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CanmetENERGY is the science and technology branch of Natural Resources Canada and operates three labs across Canada with over 450 scientists, engineers and technicians.

CanmetENERGY works with a broad network of domestic and foreign partners (i.e. companies, universities, other government organizations) to assess, develop and deploy energy technologies that will reduce environmental impacts (GHG and CAC emissions), increase productivity and generate knowledge-based economic growth in Canada.

The Bioenergy Program assists industry to develop cleaner, more energy-efficient biomass conversion processes. Our in-house research focuses on optimizing the performance of stationary equipment and evaluating and developing new products and retrofit technologies for biomass and renewable fuels.
Biomass Co-Firing with Coal

• Biomass co-firing is seen as the most cost-effective method of introducing biomass into the power generation sector

• Biomass co-firing offers higher efficiency than biomass stand-alone and offers improved environmental performance with reduction in greenhouse gases and criteria air contaminants

• There has been significant worldwide experience although this has been associated with retrofit projects at co-firing ratios up to around 20%
Co-firing Methodologies

- **Preprocessing/Communionation**
  - Biomass
  - Pyrolysis/Gasification
    - Bio-gas
    - Bio-oil
      - Storage
    - Charcoal
      - Storage
  - CO-FIRING
Co-firing Limitations

Maximum % Biomass

Cofiring Mode

- Direct
- Mixed
- Separate
- Indirect
- Parallel

Techniques to Overcome Limitations

• Pelletization
• Pyrolysis
• Torrefaction
## Fuel Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WOOD</th>
<th>FOREST RESIDUES</th>
<th>WHEAT STRAW</th>
<th>RDF</th>
<th>BITUMINOUS COAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Carbon</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>15-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile Matter</td>
<td>86.22</td>
<td>82.41</td>
<td>75.27</td>
<td>73.40</td>
<td>45-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>49.96</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>44.92</td>
<td>39.70</td>
<td>76-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>3.5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen (diff.)</td>
<td>43.77</td>
<td>39.99</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>3-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ/kg</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>28-33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biomass Ash

- Biomass materials generally have low ash content (typically <5%), compared to power station coals.
- Biomass ashes are very different chemically from coal ashes, i.e. they are not an alumino-silicate system, but a mixture of simple inorganic compounds, of Si, K, Ca, P and S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biomass</th>
<th>Forestry residue</th>
<th>SRC willow</th>
<th>Cereal straw</th>
<th>Oil seed rape straw</th>
<th>Olive residue</th>
<th>Palm kernel</th>
<th>Distillers grains</th>
<th>Poultry litter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ash (%)</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al PPM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Data: W R Livingston)
Co-firing Risks

- Potential for increased rates of ash deposition on boiler surfaces, and on the surfaces of SCR catalysts
- Increased rates of high temperature corrosion of boiler components, particularly with high chlorine biomass materials
- Biomass tends to increase the level of submicron particulates which will impact particulate emissions control equipment
- Utilisation/disposal issues with mixed coal/biomass ashes
CanmetENERGY Research

Current State-of-the-Art

- Existing techniques for fuel characterization are optimized for coal
- Most testing has been at low biomass levels
- Full-scale tests are expensive and potentially risky

CanmetENERGY Approach

- Evaluate Biomass/coal co-firing:
  - Fuel handling, preparation, comminution, storage, delivery and blending
  - Ash deposition
  - Combustion performance with coal
  - Pollutant formation

- RD&D co-firing collaboration with Ontario Power Generation and Nova Scotia Power
Mini-FluidBed Reactor

- Combustor or Gasifier
- Bubbling or Circulating Mode
- 5 - 20 kg/h Biomass
- Air-blown
## Fuel Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lignite</th>
<th>Pine</th>
<th>Pellets</th>
<th>Peat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximate analysis, wt% d.b.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile matters (VM)</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>80.75</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed carbon</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture, wt% as received</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHV (MJ/ kg dry)</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lignite</th>
<th>Pine</th>
<th>Pellets</th>
<th>Peat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dry ash analysis, wt% d.b.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>49.76</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>28.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al₂O₃</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe₂O₃</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO₂</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>&lt;0.03</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₂O₅</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>17.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K₂O</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lignite</th>
<th>Pine</th>
<th>Pellets</th>
<th>Peat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ultimate analysis, wt% d.b.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>47.99</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>40.73</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorine, μg/g.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromine, μg/g.</td>
<td>&lt; 21</td>
<td>&lt; 29</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorine, μg/g</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&lt; 29</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership in ecoInnovation**
Ash Deposition Probe

Ash Analyses:
- Scanning electron microscopy (SEM)
- Ion chromatography (IC)
- X-ray fluorescence (XRF)
- X-ray diffraction (XRD)
Effect of Co-firing Ratio

- Deposition rate (g/m²/h)
- Ash
- Relative Ash Deposition

Blending ratio:

- Lignite alone
- 0%
- 20%
- 50%
- 80%
- 100%
- Peat alone
- 0%
- 20%
- 50%
- 80%
- 100%
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Effect of Co-firing Ratio (contd)

- Effect of Co-firing Ratio (contd)
  - Lignite alone
  - Pine alone

![Bar chart showing Ash deposition rate (g/m²/h) for different co-firing ratios (0%, 20%, 50%, 80%, 100%) with WPP.

- Ash deposition rate (g/m²/h)
- Relative Ash Deposition
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Comparison of XRF Results

Peat Fraction

Concentration (wt%)

0% 20% 50% 80% 100%

SiO2 Al2O3 Fe2O3 TiO2 P2O5 CaO MgO SO3 Na2O K2O
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Summary of Ash Results

- The ash deposition rate strongly depended on the fuel type, showing that peat > crushed lignite > pine.

- Although the lignite used in this work contains a very high ash content (22 wt% db), the deposition rates were low which may be accounted for by the very high concentrations of SiO$_2$ and Al$_2$O$_3$ and low concentrations of alkali and alkaline-earth metals as well as low chlorine content in the coal ash.

- Co-firing fuel blend of lignite with either peat or pine at all the blending ratios tested between 20-80% generally increased the superficial ash deposition rates. However, in terms of relative ash deposition rates, the optimal blending ratio was found to be 50% (heat input).

- Generally, a smaller particle size or a higher moisture-content reduced the ash deposition rates regardless of the fuel type and composition.

- Sulphur addition could reduce corrosion, but it would generally enhance ash deposition rate, in particular for the woody biomass combustion!
Emissions Trends

- **Sulphur (wt% d.b.):**
  - Lignite: 0.5
  - Pine: <0.1
  - Peat: 0.2

![Graph showing emissions trends](image)

**Proximate analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lignite</th>
<th>Pine</th>
<th>Peat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sulphur</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emissions trends (Contd)

\[ \text{NO} + \text{CO} \rightarrow 0.5 \text{N}_2 + \text{CO}_2 \]
Summary of Emissions Results

- The CO emissions were greatly reduced when using the oven-dried feedstocks. Lower excess air was also found to be effective for reducing the CO emissions from co-combustion of the wood pellets or the peat pellets.

- Even though lignite had a greater sulphur content than peat, peat combustion resulted in higher SO2 emissions. Furthermore, for combustion of lignite alone and co-firing of 50% lignite and 50% pine or peat, the SO2 emission could be lowered considerably when as-received fuels (with a higher moisture content) were used in the combustion, and operated at a lower excess air ratio. Clearly ash components such as CaO and ash particle residence time play a key role in SO2 emissions reduction for these fuels.

- As the excess air increased from 40% to 60%, the CO formation reduced and NOx increased when firing the feedstock of lignite, peat or white pine pellets alone. This might be owing to the increased secondary air flows, which could improve the combustion of volatile matters from these feedstocks all containing a high volatile content, hence resulting in a lower CO concentration in the process. The lower CO concentration in the process at a higher excess air can also account for higher emissions of NOx.
Conclusions and Outlook

- CanmetENERGY pilot-scale testing can generate reliable information on biomass fuel, ash and emissions behaviour. CanmetENERGY is broadening its testing to consider increased pre-treatment options such as pyrolysis (slow and fast) and torrefaction.

- Biomass fuels tend to have a lower sulphur content than coal and therefore emissions of SO2 can be reduced although for low sulphur coals the importance of ash (CaO) interactions should be considered.

- The impact of biomass co-firing on NOx emissions is much more complex. NOx emissions have been observed to either decrease or increase during biomass co-firing. Woody biomass has high volatile matter content and low fuel nitrogen than coal and generally results in NOx reductions. The high fuel nitrogen content of agricultural residues contributes to the generally higher NOx. The effect of CO on NOx levels means that partial fuel rich environments as generated by high volatile content fuels can help to reduce NOx emissions. The lower flame temperatures and different combustion stoichiometry of biomass systems can also result in lower thermal NOx production.

- Some biomass materials, such as straw, grass and peat can have higher potassium and chlorine than coal which may lead to problems such as slagging and fouling. There are also potential issues with respect to changes in the operation of pollution control technologies.

- At low (<50% co-firing) ratios the impact on ash deposition can be modest however at higher ratios ash deposition impacts can be substantial and require careful study of the biomass material being co-fired.
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