

# **Low Carbon Economy**

**Volume III**

**Shania Gomes**

# **Low Carbon Economy**

## **Volume III**

**Edited by Shania Gomes**



New York

Published by Callisto Reference,  
106 Park Avenue, Suite 200,  
New York, NY 10016, USA  
www.callistoreference.com

**Low Carbon Economy: Volume III**  
Edited by Shania Gomes

© 2015 Callisto Reference

International Standard Book Number: 978-1-63239-455-2 (Hardback)

This book contains information obtained from authentic and highly regarded sources. Copyright for all individual chapters remain with the respective authors as indicated. A wide variety of references are listed. Permission and sources are indicated; for detailed attributions, please refer to the permissions page. Reasonable efforts have been made to publish reliable data and information, but the authors, editors and publisher cannot assume any responsibility for the validity of all materials or the consequences of their use.

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover boards used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

**Trademark Notice:** Registered trademark of products or corporate names are used only for explanation and identification without intent to infringe.

Printed in China.

**Low Carbon Economy**

**Volume III**

## Preface

As the term clearly suggests, Low Carbon Economy refers to an economy that has a minimal output of greenhouse gas emissions, specifically focussing on carbon dioxide emissions. Greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide, methane, water vapour etc., allow direct sunlight to reach the Earth's surface uninterrupted. This allows only limited heat to escape back to space, thereby trapping it in the lower atmosphere. Scientists are concerned about the negative impacts of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide due to climate changes.

The origin of the concept of Low Carbon Economy can be traced to the year 1972 in Stockholm, at the inaugural UN Conference on the Human Environment. In this direction, a prominent step was the signing of the Kyoto Protocol. The Kyoto Protocol came into force on February 16, 2005, under which most industrialized countries committed themselves to reduce their carbon emissions.

Keeping the present scenario in mind, a Low Carbon Economy is crucial to the society, in order to avoid catastrophic climatic changes. Moreover, it would also help keep in check the use of fossil fuels and has led to a growing emphasis on using renewable sources of energy. An economy majorly based on renewable energy and a carbon-free society would definitely slow down the present rate of climate change.

I would like to thank all the contributors for being a part of this book by sharing their valuable work. I would also like to thank my family for cooperating with me at every step.

**Editor**

# Contents

---

	<b>Preface</b>	<b>IX</b>
Chapter 1	<b>Technico-Economical Evaluation of CO<sub>2</sub> Transport in an Adsorbed Phase</b> Mildred Lemus Perez, Manuel Rodriguez Susa, Mario Pellerano, Arnaud Delebarre	<b>1</b>
Chapter 2	<b>The Economics of Power Generation Technology Choice and Investment Timing in the Presence of Policy Uncertainty</b> Robert Lundmark, Fredrik Pettersson	<b>14</b>
Chapter 3	<b>The Research on the Cooperation and Coordination Game in Constructing Low-Carbon Green Oil Port</b> Houming Fan, Guosong Dong, Xiaonan Zhang, Xiaohua Li, Xia Liang	<b>24</b>
Chapter 4	<b>Importance of CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions in Construction Phase: Two Case Studies: New Construction and Renovated Building</b> Gonzalo Fernández-Sánchez, Fernando Rodríguez-López	<b>29</b>
Chapter 5	<b>Economic Impacts of Climate Change on Secondary Activities: A Literature Review</b> Surender Kumar, Amsalu W. Yalew	<b>34</b>
Chapter 6	<b>International Technology Spillover, Energy Consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions in China</b> Rihui Lei, Yabin Zhang, Sichao Wei	<b>44</b>
Chapter 7	<b>A Study on Establishing Low-Carbon Auditing System in China</b> Wei Zhang, Zhongxin Wu	<b>49</b>
Chapter 8	<b>Feasibility Study of 1 MW Standalone Hybrid Energy System: For Technical Institutes</b> Pragya Nema, Sayan Dutta	<b>53</b>
Chapter 9	<b>Dieselization and Road Transport CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions: Evidence from Europe</b> António Cardoso Marques, José Alberto Fuinhas, Bruno Miguel Gonçalves	<b>59</b>

Chapter 10	<b>Analysis of Life-Cycle Energy Use and GHG Emissions of the Biomass-to-Ethanol Pathway of the Coskata Process under Chinese Conditions</b> Xiaoyi He, Xunmin Ou, Shiyan Chang, Xu Zhang, Qian Zhang, Xiliang Zhang	68
Chapter 11	<b>Post-Kyoto Global Emissions Trading: Perspectives for Linking National Emissions Trading Schemes with the EU ETS in a Bottom-Up Approach</b> Sebastian Goers, Barbara Pflüglmayer	73
Chapter 12	<b>Carbon Emission: Invalid Strategy and Ecological Rule</b> Li Zhou	84
Chapter 13	<b>An Econometric Analysis for CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions, Energy Consumption, Economic Growth, Foreign Trade and Urbanization of Japan</b> Sharif Hossain	87
Chapter 14	<b>Production of MgO-X Refractory Material with Cellular Matrix by Colloidal Processing</b> Wagner da Silveira, Guido Falk	101
Chapter 15	<b>The “District Heating Wall”: A Synergistic Approach to Achieve Affordable Carbon Emission Reductions in Old Terraced Houses</b> Claire Frost, Fan Wang, Paul Woods, Robert MacGregor	110
Chapter 16	<b>New Relationship in Carbon Cycle</b> Alekssei Naumov	125
Chapter 17	<b>Achievement of Climate Planning Objectives among US Member Cities of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI)</b> Margaret A. Reams, Kelsey W. Clinton, Nina S. N. Lam	129
Chapter 18	<b>Carbon Capture and Storage and the UNFCCC: Recommendations to Address Trans-Boundary Issues</b> Viviane Romeiro, Virginia Parente	136
Chapter 19	<b>Carbon Credits on Private Lands in British Columbia</b> Balbinder Deo, Han Donker, Michael Schulz	143
Chapter 20	<b>Inspiration from Green Effect of South Korea’s Low-Carbon Economy Development to China</b> Dong-Xin Li, Taewon Kang	153
Chapter 21	<b>The Comparative Study of Fatigue Crack Propagation Experiment and Computer Simulation on the Component Materials for the Crane Life Remained</b> Sangyeol Kim, Hyungsub Bae, Myeongkwan Park, Seongsoo Kim, Hanshik Chung, Heekyu Choi	159

- Chapter 22 **Brazilian Family Farming Agriculture in the Biodiesel Production:  
A Portrait of Regional Possibilities** 165  
Arlindo Kamimura, Aline de Oliveira, Geraldo F. Burani
- Chapter 23 **Analysis of Material Metabolism of Eco-Economic System in  
Chongqing Based on the Emergy Theory** 173  
Gao Xue-song, Luo Xiao-jiao, Deng Liang-ji, Zeng Min
- Chapter 24 **Broadband and Telecommuting: Helping the  
U.S. Environment and the Economy** 182  
Joseph P. Fuhr, Stephen Pociask
- Chapter 25 **Bio Diesel from Castor Oil - A Green Energy Option** 189  
Hemant Y. Shirame, N. L. Panwar, B. R. Bamniya

**Permissions**

**List of Contributors**



# Technico-Economical Evaluation of CO<sub>2</sub> Transport in an Adsorbed Phase

Mildred Lemus Perez<sup>1</sup>, Manuel Rodriguez Susa<sup>1</sup>, Mario Pellerano<sup>2</sup>, Arnaud Delebarre<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CIIA, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Universidad de Los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia; <sup>2</sup>S3D, Nantes, France;

<sup>3</sup>Ecole Supérieure des Sciences et Technologies de l'Ingénieur de Nancy, Université Henri Poincaré, Nancy, France.

## ABSTRACT

This work considers the possibility to transport CO<sub>2</sub> in an adsorbed phase and analyzes its cost as a function of transported quantities, transport conditions and transportation means. CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption capacities of 6 different adsorbents, comprising 4 activated carbons and 2 zeolites, were empirically evaluated in a given range of pressure and temperature. The adsorbent with the highest mass adsorption capacity (AC1), as well as another sorbent described in the literature (AC5) were selected to be used for CO<sub>2</sub> transportation by ships, trains or trucks. Their characteristics and performances were then used to develop an economic analysis of transportation costs and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions generated by the transport with or without storage. Economic evaluation of CO<sub>2</sub> batch transport shows that CO<sub>2</sub> transported in an adsorbed phase by train was seen to be almost competitive on distances between 250 and 500 km, in comparison to liquefied CO<sub>2</sub>. One of the activated carbon appeared to be competitive on short distances by truck when transport was not followed by storage. Ship transport of adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> on distances around 1500 km was competitive, when CO<sub>2</sub> was used as delivered; there was an over cost of only 16%, when there was storage after the transport. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions generated by CO<sub>2</sub> transport and storage when transport is carried out in an adsorbed phase were smaller than the ones generated by liquid phase transport below 1200 km, 500 km and 300 km by ship, train and truck respectively, as a function of the adsorbent used. Adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> transported on 1500 km by ship generated 27% less CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than liquid phase and 17% by train for a distance of 250 km and 16% by truck on 150 km, although these differences were decreasing with the distance of transport.

**Keywords:** CO<sub>2</sub>; Transport; Adsorption; Activated Carbon; Economical Analysis

## 1. Introduction

Control of greenhouse gases emission, especially carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), is the principal goal of World Climate Change Protocols. CO<sub>2</sub> capture and storage (CCS) looks like an option to achieve this objective, avoiding CO<sub>2</sub> emissions at the atmosphere by holding them in geological formations or by injection in ocean. CCS is principally composed of three steps: capture, transport and storage. Capture includes CO<sub>2</sub> separation and concentration to being transported and stored in a disposal place where the CO<sub>2</sub> release will be reduced. The CO<sub>2</sub> transport is normally processed in liquid or supercritical phase which generate additional costs and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The supercritical state is used with pipeline in continuous flux, and the liquid one for batch transportation (e.g. train, truck, ship). CO<sub>2</sub> transport via pipeline has been used for several years in the oil industry for the extraction system. Conditions of pressure and temperature handled in the

supercritical phase need temperatures below -60°C and pressures higher than 7.38 MPa [1]. In addition, due to problems caused by static pressure drops, and friction within pipes, CO<sub>2</sub> must be compressed at pressure between 10 and 80 MPa [1,2]. The batch CO<sub>2</sub> transport condition is generally liquid state because solidification requires twice of energy than liquefaction [3] doing it energetic and economic inefficient [4,5]. Besides CCS, CO<sub>2</sub> transport via truck or train is used for delivery in industry that uses CO<sub>2</sub> such as food industry which demands 100,000 tons/year [1]. CO<sub>2</sub> transport by ship, still in development, is similar to the liquefied gas petroleum (LPG) using high pressure, low temperature or both conditions [5].

CO<sub>2</sub> transportation costs are not known in detail because it has not been yet scaled up to large amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> or for CCS projects [5]. The cost assessment has been made according to different scenarios in which quantity, distance and media are relevant. Svensson *et al.*, [1] made a cost comparison between on shore pipeline,

\*Corresponding author.

on shore pipeline-water carrier, offshore pipeline and railway-water carrier for 1.0 Mt/y of CO<sub>2</sub> and 10 Mt/y of CO<sub>2</sub> transported. The on shore for 110 km and 10 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>/y scenario, showed the best price per ton of CO<sub>2</sub> transported: 0.95 €/ton. In the same way, for longer distances (600 km) offshore pipeline-water carrier was the cheapest option (5.61 €/ton) in comparison with railway-water carrier scenario (8.58 €/ton) and on shore off shore transportation (17.75 €/ton) (pressure and temperature conditioning are not included). Some other studies have been reported about CO<sub>2</sub> ship transportation [4-6]. They concluded that CO<sub>2</sub> shipping could be a promised route for CO<sub>2</sub> transportation on long distances with a cost comprised between 13 and 55 US\$/t.

The economy of scale plays an important role reducing transportation cost in 70% and 80% by pipeline and ship, if raising the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> transported per year by 10 times [1]; 64% if it is increased 7 times [6]; 30% by tanker if the amount is increased 3 times [4] or 33% by 2.5 increments [2-7].

Also, conditioning process (*i.e.* liquefaction) impacts the total transportation cost. Kaarstad and Hustad [8] estimated the cost of transport by ship of 5.5 Mt/y of CO<sub>2</sub> with or without liquefaction. Their results showed a difference of 57% when conditioning is included, 34 US\$/t-55 US\$/t. Decarre *et al.*, [6] also compared investment cost of two conditioning systems: -50°C, 0.7MPa and -35°C, 0.15MPa. The second scenario was the more economically efficient, minimizing the energy requirements for liquefaction from 37kWh/t CO<sub>2</sub> to 12 kWh/t CO<sub>2</sub>.

The different economic studies have shown that the cost effective CO<sub>2</sub> transportation are pipeline or ship [1,4], the last one being the cheapest one for distances longer than 1000 Km compared to offshore pipeline [5,9]. It was also demonstrated that the cost per ton of CO<sub>2</sub> decrease when the whole transported quantity increase [2,4-7].

The CO<sub>2</sub> transportation could represent 20% of total CCS cost [10] that ranged between 30 - 70 US\$/t in the case of a pulverized coal power plant (PC) and for a capture of 1.6 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>/y. The cost of capture is the largest component cost (23 - 35US\$/t) that includes the compression until required condition for transport by pipeline: 14MPa [5]. The total cost of CCS will change with the quantity of CO<sub>2</sub>, the distance of transport and the storage system. The capturing of 0.19 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>/y from a 24 MW biomass IGCC plant is estimated to be about 82 US\$/t CO<sub>2</sub> while for a 400MW of 2.1 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>/y could be 11 US\$/t CO<sub>2</sub> [5].

In the case of CCS, CO<sub>2</sub> storage is the ending process after transportation. It could be made in geological formations (*i.e.* oil-gas depleted reservoirs, saline water-saturated reservoir rocks, coal seams, basalts), or inside ocean by injection, searching CO<sub>2</sub> dilution, or keeping on

a hollow of sea floor. Storage cost ranges between 0.6 and 8.3 US\$/t CO<sub>2</sub> [5]. This value depends of zone location, depth, number of injection wells as conditioning for CO<sub>2</sub> disposition (*i.e.* pressure). Shafeen *et al.*, [11] estimated CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration cost from a power plant in Ontario, Canada, inside sandstone formation including pipeline transportation and storage 1000 km of depth by injection in 10 wells. Their calculations gave US\$ 7.5/t of CO<sub>2</sub>, 20% of total capture and sequestration cost. Overpressure is required to avoid changing phase problems inside pipelines. Injection in 1000 km well could require 13 - 18 MPa of pressure [5]. Ocean storage cost estimation at 3000 m depth is US\$ 5.3/t CO<sub>2</sub> including injection platform, pipe and nozzles.

The CO<sub>2</sub> capture technology could modify the transportation cost considering its selectivity (*i.e.* impurity) and operation conditions (*i.e.* pressure, temperature). In CO<sub>2</sub> post combustion capture, options are solvents absorption, membranes, solid sorbents and liquefaction. Solid sorbents like activated carbon and zeolites have a high sorption capacity in operating low pressures and recovery sorbent material option [12]. In the present work, as a new method of transportation which could link capture and transport, batch CO<sub>2</sub> transport in an adsorbed phase was studied and compared with liquefied one, in scenarios with or without geological or ocean disposal. The following scenarios studied thereafter, include geological or ocean storage which correspond to CCS application evaluation, as well as absence of storage step corresponding to the use of CO<sub>2</sub> for food industry, greenhouse agricultural applications... The proposed principle of transport in an adsorbed phase takes advantage of recent industrial developments of activated carbon media and filters, based on optimized disposition of fixed activated carbon fibres and cloths [13], or of compartments of fixed bed of immobilized granular activated carbon particles. It is thus possible to conceive and construct reservoirs with an adapted and structured adsorbent filling content that allow a homogenous conditioning and an easy filling, emptying and thus reuse as a batch transport system. In contrast, the adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> transport was not compared in detail to pipeline transport because the extrapolation of activated particles supporting adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> and being continuously transported in pipes was not straightforward. Nevertheless, the comparison of batch adsorbed and liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> transport with continuous transport in pipeline is given through some cost evaluation available in literature.

In the present study, adsorption capacity of activated carbon and zeolites were first evaluated at temperature of 0°C, 25°C, 75°C at pressure below 0.8 MPa to define CO<sub>2</sub> transportation sorbent. Another activated carbon described in literature was also selected. The economic analysis and environmental evaluation of the CO<sub>2</sub> transport by

ship, truck and train were carried out for adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> and liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> to compare them. The different parameters that influence the transport cost (*i.e.* distance, tanker size, operating conditions, means of transport) were studied for CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed or liquid scenarios. Finally, adsorbed-liquefied transport comparison was made. Operating conditions for adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> transport were fixed at 0°C and 1.5 MPa by extrapolation of experimental results. Geological storage was chosen for CO<sub>2</sub> transported by truck or train, and ocean storage by shipping. Moreover, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions resulting from transportation and storage were also evaluated as a function of the same parameters.

## 2. Experimental Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Experimental Assembly

The equipment used for adsorption tests consists in a bottle of CO<sub>2</sub> linked through a pipe to the system. A cylindrical cell stainless steel reactor (254 mL) was equipped with an internal thermocouple that allowed measuring the temperature within the bed of the adsorbents; the cell was immersed in a liquid bath (*i.e.* water, glycol) having a controlled temperature in order to fix the chosen adsorption temperature. Equipment is described in detail in [14].

A pressure monitoring system, which gives the pressure within the system and a mass flow-meter Brooks 5850S, allowed knowing the input mass of the gas. Experiments were carried out at 0°C, 25°C, 75°C and the pressure was increased step by step up (0.04, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 0.8 MPa) to 0.8 MPa. Prior to adsorption measurements, the moisture of the solid sorbent sample was eliminated in oven, in air atmosphere, for 12 h at 100°C and after it was inserted in the cell. Before loading the system with gas, the circuit was purged using a vacuum pump until reaching a pressure around 2 kPa. The loading process was started by opening main input valve and regulated with a manual fine valve in order to respect the max flow imposed by the flow meter. The gas flow rate and the gas

mass input were continuously recorded as a function of time. The data of temperature, pressure and CO<sub>2</sub> mass flow were acquired at the acquisition frequency of 1Hz. The assembly was previously tested to prevent leakage and tests were repeated several times with an empty cell assessing the reproducibility and accuracy of the experiments.

### 2.2. Characterisation of Adsorbents

Four activated carbons (AC) and two zeolites were tested in this study. The samples were named AC1, AC2, AC3 and AC4 for activated carbons characterized in the present study and AC5 for another one from literature that will be considered later, and Z1 and Z2 for zeolites. Sample AC4 was used with two different conditioning: one as a woven material, which was a delivered form of an activated carbon tissue (a); the second made of bulk fibres of the tissue not woven (b) (**Table 1**).

Surface areas and information about micropores were determined using a Micrometrics model ASAP 2010 micropore-volume reactor. Before the nitrogen analysis, samples were conditioned at 350°C for 24 h. Nitrogen adsorption measurements were conducted at liquid nitrogen temperature (77°K). Different methods were used for porosity characterization: t-plot (size pore distribution), Horvath-Kawazoe (micropore volume), BJH (mesoporosity) and BET (surface area). The porosity type classification was based on International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC).

### 2.3. Expressions of Adsorption Capacities

Effective adsorbed quantity of CO<sub>2</sub> (Q<sub>eff</sub>) on the adsorbents materials is deduced from two measured quantities: Q<sub>tot</sub> that is the CO<sub>2</sub> mass contained in the total circuit, composed of the pipes and the cell containing the adsorbents, and Q<sub>dead</sub> the CO<sub>2</sub> mass contained only in the pipes. Q<sub>eff</sub> was then calculated making the difference Q<sub>tot</sub>-Q<sub>dead</sub>.

**Table 1. Physical properties of adsorbent.**

Materials	Company-sample	BET Surface m <sup>2</sup> /g	Microporosity (cm <sup>3</sup> /g)		Mesoporosity cm <sup>3</sup> /g	Bulk Density g/ml	Sorbents
			0.35 - 0.5 nm	0.5 - 1.6 nm			
AC1	PICA-SC	2187	0	0.82	0.82	0.28	
AC2	CECA-BGX	1468	0.07	0.56	0.67	0.18	GAC
AC3	PICA - NC60	1087	0.3	0.44	0.03	0.58	
AC4	ACTITEX-WWP3	989	0.3	0.41	0.04	0.27	F
AC5	NORIT-RB2	1063	(<2 nm) 0.40		-	0.79	GAC
Z1	AXENS-13X	550	0.22	0.24	0.02	0.75	
Z2	AXENS-5A	499	0.20	0.21	0.02	0.73	Zeolites

GAC: Granular Activated Carbon; F: Activated Carbon Fibre Tissue.

Once  $Q_{eff}$  was determined, adsorption isotherms were represented by the amount of  $CO_2$  on the adsorbent as a function of pressure. Quantity of  $CO_2$  adsorbed can be expressed in terms of sorbent mass or volume. Thus, isotherms were represented as adsorbed moles of  $CO_2$  per kilogram of sorbent ( $Q_m$ ) or as adsorbed moles of  $CO_2$  per litre of sorbent ( $Q_v$ ).  $Q_m$  and  $Q_v$  are related one to each other through material bulk density. These two adsorption efficiency criteria are useful depending on the constraints imposed to the adsorption application. In case of transportation and its cost evaluation, the weight was considered to be the limiting factor and thus, comparison of adsorption performances between adsorbents was done by the means of  $Q_m$ . In contrast,  $Q_v$  would be useful if the constraint comes from the size (volume) of a separation reactor.  $Q_m$  and  $Q_v$  are appreciated within an accuracy range of  $\pm 5\%$  regarding repetition of tests presented in [14].

### 3. Technico-Economical Evaluation Methodology

#### 3.1. Cost Evaluation Methodology Generalities

Considered specifications to cost evaluation were the following: total costs were expressed in US\$/ton of  $CO_2$  (annual total cost basis). The assessment of the  $CO_2$  transportation cost includes different stages: conditioning (liquefaction-adsorption), storage, transport and load and unloading [15]. Storage cost evaluation includes: requirements of booster compressors, injection wells and off shore platforms [11]. To calculate annual investment costs, the life utility (15 years), the effective annual interest rate (7%) and the maintenance rate (45%) were considered constant for each step of the total transport and storage costs [15]. To analyse transportation costs by ship, train and truck, the proposed methodologies by Ozaki *et al.* [15], Öztürk [16], and Edwards [17] were considered respectively. The storage cost methodology used is reported by Shafeen *et al.* [11] and Aka *et al.* [18].

The boundary conditions of cost and environmental impact calculations for transport in liquid phase and in an adsorbed phase were:

—Initial conditions  $15^\circ C$  and 0.11 MPa with a gas purity of 100% of  $CO_2$  (after Aspelund *et al.* [19]),

—Final conditions for transport in case of applications using  $CO_2$ , other than storage, are “as delivered”:  $-50^\circ C$  and 0.7 MPa in case of liquid and  $0^\circ C$  and 0.02 MPa for adsorbed phase transport (*i.e.* desorption conditions),

—Final conditions for transport + storage, *i.e.* sequestration, were for both liquid and adsorbed  $CO_2$ :  $0^\circ C$ , 33 MPa (geological), 34 MPa (ocean).

Both liquid and adsorbed transport processes may be economically advantaged or disadvantaged in their comparison by the choice of some of the initial or final con-

ditions, knowing these conditions might be relevant of the  $CO_2$  capture or of the  $CO_2$  storage processes, particularly when optimizing the global capture—transport—storage costs and environmental impacts. Energy necessary to the adsorption process to cool and to compress  $CO_2$  from initial conditions to the transport operational conditions were calculated on the basis of three sets of transport settings:  $0^\circ C$  - 0.8 MPa,  $0^\circ C$  - 1 MPa,  $0^\circ C$  - 1.5 MPa.

#### 3.2. Transport Scenario

$CO_2$  is commonly transported by pipelines or in containers (tank or cistern). Only the last ones were considered in this scenario. Different states of  $CO_2$  can be transported in tanks according to the operating conditions: solid state, at atmospheric pressure and  $-80^\circ C$ , compressed liquid  $CO_2$ , at 8 MPa and room temperature, but the most used condition to transport  $CO_2$  is liquefied, at  $-50^\circ C$  and 0.7 MPa or  $-25^\circ C$  and 1.5 MPa [2]. The set of conditions of  $-50^\circ C$  and 0.7 to 1.5 MPa were used in this work for the evaluation of the transport costs and their comparison with the adsorbed phase transport.

**Table 2** shows the transport scenario with different amount of produced gas, as a function of power plants capacity, tanker size and the distances which were considered for this study. Coal based thermal power stations (PC) of 1000 and 300 MW with an amount of produced  $CO_2$  of 20,000 and 5500 t  $CO_2$ /day and ship transport were considered. For plants of 100 MW, an amount of produced  $CO_2$  of 2000 t  $CO_2$ /day and transport by train was assessed. And for plants of 30 MW with a generation of 500 ton of  $CO_2$  per day, truck transport was selected.

The different sizes for the ship evaluated in this study were: 50,000 deadweight tonnage (DTW), 80,000 DTW and 170,000 DTW [15] (respectively 46,000 m<sup>3</sup>, 101,000 m<sup>3</sup> and 157,600 m<sup>3</sup>) used for transportation distances of 1500 km, 3000 km, 6000 km and 12,000 km. The transportation distances assessed by train were: 250 km, 300 km and 500 km and by truck: 150 km, 250 km and 300 km. **Table 3** shows detailed specifications about ship transport.

**Table 2. Transport scenario.**

Transport Way	Power Plant Size (MW)	Amount Produced (Ton $CO_2$ /day)	Container Size (ton)	Distances (km)
Ship	1000 - 300	20,000 - 5500	170,000, 80,000, 50,000	1500, 3000, 6000, 12,000
Train	100	2000		250, 300, 500
Truck	30	500		150, 250, 300

**Table 3. Ship reservoir dimension and quantity.**

Ship Container Size (DTW)	Tank Number	Dimension Tank (m)	Dimension Ship (m)
50,000	5	Φ 26	190 × 38.8
80,000	11	Φ 26	320 × 32.2
170,000	1	38.8 × 17 × 270	289 × 45

### 3.3. Storage Scenario

Transported CO<sub>2</sub> could be held in geological or ocean reservoirs for long periods. To calculate cost, storage scenarios were linked with means of transport: by ship in ocean reservoir, by train and truck in geological formations. Both liquefied and adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> must be compressed to reach a higher pressure than injection point (9% - 18% above) [11]. Either supposed geological or ocean injection depth was 3000m. The number of injection wells was calculated according to flow rate of CO<sub>2</sub> of each scenario based on Shafeen *et al.*, methodology [11]. Off shore platforms for ocean storage were included supposing a depth of 25 m. Standards for maximum injection pressures ranged from 13 to 18 kPa/m for oil and gas wells [5]. A pressure of 11 kPa/m was chosen, so 33 MPa is required to geological injection. Ocean storage requires a pressure at the bottom of 34 MPa. The cost calculation included thus: platform (offshore), injection wells, booster, energy cost, operation and maintenance. The CO<sub>2</sub> retention both in geological and ocean storage has been modelled for injection wells of 3000 m, and around 100% should be holding in a period of 100 years [5]. For these reasons, the leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> accounted for 0% of total transported.


### 3.4. Emissions

The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for the different transport ways were assessed in order to measure their impact to the environment. The CO<sub>2</sub> quantity emitted during the transport and storage was evaluated with the help of literature data as the sum of three principal steps. The first one is the CO<sub>2</sub> emitted during the conditioning step; the second one is the CO<sub>2</sub> emitted during the transportation step; and the third one is CO<sub>2</sub> emitted during booster compression for injection in geological or ocean storage. The emissions were calculated considering electric energy and fuel used respectively during the two transport steps and diesel engine in platform for CO<sub>2</sub> injection. For CO<sub>2</sub> conditioning 0.833 kg·CO<sub>2</sub>/kW [15] is the environmental impact related to the electric energy consumed during this step. For the transport step emissions are depending on the way of transport: by ship transport 3.19 ton CO<sub>2</sub>/t fuel [15] and [20] was considered; by truck transport 2.772 kg·CO<sub>2</sub>/L diesel fuel [20] and by train transport 10.78 kg·CO<sub>2</sub>/km [21], based on emission data from electric energy consumption per km. In storing process, 2.772 kg·CO<sub>2</sub>/L diesel fuel and 0% leaking of transported CO<sub>2</sub> was assumed [5].

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Adsorption Results and Selection of the Best Adsorbents

One topic to selecting sorbents to be used in pressure swing process is the adsorption capacity of the material for the considered gas. The adsorption isotherms of pure CO<sub>2</sub> on the samples mentioned above are shown in **Figures 1(a)** and **(b)**, which show that the best sorbent in



**Figure 1. Adsorption isotherms moles CO<sub>2</sub>: (a) based on adsorbent volume Qv at 25°C and (b) based on adsorbent mass Qm.**

terms of capacity depends on the parameter of selection (*i.e.* ( $Q_m$ ), mass capacity or ( $Q_v$ ) volumetric capacity), confirming that the bulk density of the material could make a difference. **Figure 1** shows that for the zeolites Z1 and Z2 the volumetric and mass adsorption capacities increased almost at a plateau value when the pressure was risen up to 0.1 MPa. After 0.1 MPa till up to 0.8 MPa, the adsorption capacity remained almost constant. For activated carbon the adsorption increased moderately up to 0.8 MPa and may grow up again after that, as confirmed by results from [12], who indicated that some AC adsorption capacity increases up to 3 MPa and becomes steady after 3 - 3.5 MPa. It can be noted that at low pressure the best sorbent resulted from zeolites (Z1 and Z2) despite their reduced surface area. Thus for zeolites it can be supposed that the surface area not the sole determining factor. The homogeneous structure and chemical affinity of CO<sub>2</sub> in zeolites can be important factors for enhancing adsorption capacity. At higher pressure, activated carbons AC1 and AC3 proved comparably or more efficient than zeolites regarding respectively mass and volumetric adsorption capacity. For AC, **Table 1** together with **Figure 1** shows that the bigger the surface, higher the adsorption capacity. In fact at 0.8 MPa the adsorbent are ranked between themselves by their BET surface value. The BET surface area of the sample AC1 was measured as being the highest of the considered samples. Zeolites Z1 and Z2 are characterized by having a high microporosity despite having a low surface area. When the adsorption isotherms are denoted in moles of gas per unit of volume of adsorbent ( $Q_v$ ) (**Figure 1(a)**), the best adsorbents are zeolites (*i.e.* sample Z1). The adsorption capacity of activated carbon AC3 is almost the same than the one of zeolite Z1 at 0.8 MPa and even seems to increase after this pressure. This affirmation is reported and confirmed in results by Siriwardane *et al.* [22], for activated carbons in general. Although those zeolites have a small BET surface, they demonstrated to be better sorbents than AC at low pressure. Chue *et al.* [23] affirmed that zeolites are the best sorbent for pressure swing adsorption (PSA) process when adsorption pressure is close to the atmospheric pressure. For adsorbent selection, operating conditions are thus an important element to consider.

Accounting for these results, it was decided to choose AC1 as the selected material for transportation cost evaluation of adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> because of its high sorption capacity per mass of active carbon. Another sorbent from literature, named as AC5, was taken into account thanks to its large  $Q_v$  [24].

#### 4.2. Ship Transportation and Sequestration Costs

Costs have been evaluated for different means of transport. **Figure 2** shows the price per ton of delivered CO<sub>2</sub>

linked to distance, material (*i.e.* A1 - A5), and ship size, for an operational condition of 0°C and 1 MPa. It should be noted that the price increases rapidly with the distance, at rates depending on sorbent material and system capacity.

As it is displayed in **Figure 2(a)** lot of parameters influence the cost such: the transported amount, the ship size and the distance. The cost variation between the two sorbent materials used in different ship size for transportation of 5500 t/d of CO<sub>2</sub> along 1500 km is weak. At higher distance, as costs increases, the ship size and sorbent used influence the cost more sensitively. In general, the transportation cost for higher delivered amounts (*e.g.* 20,000 t CO<sub>2</sub>/d), in the 80,000 DTW ship with AC5, appeared to be more profitable. A reduction of 16% is shifted rising 3.6 times the quantity transported (*i.e.* from 5500 to 20,000 t CO<sub>2</sub>/d) if AC5 and 80,000 DTW ship are selected (12,000 km, 0°C, 1 MPa) (**Figures 2(a) & (b)**). The amount of transported CO<sub>2</sub> in adsorbed via influences the cost but in different range than liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> by ship. The saving cost is 30% by ship transport of liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> increased by 3 times [4] or 33% in 2.5 increments [2,7]. If the operating pressure is changed to 1.5 MPa the cost is reduced as it is shown in **Figure 3**.

The ship size has a significant importance for large distances for both adsorbent, in accordance with observations from [8] and [15] for liquefied CO<sub>2</sub>. Nevertheless, as Ozaki *et al.* affirmed, when the greatest size ship is used an opposite effect is exerted and the cost increases [15].

The quantity of transported CO<sub>2</sub> is associated directly with the sorbent material and its capacity of adsorption, which grows when the pressure rises. The sorbent cost and its capacity play a major role on the total transport expenses linked with the number of required ships and the fuel intake which influence investment, operational and maintenance costs, representing between 78% - 93% of total transportation expenses. The cost of the sorbent material ranked from 1.30 to 13.81 US\$/t CO<sub>2</sub> (**Figure 3**). Otherwise storage cost in geological or ocean reservoir could represent between 12% to 33% of total sequestration (transport + storage) cost, being 10.97 US\$/t by adsorbed phase and 6.12 US\$/t by liquefied CO<sub>2</sub>. The distance raises both numbers of required ships and of fuel intake, increasing the CO<sub>2</sub> transportation cost linearly, as the **Figure 4** shows. The rate of increase is higher in adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> by AC1 than by AC5 and by adsorbed phase than by liquefied CO<sub>2</sub>. Moreover, the liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> transport is generally the most attractive condition on economic viewpoint, attributed to its bigger capacity per trip (*i.e.* investment, operational and maintenance) shown in the transport cost participation of 51% - 78% of total expenses. Nevertheless, the adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> transport shows competitive costs in a distance of 1500 km, with sequestration cost of 32 US\$/t for an annual quantity of 7.3 Mt of CO<sub>2</sub> (**Figure 3**).




Figure 2. Total transport cost at operating conditions (0°C, 1 MPa) in adsorbed phase for the considered adsorbent AC1 and AC2 and reservoir and ships from Tables 2 and 3: (a) amount of CO<sub>2</sub> produced of 20,000 ton CO<sub>2</sub>/d and (b) 5500 ton CO<sub>2</sub>/d.




Figure 3. Cost comparison between adsorbed and liquid routes in ship transport for 20,000 ton/d. L-U: Load-download; AC: Activated carbon; IT: Investments of transport; O and MT: Operation and maintenance of transport; PC: Port cost; ET: Energy cost in transport.




Figure 4. Relationship between distance and cost in ship transport.

The CO<sub>2</sub> transport in the adsorbed phase brings a smaller cost contribution during the conditioning process, 0°C for adsorbed phase instead of -50°C for liquid phase (Figure 3), but the storage cost increases more for adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> than for liquefied transport, due to higher energy requirements, giving a more expensive global cost. Although there is a saving cost in transport fees for conditioning energy requirements by adsorbed phase, it decreases with the distance for the other input costs (*i.e.* fuel, investment, maintenance, operative cost) that increase the total transportation price. For liquid CO<sub>2</sub> transport several authors [2,7,15] attribute to the liquefaction step, the biggest part of the total cost, although its influence in total cost decreases as the distance becomes longer.

The difference cost between the two considered adsorbents is obviously due to the different adsorption capacities of the two sorbents.

#### 4.3. Train Transportation-Sequestration Costship Transportation and Sequestration Costs

In the case of train transport, the considered operating conditions were of 1.5 MPa at 0°C. Figure 5 shows that, for train, the adsorbed phase is often more economical than liquid one in transportation, especially for a distance of 300 km and adsorbent AC5, with a cost of 14.4 US\$/t and a difference of 21%. The total cost of the absorbent material ranked from 0.12 to 0.37 US\$/t of transported CO<sub>2</sub> (Figure 5).

Components of total transportation cost show that the conditioning price for liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> represents 62% of the total (11.3 US\$/t CO<sub>2</sub>), whilst for adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> transportation by AC5 is only 32% (5.4 US\$/t CO<sub>2</sub>). This fact explains why the adsorbed phase transportation is

cheaper than the liquid one (Figure 5).

The total transport cost by AC1 material is higher than AC5 because of the lower AC1 volume adsorption capacity (Q<sub>v</sub>). As a result, by AC5, it is possible to store a larger quantity of CO<sub>2</sub> in smaller number of containers and lower maintenance and investment costs are required. The lower cost is also resulting from the reduced energy consumption due to the lower numbers of transport travels.

If the storage step is considered, the total sequestration cost is less for liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> than for adsorbed, as the storing cost by adsorbed phase is 10.95 US\$/t and by liquefied is 5.81 US\$/t. The total sequestration cost by train ranked between 28 and 34 US\$/t by AC1, 25 - 28 US\$/t by AC5 and 23 - 26 US\$/t by liquefied CO<sub>2</sub>. Adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> transport appears thus to be a more competitive route than liquid route, if transported CO<sub>2</sub> is to be used for applications which demand conditioning conditions near the desorption conditions.

#### 4.4. Truck Transportation-Sequestration Costs

The truck system is the worst economical option. Nevertheless, at very short distances and for reduced amounts, it might be a possible alternative compared to pipeline transport because of its lower infrastructure investment cost [25].

For transport by truck, the liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> is the most viable condition (Figure 6). For adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> transportation the cost using AC1 material is lower than AC5 material due to the larger fuel consumption, because with AC5, it might be possible to save money regarding the number of necessary trucks, but the fuel cost becomes larger. The fuel cost contribution in the total transport fee of the truck system is the biggest of the three via, with a 25% - 33% for A1, 38% - 48% for A5 and 17% - 24%






Figure 5. Cost comparison between adsorbed and liquid routes in train transport.




Figure 6. Cost comparison between adsorbed and liquid routes for truck transport.

for the liquid phase (Figure 6) while for ship and train, it is below to 7% (Figures 3-5). The cost of the absorbent material (AC1 - AC5) represents only 0.7% of the total transport fee, between 0.12 and 0.37 US\$/t CO<sub>2</sub> transported compared to the transportation cost of 32 - 44 US\$/t by AC1, 34 - 48 US\$/t by AC5.

The storage of CO<sub>2</sub> transported in adsorbed phase increases the total sequestration cost in 16 US\$/t CO<sub>2</sub> whilst for liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> it rises in 11 US\$/t CO<sub>2</sub> (Figure 6).

#### 4.5. CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions by CO<sub>2</sub> Transport and Storage

As it is shown in Figures 7, 8 and 9, CO<sub>2</sub> transport by adsorbed phase exhibits lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions compared to those caused by liquid transport in distances below of 6000 km by ship, 300 km by train and 150 km by truck, although these differences are not above 3% of total CO<sub>2</sub> transported. Transport by ship in adsorbed phase with active carbon AC1 is the most effective environmentally with low CO<sub>2</sub> emissions compared with liquefied CO<sub>2</sub> or

adsorbed in AC5. This advantage becomes less significant as the distance becomes larger for the bigger fuel use and the storage energy requirements as these last represent between 23% - 49% of emissions whilst by liquefied is only 2%. The fuel ship emissions for adsorbed transport is more significant than for liquid one with a contribution of 9% - 50% in comparison with 3% - 20% (Figure 7).

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of train transportation by adsorbed phase are lower than liquid one when AC5 is used as sorbent. In this case, as mentioned above for train costs, the limiting factor is the volume and as lower energy intake is required, lower CO<sub>2</sub> quantities are emitted. Similar to ship via, the fuel contribution is bigger in the adsorbed phase, ranging between 24% - 49%, while for liquid phase conditioning emission are the most important with 79% - 89% of total CO<sub>2</sub> (Figure 8). The storage emission is still being most important in adsorbed CO<sub>2</sub> than liquefied: it represents 34% - 41% of the total and only 1% for liquid one.