



SIXTH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
ON
COAL SLURRY COMBUSTION

Hyatt Orlando, Kissimmee, Florida

June 25-27, 1984

WELCOMING ADDRESS

Dr. Sun W. Chun, *Director*
Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, DOE

KEYNOTE SPEAKER

William A. Vaughan, *Assistant Secretary*
for Fossil Energy, DOE

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Charles A. Thomas, *Symposium Chairman*
Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, DOE

PROCEEDINGS OVERVIEW

(Gray Pages Divide Sessions)

- I Pilot Testing
- II Commercial and Industrial Applications
- III Combustion Technology
- IV Slurry Rheology and Characterization
- V Commercialization and Economics
- VI Additive Considerations
- VII Demonstration Projects
- VIII Fuel Clean-up (Beneficiation)
- IX Bench-Scale and Pilot Testing
 - X Slurry Handling
 - XI Slurry Preparation
 - XII Equipment



Department of Energy
Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center
P.O. Box 10940
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15236

On behalf of the United States Department of Energy, allow me to wish you all a warm welcome to Orlando, Florida, and the Sixth International Symposium on Coal Slurry Combustion and Technology.

The progress we have seen in coal slurry combustion, particularly in the past year, is most promising. Not only are the industrial and electric utility sectors showing increasing interest in this technology, but new and existing companies are displaying their creativity by expanding the market potential for this kind of energy source. Because of these efforts, the Department of Energy is proud and eager to assist you in pioneering coal slurry combustion technology by sponsoring this symposium.

We feel confident that the technical program for this year's symposium is both an accurate reflection of the state-of-the-art and a working blueprint for the future. However, the benefits we hope to realize will be determined by our active participation in these sessions. Your enthusiasm, opinions, and technical contributions have made this annual symposium a success, and we look forward to this same kind of interaction in the days ahead.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Sun W. Chun", is written over a faint, circular official stamp.

Sun W. Chun, Director
Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center
U. S. Department of Energy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SESSION I—PILOT TESTING

Monday, June 25, 1984

Chairman: Howard Feibus, Office of Coal Utilization Systems, DOE

Combustion of Coal-Methanol-Water Mixtures In A 700-HP Watertube Boiler	
<i>Y. C. Fu, G. T. Bellas, R. B. Snedden and J. I. Joubert—Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center</i>	3
*Combustion Of Coal-Water And Petroleum Coke-Water Mixtures In A Firetube Boiler	
<i>Y. C. Fu, G. T. Bellas, T. Brown and J. I. Joubert—Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center</i>	19
*Coal Slurry Conversion Study On Some Oil-Fired Boilers And Coal-Oil-Mixture Testing In A Small Oil-Fired Boiler	
<i>Hao Lin and Wen-Hau Zhou—Tsinghua University</i>	20
Coal Water Slurry Combustion In Industrial Gas Turbines	
<i>H. G. Lew, J. L. Toof, K. L. Rieke—Westinghouse Electric Corporation;</i>	
<i>N. F. Rekos, Jr.—Morgantown Energy Technology Center</i>	21
*Coal Water Slurry Utilization In Fluidized Bed Combustion	
<i>U. Arena—Istituto di Ricerche sulla Combustione; G. DeMichele, A. Maresca—ENEL;</i>	
<i>L. Missimilla and M. Miccio—Istituto di Ricerche sulla Combustione</i>	29
Present Status And Prospect Of Highly-Loaded Coal Water Slurry Project In Japan	
<i>Y. Nakabayashi and M. Kamao—Electric Power Development Co., Ltd.</i>	30

SESSION II—COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL APPLICATIONS

Monday, June 25, 1984

Chairman: Rolf Manfred, Electric Power Research Institute

The Conversion Of Industrial Oil-Fired Boilers To Coal-Water Slurry	
<i>R. G. Carpenter and R. D. Berg—Gilbert/Commonwealth</i>	51
The P. L. Bartow Plant: Two Years Of Operation On COM	
<i>M. E. Higgins—Florida Power Corporation</i>	67
CoalLiquid Coal Slurry Fuel Program—1984	
<i>G. T. Hawkins—CoalLiquid, Inc.</i>	72
The Prospects And Some Problems On The Application Of CWM In China	
<i>Wang Zu-Na—China Association for Coal Processing and Utilization;</i>	
<i>Chen Fung-Ying—Bureau of Coal Processing and Utilization, Ministry of Coal Industry</i>	78
COMCO's Experience In Commercial Scale Application Of Slurry Fuels	
<i>J. C. Wilda and P. D. Hay—COMCO</i>	89
Assessment Of Coal-Liquid Mixtures In Cooperating IEA Countries	
<i>H. Whaley—EMR-Canada; M. Takagi, H. Kumano, K. Kuwano, J. Nagasaka—NEDO, Japan;</i>	
<i>Y. Nakabayashi—EPDC, Japan; B. Fortuin—NEOM, Netherlands;</i>	
<i>P. Svenningsson—The Beijer Institute, Sweden; K. Borgne—NE Admin., Sweden;</i>	
<i>J. Harrison—NCB, United Kingdom; C. Foster—U.S. DOE/Hq., USA;</i>	
<i>R. Kurtzrock—U.S. DOE/PETC, USA; E. Jamgochian, O. Foo—MITRE, USA</i>	95

SESSION III—COMBUSTION TECHNOLOGY

Monday, June 25, 1984

Chairman: Roy Kurtzrock, Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, DOE

Combustion Histories Of Various Coal-Water Fuels	
<i>K. J. Matthews and P. J. Street—Central Electricity Generating Board, Marchwood Engineering Laboratories</i>	109

*Papers were not available at time of publication.

Combustion Characterization Of Coal-Water Mixtures <i>M. J. Hargrove, A. A. Levasseur and O. K. Chow—Combustion Engineering, Inc.</i>	127
Space Resolved Coal-Water Mixture Combustion And Pollutant Formation Studies In A Laboratory Scale Furnace <i>G. J. Germane, K. H. Richardson, D. C. Rawlings, P.O. Hedman and L. D. Smoot—Brigham Young University</i>	143
*Further Research Establishing The Benefits Of Oxygen-Enriched Air In Coal-Water Slurry Combustion <i>J. J. Reuther—The Pennsylvania State University; D. R. Taschler—Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.</i>	157
Process Heat From Residual Coal-Water Fuels <i>L. Green, Jr.—Energy Conversion Alternatives, Ltd.</i>	158
NO_x And Carbon Emission Control In Coal-Water Slurry Combustion <i>W. F. Farmayan, S. Srinivasachar, L. Monroe, F. DiTaranto, J. D. Teare and J. M. Beér—Massachusetts Institute of Technology</i>	165
*Pressurized Combustion Of Beneficiated Coal Water Mixtures <i>D. Davis-Waltermire and R. J. Anderson—Morgantown Energy Technology Center</i>	185
The Combustion Of Coal-Liquid Mixtures And Pulverised Coal With Oxygen <i>C. Moore—British Oxygen Company, Ltd.; D. P. Jenkins—British Steel Corporation</i>	186
*CWS Bears Combustion With Pulverized Coal From The Radiation Heat Utilization Point Of View <i>Fong Tzuu-yih—Design Institute, Ministry of Light Industry; Wang Zhao-yuan—Suzhou Science and Technology Institute</i>	203
*The Impact Of Oxygen-Enriched Combustion Of Coal-Water Slurries On The Retrofit Costs And Performance Of Large Industrial Boilers <i>D. R. Taschler—Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.; F. S. Nolte and T. E. Stringfellow—Stearns-Roger World Corporation</i>	204
Combustion Of Coal-Water Mixtures <i>H. Kikkawa, K. Okiura and Y. Arikawa—Babcock Hitachi, K.K.</i>	205
SESSION IV—SLURRY RHEOLOGY AND CHARACTERIZATION	
<i>Monday, June 25, 1984</i>	
Chairman: John Cutting, Advanced Energy Systems, Gilbert Commonwealth	
Measurement Of The Physical Properties Of Coal Powders, Aqueous Slurries And Dispersions <i>Chyong-Hwa Chang and R. L. Rowell—University of Massachusetts</i>	219
Research On CWM Preparation Technique With Chinese Coals <i>Zheng Rong-Zeng, Zeng Fang, Hu Kun-Mu—China Institute of Mining; Gao Ming-Oiu—Beijing Coal Mine Administration</i>	234
The Effects Of Surface Active Agents On Coal/Water Slurry Stability <i>E. Z. Casassa, G. D. Parfitt, A. S. Rao and E. W. Toor—Carnegie-Mellon University</i>	251
A Direct Rheological Characterization Of Highly Loaded Coal-Water Slurries Flowing Through Pipes <i>G. Antonini, O. Francois, P. Gislais, A. Touret—Université de Technologie de Compiègne; P. Girard—Centre de Recherches ELF-SOLAIZE</i>	266
*Coal And CWM Selection For The DOE Characterization Project <i>E. W. Albaugh, B. E. Davis—Gulf Research & Development Company; A. A. Levasseur—Combustion Engineering, Inc.</i>	282
Effects Of Weathering Of Coals On Slurriabilities <i>T. Igarashi, N. Kiso, Y. Hayasaki, M. Yamamoto, T. Ogata, K. Fukuhara and S. Yamazaki—Nippon Oil & Fats Co., Ltd.</i>	283
Effect Of The Interaction Between Particles On The Viscosity Of Coal Water Slurries <i>G. D. Botsaris and K. N. Astill—Tufts University</i>	304
Relationship Between Properties Of Adsorption Layer On Coal Surfaces And Rheological Characteristics Of Coal Water Slurry <i>Tiefeng Chen, Mei Cai and Long Jiang—Institute of Photographic Chemistry, Academia Sinica</i>	313
Coal-Water-Methanol Slurries: Viscometric Properties And The Effects Of Coal Type <i>A. C. Ekmann and J. Ekmann—Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center</i>	325

*Papers were not available at time of publication.

*Investigation Of Spray Characteristics Of Coal Water Slurry Fuels C. F. Smith, P. E. Sojka and A. H. Lefebvre—Purdue University	338
SESSION V—COMMERCIALIZATION AND ECONOMICS	
Tuesday, June 26, 1984	
Chairman: Eugene Chao, EBASCO Services, Inc.	
Economic And Technical Factors Governing Coal-Water Slurry Use At North American Blast Furnaces B. Schiller—Consultant in Process Metallurgy; R. T. Ivey—Republic Steel Research Center	341
Market And User Factors Determining The Attractiveness Of Coal Water Fuels B. Hoegberg—NYCOL AB	355
*Coal-Water Mixture Fuels—One Year Closer To Commercialization N. D. Brown and R. A. Passman—Atlantic Research Corporation	367
*Coal Slurry Fuel In A Phosphate Hold Dryer . . . Phosphate User J. Roads and D. Fuller—Coaliquid, Inc.	368
Coal-Water Mixtures As An Alternative To Heavy Fuel Oil J. R. Siemon—IEA Coal Research	369
Present Status Of Business Plan By Japan COM Company, Ltd. I. Usui—Japan COM Company, Ltd.	388
*Commercial Production And Utilization Of Fluidcarbon Fuel R. G. Carlson—Allis-Chalmers Corporation; L. Stigsson—Fluidcarbon International AB; C. Johansson—Svenska Fluidcarbon AB	403
Conversion Study Of An Oil-Designed Commercial Boiler SRC-Water Slurry M. R. Ghassemzadeh—Babcock & Wilcox; R. Holtzapfel—International Coal Refining Company	404
*Combustion Tests Of CWS On Industrial Boiler And Large Power Station G. DeMichele, M. Graziadio, S. Ligasacchi, G. Trebbi and G. Saccenti—ENEL	412
SESSION VI—ADDITIVE CONSIDERATIONS	
Tuesday, June 26, 1984	
Chairman: Richard Gannon, AVCO/AERL	
Dispersant For Highly-Loaded Coal Water Slurry Y. Kiyonaga and M. Narita—Lion Corporation, Development Labs. II	415
Testing Of Clay-Stabilized Coal Water Slurries—Combustion And Loop Test Stability R. J. Purcell, Jr. and E. W. Sawyer, Jr.—Floridin Company—ITT	423
Study On The Additives Of Coal-Water Slurry Zeng Yuhua, Qian Liuqing, Du Wenying, Zhang Honggen, Yang Yuping and Hu Changming —Shanghai Institute of Organic Chemistry, Academia Sinica	437
Industrial Experimental Study of COM With Additives In An 100 T/H Steam Boiler Zeng Yuhua, Qian Liuqing, Zhang Honggen, Yang Yuping, Du Wenying, Hu Changming —Shanghai Institute of Organic Chemistry, Academia Sinica; Song Yongwei, Wei Tingfu, Li Xinsheng, and Luo Chao—Institute of Coal Chemistry, Academia Sinica	452
*Fundamental Research Of CWM Property T. Ogura, M. Usami, A. Yasutake and T. Gengo—Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd.	460
Effect Of Additives On The Flow Type Of Coal Water Slurry Long Jiang, Zixiu Zang and Jiayun Zhang—Institute of Photographic Chemistry, Academia Sinica	461
Effect Of Several Factors On HCWS Rheological Property Shin-ichi Watanabe and Ken-ichi Katabe—Kao Corporation	467
SESSION VII—DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS	
Tuesday, June 26, 1984	
Chairman: Jon Wilda, COMCO	
EPRI Industrial Coal-Water Slurry Demonstration R. P. Perkins—E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.; R. K. Manfred—Electric Power Research Institute; B. E. Taylor—Babcock & Wilcox Company	481

*Papers were not available at time of publication.

The Design And Test Firing Of A 125 Million BTU/HR Combined Coal Water Mixture And Oil Burner	
J. W. Allen—NEI International Combustion Ltd.	499
Mixed Combustion Performance Of Oil Fuel And CWM In A Steam Boiler	
Huang Zhaoxiang, Chen Jingyi, Wu Yifeng, Sung Zheng, Yao Zhihua, Wang Yizhen, Fang Xiubing, Shen Dixin —Chinese Academy of Sciences; Wu Jianbo and Chen Jiatian—Beijing Dyeing and Printing Plant	508
Utility Boiler Demonstration Of Coal-Water Mixture Combustion At Chatham, New Brunswick	
H. Whaley—Combustion and Carbonization Research Laboratory, CANMET; D. M. Rankin—N. B. Electric Power Commission; P. G. Landry—Cape Breton Development Corporation; I. D. Covill—Nova Scotia Power Corporation	519
Introduction Of Coal Slurry Fuels To Israel	
M. Keren—Coal United Company, Ltd.; C. J. Lauer—CoaLiquid International, BV	527
*New Development On Coal-Water Mixture	
G. Malgarini, S. Palella and M. A. Cama—Centro Sperimentale Metallurgico	540
CWM Demonstration At Sundbyberg	
L. Astrand and L. H. Rey—Uppsala Kraftvarme AB	541
EPRI Coal-Water Slurry Demonstration Using Co-AL®	
R. C. Furman—Consulting Engineer	548
Status Report On Co-AL® Fuel	
E. G. Atkins—Babcock Power Ltd.	557

SESSION VIII—FUEL CLEAN-UP (BENEFICIATION)

Tuesday, June 26, 1984

Chairman: Gary E. Voelker, U.S. Department of Energy

Selective Flocculation Coal Cleaning For Coal Slurry Preparation	
Y. A. Attia, H. N. Conkle and S. V. Krishnan—Battelle's Columbus Laboratories	571
Static Tube Flotation For Fine Coal Cleaning	
D. C. Yang—Institute of Mineral Research, Michigan Technological University	582
Laboratory And Pilot Plant Studies Of Coal Beneficiation For CWF	
M. E. Morgan, K. S. Priggen, E. G. Skolnik, J. M. Sultzbaugh and E. T. McHale —Atlantic Research Corporation	598
Cleaning Process For Highly Loaded Coal Water Slurry	
T. Kuwabara, K. Aoki and K. Shinano—Sumitomo Heavy Industries, Ltd.	605
A Study Of Slurry Using De-Ashed Coal	
Y. Ogura, Y. Mizuno, N. Ueshima—NEOS Co., Ltd.; A. Naka—Dai-Ichi-Kogyo-Seiyaku Co., Ltd.	621
Improved Oil Agglomeration Process For Coal Beneficiation	
O. Trass—University of Toronto; O. Bajor—General Comminution, Inc.	639
Refining Solid Coal To Enhance Combustion Characteristics Of Coal Water Slurry Fuels	
J. Pinta, Jr.—Gulf Research & Development Company	649

SESSION IX—BENCH-SCALE AND PILOT TESTING

Wednesday, June 27, 1984

Chairman: James I. Joubert, Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center/DOE

Ash Deposition From The Combustion Of Clean Coal-Water Slurries	
S. A. Johnson, A. Boni, A. R. Garman—Physical Sciences Inc.; J. M. Thames—Morgantown Energy Technology Center/DOE	667
The Investigation Of Coal Rank On The Handling, Combustion and Emissions From Coal-Oil Dispersions	
J. S. Alabaf—University of Surrey	683
*Developing And Comparative Testing Of Commercial Scale Atomizers For Slurry Fuels	
R. W. Borio, D. A. Smith and R. C. LaFlesh—C-E Power Systems, Combustion Engineering	709
A Study Of The Combustion Characteristics Of A Number Of Coal-Water Slurries	
S. Bortz, E. D. Engelberts and W. Schreier—International Flame Research Foundation	710

*Papers were not available at time of publication.

Combustion Experiment Of Coal-Water Slurry In A Tunnel Furnace <i>Lu Deshou, Xie Minghu, Cao Xingyu, Gong Baixun, Huang Guoquan, Luo Zhongyang, Ni Mingjiang, Chen Fengying and Cen Kefa—Zhejiang University</i>	731
Program To Develop Anthracite Coal-Liquid Mixtures <i>M. Borden and J. C. Cutting—Gilbert/Commonwealth</i>	751
Experimental Research On Fluidized Bed Combustion Of Coal Slurry And Washing Tailings <i>Huang Guoquan, Ni Mingjiang, Cao Xinyu, Huang Zheyu, Luo Zhongyang, Lu Deshou, Xie Minghu, Cen Kefa—Zhejiang University</i>	756
Coal-Fueled Diesel Engines <i>F. Robben, D. D. Brehob, M. Namazian, R. F. Sawyer and P. Sherman—Lawrence Berkley Lab., University of California</i>	767

SESSION X—SLURRY HANDLING

Wednesday, June 27, 1984

Chairman: Victor Engleman, Science Applications, Incorporated

Densecoal—An Alternative To Gas And Oil <i>R. B. Klose—Stahlwerke Peine-Salzgitter AG</i>	791
Potential Feasibility Of Integrated Coal-Water Mixture Transportation Systems <i>O. Yucel—Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</i>	806
Front End Boiler Equipment Performance And Hydraulics For Using Coal Water Mixtures <i>E. P. Motley, R. A. Meyers, L. C. McClanathan, J. F. Jones and C. C. Shih —TRW Energy Development Group</i>	814
*The Handling Properties Of Coal/Water Slurries, II <i>J. Dooher, B. Gilmartin, D. Cote, N. Malicki and D. Wright —Adelphi Center for Energy Studies, Adelphi University</i>	826
Atomization Of Coal-Water Slurries <i>N. Chigier and P. L. Meyer—Carnegie-Mellon University</i>	827
Flow Characteristics And Handling Properties Of Commercial Coal-Water Mixtures <i>D. J. Wildman and J. M. Ekmann—Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center/DOE</i>	845
Measurement Of Stability Of Highly Loaded CWM <i>J. E. Funk, B. R. Dinger, J. E. Funk, Jr., and D. R. Dinger—Alfred University</i>	862
Experiment And Analysis Of Coal-Water Mixture Flow Properties <i>Chen Jingyi, Huang Zhaoxiang, Wei Xiaolin, Kou Tiecheng—Chinese Academy of Sciences; Chen Jiatian, Wu Jianbo and Xu Xiaochun—Beijing Dyeing and Printing Plant</i>	881
Temperature Effects In The Handling Properties Of Coal-Water Slurries <i>G. Antonini, O. Francois, P. Gislais, B. Roux—Université de Technologie de Compiègne; P. Girard—Centre de Recherches ELF-SOLAIZE</i>	899

SESSION XI—SLURRY PREPARATION

Wednesday, June 27, 1984

Chairman: Richard Markuszewski, Ames Laboratory, Iowa State University

Development Of Highly Loaded CWM Preparation System <i>H. Kikkawa, K. Okiura and Y. Arikawa—Babcock Hitachi K.K.</i>	921
South Point Coal-Water Fuel Production Plant <i>R. V. Carlson, R. D. Daley, J. M. Wilkinson—The Babcock & Wilcox Company; P. C. Emmons—Ashland Oil, Inc.</i>	933
Stability Of Coal Slurries Prepared By Wet Grinding In The Szego Mill <i>V. R. Koka, O. Trass—University of Toronto; G. Papachristodoulou—General Comminution, Inc.</i>	939
Role Of Shape And Size Of Particles In The Preparation Of Highly Loaded Coal Water Slurry <i>Long Jiang, Hongnian Yun and Lin Zhang—Institute of Photographic Chemistry, Academia Sinica</i>	951
*Research And Development Of HCWS Combustion <i>K. Tokuda, T. Gengo and H. Takatsuka—Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd.</i>	960

*Papers were not available at time of publication.

Highly Loaded Coal Water Slurry Preparation Test At A Pilot Plant N. Sato, M. Sakata, N. Suzuki and T. Katahata—Kawasaki Heavy Industries, Ltd.	961
The OXCE Fuel Company Coal-Water Mixture Demonstration Project E. Knell, T. J. Murphy and E. P. Flanigan—OXCE Fuel Company	976
Manufacture And Commercial Use Of Carbogel Coal/Water Fuel In Canada T. K. Hammond and M. M. Mathiesen—Carbogel, Inc.	982
*Characterization Of 200 Mesh and Micronized Coal-Water Slurries Prepared In A Columbia Chase Integrator S. K. Batra, R. B. Kenney—GIMRET International, Inc.; A. O'Toole—Columbia Chase Corporation	990
SESSION XII—EQUIPMENT	
Wednesday, June 27, 1984	
Chairman: Robert R. Faddick, Colorado School of Mines	
C-E Canada CWM Nozzle Development And Firing Experience D. A. Cook, J. D. Kearns—C-E Canada; D. A. Smith, M. J. Rini and R. C. LaFlesh—Combustion Engineering, Inc.	993
Design Of A Coal-Water Fuel (CWF) Burner For Low Air-Side Pressure Drop C. F. Eckhart, G. D. Lindstrom and G. A. Farthing, Jr.—The Babcock & Wilcox Company	1012
*Combustion Test Results Of A Second Generation Coal-Slurry Burner S. K. Batra—GIMRET International, Inc.; W. A. Walsh, Jr.—The Lezzon Group	1019
The Atomization Of Slurries H. C. Simmons—Parker Hannifin Corporation	1020
*Electrostatic Precipitator Performance On Flyash From Coal Slurry Fuels J. Doohar, T. Kanabrocki, D. Cote, J. Gozelski, D. Wright—Adelphi Research Center, Inc.; M. Schilling, R. Gleadall and D. Poole—United McGill Corporation	1026
High Pressure Centrifugal Coal Slurry Pump Development G. S. Wong, R. E. Aukerman, F. C. Catterfeld—Rockwell International/Rocketdyne Division R. R. Faddick—Colorado School of Mines Research Institute	1027
Positive Displacement Rotary Pump Performance On Highly Loaded Coal Slurry Applications P. H. Kline and E. D. Gray—Robbins & Myers, Inc.	1040
*A Laboratory Coal-Water Fuel Droplet Generator D. J. Maloney, L. A. McCarthy, W. F. Lawson, G. E. Fasching and K. H. Casleton —Morgantown Energy Technology Center	1051
Burner Development For Slurry Fuel: The Rotating Cup Approach R. J. Marnicio, H. T. Sommer—Carnegie-Mellon University; L. G. Thylander and K. Landaeus—Fluidcarbon International	1052
Authors Index	1065

Session I

PILOT TESTING

Monday, June 25, 1984

Chairman: Howard Feibus
Office of Coal Utilization Systems, DOE

COMBUSTION OF COAL-METHANOL-WATER MIXTURES IN A 700-HP WATERTUBE BOILER

Y.C. Fu, G.T. Bellas, R.B. Snedden, and J.I. Joubert

United States Department of Energy
Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15236

ABSTRACT

The use of coal-methanol-water (CMW) mixtures as substitute fuels has been evaluated in the Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center's 700-hp watertube boiler designed for oil firing. Tests were conducted with mixtures prepared with a high volatile A bituminous coal and a high volatile C bituminous coal to determine the minimum level of methanol required in the fuel mixture to maintain a stable flame without preheated combustion air. Tests were also carried out using preheat temperatures typical of utility boiler conditions.

With CMW mixtures containing 60 percent hvAb coal, the minimum level of methanol required without using preheated combustion air was determined to be about 16 percent. The carbon conversion and boiler efficiencies at full load for mixtures containing 6 percent to 39 percent methanol were in the ranges of 92 percent to 98 percent and 72 percent to 81 percent, respectively, when the combustion air temperature varied from ambient temperature to 500°F.

With CMW mixtures containing hvCb coal, no more than 51 percent coal could be added because of the formation of high viscosity mixtures, resulting in high fuel-pump pressures and nozzle-plugging problems. A series of combustion tests with mixtures containing 51 percent coal showed that mixtures containing 23 percent or less methanol required preheating of the combustion air to be fired successfully. For mixtures containing 12 percent to 45 percent methanol, the carbon conversion efficiencies at full load were all ≥ 99.4 percent, and the boiler efficiencies were in the range of 76 percent to 81 percent when the combustion air temperature was varied from ambient temperature to 500°F.

INTRODUCTION

Coal-methanol-water mixture (CMW) combustion tests have been conducted at the Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center (PETC) to determine the maximum level of water that can be tolerated in the fuel mixture while still maintaining a stable flame using ambient-temperature or minimally preheated combustion air and also using an air-preheat temperature typical of utility boiler conditions.

Results of combustion tests conducted with CMW mixtures in an oil-designed 100-hp firetube boiler at PETC have been reported previously.¹ More recently, CMW tests were conducted at PETC in an oil-designed, 700-hp watertube boiler. The 100-hp boiler has a design heat liberation rate of 184,000 Btu/hr/cu ft, while the 700-hp boiler has a design heat liberation rate of 47,000 Btu/hr/cu ft. A high-volatile A bituminous (hvAb) coal and a high-volatile C bituminous (hvCb) coal were used in the tests.

COMBUSTION TEST FACILITY

The Combustion Test Facility, as arranged for firing CMW mixtures, is shown in Figure 1. The test unit is a Nebraska 700-hp, "D" type watertube, packaged industrial boiler originally designed for No. 6 oil firing. The boiler generates about 24,000 lb of steam at full load. Figure 2 is a sectional plan view through the firebox and convective section of the boiler. Flue gas cleanup devices include a dry sorbent injection system for SO₂ removal and a baghouse for particulate control. Modest retrofitting to the fuel feed system included a feed tank mixer, a recirculation pump and loop, a variable-speed feed pump, and nonclogging fuel-metering capabilities. Preheated combustion air is provided by an external source because the boiler was not equipped with an air preheater. Extensive instrumentation and a computer-controlled data acquisition system provide considerable experimental data for detailed analysis and evaluation of the tests.

Figure 3 is a cross-sectional view of the burner/air register used for test firing. The air register depicted is a Coen single-air-zone register provided with the boiler. One of two modifications made to the air register was a diameter change of the sheet metal shroud, which increased the secondary air linear velocities at the exit throat of the register. The other simple change was the insertion of a center air tube to establish a stable flame front. The center tube had a fixed air spinner, and both the center-tube air feed and the secondary air feed had independent flow control systems. This allowed considerable flexibility of burner operating capabilities.

The burner nozzle (Figure 4) used in carrying out all CMW mixture tests is only slightly different from the originally supplied oil-designed, inside-mix, steam-atomized burner nozzle. The changes are the following: (1) enlargement of the nozzle hole cross-sectional area, (2) installation of tungsten carbide

sleeves to reduce erosion, (3) reduction of the burner spray angle, (4) utilization of air atomization, and (5) enlargement of fuel gap width in the mixer to reduce fuel pressure (at Section A-A, Figure 4).

COMBUSTION TEST PROCEDURES

Preparation of CMW mixtures was accomplished by first charging the 2500-gallon mix tank with a measured quantity of methanol and/or water. Pulverized coal (particle size-consist of ≈ 90 percent minus 200 mesh; top particle size of 140 mesh) was subsequently added to the liquid constituents of the CMW mixture until the desired coal loading was attained. Mixture concentration and viscosity were periodically determined to assure that mixture specifications were met.

Prior to each combustion test, the furnace ash was removed and the firebox was thoroughly cleaned. Firing of the boiler with No. 6 fuel oil at full-load conditions was initiated about 12-15 hours before a test with a CMW mixture. This was done to allow the boiler to heat up thoroughly and reach steady-state conditions. The heat transfer surface in the convective bank of the boiler was cleaned during this period by activating the soot blower several times. The soot blower was not used during a test to avoid interference with data acquisition. The boiler was switched to natural gas at one-third load immediately prior to a CMW test. Preheated combustion air flow and temperature were then established. The CMW mixture combustion was initiated with a natural gas support flame, and the load was slowly brought up by increasing the CMW mixture flow rate to a point where the natural gas support flame could be extinguished. The CMW mixture flow rate was further increased until reaching the proper firing rate, and the excess air level was adjusted to the specified condition.

Atomizing air flow and pressure, secondary air swirl, center-tube air to secondary air ratio, and the burner nozzle position were adjusted to obtain the best flame pattern (short bushy flame) without impingement on the quartz or furnace walls. The boiler was operated at steady-state conditions for about one hour before acquisition of any test data. Instrumentation was calibrated during the steady-state operation period before the test. Each test lasted two to three hours.

After completion of a test, the boiler was switched back to natural gas, and the load brought down with minimal disturbance to the furnace ash accumulation. The furnace was allowed to cool and then was opened for inspection. Furnace deposits were collected, weighed, and analyzed.

COAL-METHANOL-WATER MIXTURE PROPERTIES

A Pittsburgh seam hvAb coal and an Alberta (Canada) hvCb coal were used to prepare the CMW mixtures. Typical analyses of these two coals are given in Table 1. Both coals were pulverized to a particle size-consist of about 90 percent minus 200 mesh.

Earlier viscosity measurements of CMW mixtures containing 60 percent Pittsburgh hvAb coal indicate that there is a viscosity maximum at a methanol/water ratio of about 40/60 in the liquid phase and that the viscosity of the coal-methanol mixture is somewhat lower than that of the coal-water mixture.² The addition of small amounts of Lomar D (a surfactant) slightly reduced the viscosity of the CMW mixtures. The CMW mixtures prepared for the test program contained ≈ 60 percent coal and 0.24 percent to 0.53 percent Lomar D (except for the coal-methanol mixtures). The viscosities ranged from 325 to 693 cP at 100 sec⁻¹ shear rate and at room temperature.

The CMW mixtures prepared with hvCb coal also displayed a similar viscosity maximum in the plot of slurry viscosity vs. percent methanol in the liquid, as illustrated in Figure 5. With the CMW mixtures containing hvCb coal, no more than 51 percent coal could be added because the formation of high-viscosity mixtures resulted in high fuel-pump pressures and nozzle-plugging problems. The addition of Lomar D to these CMW mixtures did not have a beneficial effect in reducing the viscosity. The hvCb CMW mixtures used in the test program contained about 51 percent coal and had viscosities in the range of 295 to 826 cP at 100 sec⁻¹ shear rate and room temperature.

COMBUSTION TEST RESULTS

Combustion tests were conducted at full boiler load (24,000 lb/hr steam output) and with combustion air at temperatures ranging from ambient to 500°F. The minimum levels of methanol required in the hvAb and hvCb CMW mixtures to maintain stable combustion at full load without preheated combustion air were determined. In addition, minimum preheat requirements at half-boiler load were determined for hvAb CMW mixtures containing varying levels of methanol.

Pittsburgh hvAb Coal

Table 2 shows analyses of CMW mixtures prepared with ≈ 60 percent Pittsburgh hvAb coal and various levels of methanol and water. As the methanol content in the fuel increased from 0 percent to 38.9 percent, the heating value of the fuel increased from 7,729 Btu/lb to 11,695 Btu/lb.

TABLE 1. Analysis of Coals

	Pittsburgh hvAb	Alberta hvCb
Proximate Analysis (%) - As-Fired		
Moisture	1.73	8.99
Volatile Matter	35.86	33.68
Fixed Carbon	51.68	43.88
Ash	10.73	13.45
Ultimate Analysis (%) - Moisture-Free		
Hydrogen	5.27	5.54
Carbon	73.32	64.90
Nitrogen	1.55	1.51
Sulfur	1.75	0.39
Oxygen (ind.)	7.19	12.88
Ash	10.92	14.78
Heating Value (Btu/lb) - Moisture-Free	13,102	11,278
Ash Fusion Temperatures (°F)		
Initial Deformation Temperature	2,460	2,320
Softening Temperature	2,540	2,390
Fluid Temperature	2,620	2,530

Boiler operating conditions and performance are shown in Table 3. Both carbon conversion and boiler efficiencies increased with increasing methanol content in the CMW mixtures when operating at full load using combustion air preheated to $\approx 500^{\circ}\text{F}$, and excess air levels of 9 percent to 11 percent. This trend is presented in Figure 6.

Tests 4-11 of Table 3 show the results obtained at full and half loads using ambient-temperature combustion air or minimally preheated combustion air to sustain a stable flame. At full-boiler load, the minimum level of methanol required without using preheated combustion air was determined to be 40 percent in the liquid phase; this corresponds to an overall composition of 60 percent coal, 24 percent water, and 16 percent methanol (Test No. 5). At half-boiler load, however, the same CMW mixture containing 16 percent methanol required a minimum combustion air temperature of 389°F to burn successfully. As the methanol content in the CMW mixture was increased for the half-load tests, the required preheating of the combustion air was decreased.

As methanol content in the CMW mixtures increases, water content decreases, but hydrogen content increases slightly (Table 2). It is expected that the heat consumed in evaporating water would decrease but the heat lost in formation of moisture from burning hydrogen in the fuel would increase. With methanol content in CMW mixtures varying from 0 to 38.9 percent and with 500°F combustion air, heat loss due to water content decreased from 6.15 percent to 0.08 percent, while heat loss due to hydrogen content increased from 4.13 percent to 7.12 percent (see Table 3, Tests 1-3). For full-load tests, actual heat losses due to water content and hydrogen content in fuel, expressed as the percentage of total thermal input, are plotted in Figure 7. Apparently, with the displacement of water by methanol, the reduction in heat loss due to water content in the fuel is more than enough to offset the increase in heat loss due to H_2O formation from methanol.

Table 4 shows flue gas analysis and particulate emissions obtained during the combustion tests. Particulate emissions during full-load tests using 500°F combustion air decreased with the increase of methanol content (see Figure 8). This was probably due to the increase in carbon burnout, which reduced the carbon content of the particulates.

Alberta hvCb Coal

Tests with CMW mixtures prepared from about 51 percent Alberta hvCb coal were conducted at full load using 500°F and ambient-temperature or minimally preheated combustion air. The methanol concentrations of the mixtures varied from 12.4 percent to 44.6 percent, and the heating values from 6,881 Btu/lb to 10,326 Btu/lb. Analyses of these mixtures are shown in Table 5.

Boiler operating conditions and performance are given in Table 6. The boiler efficiency increased from 77.1 percent to 81.2 percent with increasing methanol content, but the carbon conversion efficiencies were

	1	2	3	4	5
59.60	59.80	60.30	59.70	59.90	59.90
0.00	23.75	38.90	11.96	15.78	15.78
39.90	16.21	0.80	27.83	23.83	23.83
0.50	0.24	0.00	0.51	0.49	0.49
90	89	93	94	91	91
7.6	8.0	8.2	7.8	7.8	7.8
43.2	52.9	58.8	48.5	50.1	50.1
0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
1.5	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
39.7	30.6	24.5	35.0	33.4	33.4
7.2	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.7	6.7
7,729	10,171	11,695	9,031	9,427	9,427
NA	502	325	513	531	531

Test	
Fuel Composition (%)	
Coal (Moisture-Free)	
Methanol	
Water	
Lomar D	
Coal Size Consist	
(% minus 200 mesh)	
Ultimate Analysis (%)	
Hydrogen	
Carbon	
Nitrogen	
Sulfur	
Oxygen	
Ash	
Heating Value (Btu/lb)	
Viscosity (cp @ 100 sec ⁻¹)	

TABLE 3. Operating Conditions and Boiler Performance for Coal-Methanol-Water Mixture Tests With Pittsburgh hvab Coal

Test Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Methanol/Water Ratio	0/39.9	23.75/ 16.21	38.9/ 0.80	11.96/ 27.83	15.78/ 23.83	15.78/ 23.83	19.34/ 19.06	19.34/ 19.06	23.75/ 16.21	23.81/ 15.36	38.9/ 0.80
Load	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Half	Full	Half	Full	Half	Full
Flue Gas O ₂ (%)	2.5	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.4	3.4	3.1	3.7	2.9	3.1	2.3
Excess Air (%)	9	11	9	9	7	17	10	20	12	15	6
Steam Flow (lb/hr)	23,980	23,840	23,840	24,020	23,230	12,500	23,860	12,080	23,910	12,170	24,200
Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	3,697	2,750	2,210	3,336	3,384	1,598	3,385	1,380	3,159	1,416	2,594
Thermal Input (MBtu/hr)	31.06	30.23	27.63	31.15	32.26	16.05	33.65	14.39	32.25	15.28	30.52
Combustion Air Temperature (°F)	493	497	509	223*	119**	389*	102**	346*	72**	299*	91**
Total Air Flow (lb/hr)	24,810	22,310	20,510	24,610	25,750	13,290	27,160	12,090	25,890	12,340	23,820
Atomizing Air Flow (lb/hr)	1,129	1,373	1,338	1,330	1,241	1,045	1,317	809	1,364	948	1,342
Atomizing Air Pressure at Burner (psig)	95	129	126	133	121	130	128	130	130	130	128
Fuel Pressure at Nozzle (psig)	89.1	101.9	85.2	132.8	103.8	66	103.1	50.1	108.1	60.8	89.3
Center-Tube Air Flow (lb/hr)	4,677	5,165	4,704	5,904	6,080	3,838	5,939	2,885	6,078	4,434	5,798
Average Flue Gas Temperature (°F)	554	522	520	598	525	454	598	466	572	470	521
Carbon Conversion Efficiency (%)	95.5	97.3	97.9	94.2	93.5	97.4	91.8	97.2	94.8	97.3	93.4
Boiler Efficiency (%) (Heat Loss Method)	75.0	80.0	81.2	73.5	74.8	79.2	72.0	78.8	75.2	79.5	77.0
Heat Loss Due to H ₂ O in Fuel (%)	6.15	1.85	0.08	3.86	3.13	2.89	2.45	2.22	2.03	1.75	0.09
Heat Loss from Burning H (%)	4.13	6.26	7.12	5.78	6.07	5.60	6.53	5.91	6.89	6.32	7.67

* Minimum combustion air preheat based on stable combustion and carbon monoxide emissions \leq 400 ppm.

** Ambient-temperature air.

TABLE 4. Flue Gas Emissions in Coal-Methanol-Water Mixture Tests With Pittsburgh hvab Coal

Flue Gas Analysis	Test Number										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
O ₂ (%)	2.5	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.4	3.4	3.1	3.7	2.9	3.1	2.3
CO ₂ (%)	15.3	14.5	14.9	14.8	14.8	14.1	13.8	13.2	13.9	14.3	15.1
CO (ppm)	86	58	122	142	374	100	448	122	151	107	181
SO ₂ (ppm)	1,981	1,218	1,032	1,500	1,424	1,288	1,328	1,176	1,196	1,164	1,131
(lb/HBtu)	3.69	2.23	1.81	2.73	2.53	2.52	2.47	2.42	2.22	2.18	1.86
NO _x (ppm)	452	355	401	393	340	360	298	403	340	543	424
(lb/HBtu)	0.61	0.47	0.50	0.51	0.43	0.51	0.40	0.60	0.45	0.73	0.50
THC* (ppm)	9	<1	<1	1.3	1.7	1.1	2.4	2.1	1.1	1.3	0.7
Opacity (%)	N.A.	53.3	53.6	56	6	56	62	50	55	54	60
Particulate Emissions, Uncontrolled (lb/hr)	249	153	134	266	253	76	338	69	227	66	262
(lb/HBtu)	8.0	5.1	4.8	8.5	7.8	4.7	10.0	4.8	7.0	4.3	8.6
Analysis (%)											
Carbon	N.A.	24.96	19.47	34.86	43.01	26.68	41.85	27.36	37.29	29.90	37.85
Sulfur	N.A.	0.38	N.A.	0.52	0.51	N.A.	0.63	0.20	0.48	N.A.	0.45

*Total hydrocarbons.