the Energy to Lead

#### Hybrid Membrane/Absorption Process for Post-combustion CO<sub>2</sub> Capture

#### DOE Contract No. DE-FE-0004787

S. James Zhou, Shiguang Li, Dennis Rocha, and Howard Meyer, *GTI* Yong Ding and Ben Bikson, *PoroGen* 

> NETL CO<sub>2</sub> Capture Technology Meeting July 9, 2012



### Introduction to GTI and PoroGen

### gti

- Not-for-profit research company, providing energy and natural gas solutions to the industry since 1941
- Facilities
  - 18 acre campus near Chicago
  - 200,000 ft<sup>2</sup>, 28 specialized labs



- Materials technology company commercially manufacturing products from high performance plastic PEEK (poly (ether ether ketone))
- Products ranging from membrane separation filters to heat transfer devices







### **Project overview**

- Funding: \$3,736 K (DOE: \$2,986 K, Cost share: \$750 K)
  - BP1 budget: DOE: \$799 K, Cost share: \$200 K (20%)
  - BP2 budget: DOE: \$1,036 K, Cost share: \$262 K (20%)
  - BP3 budget: DOE: \$1,149 K, Cost share: \$287 K (20%)
- **Performance period**: Oct. 1, 2010 Sept. 30, 2013

#### Project participants:

- GTI: process design and testing
- PoroGen: membrane and membrane module development
- Aker Process Systems: economic analysis
- Midwest Generation: providing field test site



#### **Objective and scope**



### What is a membrane contactor?

- High surface area membrane device that facilitates mass transfer
- Gas on one side, liquid on other side
- Membrane does not wet out in contact with liquid



5

 Separation mechanism: CO<sub>2</sub> permeates through membrane and reacts with the solvent; N<sub>2</sub> does not react and has low solubility in solvent

#### Comparison to conventional membrane process

Membrane technology	Need to create driving force?	$CO_2/N_2$ selectivity ( $\alpha$ )	Can achieve >90% CO <sub>2</sub> removal and high CO <sub>2</sub> purity in one stage?
Conventional membrane process	Yes. Feed compression or permeate vacuum required	Determined by the dense "skin layer", typically $\alpha = 50$	No. Limited by pressure ratio, multi-step process required*
Membrane contactor	No. liquid side partial pressure of CO <sub>2</sub> close to zero	Determined by the solvent, $\alpha > 1000$	Yes

PoroGen

\* DOE/NETL Advanced Carbon Dioxide Capture R&D Program: Technology Update, May 2011

### **Process description**



Process identical to DOE's benchmark technology amine plant except membrane absorber and desorber are used instead of absorption and regeneration towers



## PoroGen has a patented process for preparation of nano-porous PEEK hollow fiber membrane



Hollow fiber morphology, and pore size are continuously improved to meet membrane contactor operating requirements





## Two types of super-hydrophobic membranes under development

#### a) Nano-porous PEEK hollow fiber membrane



**b)** Composite PEEK hollow fiber membrane **Thin layer (0.1 μm) of smaller surface pores** 



Asymmetric porous structure

### Super-hydrophobic surface not wetted by alcohol



Alcohol droplet





### Membrane intrinsic CO<sub>2</sub> permeance exceeded initial target for commercial performance



#### Membrane module design and scale-up



# BP1: Membrane Absorber Study





### **Bench-scale membrane absorber CO<sub>2</sub> capture performance demonstration**

- <u>Feed</u>: Simulated flue gas compositions  $(N_2 + CO_2)$  saturated H<sub>2</sub>O, SOx, NOx, O<sub>2</sub>) at temperature and pressure conditions after FGD.
- <u>Membrane module</u>: Performance can be essentially linearly scaled to commercial size modules.
  - Uncertainty exists because gas/liquid contactor interface issues
  - Additional factors affect mass transfer coefficient
- <u>Solvents</u>: Commercial aMDEA (40 wt%) and activated K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> (20 wt%), testing of advanced solvents planned.
- Use of design of experiment test matrix: totally over 140 tests.

Activated methyldiethanolamine = aMDEA



Module for lab testing (Ø2" x 15" long, 1m<sup>2</sup>)



# Technical goal achieved with commercial aMDEA and $K_2CO_3/H_2O$

Module 2PG285, 1100 GPU

Parameters	Goal	aMDEA	K <sub>2</sub> CO <sub>3</sub>
CO <sub>2</sub> removal in one stage	≥ 90%	90%	94%
Gas side $\Delta P$ , psi	≤ 2	1.6	1.3
Mass transfer coefficient,(sec)-1	≥ 1	1.7	1.8



#### CO<sub>2</sub> removal rate is not affected by O<sub>2</sub> SOx, and NOx contaminants in feed

Module 2PG286, 1000 GPU



<u>Measured results</u> :			
CO <sub>2</sub> removal	91%		
Mass transfer coefficient,(sec) <sup>-1</sup>	1.6		
Gas side $\Delta P$ , psi	1.6		
CO <sub>2</sub> capture rate, kg/h/m <sup>2</sup>	0.5		

#### Compared to conventional amine scrubber

 15% less of the inlet SO<sub>2</sub> was absorbed by the solvent as compared with conventional column. The formation of heat-stable salts will be reduced.

14

Another test showed CO<sub>2</sub> removal rate is not affected by NO<sub>x</sub>



## **BP2: Membrane Desorber Study**





qti

### **Bench-scale membrane desorber CO<sub>2</sub> stripping performance demonstration**

- Membrane module: Performance can be essentially linearly scaled to commercial size modules
- Liquid feed: CO<sub>2</sub> loaded aMDEA and activated K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> rich solvents, flow rate: 0.2-0.7 L/min
- Four flow configurations (Modes) investigated: over 60 tests



Module for lab testing (Ø2" x 15" long, 1m<sup>2</sup>)



#### **Examples of Modes for solvent regeneration**





# High CO<sub>2</sub> stripping rate and high regeneration efficiency obtained

- CO<sub>2</sub> stripping rate: <u>4.1 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/h</u>, <u>10 times higher</u> than the absorption rate. Thus, only <u>10%</u> membrane area is required for regeneration.
- CO<sub>2</sub> purity: 97% (target is 95%), 3% is water vapor, can be further condensed.
- Regeneration efficiency: <u>66%</u> in one stage, and can be further increased by increasing operation temperature and optimizing process design.





#### **Phase II technical goal achieved**

Parameters	Goal	Mode III	Mode IV
CO <sub>2</sub> purity	≥ 95%	97%	97%
CO <sub>2</sub> stripping rate (kg/m <sup>2</sup> /h)	≥ 0.25*	2.8	4.1

\* Calculated based on a mass transfer coefficient of 1.0 (sec)<sup>-1</sup> for regeneration



# Updated COE and increase in COE when use of membrane regeneration is considered

Casa	COE,	Increase
Case	mills/kWhr	in COE
DOE Case 9 no capture	64.00	
DOE Case 10 state of the art (amine plant)	118.36	85%
BP1 status: membrane absorber	100.11	<b>56%</b>
BP2 status: membrane desorber	98.67	<b>54%</b>



#### **R&D strategy to meet DOE's target**

Case	COE, mills/kWhr	Increase in COE	
DOE Case 9 no capture	64.00		
DOE Case 10 state of the art (amine plant)	118.36	85%	
BP1 status: membrane absorber	100.11	<b>56%</b>	
BP2 status: membrane desorber	98.67	<b>54%</b>	
R&D strategy to meet DOE's target			
1) Module cost ↓ from \$80 to \$30/m <sup>2</sup>	95.64	48%	
2) Advanced solvent	On trajectory to meet DOE target		



gti

### **Plan for the rest of BP2**

#	Plans for future testing in BP2
1	Further membrane development based on regeneration testing results so far.
2	Modes III and IV are currently down selected for further study. Operation conditions will be further optimized to down select one mode for Phase III.
3	After regeneration mode is down selected, use of reflux in membrane desorber to improve regeneration efficiency (target: "lean" solvent lean enough for membrane absorber).
4	Refinement of the process economics based on the lab test data .
5	Finalize testing plan for Phase III.



gti

# Readiness and Plan for BP3: Integrated Absorber/Regeneration





### **Membrane contactor skid constructed**



Desorption tower (backup plan)

Designed for 25 KW equivalents of CO<sub>2</sub> capture (0.5 ton/day) Phase I: absorption Phase II: regeneration Phase III: Integrate absorption/regeneration for field testing





# CO<sub>2</sub> removal rate > 90% during the time investigated (120 hours)



# Gas side pressure drop stable and remained less than 0.7 psi (target is less than 2 psi)



## **Plans for Future Testing** and **Development**





# Plans for future testing and development in this project



# Technology implementation timeline after this project

Time	Development	CO <sub>2</sub> capture, Ton/day	Module diameter	Projected # of modules*
By 2013	25 kWe bench-scale (Current project, Phase III)	0.5	4 or 8-inch	1 (more than sufficient)
By 2015	2.5 MWe pilot scale	50	8-inch	17
			16-inch	5
By 2018	25 MWe demonstration	500	8-inch	170
			30-inch	14

\* Calculated based on:

- $CO_2$  flux of 1.2 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/h
- Module area:
  - Current Ø8-inch module: 100 m<sup>2</sup>
  - Projected Ø16-inch module: 400 m<sup>2</sup>
  - Projected Ø30-inch module: 1400 m<sup>2</sup>

PoroGen has equipment capacity to produce 8-inch modules for several 25 MWe demonstration plants



### Summary

#### BP1 membrane absorbers

- Technical goal achieved: ≥90% CO<sub>2</sub> removal in one stage; gas side pressure drop: 1.6 psi; mass transfer coefficient: 1.7 1/s
- Feasibility of contactor module scale-up demonstrated
- Economic evaluation based on membrane absorber only indicates a 56% increase in COE.
- BP2 membrane desorbers
  - Technical goal for CO<sub>2</sub> purity (97%) and CO<sub>2</sub> stripping rate (4.1 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/h) achieved. Operation optimization is on-going to ensure "lean" solvent is lean enough for membrane absorber
  - Evaluation per membrane absorber + desorber testing so far indicates a 54% increase in COE.
- In preparation for <u>BP3</u>
  - Completed constructing bench-scale membrane skid, integration of membrane absorber/regeneration tower, membrane module and performance stable with aMDEA solvent.



### **Acknowledgements**

- Financial support
  - DOE-NETL
  - ICCI (Illinois Clean Coal Institute)
  - Midwest Generation
- DOE NETL José Figueroa



