retail Electric Service											
Demand	\$ 5.78 /kW	\$ 5.82	\$ 5.87	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.10	\$ 6.29	\$ 6.48	\$ 6.66	\$ 6.72	\$ 6.84
Energy	\$ 0.0322 /kWh	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04
Blended Retail	\$ 0.0450 /kWh	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05
Natural Gas	\$ 4.00 /MMBTU	\$ 4.61	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.23	\$ 5.37	\$ 5.50	\$ 5.69	\$ 5.83	\$ 5.99	\$ 6.20	\$ 6.42
Biomass	\$ 1.89 /MMBTU	\$ 1.93	\$ 1.97	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.05	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.13	\$ 2.17	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.26	\$ 2.31
Water	\$ 1.50 /kgal	\$ 1.53	\$ 1.56	\$ 1.59	\$ 1.62	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.69	\$ 1.72	\$ 1.76	\$ 1.79	\$ 1.83
Conventional Operation											
Electricity	62,926,168 kWh	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921 MMBTU	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 2,831,678	\$ 2,851,327	\$ 2,877,847	\$ 2,917,038	\$ 2,937,917	\$ 2,989,414	\$ 3,079,426	\$ 3,172,386	\$ 3,263,479	\$ 3,293,647	\$ 3,350,137
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 2,259,686	\$ 2,606,051	\$ 2,825,169	\$ 2,955,064	\$ 3,031,380	\$ 3,105,071	\$ 3,212,719	\$ 3,292,815	\$ 3,386,486	\$ 3,504,066	\$ 3,626,277
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 5,091,364	\$ 5,457,378	\$ 5,703,016	\$ 5,872,102	\$ 5,969,297	\$ 6,094,485	\$ 6,292,145	\$ 6,465,201	\$ 6,649,965	\$ 6,797,713	\$ 6,976,414
Annual Cogeneration Production											
Electricity	41,113,224 kWh	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	123,305 MMBTU	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	433,301 MMBTU	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301
Residual Electric Load											
Electricity											
Demand, monthly average	5,357 kW	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357
Energy	21,812,945 kWh	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945
Water	2,900 kgal	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900
Fuel, Turbine Cycle & HRSG	876,123 MMBTU	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123
Fuel Mix											
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental Fuel	433,301 MMBTU	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301
Fuel Mix											
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Expenses											
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 1,658,318	\$ 1,691,485	\$ 1,725,314	\$ 1,759,821	\$ 1,795,017	\$ 1,830,918	\$ 1,867,536	\$ 1,904,887	\$ 1,942,984	\$ 1,981,844	\$ 2,021,481
Supplemental Fuel											
Biomass	\$ 820,149	\$ 836,552	\$ 853,283	\$ 870,348	\$ 887,755	\$ 905,511	\$ 923,621	\$ 942,093	\$ 960,935	\$ 980,154	\$ 999,757
Natural Gas	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Water	\$ 4,350	\$ 4,437	\$ 4,526	\$ 4,616	\$ 4,709	\$ 4,803	\$ 4,899	\$ 4,997	\$ 5,097	\$ 5,199	\$ 5,303
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 185,010	\$ 188,710	\$ 192,484	\$ 196,334	\$ 200,261	\$ 204,266	\$ 208,351	\$ 212,518	\$ 216,769	\$ 221,104	\$ 225,526
Residual Electric Service	\$ 1,073,915	\$ 1,081,367	\$ 1,091,425	\$ 1,106,288	\$ 1,114,206	\$ 1,133,737	\$ 1,167,874	\$ 1,203,129	\$ 1,237,676	\$ 1,249,118	\$ 1,270,541
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 82,368	\$ 82,940	\$ 83,711	\$ 84,851	\$ 85,458	\$ 86,956	\$ 89,575	\$ 92,279	\$ 94,928	\$ 95,806	\$ 97,449
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 3,824,110	\$ 3,885,491	\$ 3,950,743	\$ 4,022,258	\$ 4,087,406	\$ 4,166,191	\$ 4,261,856	\$ 4,359,903	\$ 4,458,389	\$ 4,533,224	\$ 4,620,057
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 1,267,254	\$ 1,571,887	\$ 1,752,273	\$ 1,849,844	\$ 1,881,891	\$ 1,928,294	\$ 2,030,289	\$ 2,105,298	\$ 2,191,576	\$ 2,264,489	\$ 2,356,357
NPV, Avoided Expense	\$ 24,689,328										

Detailed Economics for Scenario 4.0

Salary Inflation	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Non-salary Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Natural Gas	1.1%	0.7%	1.0%	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Electricity	0.4%	0.1%	-0.9%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Biomass									

Year	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Unit Expenses									
Residual Retail Electric Service									
Demand	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.14	\$ 7.22	\$ 7.38	\$ 7.55	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.89	\$ 8.08	\$ 8.24
Energy	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
Blended Retail	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06
Natural Gas	\$ 6.62	\$ 6.79	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.19	\$ 7.40	\$ 7.62	\$ 7.86	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.37
Biomass	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.45	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.55	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.76
Water	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.90	\$ 1.94	\$ 1.98	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.06	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.19
Conventional Operation									
Electricity	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168	62,926,168
Natural Gas	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921	564,921
Electric Charges	\$ 3,429,775	\$ 3,500,315	\$ 3,537,441	\$ 3,614,463	\$ 3,698,799	\$ 3,788,055	\$ 3,865,029	\$ 3,956,687	\$ 4,038,378
Natural Gas Expense	\$ 3,737,039	\$ 3,837,911	\$ 3,952,574	\$ 4,062,969	\$ 4,179,205	\$ 4,303,630	\$ 4,439,696	\$ 4,590,573	\$ 4,729,657
Subtotal, Electricity & Natural Gas	\$ 7,166,814	\$ 7,338,226	\$ 7,490,015	\$ 7,677,432	\$ 7,878,004	\$ 8,091,685	\$ 8,304,725	\$ 8,547,260	\$ 8,768,035
Annual Cogeneration Production									
Electricity	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224	41,113,224
Thermal Cogen, Heat Recovered	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305	123,305
Thermal Supplemental, Fuel	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301
Residual Electric Load									
Electricity									
Demand, monthly average	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357
Energy	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945	21,812,945
Water	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900
Fuel, Turbine Cycle & HRSG	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123	876,123
Fuel Mix									
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Supplemental Fuel	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301	433,301
Fuel Mix									
Natural Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Biomass	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Expenses									
Fuel, Cogeneration System	\$ 2,061,911	\$ 2,103,149	\$ 2,145,212	\$ 2,188,116	\$ 2,231,878	\$ 2,276,516	\$ 2,322,046	\$ 2,368,487	\$ 2,415,857
Supplemental Fuel									
Biomass	\$ 1,019,752	\$ 1,040,147	\$ 1,060,950	\$ 1,082,169	\$ 1,103,812	\$ 1,125,889	\$ 1,148,406	\$ 1,171,374	\$ 1,194,802
Natural Gas	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Water	\$ 5,409	\$ 5,517	\$ 5,627	\$ 5,740	\$ 5,854	\$ 5,972	\$ 6,091	\$ 6,213	\$ 6,337
Maintenance-Cogen	\$ 230,037	\$ 234,637	\$ 239,330	\$ 244,117	\$ 248,999	\$ 253,979	\$ 259,059	\$ 264,240	\$ 269,525
Residual Electric Service	\$ 1,300,744	\$ 1,327,496	\$ 1,341,576	\$ 1,370,787	\$ 1,402,771	\$ 1,436,622	\$ 1,465,814	\$ 1,500,576	\$ 1,531,557
Stand-by Service Charges	\$ 99,765	\$ 101,817	\$ 102,897	\$ 105,138	\$ 107,591	\$ 110,187	\$ 112,426	\$ 115,092	\$ 117,469
Sub-total Expenses with Cogeneration	\$ 4,717,618	\$ 4,812,764	\$ 4,895,593	\$ 4,996,066	\$ 5,100,905	\$ 5,209,165	\$ 5,313,842	\$ 5,425,982	\$ 5,535,546
Avoided Expense, Cogeneration	\$ 2,449,196	\$ 2,525,462	\$ 2,594,422	\$ 2,681,366	\$ 2,777,099	\$ 2,882,520	\$ 2,990,883	\$ 3,121,278	\$ 3,232,489

NPV, Avoided Expense

Appendix J: Turbine and Engine Set Manufacturers Specifications

The following pages contain engineering drawings and specification sheets for the turbine and engine set.

5						
4						
3						
2						
1	19.11.05	G.D.A.G			DRAWING ISSUED	1
SMT ISS	DATE	INITIAL	A/C OR G FORM	DESCRIPTION	SHEET REVISED AT DRAWING ISSUE	
ALTERATION ISSUE NO. SHOWN ENCIRCLED THUS				△	LATEST ISSUE CANCELS ALL PREVIOUS ISSUES	
DRAWN			ORDER NO. TUL02/635			
CHECKED						
DATE						
APPROVED:			CUSTOMER'S REFERENCE			
DRAUGHTING			BIOMASS POWER PL			
DESIGN						
ENGINEER						
EXAMINED			SOLID EDGE			
THIRD ANGLE PROJECTION					UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED ALL DIMENSIONS IN MILLIMETRES	
SCALE 1 : 50			METRES			
<div>ALSTOM</div>						
SUBJECT TO						
FURTHER DETAILS						
PROPOSED LAYOUT OF ALSTOM SUPPLIED EQUIPMENT						
TYPHOON GENERATOR SET						
DRG. No.			19-02TUL-B02-018			SMT No.
18			19			20

JENBACHER ENERGIE

JMS 620 GS-N.LI

NATURAL GAS

ENGINE DATA:

Engine type		J 620 GS-E01
Configuration		V 60°
No. of cylinders		20
Bore	in	7.48
Stroke	in	8.66
Piston displacement	cu.in	7,613
Nominal speed	rpm	1,500
Mean piston speed	in/s	433
Mean effe. press. at stand. power and nom. s	psi	260
Compression ratio	Epsilon	11.0
ISO standard fuel stop power ICFN	bhp	3756
Specific fuel consumption of engine	BTU/bhp.hr	5,804
Specific lube oil consumption	g/bhp.hr	0.22
Weight dry	lbs	26,455
Filling capacity lube oil	gal	177
Based on methane number	MN d)	70

GEARBOX & ALTERNATOR:

GEARBOX:		EICKHOFF
Efficiency	%	98.67
Gearbox ratio		1:1.2
ALTERNATOR:		
Efficiency at p.f.= 1.0	%	96.9%
Efficiency at p.f.= 0.8	%	
Ratings at p.f.= 1.0	kW	1,500
Ratings at p.f.= 0.8	kW	
Frequency	Hz	60
Voltage	kV	12.47
Protection Class		IP 23
Insulation class		F
Speed	rpm	1,800
Mass	lbs	20,000

TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS:

APPLICABLE STANDARDS:

Based on DIN-ISO 3046
Based on VDE 0530 REM with specified tolerance

STANDARD CONDITIONS:

Barometric pressure: 14.50 psi or 328ft above sea level
Air temperature: 77°F or 298 K
Relative Humidity: 30%

ENGINE OUTPUT DERATING:

Height: 0.7% for any further 328ft over 1640ft
Temperature: 0.28% for any further 1°F over 77°F

GAS QUALITY:

according to TA 1000-0300
Gas flow pressure: 1.2 - 2.9 (psi)
(Lower gas pressures upon inquiry)
Prechamber gas pressure: NATURAL GAS, SEWAGE GAS > 44 psi
Max. variation in gas pressure: ±10%

All data are based on engine full load at specified media temperatures and are subject to change.
The technical instruction TA 1100-0110 "PARAMETER FOR JENBACHER GAS ENGINES" must be strictly observed.

SCOPE OF SUPPLY GENSET JGS 620 GS-N.L

BASIC ENGINE EQUIPMENT:

- *Exhaust gas turbocharger, Intercooler
- *Motorized carburator for LEANOX control
- *Electronic contactless high performance ignition system
- *Lubricating oil pump (gear driven)
- *Lubricating oil filters in main circuit
- *Oil trip pan; Lubricating oil heat exchanger
- *Jacket water pump
- *Fuel-, lubricating oil and jacket water pipe work on engine
- *Flywheel for alternator operation; Exhaust gas manifold
- *Viscous damper
- *Knock sensors

Engine accessories:

- *Electric starter motor
- *Electronic speed governor
- *Electronic speed monitoring device including starting and overspeed control
- *Transducers and switches for oil pressure, jacket water temp., jacket water pressure, charge pressure and mixture temperature
- *One thermocouple per cylinder

SUPPLIED LOOSE:

Gas train according to DIN-DVGW consisting of:

- *Manual stop valve, fuel gas filter, two solenoid valves, Leakage control device, gas pressure regulator

Prechamber Gas Train

Documentation:

- *Operating and maintenance manual
- *Spare parts manual
- *Drawings

ASSEMBLY, PAINTING, TESTING in Jenbach/Austria

EQUIPMENT:

- *Base frame for gas engine, alternator and heat exchangers
- *Internal pole alternator with excitation alternator and with automatic voltage regulator; p.f. 0.8 lagging to 1.0
- *Flexible coupling, bell housing
- *Anti-vibration mounts
- *Air filter
- *Automatic lube oil replenishing with level control
- *Wiring of components to module interface panel
- *Crankcase breather
- *Jacket water electric preheating

ENGINE CONTROL PANEL:

- *Totally enclosed, single door cubicle, wired to terminals and ready to operate, protection IP 41 outside, IP 10 inside, according to VDE-standards

CONTROL EQUIPMENT:

- *Engine-Management-System dia.ne (Dialog Network)
 - **Visualisation (industry PC-10" color graphics display): Operation controller display, Exh. gas temp., Generator electr. connection, et
 - **Central engine- and module control: Speed-, Power output-, LEANOX-Control and knock control, etc.
- *Multi-transducer
- *Lockable operation mode selector switch
 - Positions: "OFF", "MANUAL", "AUTOMATIC"
- *Demand switch

SCOPE OF SUPPLY MODULE JMS 620 GS-N.L

Identical to Genset except that heat recovery is included.

- *jacket water heat exchanger mounted on module frame
- *exhaust gas heat exchanger mounted as separate heat recovery module
- *all heat exchangers with complete pipework
- *Heat exchangers and all inherent auxiliaries

Scope of Supply & Design Subject to Local Regulations and product development

DIMENSIONS

GENSET

Main dimensions and weights (approximate value)

Length L	in	410
Width B	in	100
Height H	in	110
Weight empty	lbs	65,210
Weight filled	lbs	67,420

Connections (at genset)

Jacket water inlet and outlet	in/lbs	4"/232
Exhaust gas outlet	in/lbs	25"/145
Fuel gas (at gas train)	in/lbs	3"/232
Intercooler water connection:		
Low Temperature Circuit	in/lbs	2½"/232

MODULE

Main dimensions and weights (approximate value)

Length L	in	410
Width B	in	100
Height H	in	110
Weight empty	lbs	66,530
Weight filled	lbs	68,740

Connections (at module)

Hot water inlet and outlet	in/lbs	4"/232
Exhaust gas outlet	in/lbs	25"/145
Fuel gas (at gas train)	in/lbs	3"/232
Intercooler water connection:		
Intercooler water-Inlet/Outlet 2nd stage	in/lbs	2½"/232

FUEL GAS QUALITY

1. General :

The analysis of the fuel gas shall be made known to the engine manufacturer prior to the contract settlement.

The analysis values must constitute a representative result.

When it is recognized and/or possible that in the course of time changes of analysis values could occur this factor should be referred to specifically.

Exceeding or remaining under fuel gas connected limit values according to table (page 2) must be declared during single measurements.

The engine is fully suitable only for the kind of fuel gas, for which it was delivered.

Because engine equipment and engine adjustment are optimized only for the indicated fuel gas it has to be guaranteed that the methane quantity will not fall below the min. methane quantity of the technical specification (e.g. addition of a liquified gas air mixture). This matter shall be clarified with the respective gas utility.

Lubricating oil can loose its anti-corrosion characteristics by soiling of the fuel gas. The results of periodical lubricating oil analysis also refer to fuel gas soiling (for this matter see TI-No. 1000-0112).

Particular prescriptions regarding the use of engine lube oils (vide technical instructions TI-No.1000-0125, TI-No.1000-0099 B and 1000-0099 C) shall be obeyed in case of existence of Halogen and sulphur bonds in the fuel gas.

2. Required characteristics of the fuel gas 4-stroke spark ignited gas engines :

a) maximum admissible varying speed of calorific value : 0,5% / 30 sec.

b) maximum admissible gas-pressure change : 10 mbar/sec. **[0,145 psi/sec]**.
(provided a pre-pressure controller is mounted).

c) Gas pre-pressure :
(constant dynamic gas pressure at interface of JENBACHER's scope of supply)

- Turbocharged gas engines : 80 – 200 mbar **[1,16 psi - 2,9 psi]**

- Br.6 Pre-combustion chamber
gas pressure 612-616 : 2500 – 4000 mbar **[36,25 psi - 58 psi]**
620 : 3000 - 4000 mbar **[43,5 psi - 58 psi]**

d) Fuel gas quality : the limiting values for the fuel gas, which have to be obeyed resp. underpassed at the interface of JENBACHER scope of supply, are enlisted in the table below.

All quantity indications refer to the volume of fuel gas in standard condition,i.e.:
a temperature of 0°C **[32°F]**, a pressure of 1,013 bar **[14,6885 psi]** and a heating
value of 10 kWh/m³ **[966,68 BTU/cu ft]**.

Other heating values are to be proportionally converted directly.

FUEL GAS QUALITY

Table :

	without catalyst	with catalyst
maximum temperature (°C)	40 [104 °F]	40 [104 °F]
maximum relative humidity (%)	80	80
condensate	0	0
maximum grade size (µm)	3	3
dust:		
maximum quantity (mg/10 kWh)	50	50
maximum content of sulphuric compounds calculated as H ₂ S (mg/10 kWh) 4)	2000	1150
maximum content of halide compounds (total Cl + 2 x sum F mg/10 kWh) 1)		
without restriction of warranty 2)	< 100	0
restricted warranty 3)	100-400	0
no warranty given against damage which is directly or indirectly due to raised halogen content	> 400	0
maximum content of silicon (mg/10 kWh)		
without restriction of warranty	5)	0
with restricted warranty (for wear on exhaust valves, cylinder liner and piston rings)	5)	0
maximum ammonia content (mg/10 kWh)	55	55
maximum oil content (mg/10 kWh)	5	5

- 1) A single exceeding of 30% of the mentioned limiting value out of 4 analysis per year shall be admissible.
- 2) TI-No. 1000-0099 B limiting values for used oil must be observed.
- 3) Condition : An increased oil sump with additional oil tank to achieve an oil service life of at least 250 working hours (better still 500/1000 working hours) must be provided (dimensioning of size must be carried out for each case of need depending on halogen content, type of oil, etc.). The limiting values for used oil according to TI 1000-0099B must be observed and the analytical findings obtained during the warranty period must be submitted to JENBACHER without prior request.
- 4) With a total sulphur content > 50 mg/10kWh a reduction of the oil service life occurs.
Attention is to be paid to this as with a defect high sulphur concentrations can arise, particularly in desulphurisation plants.

FUEL GAS QUALITY

- 5) The silicon content in the gas is difficult to measure (depending on the sample taken, the methods of analysis and the time in between). Because, however, it was possible to establish a clear relationship between the various engines regarding wear in relation to the silicon-content increase in the oil over time, a limiting value of < 0.02 has been set. If this limit is exceeded, the warranty will be limited to some extent and allowance should be made for increased wear, especially of the piston rings.

Sample calculation for the Si-content:

e.g. J 312 GS / 600 kW

Oil filling quantity 200 litres [52,84 gallon]

550 oil service hours

Si-content in engine oil 280 mg/k (ppm G)

$$\text{Rel. Si-content} = \frac{\text{ppm Si} \times \text{oil content}}{\text{Power} \times \text{service time}} = \frac{280 \times 200}{600 \times 550} = 0,17$$

3. Special instructions regarding landfill gas :

The composition of landfill gases in general is subject to extreme variations. This may result in variations of the Wobbe no. and the required air excess number and thus to variations of the combustion air ratio.

Deviations from the nominal value of the air ratio with engine under load are corrected within a defined regulating range by the Leanox control system.

In order to secure a good starting and no-load function course it may be necessary to adapt the starting position to the mixer if the CH₄ content when compared to the time of initial operation has noticeably changed.

Gas samples :

Utilization of landfill gas in engines supposes the knowledge of composition, quantity and its periodical characteristic. Gas samples shall be taken and being analyzed by qualified laboratories already in the phase of planning. Gas well with highly pollutant contents must be connected to the flare or can utilize gas, produced here by installation of a gas purifier.

The following procedure is recommended for the recording of periodical variations :

- 1st sample taking
- 2nd sample taking one week after the 1st
- 3rd sample taking two weeks after the 2nd
- 4th sample taking four weeks after the 3rd
- 5th sample taking eight weeks after the 4th

FUEL GAS QUALITY

Quarteryearly analysis of the landfill gas feed to the engine shall be taken after start-up and continued over the warranty period. These analysis shall be made available to JENBACHER without request.

When taking gas samples, make sure that no post-reactions are possible until analysis is carried out resp. that watersolluble and components condensed with the humidity of the gas (e.g. NH_3 , acids etc.) are being collected together with the gas sample.

The temperature of gases during sampling must be acquired and indicated.

Suction of outer air is to be prevented. Time between sampling and analysis must be as short as possible (max. 3 days). Time of sampling and time of analysis must be indicated.

The gas sample shall be taken at the interface of JENBACHER scope of supply.

The fuel gas shall be analyzed for the following components :

methane (CH_4)

total silicone

carbon dioxide (CO_2)

nitrogen (N_2)

oxygen (O_2)

total sulphur

total chlorine

total florine

ammonia

condensate quantity at 0°C [32°F]

relative humidity

residual oil content

dust

Sampling and analysis are to be carried out according to VDI directives. Each applied analysis procedure is to be indicated.

LUBRICATING OILS FOR ENGINES OF STANDARD SERIES 6 IN SWEET-GAS, BIOGAS, LANDFILL-GAS OR SPECIAL-GAS OPERATION, FOR ENGINES OF STANDARD SERIES 1, 2, 3 AND 4 IN NATURAL-GAS OPERATION AND FOR LAMBDA-1-ENGINES

1. Validity :

The present Technical Instruction applies to :

- Leanox engines of standard series 6 with or without oxydation-type catalytic converter in all applications (sweet gas, biogas, landfill gas and special gas),
- Engines of standard series 1, 2,3 and 4 if oil with a low ash content is required,
- Engines which are equipped with a three-way catalytic converter.

2. Requirements concerning the lubricating oil :

- SAE40
- additives suited to spark-ignition gas operation rather than diesel or regular gas
- API "CC" or MIL-L-2104 B;
- corrosion test CRC L-38 must be able to be combridged
- Sulfate ash according to DIN 51575 smaller than 0,5 weight %
- with TBN not below 3 mg KOH/g, if possible above 4 mg KOH/g
- Phosphorus contents maximum 800 ppm.

3. Note :

The sulphate-ash content can, depending on the operational conditions of the engine, affect the service life of the lubrication oil. It is very important that you take into the account oil ageing and/or that the used-oil analyses limit values (according to TD 1000-0099B) are met.

SELECTION CHART

Pegasus 705		Geostar Low Ash SAE 40		Motor Gas SAE 40
GEUM BG 40		Troncoil Gas 40		Mysella LA 40
Degasol LA 40		Dea Ectan LA40 Titan Ganymet LA40		Texaco Geotex LA 40
Gasmotorenöl LA 40		Mineralöl: ESTOR PC 40 Synthetisch: ESTOR SPC		OMG 40
Energol IC-DG 40 S		405		

US REFERENCE LIST 2001 JENBACHER					
Project	Fuel Type	Year of Installation	Application	Engine Configuration	Location
WWTP-Annacis Island	Sewer and Natural Gas	1997	Cogen	4 JMS320GS-B.L 807 kW each 3228 kW gross output	Vancouver, BC Canada
Alpha Industries	Natural Gas	1999	Cogen	2 JMS612GS-N.LC 1334 kW each 2668 kW gross output	Newark, NJ USA
WWTP-Eugene	Biogas	1997	Cogen	1 JMS316GS-B.L 800 kW 800 kW gross output	Eugene, OR USA
Catawba County	Landfill gas	1998	Container Genset	3 JMS 320GS-L.L 987 kW each 2961 kW gross output	Hickory, NC USA
Fermic	Natural gas	2000	Genset	2 JMS 620GS-L.L 2085 kW each 4170 kW gross output	Mexico City, Mexico
GE-SECCO	Well head gas	2001	Gensets	3 JGS 616 GS-B.L 1677 kW each 5031 kW gross output	Buenos Aires, Argentina
GE-Spartech	Natural gas	2001	Gensets	2 JGS 616 GS-N.L 1912 kW each 3824 kW gross output	California USA
GEER-Clark Public Utility	Natural gas	2001	Container Gensets	50 JGC 320 GS-N.L 1060 kW each 53000 kW gross output	Vancouver, WA USA
GEER-Cowlitz	Natural gas	2001	Container Gensets	6 JGC 320 GS-N.L 1060 kW each 6360 kW gross output	Long View, WA USA
GE-Tesoro	Natural gas	2001	Container Gensets	18 JGC 320 GS-N.L 1060 kW each 19080 kW gross output	Anacortes, WA USA
GE-Springfield	Natural gas	2001	Gensets	5 JGS 616 GS-N.L 1912 kW each 9560 kW gross output	Springfield, OR USA
GE-El Cap	Natural gas	2001	Gensets	10 JGS 616 GS-N.L 1912 kW each	Washington USA

				19120 kW gross output	
GE-ITT Canon	Natural gas	2001	Gensets	3 JGS 616 GS-N.L 1912 kW each 5736 kW gross output	Santa Ana, California USA
WWTP-Littelton Englewood	Sewer gas	1999	Cogen	2 JMS320GS-B.L 907 kW each 1814 kW gross output	Denver, CO USA
WWTP-El Paso	Natural Gas	1998	Direct Drive Blowers	2 JCS316GS-N.LC 650 kW each 1300 kW gross output	El Paso, TX USA
WWTP-Liverpool	Natural Gas	2001	Cogen	2 JMS 320 GS N.L 1023 kW each 2046 kW gross output	Liverpool, OH USA
Loctite Corp.	Natural Gas	1993	Cogen	2 JMS316GS-N.LC 650 kW each 1300 kW gross output	Rocky Hill, CT USA
Marina Landfill 1 + 2	Landfill gas	1996/1998	Genset	2 JMS 320 GS-L.L 987 kW each 1974 kW gross output	Marina, CA USA
Marina Landfill 3	Landfill gas	2001	Genset	1 JMS 320 GS-L.L 1060 kW 1060 kW gross output	Marina, CA USA
Maxim Energy	Natural gas	2001	Container Gensets	25 JGC 320 GS-N.L 1060 kW each 26500 kW gross output	Calgary, Alberta Canada
RTC Lyons / Shelton/Pontiac Biodyne	Landfill gas	1996	Container Genset	5 JGC320GS-L.L 987 kW each 4935 kW gross output	Chicago, IL USA
RTC 31st Street Biodyne	Landfill gas	2001	Genset	4 JGS 616 GS-L.L 1677 kW each 6708 kW gross output	Chicago, IL USA
RTC Des Plaines Biodyne	Landfill gas	2001	Genset	4 JGS 616 GS-L.L 1677 kW each 6708 kW gross output	Chicago, IL USA
Santee Cooper	Landfill Gas	2001	Container Gensets	2 JGS 320 GS-L.L 1060 kW each 2120 kW gross output	Monks Corner, SC USA
Valley Medical Ctr	Natural Gas	1997	Gensets	4 JGS320 NG 907 kW each	Renton, WA USA

				3628 kW gross output	
Winnebago Landfill	Landfill Gas	1999	Container Gensets	3 JGS 320 GS-L.L 987 kW each 2961 kW gross output	Oshkosh, WI USA
Wellesley College I	Natural Gas	1993	Cogen	4 JMS 616 GS-N.LC 1400 kW each 5600 kW gross output	Wellesley, MA USA
Wellesley College II	Natural Gas	1998	Cogen	1 JMS 616 GS-N.LC 1941 kW 1941 kW gross output	Wellesley, MA USA
ZAPCO 1 Romeoville	Landfill Gas	1997	Container Gensets	1 JGC 320GS-L.L 987 kW 987 kW gross output	Romeoville, IL USA
ZAPCO 1 122nd Street	Landfill Gas	1997	Container Gensets	4 JGC 320GS-L.L 987 kW each 3948 kW gross output	Chicago, IL USA
ZAPCO 2 Dixon Zapco Allied-Lee Landfill	Landfill Gas	1998	Container Gensets	3 JGC 320GS-L.L 987 kW each 2961 kW gross output	Dixon, IL USA
ZAPCO 3 Brickyard	Landfill Gas	1998	Container Gensets	3 JGC 320GS-L.L 987 kW each 2961 kW gross output	Danville, IL USA
ZAPCO 4/1 Roxanna	Landfill Gas	1999	Container Gensets	4 JGC 320GS-L.L 987 kW each 3948 kW gross output	Roxanna, IL USA
ZAPCO 3/2 Streator	Landfill Gas	1999	Container Gensets	2 JGC 320GS-L.L 987 kW each 1974 kW gross output	Streator, IL USA
Zapco 4/2 Upper Rock	Landfill Gas	1999	Container Gensets	3 JGC 320GS-L.L 987 kW each 2961 kW gross output	Upper Rock, IL USA
Zapco - Dolton	Landfill Gas	2001	Gensets	5 JGS 320 GS-L.L 1060 kW each 5300 kW gross output	Dolton, IL USA
				Total kW 231173 Total engines 197	