

Reihe 3

Verfahrenstechnik

Dipl.-Ing. Elizabeth Heischkamp,  
Mülheim a. d. Ruhr

Nr. 953

## Scrubbing System Design for CO<sub>2</sub> Capture in Coal-Fired Power Plants

**LUAT**

Lehrstuhl für Umweltverfahrens-  
technik und Anlagentechnik



## **Scrubbing System Design for CO<sub>2</sub> Capture in Coal-Fired Power Plants**

Von der Fakultät für Ingenieurwissenschaften, Abteilung Maschinenbau und Verfahrenstechnik

der

Universität Duisburg-Essen

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

einer

Doktorin der Ingenieurwissenschaften

Dr.-Ing.

genehmigte Dissertation

von

Elizabeth Heischkamp

aus

Tampico, Mexiko

Gutachter:

Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Klaus Görner

Univ.-Prof. Dr. techn. Günter Scheffknecht

Tag der mündlichen Prüfung:

20.02.2017



# Fortschritt-Berichte VDI

Reihe 3

Verfahrenstechnik

Dipl.-Ing. Elizabeth Heischkamp,  
Mülheim a. d. Ruhr

Nr. 953

Scrubbing System Design  
for CO<sub>2</sub> Capture in  
Coal-Fired Power Plants

**LUAT**

Lehrstuhl für Umweltverfahrens-  
technik und Anlagentechnik

Heischkamp, Elizabeth

## **Scrubbing System Design for CO<sub>2</sub> Capture in Coal-Fired Power Plants**

Fortschr.-Ber. VDI Reihe 3 Nr. 953. Düsseldorf: VDI Verlag 2017.

194 Seiten, 72 Bilder, 23 Tabellen.

ISBN 978-3-18-395303-5, ISSN 0178-9503,

€ 71,00/VDI-Mitgliederpreis € 63,90.

**Keywords:** CO<sub>2</sub> capture – chemical absorption – post-combustion – CCS – simulation – absorber intercooling

Within the last decades a continuous tightening of environmental regulations has been observed in several countries around the world. These include restriction of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, since they are considered responsible for intensifying global warming. Coal-fired power plants represent a good possibility for capturing CO<sub>2</sub> before it is emitted in the atmosphere, thereby contributing to combat global warming. This work focuses on reducing the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of such a power plant by 90 %. For this purpose a hard coal power plant is retrofitted with a chemical absorption using different solutions of piperazine promoted potassium carbonate. The resulting power plant's efficiency losses have been accounted for. A comparison of different scenarios such as the variation of operating parameters offer an insight in detecting suitable operating conditions that will allow to minimize efficiency penalties. Simulation details are provided along with a technical and an economic analysis.

### **Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek**

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet unter <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

### **Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Bibliothek**

(German National Library)

The Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie (German National Bibliography); detailed bibliographic data is available via Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

Von der Fakultät für Ingenieurwissenschaften,  
Abteilung Maschinenbau und Verfahrenstechnik  
der Universität Duisburg-Essen  
genehmigte Dissertation

Gutachter:

Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Klaus Görner  
Prof. Dr. techn. Günter Scheffknecht

Datum der mündlichen Prüfung:

20.02.2017

© VDI Verlag GmbH · Düsseldorf 2017

Alle Rechte, auch das des auszugsweisen Nachdruckes, der auszugsweisen oder vollständigen Wiedergabe (Fotokopie, Mikrokopie), der Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen, im Internet und das der Übersetzung, vorbehalten.

Als Manuskript gedruckt. Printed in Germany.

ISSN 0178-9503

ISBN 978-3-18-395303-5

## Acknowledgements

This work was developed while I was a member of the research staff at the Chair for Environmental Process Engineering and Plant Design (LUAT from the name in German) in the Faculty of Engineering, Department of Mechanical and Process Engineering at the University of Duisburg-Essen.

At this point, I would like to express my gratitude to many people who have supported me directly or indirectly in the completion of this dissertation. Special thanks go to my doctoral supervisor Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. K. Görner, who encouraged me to do research in the field of advanced power plants and carbon capture technologies and who always supported me in pursuing my goals and interests. His unwavering support, patience, as well as the trust he granted me, have been a crucial contribution for this work's completion. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. techn. G. Scheffknecht for taking over the task of second referee and for his interest in my work. Prof. Dr. rer. nat. B. Atakan and Prof. Dr.-Ing. D. Bathen, thank you for your participation in the examination committee.

I would also like to thank current and former LUAT employees and students, who helped me in the creation of this work. I especially would like to thank my adviser Dr.-Ing. G. Oeljeklaus, to whom I am most grateful. His continuous contributions have had a great impact in my development as a researcher and as a person. Doing research with him was a real pleasure. Dr. rer. nat. P. Behr, thank you for having read my drafts so many times and for being able to explain chemical phenomena so easily. For all those real "Big Bang Theory" moments I would like to thank Dr.-Ing. H. Yilmaz, Dr.-Ing. Ö. Korkmaz, Dr.-Ing. T. Klasen, M. Sc. S. Perumalsamy, M. Sc. A. Al-Zuhairi, Dr.-Ing. S. Multhaupt, Dr.-Ing. T. Vogel, M. Sc. L. Woetki and Dipl.-Ing. M. Varlik.

I am deeply grateful to my Mexican family: my parents, Roberto and Esther, and my sister, Ingrid, for their ongoing support of any kind and their immeasurable source of motivation. This also applies to my German family, including my husband Peter and my kids Natascha and Ben. Thank you so much for supporting me, even if it often meant that you had to be left out for a while. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my sister Lilia. Words can hardly describe how thankful I am to her. Indeed, she went beyond the duties of a big sister by reading all of my drafts and discussing them with me countless times to assist me in the editing of

this work in what must have felt like forever. Thank you Lilia, I will be eternally grateful.

Mülheim an der Ruhr, 2017

Elizabeth Heischkamp

# Index

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>Acronyms and abbreviations</b> .....	<b>VII</b>
<b>Nomenclature</b> .....	<b>IX</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Research motivation.....	1
1.2 Analysis procedure.....	2
1.3 Electricity generation with coal.....	4
1.3.1 Coal-fired power plants – State of the art technology .....	4
1.3.1.1 Reference Power Plant.....	5
1.3.2 CO <sub>2</sub> reduction alternatives in coal-fired power plants .....	8
1.3.2.1 Pre-Combustion Capture .....	10
1.3.2.2 Oxy-Fuel Combustion .....	10
1.3.2.3 Post-Combustion Capture.....	11
1.3.3 CO <sub>2</sub> capture technologies .....	12
1.3.3.1 Adsorption.....	12
1.3.3.2 Cryogenics .....	13
1.3.3.3 Membranes .....	13
1.3.3.4 Microbial/Algal Systems.....	14
1.3.3.5 Carbonate Looping.....	14
1.3.3.6 Absorption.....	15
1.3.4 Alternative options for CO <sub>2</sub> emission reduction.....	15
<b>2 Downstream scrubbing of flue gases</b> .....	<b>18</b>
2.1 Solvents in chemical absorption.....	19
2.1.1 Organic solvents.....	20
2.1.1.1 Alkanolamines.....	20
2.1.1.2 Amino-acid salts.....	23
2.1.1.3 Cyclic amines.....	24
2.1.2 Inorganic solvents .....	26
2.1.2.1 Ammonia.....	26
2.1.2.2 Sodium carbonate.....	27
2.1.2.3 Potassium carbonate .....	28
2.1.3 Blends .....	29
<b>3 Modelling of CO<sub>2</sub> capture systems</b> .....	<b>31</b>
3.1 Definitions and data on chemical media.....	31
3.1.1 CO <sub>2</sub> loading.....	31
3.1.2 Monoethanolamine.....	33

3.1.3	Piperazine promoted potassium carbonate.....	35
3.2	System boundary and implementation.....	39
3.2.1	Boundary conditions.....	40
3.2.1.1	Flue gas conditioning.....	43
3.2.1.2	Baseline case MEA.....	46
3.2.1.3	Study cases with piperazine promoted potassium carbonate.....	47
3.2.2	General methodology and specifications in Aspen Plus.....	48
3.2.2.1	Flue gas conditioning system.....	49
3.2.2.2	Absorber.....	52
3.2.2.3	Heat exchanger and stripper system.....	63
<b>4</b>	<b>Technical analysis.....</b>	<b>70</b>
4.1	Important packed columns facts and considerations.....	70
4.2	Flue gas preconditioning.....	75
4.3	Scrubbing process.....	86
4.3.1	Solvent flow rate.....	86
4.3.2	Absorber.....	87
4.3.3	Reboiler duty.....	90
4.3.4	Lean-rich heat exchanger.....	95
4.3.5	Cooling duty.....	98
4.3.6	Absorber intercooling.....	105
4.4	Column geometry.....	122
4.5	Integration into the power plant.....	126
4.5.1	Thermal requirement.....	127
4.5.1.1	Steam tapping.....	127
4.5.1.2	Cooling demand.....	135
4.5.2	Auxiliary power.....	136
<b>5</b>	<b>Analysis of economic feasibility.....</b>	<b>143</b>
5.1	Basis of calculations and boundary conditions.....	143
5.2	Discussion of results.....	146
<b>6</b>	<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Appendixes.....</b>	<b>168</b>
A.1	Detailed compilation of flue gas conditioning simulation results.....	168
	<b>List of references.....</b>	<b>171</b>

## Acronyms and abbreviations

<b>AHPC</b>	Activated Hot Potassium Carbonate
<b>aMDEA</b>	Activated Methyl Diethanolamine
<b>AMP</b>	2-Amino-2-Methyl-1-Propanol
<b>ASU</b>	Air Separation Unit
<b>CaL</b>	Calcium Looping
<b>CAP</b>	Chilled Ammonia Process
<b>CAPEX</b>	Capital EXpenditure
<b>CLC</b>	Chemical Looping Combustion
<b>DCC</b>	Direct Contact Cooler
<b>DEA</b>	Diethanolamine
<b>DIPA</b>	Diisopropanolamine
<b>EPC</b>	Engineering, Procurement, and Construction costs
<b>ESA</b>	Electric Swing Adsorption
<b>EUA</b>	European Emission Allowance
<b>FG</b>	Flue Gas
<b>FGD</b>	Flue Gas Desulphurisation
<b>GDPC</b>	Generalized Pressure Drop Correlation
<b>GTCC</b>	Gas Turbine Combined Cycle
<b>GWP</b>	Global Warming Potential
<b>HETP</b>	Height Equivalent to a Theoretical Plate
<b>HP</b>	High Pressure
<b>HPC</b>	Hot Potassium Carbonate
<b>IEA</b>	International Energy Agency
<b>IEA GHG</b>	IEA Greenhouse Gas R&D Programme
<b>IGCC</b>	Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle
<b>IMTP</b>	Intalox Metal Tower Packing
<b>IP</b>	Intermediate Pressure
<b>IPCC</b>	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
<b>IPFO</b>	Interface-Pseudo-First-Order
<b>L/G ratio</b>	Liquid to Gas ratio
<b>LCOE</b>	Levelised Cost of Electricity
<b>LHV</b>	Lower Heating Value
<b>LNG</b>	Liquefied Natural Gas
<b>LP</b>	Low Pressure
<b>MAPA</b>	Methyl Amino Propylamine

<b>MDEA</b>	Methyl diethanolamine (also known as N-methyl diethanolamine)
<b>MEA</b>	Monoethanolamine
<b>NRTL</b>	Non-Random Two-Liquid
<b>OPEX</b>	OPerational EXpenditure
<b>PIP</b>	Piperidine
<b>PSA</b>	Pressure Swing Adsorption or Adsorption (as the case may be)
<b>PYR</b>	Pyrrolidine
<b>PZ</b>	Piperazine
<b>RPP NRW</b>	Reference Power Plant NRW
<b>TA-Luft</b>	Technische Anleitung zur Reinhaltung der Luft – Technical Instructions on Air Quality Control
<b>TEA</b>	Triethanolamine
<b>TSA</b>	Temperature Swing Adsorption
<b>UOM</b>	Unit Operation Model
<b>VLE</b>	Vapour-Liquid Equilibrium
<b>Wol</b>	Working Investment
<b>ZEP</b>	Zero Emissions Platform
<b>ZEP PP</b>	Zero Emissions Platform reference Power Plant

## Nomenclature

$A$	$[\text{m}^2]$	Heat transfer area
$a$	$[-]$	Annuity factor
$A_T$	$[\text{m}^2]$	Column cross-sectional area
$b$	$[\text{mol}/\text{kg}]$ also $[m]$	Molality
$c$	$[\text{mol}/\text{L}]$ also $[M]$	Molarity
$CaI_{fixed}$	$[M\text{€}]$	Fixed capital investment
$CAPEX$	$[\text{€}/\text{MW}]$	Capital expenditure
$C_{av,CO_2}$	$[\text{€}/\text{t}_{CO_2}]$	CO <sub>2</sub> avoidance cost
$C_{fuel}$	$[\text{€}/\text{MWh}]$	Levelised fuel cost
$Column_i$	$[M\text{€}]$	Price of selected reference column
$Compressor$	$[M\text{€}]$	CO <sub>2</sub> compressor investment
$CP$	$[(\text{m}/\text{s})(\text{m}^{-1})^{0.5}(\text{m}^2/\text{s})^{0.5}]$	Capacity factor (packed towers)
$C_s$	$[\text{m}/\text{s}]$	C-factor based on tower superficial cross-sectional area
$d$	$[\text{m}]$	Column diameter
$DC_{total}$	$[M\text{€}]$	Total direct cost
$E$	$[\text{kJ}/\text{kmol}]$	Activation energy
$e_b$	$[\text{t}_{CO_2}/\text{MWh}]$	Specific CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor for hard coal
$e_{CO_2,CC}$	$[\text{t}_{CO_2}/\text{MWh}]$	Specific CO <sub>2</sub> emissions of RPP NRW with carbon capture
$e_{CO_2,ref}$	$[\text{t}_{CO_2}/\text{MWh}]$	Specific CO <sub>2</sub> emissions of RPP NRW
$F$	$[\text{m}/\text{s}(\text{kg}/\text{m}^3)^{0.5}]$	F-factor for gas loading
$F_{LG}$	$[-/-]$	Flow parameter
$F_p$	$[\text{m}^{-1}]$	Packing factor
$F_p$	$[\text{m}^{-1}]$	Packing factor
$G$	$[\text{kg}/(\text{s}\cdot\text{m}^2)]$	Gas phase mass velocity
$h$	$[\text{h}]$	Operating hours
$h$	$[\text{m}]$	Packing height

$H_u$	[kJ/kg]	Lower heating value
$i$	[mol/L]	species $i$ concentration
$IC_{total}$	[M€]	Total indirect cost
$ISBL$	[M€]	Inside the battery limits
$k$	[mol/(l·s)]	Pre-exponential factor (independent of temperature)
$k$	[W/m <sup>2</sup> K]	Heat transfer coefficient
$k_a$	[-]	Activity-based rate constant
$k_c$	[-]	Concentration-based rate constant
$L$	[kg/(s·m <sup>2</sup> )]	Liquid mass velocity
$L/G$	[l/m <sup>3</sup> ]	Liquid to gas ratio
$LCOE_{CC}$	[€/MWh]	Cost of electricity with carbon capture
$LCOE_i$	[€/MWh]	Levelised cost of electricity
$LCOE_{ref}$	[€/MWh]	RPP NRW's levelised cost of electricity
$\dot{m}_{CO_2}$	[kg/s]	CO <sub>2</sub> mass flow rate
$\dot{m}_{fuel}$	[kg/s]	Fuel mass flow rate
$n$	[-]	Temperature exponent
$N_i$	[kmol/(m <sup>2</sup> s)]	species $i$ molar flux
$OPEX$	[€]	Operational expenditure
$OSBL$	[M€]	Outside the battery limits
$P$	[W]	Power
$P_{compression}$	[kW]	Electric demand by compression
$p_{des}$	[bar]	Desorber pressure (gauge)
$P_{expansion}$	[kW]	Electric demand by expansion
$P_i$	[MW]	Power plant net output
$p_{ref}$	[bar]	Reference pressure
$\dot{Q}$	[W]	Heat duty, heat transfer capacity (heat exchanger)
$r$	[mol/(l·s)]	Reaction's rate
$r$	[-]	Interest rate

$R_{CC}$	[%]	CO <sub>2</sub> capture rate (0% < R < 100%)
$R_{CO_2}$	[kJ/kg·K]	CO <sub>2</sub> gas constant
$Solvent$	[M€]	Solvent cost
$Startup$	[M€]	Start-up cost
$T$	[K]	Reference temperature (298.15K)
$T$	[-]	Plant life
$T_{amb}$	[bar]	Ambient temperature
$u_s$	[m/s]	Superficial gas velocity
$\dot{V}_G$	[m <sup>3</sup> /s]	Gas rate
$V_{new}$	[m <sup>3</sup> ]	New column's packing volume
$V_{ref}$	[m <sup>3</sup> ]	Reference column's packing volume (MEA Case I)
$w_{comp}$	[kJ/kg]	Specific compressor work
$x_i$	[-]	species $i$ fraction of reactant
$x_i$	[-]	reactant species $i$ mole fraction
$x_i$	[kmol/kmol]	species $i$ liquid phase mole fraction
$y_i$	[kmol/kmol]	species $i$ gas phase mole fraction

---

### Greek symbols

---

$\alpha$	[mol <sub>acid gas</sub> /mol <sub>alkalinity</sub> ]	Loading
$\alpha_i$	[-]	species $i$ reaction order
$\alpha_{lean}$	[mol <sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub> /mol <sub>alkalinity</sub> ]	Lean loading
$\alpha_{rich}$	[mol <sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub> /mol <sub>alkalinity</sub> ]	Rich loading
$\delta$	[m]	film thickness
$\rho_G$	[kg/m <sup>3</sup> ]	Gas density
$\rho_L$	[kg/m <sup>3</sup> ]	Liquid density
$\Delta\theta$	[K]	Temperature difference
$\Delta\eta$	[% points]	Efficiency losses due to CCS
$\gamma$	[-]	activity coefficient

$\eta$	[-]	Efficiency
$\eta_i$	[-]	Power plant net efficiency
$\eta_{is}$	[-]	Isentropic efficiency
$\eta_{ref}$	[%]	RPP NRW's net efficiency
$\nu$	[m <sup>2</sup> /s]	Kinematic viscosity of liquid

---

### Subscripts

---

<i>el</i>	electric
<i>flood</i>	at flood
<i>i</i>	RPP NRW or carbon capture (CC)
<i>PZ</i>	Piperazine

---

### Superscripts

---

<i>B</i>	bulk
<i>gross</i>	gross value
<i>G</i>	gas
<i>i</i>	species i
<i>I</i>	interface
<i>L</i>	liquid
<i>net</i>	net value
<i>ref</i>	reference