+For publication in *Energy Conversion and Management*

Integrated process for synthetic natural gas production from coal and coke-oven gas with high energy efficiency and low emission

Yi Man, Siyu Yang, Yu Qian*

School of Chemical Engineering, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, 510640,
People's Republic of China

*Corresponding author:

Phone: +86-20-87113046

Email: ceyuqian@scut.edu.cn

Website: www2.scut.edu.cn/ce/pse/qianyuen.htm

Abstract

There was a rapid development of coal to synthetic natural gas (SNG) projects in the last few years in China. The research from our previous work and some other researchers have found coal based SNG production process has the problems of environmental pollution and emission transfer, including CO₂ emission, effluent discharge, and high energy consumption. This paper proposes a novel co-feed process of coal and coke-oven gas to SNG process by using a dry methane reforming unit to reduce CO₂ emissions, more hydrogen elements are introduced to improve resource efficiency. It is shown that the energy efficiency of the co-feed process increases by 4%, CO₂ emission and effluent discharge is reduced by 60% and 72%, whereas the production cost decreases by 16.7%, in comparison to the conventional coal to SNG process. As coke-oven gas is a waste gas in most of the coking plant, this process also allows to optimize the allocation of resources.

Keywords: Coal gasification; Coke-oven gas; SNG; Energy efficiency; CO₂ emission

1. Introduction

In China, coal accounts for 67.4% of the total energy consumption [1]. Too much coal consumption, insufficiently clean processing and burning have brought about serious haze problem in China. Using natural gas to replace coal is one of the key measures to tackle with the air pollution caused by coal combustion [2]. However, the production of natural gas is only 1.57×10^{11} m³ (including the production of shale gas) while the natural gas consumption is about 2.5×10^{11} m³ in 2015 [3]. China is facing the problem of supply shortage of natural gas.

Aiming at the promising market opportunity, Chinese industry made a great efforts to push forward coal to synthetic natural gas (CtSNG) process in recent years. Till now, there have been 8.73×10^{10} m³/y production capacity of CtSNG projects in commercial operation in China [4].

A schematic diagram of CtSNG process is shown in Fig. 1. Feedstock raw coal is gasified to crude syngas. The crude syngas is sent into the water gas shift (WGS) unit to adjust the hydrogen-to-carbon (H/C) ratio. Next the syngas is sent into the acid gas removal (AGR) unit to remove CO₂ and sulfide. Finally, the clean syngas is sent into methanation unit for producing SNG [5]. Li et al. [6] made a comparison of techno-economic and environmental performance between coal-based SNG and coal directly burning. The results showed that the coal based SNG using in residential sector could relieve urban haze pollution caused by the direct coal burning. However, coal based SNG has nearly two times higher consumption of raw material and 1.65 times higher CO₂ emission than coal burning.

Fig. 1. Schematic diagram of CtSNG

CtSNG process uses lignite as the feedstock due to the limitation of resource allocation. That means the crude syngas from gasification would contain large amount of CO₂. H/C ratio of the crude syngas is around 2.3-2.7, while the required H/C ratio for methanation is about 3.1-3.3. The syngas is lack of hydrogen source. CO of the syngas needs to be converted to H₂ in WGS unit. It results in a high emission of CO₂ and waste of carbon resource, as well as very high consumption of energy in the WGS unit. Meanwhile, the crude syngas from Lurgi gasification needs to be washed with water to remove the phenol and ammonia. This process generates almost 98% waste water of the CtSNG process [7]. To treat the effluent with high concentration of phenol and ammonia would consume large amount of energy together with high production cost. Discharge of the effluent without fully treatment would cause serious impact to the environment [8].

Coke-oven gas (COG) is generated in the coking process as a by-product of coal carbonization. The annual COG production is estimated at $7 \times 10^{10} \text{ m}^3$ in China [9]. However, most of the COG is directly discharged into the atmosphere. It causes considerable energy waste and serious environmental consequences [10]. COG is a kind of hydrogen-rich gas, which contains H₂ (55-60%), CH₄ (23-27%), CO (5-8%), N₂ (3-6%), CO₂ (less than 2%). Co-feed system could take advantage of coal and

COG to produce syngas with suitable H/C ratio. Authors' previous work [11] on COG assisted coal to olefins process found that the energy efficiency of co-feed system improved by 10% and the CO₂ emission decreased by 85% when compared with single coal feed. The co-feed process of coal and COG to SNG is a promising alternatives in dealing with the problems of high CO₂ emission and energy consumption. In China, most of CtSNG projects are surrounded by coal coking plants. Plentiful COG source makes assurance for feedstock supply for the co-feed system of coal and COG to SNG process.

Following the above ideas, this paper proposes a novel co-feed process of coal and COG to SNG with high energy efficiency and low CO₂ emission. The co-feed process integrates a dry methane reforming unit to reduce CO₂ emission, and uses the hydrogen resource in COG to raise the H/C ratio of the syngas. A conceptual design and a techno-economic analysis for the co-feed process is put forward in this paper.

2. Coal and coke-oven gas to SNG process

The schematic diagram of the proposed co-feed process of coal and COG to produce SNG (CGtSNG) is shown in Fig. 2. CGtSNG process contains coal gasification unit, acid gas removal unit, and methanation unit. However, it removes the WGS unit, while adds a COG separation unit and a dry methane reforming (DMR) unit compared with CtSNG process. Part of methane from COG is sent into DMR unit to react with CO₂ from the coal gasification unit. DMR unit produces clean syngas and reduces CO₂ emission. The syngas with suitable H/C ratio for methanation is

obtained by adjusting the proportion of DMR syngas, coal gasification syngas, and H₂ from COG.

Fig. 2. Proposed schematic diagram of CGtSNG process

CGtSNG process is composed of three subsystems: (1) coal gasification and syngas clean; (2) COG separation and dry methane reforming; (3) methanation. The subsystems are introduced as follows. Feedstock composition of CGtSNG is shown in Table 1. The proximate and ultimate analysis of lignite is shown in Table 2. The data is referred to the lignite from Shengli coalfield of Xilinhote, China. To facilitate comparison between CGtSNG and CtSNG, the production capacity of SNG in CGtSNG is set to 4.0 billion m³/y, same as industrial CtSNG project of Datang Corporation in Chifeng, China [7].

Table 1 Feedstock for CGtSNG process

Raw material	Temperature, °C	Pressure, MPa	Mass flow, t/h
Lignite	25	4.0	558
COG	25	2.5	470
Water	25	0.4	1670
Oxygen	40	4.0	94.5

Table 2 Proximate and ultimate analysis of lignite

	proximate analysis (wt. %, ar)				ultimate analysis (wt. %, ar)				
	M _t	M _{ad}	V _{daf}	A	C	H	O	N	S
lignite	36.9	17.8	42.1	9.23	40.1	2.5	9.6	0.5	1.2

2.1. Coal gasification and syngas clean

Due to the resource allocation limitation, all the coal to SNG processes in China use lignite as the raw material. That means only Lurgi and BGL gasification technologies could be used in CtSNG. The syngas from Lurgi gasification contains 39% H₂, 14% CO, and 32% CO₂. The syngas from BGL gasification contains 28% H₂, 55% CO, and 6% CO₂. BGL has advantage in low CO₂ content. However, H/C ratio of BGL gasification syngas is as low as 0.5, while the H/C ratio of Lurgi gasification syngas is 2.7. For methanation, the H/C ratio is required above 3.05 at least. That means a large scale of water gas shift unit is needed to convert CO into CO₂ and H₂ to raise the H/C ratio. The total amount CO₂ for CtSNG process of BGL is 18.8% higher than that of Lurgi. That also means that the handling scale of coal gasification unit and acid gas removal unit should be enlarge which causes the increasing of capital investment and operation cost. In China, the existent CtSNG projects in commercial operation uses Lurgi gasification technology.

The subsystem of coal gasification and syngas clean selects Lurgi pressurized coal gasification technology and Rectisol methanol washing technology as the simulation model referred to the CtSNG project of Datang Corporation in Chifeng, China. The flowsheet of this subsystem is shown in Fig. 3.

CtSNG process uses Lurgi type MARK-IV gasifier. The crude syngas contains 39% H₂, 14% CO, 32% CO₂ and 15% CH₄. The high content of CO₂ is because of the high feedstock of the steam. The impact of steam/coal feedstock ratio on mole fraction of H₂, CO, CO₂, and CH₄ of the syngas is plotted in Fig. 4. With the increasing of steam/coal feedstock ratio, the H₂, CH₄, and CO₂ content of the syngas increases, while CO decreases. When the feedstock ratio is around 0.9, the composition of the crude syngas is very close to the industrial data of the CtSNG project of Datang Corporation.

Fig. 4. Mole fraction of the H₂, CO, CO₂, and CH₄ with different steam/coal feedstock ratio

Crude syngas from the gasifier is sent into an exhaust boiler to generate high temperature steam with 0.5 MPa. Next the crude syngas is sent into a water scrubber to remove most of the particulate matter and gaseous impurity which is easily

dissolved in water, such as phenol and ammonia. Then the produced syngas is sent into AGR unit for further cleaning.

As shown in the right part of Fig. 3, AGR unit contains an absorber (uses chilled methanol to absorb H_2S , COS and CO_2), a CO_2 desorption column (desorbs CO_2 from the CO_2 -rich methanol), an H_2S concentrator (collects and concentrates H_2S from the H_2S -rich methanol) and a methanol regenerator. Modelling and simulation of the water scrubber and AGR unit has been presented in the previous works on improved Rectisol methanol washing technology from parts of the authors [13]. Table 3 lists the energy consumption of AGR unit in CGtSNG.

Table 3 Energy consumption of AGR unit

Items	Specification	Metric	Consumption
Circulating cooling water	25 °C	t/h	3170
Electricity	\	kW	5400
LP steam	0.5 MPa	t/h	41
MP steam	2.5 MPa	t/h	20
LP nitrogen	0.5 MPa	m ³ /h	3240
Cryogenic energy	-40 °C	kW	28800

2.2. COG separation and dry methane reforming

In most of the coal based chemical process, especially the process using Texaco or Shell gasification technologies, the source of CO_2 emission mainly comes from the WGS unit. The existent coal based co-feed processes usually achieve the goal of CO_2 reduction by reducing the shift degree of WGS unit. However, due to the resource allocation limitation, the present CtSNG processes in China adopt lignite as the feedstock and use Lurgi or similar gasification technology. The advantage of Lurgi gasification is that the H/C ratio of the gasification syngas is as high as 2.1-2.4. That

means the shift degree could be so low that the energy consumption could be decreased in the WGS unit. The disadvantage of Lurgi gasification is the high CO₂ generation. Syngas from Lurgi gasification contains 35% CO₂, which accounts for more than 80% of the CO₂ emission in CtSNG. In co-feed process for producing SNG, only use hydrogen-rich resource to reduce the shift degree is not an effective solution for reducing CO₂ emission and energy consumption. The proposed co-feed process in this paper adds a DMR unit to recycle the CO₂ from Lurgi gasification unit.

DMR offers valuable environmental benefits. It is an effective way to recycle CO₂ from the coal gasification process [14]. In DMR reaction, excessive H₂ would inhibit reaction equilibrium of DMR. And there may occur the side reaction, a reverse WGS reaction. This reaction would take away the useful H₂ in the syngas, and it is a strongly endothermic process and consumes considerable amount of energy [14]. COG has to be separated into H₂ and CH₄ before DMR. A pressure swing adsorption (PSA) unit is used for COG separation. The separated CH₄ from COG will be sent into DMR unit and H₂ will be mixed with the syngas for adjusting the H/C ratio in the later step. The subsystem flowsheet of COG separation and dry methane reforming is shown in Fig. 5.

Fig. 5. Subsystem flowsheet of COG separation and DMR

Main and side reaction in DMR is shown as Eq. (10) (11). Ni-Co based catalyst is used in DMR unit with the reaction temperature of 700 °C. In such condition, the conversion rate of CH₄ and CO₂ could be achieved up to 95% [15]. Peng-Robinson state equation is used as the equilibrium properties method in Aspen Plus. And RGibbs reactor model is used in simulations [16].

RGibbs reactor model predicts a thermodynamically limited maximum methane conversion of 95% at 700 °C and 0.4 MPa. Referred to the work of Luyben [15], the expressions used for the forward and reverse reaction rates of Eq. (10) are given in the following equations.

$$r_F = 5 \times 10^{-9} e^{-50000/RT} P_{\text{CH}_4} P_{\text{CO}_2} \quad (12)$$

$$r_R = 1.094 \times 10^{-22} e^{-195900/RT} P_{\text{CO}} P_{\text{H}_2} \quad (13)$$

For the reverse water gas shift reaction of Eq. (11), a simple kinetic expression is assumed with the following equation referred to the work of Luyben [15].

$$r_{\text{RWGS}} = 10^{-11} e^{-50000/RT} P_{\text{CO}_2} P_{\text{H}_2} \quad (14)$$

By mass balance calculation, the quantity of CH₄ sent into DMR accounts for 1.5% of the SNG production while it reduced 60% CO₂ emission.

Syngas for methanation is obtained from the mixture of coal gasification syngas, DMR syngas, and H₂ from COG.

2.3.Methanation

Main reaction in methanation is shown in Eq. (15). Eq. (16) only occurs when CO concentration is very low [17]. Referred to the CtSNG project of Datang Corporation, subsystem of methanation selects Davy methanation technology as the simulation model. The flowsheet of this subsystem is shown in Fig. 6. Four sequential adiabatic reactors are used to convert syngas into SNG. The first two reactors are bulk methanation reactors, in which most of the CO, CO₂, and H₂ will convert into CH₄. The last two reactors are trim methanation reactors. Unreacted gas from bulk methanation reactors is sent into trim methanation reactors for converting the rest of the CO, CO₂, and H₂. Methanation reactions are strongly exothermic. The heat released from methanation is recovered by the waste-heat boiler for generating high temperature and pressure steam. Peng-Robinson state equation is used as the equilibrium properties method in Aspen Plus and RPlug reactor model is used in simulations [17].

Yadav and Rinker [18] developed the empirical correlations for the methanation of CO [Eq. (15)] as part of a laboratory data program. The correlation is as follows:

$$r = \frac{A}{C^2} \frac{P_{\text{CO}}}{P_{\text{H}_2}^{0.5}} \quad (17)$$

where r is the reaction rate in $\text{mol} \cdot (\text{g} \cdot \text{s})^{-1}$, P refers to partial pressure in kPa, and A and C are empirical constants determined at each temperature.

The data reported by Yadav and Rinker [18] at 503, 513 and 529 K were fitted to a simple Arrhenius equation as follows:

$$r = 0.314 e^{1300(\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{513})} \frac{P_{\text{CO}}}{P_{\text{H}_2}^{0.5}} \quad (18)$$

Proper modeling of the methanation should include the effect of the backward reaction as equilibrium is approached. The complete version of Eq. (15) is as follows:

$$r = A_C 0.314 e^{1300(\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{513})} \frac{P}{P_{\text{H}_2}^{0.5}} \left(y_{\text{CO}} - \frac{y_{\text{CH}_4} y_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{y_{\text{H}_2}^3 P^2 K_{\text{CO}}} \right) \quad (19)$$

$$K_{\text{CO}} = e^{(-38.4523 + 26270/T)} \quad (20)$$

where P is the pressure in kPa, y is the component mole fraction, K_{CO} is the equilibrium constant for Eq. (15) and A_C is the catalyst activity factor.

For the methanation of CO_2 , the same kinetic expression for CO_2 is used as for CO , recognizing that the concentration of CO_2 in the process is very small. The rate of Eq. (16) is as follows:

$$r = A_C 0.314 e^{1300(\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{513})} \frac{P}{P_{\text{H}_2}^{0.5}} \left(y_{\text{CO}_2} - \frac{y_{\text{CH}_4} y_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}^2}{y_{\text{H}_2}^4 P^2 K_{\text{CO}_2}} \right) \quad (21)$$

$$K_{\text{CO}_2} = e^{(-33.923 + 21621/T)} \quad (22)$$

Fig. 6. Subsystem flowsheet of methanation

2.4. Process simulation of CGtSNG

The main operation conditions and specifications are shown in Table 4. By simulation, data for each main stream is obtained and shown in Table 5, which includes compositions, temperatures, and pressures. The stream number in Table 5 is referred to Fig. 1. Fig. 7 shows the steam balance of CGtSNG based on the simulation data of Aspen Plus.

Table 4 Main operation conditions of CGtSNG process

Unit	Operation conditions	Value
Coal gasifier (Lurgi)	Gasification pressure, MPa	4
	Gasification temperature, °C	>800
	Carbon conversion, %	99.9
DMR reactor	Reaction pressure, MPa	0.4
	Reaction temperature, K	~700
	Carbon conversion, %	95
Pressure swing adsorption	Hydrogen yield (%)	>90
	Number of absorber	2
Acid gas removal	Solvent	Rectisol®
	Overall H ₂ S removal yield (%)	99.5
Methanation	Residual content of CO and CO ₂	<10 ppm

248

Table 5 Simulation results of CGtSNG process

Steam No.	1	2	3	4	5
Mole fraction, %					
CO	14.5	21.2	5.8	17.9	Trace
CO ₂	31.9	1.8	2.8	1.5	0.7
H ₂	39.00	57.2	59.5	60.8	1.7
O ₂	0.3	0.4	1.6	0.4	0
CH ₄	12.8	18.8	24.4	18.9	96.8
C ₂ +	0.6	0.2	1.4	0.2	0
H ₂ S	0.7	0	0	0	0
N ₂	0.2	0.4	4.5	0.3	0.8
Mole flow, kmol/h	26982.9	18707.2	45200.9	66732.1	22321.4
Temperature, °C	180	40	25	40	40
Pressure, MPa	4	4	0.1	3.3	3.3

249

250

Fig. 7. Steam balance of CGtSNG

251

252 **2.5. Key operational variables analysis**

253 In CGtSNG process, syngas for methanation is obtained by the mixture of coal
254 gasification syngas, DMR syngas, and H₂ from COG. Insufficient COG feedstock rate
255 would result in low H/C ratio of syngas, thereby reduce the yield of SNG production.
256 And insufficient CH₄ from COG could not react with whole content of CO₂. As a

result, the reduction of carbon emission would be little. On the other hand, excessive COG feedstock rate would bring about high H/C ratio of syngas. Redundant H₂ not only waste the hydrogen resource, but also bring problems in SNG refinement. Suitable range of feedstock rate for COG needs to be found.

H/C ratio of the syngas is a very important indicator for methanation reaction. The optimal H/C ratio for methanation is in the range 3.05 to 3.2. The change of H/C ratio with different feedstock ratio of COG to coal is analyzed in this paper.

Consumed feedstock of coal affects resource utilization, energy efficiency, and economic benefit. It also embodies the contribution of the system to CO₂ emission. Efficiency of carbon use (treated as an element) is taken as an investigation object when analyzing the technical performance of the process. Elementary carbon efficiency is defined as the ratio of effective carbon compounds of the outlets to effective carbon compounds of the inlets streams [19]. For CGtSNG process, coal (carbon content of lignite is valued as 75%wt.) and CH₄ in COG are inlet effective compounds, SNG is outlet effective compound. Elementary carbon efficiency of CGtSNG is defined as following equations (23).

$$f = \frac{F_{\text{SNG}}^{\text{out}}}{F_{\text{Coal}}^{\text{in}} + F_{\text{COG}}^{\text{in}}} \times 100\% \quad (23)$$

where f is the elementary carbon efficiency, $F_{\text{Coal}}^{\text{in}}$ is the mole flow rate of carbon content in coal, $F_{\text{COG}}^{\text{in}}$ is mole flow rate of CH₄ in COG, and $F_{\text{SNG}}^{\text{out}}$ is mole flow rate of SNG product.

The impact of COG/coal feedstock ratio on H/C ratio is plotted in Fig. 8. With increase in the feedstock ratio, the H/C ratio rises due to the CO content of

methanation syngas gradually decrease. When the ratio of COG/coal feedstock reaches 0.8-1.0, and H/C ratio is in the range 3.05-3.2.

Fig. 8. Impact of COG/coal feedstock ratio on H/C ratio

The impact of COG/coal feedstock ratio on elementary carbon efficiency and CO₂ emission is plotted in Fig. 9. The efficiency of elementary carbon increases with the increase in the feedstock ratio. When the ratio of COG/coal feedstock reaches around 0.9, almost all CO₂ from AGR unit is reacted, the increasing of elementary carbon efficiency becomes smooth. Continuing raise the feedstock would lead to the waste of the raw material and makes a decrease in elementary carbon efficiency.

In consequence, COG/coal feedstock ratio for CGtSNG process should be around 0.8-0.9. In such conditions, the elementary carbon efficiency reaches up to 70% and the value of H/C ratio is adequate for the methanation process.

Fig. 9. Impact of COG/coal feedstock ratio on elementary carbon efficiency and CO₂ emission

3. Coal and coke-oven gas to SNG process without DMR

A co-feed process of coal and COG to produce SNG without DMR unit (CGtSNG w/o DMR) is designed in this paper, shown in Fig. 10. In this process, desulfurated coke-oven gas is directly mixed with coal gasification syngas. After mixture, the syngas with suitable H/C ratio is sent into methanation unit. Compared with CGtSNG, the PSA and DMR units are cancelled in this process. It avoids the energy consumption of matter conversion. However, CO₂ in this process cannot be recycled without DMR reaction.

Fig. 10. Schematic diagram of CGtSNG w/o DMR process

4. Techno-economic analysis of CGtSNG process

4.1. Energy efficiency

Table 6 shows the consumption, product output, and energy efficiency of CtSNG, CGtSNG, and CGtSNG w/o DMR processes. Utilities consumption is calculated by the lignite coal consumption for fuel, including steam and power generation. High elementary carbon efficiency makes CGtSNG process need much smaller amount of coal, as raw material, to produce the same amount of SNG. That means the scale of coal gasification, AGR, and ASU units of CGtSNG are also smaller than CGtSNG. The total energy input of CGtSNG is significantly reduced. As a result, energy efficiency of CGtSNG is 4.1% higher than CtSNG process. CGtSNG w/o DMR process do not make use of CO₂. However, WGS unit is canceled in CGtSNG w/o DMR process and the waste of elementary carbon convention is avoided. The energy efficiency of CGtSNG w/o DMR is 7.6% higher than CtSNG process.

Table 6 Consumption, product output, and energy efficiency

Item	CtSNG [7]	CGtSNG	CGtSNG w/o DMR	Lower heating value
------	-----------	--------	-------------------	------------------------

Consumption				
Lignite, t	1.55E7	4.47E6	1.07E7	14.4 MJ/kg
Coke-oven gas, m ³	—	8.1E9	2.73E9	17.4 MJ/m ³
Lignite for fuel	3.75E6	3.61E6	2.78E6	14.4 MJ/kg
Water, t	1.83E7	6.42E6	1.03E7	—
Total energy input, GJ	2.77E8	2.57E8	2.42E8	—
Products output				
SNG, m ³	4.0E9	4.0E9	4.0E9	35.99 MJ/m ³
CO ₂ emission, t	7.85E6	3.14E6	5.67E6	—
Total energy of SNG, GJ	1.44E8	1.44E8	1.44E8	—
Energy efficiency, %	51.9	56.0	59.5	—

4.2. CO₂ emission and effluent discharge

CO₂ emission and effluent discharge of CtSNG, CGtSNG, and CGtSNG w/o DMR with 4.0 billion m³/y SNG production capacity is shown in Fig. 11. The total CO₂ emission of CtSNG is 7.85×10⁶ t/y, and the mass flow of waste water is 1670 m³/h. In CtSNG process, the waste water from gasification unit accounts for 98% of the total effluent discharge [7]. Hence, the calculation of effluent in this paper only considers the waste water from coal gasification unit. The waste water is generated by crude coal gas washing. The amount of waste water is depended on the amount of crude coal gas. The total amount of waste water of CGtSNG and CGtSNG w/o DMR could be obtained by calculating the amount of the crude coal gas.

The increase in elementary carbon efficiency of CGtSNG makes the process emit less CO₂ and the application of DMR unit takes use of the CO₂ from coal gasification. As a result, CO₂ emission of CGtSNG decreases by 60% in comparison of CtSNG. The consumption for lignite in CGtSNG process is around 29% of that in CtSNG process. That means the amount of crude syngas from coal gasification of CGtSNG is much smaller than CtSNG. Water usage for crude syngas scrubbing would have a

corresponding decrease. The result shows the effluent discharge of CGtSNG is reduced by 72%. This will reduce the water consumption for the production process and relieve the pressure on effluent treatment.

For CGtSNG w/o DMR process, CO₂ is not reused. However, the canceled WGS unit makes this process generate less CO₂. And the introduction of COG as the raw material also saves some coal consumption. As a result, CO₂ emission of this process decreases by 27.8% and the effluent discharge decreases by 30.9%.

Fig. 11. CO₂ emission and effluent discharge

4.3. Economic performance

Economic performance for CGtSNG process with the production capacity of 4.0 billion m³/y SNG is analyzed and made a comparison to the CtSNG of Datang Corporation.

Total capital investment

Estimation method of total capital investment is followed with the authors' previous works [20].

The total capital investment includes fixed investment and variable cost. Fixed investment is estimated by Eq. (24), according to the benchmark case shown in Table 7.

$$I_2 = \theta \cdot I_1 \cdot \left(\frac{Q_2}{Q_1}\right)^n \quad (24)$$

where I_1 and Q_1 are the fixed capital investment and the production capacity of the current project; I_2 and Q_2 are the fixed capital investment and the production capacity of the planned project; θ is the domestic-made factor; n is scale exponent, $n=0.6$ is a common value for chemical processes.

Table 7 Summary of investment data for main equipment components

Unit	Benchmark	Q_I	θ	I_I (10^8 CNY)
Air separation [11]	Oxygen supply	21.3 kg/s	0.50	2.83
Coal gasification [21]	Daily coal input	39.2 kg/s	0.80	4.84
Pressure swing adsorption [11]	Hydrogen supply	21.3 kg/s	0.50	2.83
Dry methane reforming [11]	Material caloric value	716 MW	0.65	3.84
Water gas shift [22]	Coal caloric value	1377 MW	0.67	2.47
Acid gas removal [22]	CO ₂ absorption	2064.4 mol/s	0.65	2.03
Methanation [23]	Syngas input	10810 mol/s	0.65	1.26

The components of the total capital investment could be determined according to their ratios to the equipment investment. The ratios are shown in Table 8 and the calculation follows Eq. (25)

$$TCI = I \cdot (1 + \sum_i RF_i) \quad (25)$$

where TCI the total capital investment, I is the fixed capital investment, and RF_i is the ratio factor of capital investment of component i .

Table 8 Ratio factors for capital investment

Component	Ratio factor (RF, %) [24]
(1) Direct investment	
(1.1) Equipment	100
(1.2) Installation	48
(1.3) Instruments and controls	24
(1.4) Piping	57
(1.5) Electrical	29
(1.6) Buildings(including services)	71
(1.7) Land	5
(2) Indirect investment	
(2.1) Engineering and supervision	48
(2.2) Construction expenses	43
(2.3) Contractor's fee	19
(2.4) Contingency	33
(3) Fixed capital investment	477
(4) Working capital	80
(5) Total capital investment	557

368 Total capital investment of CtSNG, CGtSNG, and CGtSNG w/o DMR processes
369 is shown in Fig. 12. Total capital investment of the CtSNG of Datang Corporation is
370 around 2.006×10^{10} CNY [7]. Based on the benchmark of CtSNG, total capital
371 investment of CGtSNG and CGtSNG w/o DMR processes with same production
372 capacity could be estimated to be around 1.926×10^{10} CNY and 17.99×10^{10} CNY.
373 CGtSNG adds a COG separation and DMR units. However, it removes the
374 high-energy-consumption WGS unit. Correspondingly, the scale of acid gas removal
375 unit becomes smaller. At the same time, number of the gasifiers reduces to a quarter
376 of the CtSNG process because of the improvement of the coal utilization efficiency.
377 CGtSNG w/o DMR process canceled the WGS unit in CtSNG and PSA and DMR
378 units in CGtSNG. As a result, the total capital investment for CGtSNG and CGtSNG
379 w/o DMR processes are reduced by 4% and 10%.

Fig. 12. Total capital investment

Production cost

Estimation method of production cost is based on the work of the authors' previous works [24]. Unit price of raw material and utilities are listed in Table 9 based on the average price in China in 2015. Since the waste COG from coking plant is not a kind of commodity, it is hard to find the price of COG. Therefore, the price of COG is estimated by comparing the heating value of COG and electricity based COG combustion power generation, as shown in Eq. (26). The price of electricity is referred to the generation price of Inner Mongolia in 2015 [25].

$$\frac{C_{\text{COG}}}{C_{\text{Ele}}} = \frac{Q_{\text{COG}}}{Q_{\text{Ele}}} \cdot \lambda \quad (26)$$

where, C_{COG} is the price of COG; Q_{COG} is the heating value of COG; Q_{Ele} is the heating value of electricity; λ is the efficiency of COG combustion power generation, adopted as 30%; C_{Ele} is the generation price of Inner Mongolia in 2015, adopted as 0.3 CNY/kWh.

395

Table 9 Estimation of production cost

Component	Economic assumptions
(1) Raw material	Lignite 120 CNY/t, Coke-oven gas 0.43 CNY/m ³
(2) Utilities	Water 2 CNY/t, electricity 0.7 CNY/kWh, steam 42 CNY/GJ
(3) Operating & Maintenance	
(3.1) Operating labor	300 labors 10000 CNY/labor/year
(3.2) Direct supervisory and clerical labor	20 % of operating labor
(3.3) Maintenance and repairs	2 % of fixed capital investment
(3.4) Operating supplies	0.7 % of fixed capital investment
(3.5) Laboratory charge	15 % of operating labor
(4) Depreciation	Life period 20 years, salvage value 4%
(5) Plant overhead costs	60 % of (3.1+3.2+3.3)
(6) Administrative costs	2 % of product cost
(7) Distribution and selling costs	2 % of product cost
(8) Product cost	(1) + (2) + (3) + (4) + (5) + (6) + (7)

396

Comparison of the production cost for CtSNG, CGtSNG and CGtSNG w/o DMR

397

is shown in Fig. 13. As discussed before, the total capital investment of CGtSNG is

398

lower than that of CtSNG. And the feedstock of the raw material reduces a lot due to

399

the high carbon utilization efficiency. Therefore, the production cost of CGtSNG is

400

approximately 2 CNY/m³ SNG. Production cost of CGtSNG is 16.7% lower than that,

401

2.4 CNY/m³, of CtSNG. Production cost of CGtSNG w/o DMR is 2.28 CNY/m³ SNG,

402

which decreased 5% due to the lower total capital investment and less raw material

403

consumption.

404

405

Fig. 13. Production cost

5. Conclusions

This paper proposes a novel coal and COG to SNG process. In CGtSNG process, methane in COG is used for DMR reaction for reducing CO₂ emission. And H₂ in COG is used for adjusting the H/C ratio of the methanation syngas. Key operational variables are analyzed. The result shows the elementary carbon efficiency reaches up to 70% and the H/C ratio of the syngas is appropriate for the methanation when COG/coal feedstock ratio is around 0.8-0.9. A process of coal and COG to SNG without DMR unit is also proposed. Although CGtSNG w/o DMR process do not make use of CO₂, the CO₂ emission and energy consumption are also decreased by system integration.

The major advantages of the proposed CGtSNG process are: (1) CGtSNG enables to take advantage of the wasted COG in China's coke industry, what allows to optimize the allocation of resources and enhances the economic value of COG. (2) CGtSNG has high energy efficiency and low emission. The energy efficiency of CGtSNG and CGtSNG w/o DMR is 4.1% and 7.6% higher than that of CtSNG. CO₂ emission of CGtSNG and CGtSNG w/o DMR decrease by 60% and 27.8% in comparison to the CtSNG process, with the effluent discharge decrease by 72% and 30.9%. (3) CGtSNG has advantaged in economic performance. Production cost of CGtSNG and CGtSNG w/o DMR is 16.7% and 5% lower than that of CtSNG.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for financial support from the China NSF projects (No. 21136003 & 21306056), and the National Basic Research Program (No. 2012CB720504).

References

- [1] National Bureau of Statistics of China. China Energy Statistics Yearbook. Beijing (China): China Statistics Press; 2013. [in Chinese]
- [2] Wojdyga K, Chorzelski M, Rozycka-Wronska E. Emission of pollutants in flue gases from Polish district heating sources. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2014;75:157-65.
- [3] National Bureau of Statistics of China. China Energy Statistics Yearbook. Beijing (China): China Statistics Press; 2012. [in Chinese]
- [4] Li C, Liu Y, Li C, Zuo Y. Analysis of the present status, the policy and application development of coal to SNG in China. *Chemical Industry*. 2015;33(1):1-9. [in Chinese]
- [5] Li S, Jin H, Gao L, Zhang X, Ji X. Techno-economic performance and cost reduction potential for the substitute/synthetic natural gas and power cogeneration plant with CO₂ capture. *Energy Conversion and Management*. 2014;85:875-87.
- [6] Li H, Yang S, Zhang J, Qian Y. Coal-based synthetic natural gas (SNG) for municipal heating in China: analysis of haze pollutants and greenhouse gases (GHGs) emissions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2015. [dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.04.078](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.04.078)
- [7] Datang Energy and Chemical Co., Ltd. Coal to SNG project introduction of Datang Corporation in Chifeng, Inner Mongolia, 2009. [in Chinese]
- [8] Greenpeace, Investigation report for coal to SNG project of Datang Corporation, 2014 [in Chinese]. www.greenpeace.org.cn/keqi-ctg-pollution-report/ (Accessed 01/10/2015)
- [9] Razzaq R, Li C, Zhang S. Coke oven gas: Availability, properties, purification, and utilization in China. *Fuel*. 2013;113:287-99.
- [10] Hao Y, Huang Y, Gong M, Li W, Feng J, Yi Q. A polygeneration from a dual-gas partial catalytic oxidation coupling with an oxygen-permeable membrane reactor. *Energy Conversion and*

Management. 2015;106:466-78.

[11] Man Y, Yang S, Zhang J, Qian Y. Conceptual design of coke-oven gas assisted coal to olefins process for high energy efficiency and low CO₂ emission. *Applied Energy*. 2014;133:197-205.

[12] Li S, Jin H, Gao L. Cogeneration of substitute natural gas and power from coal by moderate recycle of the chemical unconverted gas. *Energy*. 2013;55:658-67.

[13] Liu X, Yang S, Hu Z, Qian Y. Simulation and assessment of an integrated acid gas removal process with higher CO₂ capture rate. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*. 2015;85:48-57.

[14] Rahemi N, Haghighi M, Babaluo AA, Allahyari S, Jafari MF. Syngas production from reforming of greenhouse gases CH₄/CO₂ over Ni–Cu/Al₂O₃ nanocatalyst: Impregnated vs. plasma-treated catalyst. *Energy Conversion and Management*. 2014;84:50-9.

[15] Aw MS, Zorko M, Osojnik Črnivec IG, Pintar A. Progress in the synthesis of catalyst supports: synergistic effects of nanocomposites for attaining long-term stable activity in CH₄–CO₂ dry Reforming. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2015;54(15):3775-87.

[16] Luyben WL. Design and control of the dry methane reforming process. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2014;53(37):14423-39.

[17] Li S, Ji X, Zhang X, Gao L, Jin H. Coal to SNG: Technical progress, modeling and system optimization through exergy analysis. *Applied Energy*. 2014;136:98-109.

[18] Yadav R, Rinker RG. Steady-state methanation kinetics over a Ni/Al₂O₃ catalyst. *Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering*. 1993;71(2):202-8.

[19] Man Y, Yang S, Xiang D, Li X, Qian Y. Environmental impact and techno-economic analysis of the coal gasification process with/without CO₂ capture. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2014;71:59-66.

[20] Qian Y, Man Y, Peng L, Zhou H. Integrated Process of Coke-Oven Gas Tri-Reforming and Coal Gasification to Methanol with High Carbon Utilization and Energy Efficiency. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2015;54(9):2519-25.

[21] Lin H, Jin H, Gao L, Han W. Techno-economic evaluation of coal-based polygeneration systems of synthetic fuel and power with CO₂ recovery. *Energy Conversion and Management*. 2011;52(1):274-83.

[22] Keipi T, Hankalin V, Nummelin J, Raiko R. Techno-economic analysis of four concepts for thermal decomposition of methane: Reduction of CO₂ emissions in natural gas combustion.

485 Energy Conversion and Management. 2016;110:1-12.

486 [23] Yu B-Y, Chien IL. Design and Economic Evaluation of a Coal-to-Synthetic Natural Gas Process.

487 Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research. 2015;54(8):2339-52.

488 [24] Xiang D, Yang S, Qian Y. Techno-economic analysis and comparison of coal based olefins

489 processes. Energy Conversion and Management. 2016;110:33-41.

490 [25] National Development and Reform Commission of China. Notification on price reduction of

491 power generation and electricity for industrial and commercial use, 2015 [in Chinese].

492 www.sdpc.gov.cn/zcfb/zcfbtz/201504/t20150417_688505.html (Accessed 01/10/2015)