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\textbf{ABSTRACT}. The present work addresses the techno-economics of the decentralized co-production of Fischer-Tropsch biocrude and Liquefied Natural Gas via thermo-chemical conversion of woody biomass and wet organic waste to syngas in an entrained flow gasification
reactor. The process design considers thermal pretreatment of the feedstock based on integrated drying of both the woody biomass and the organic waste using direct-contact superheated steam, and torrefaction for the dried wood. The super-heated steam required for drying is produced from recovery of residual heat from the main conversion process. The overall cost of biocrude production has been shown to decrease when increasing the fraction of organic waste when considering gate fees for the organic waste, at the production site, above 10 $/ton. For gate fees of 50 $/ton, which are realistic for the current waste market, the cost of biocrude ranges between 25 and 22 $/GJ for plant scales between 150 and 600 MW based on the input feedstock energy to the entrained flow gasification. Although the sludge has lower calorific value and higher moisture content, which require higher capital investment for pretreatment, the reduction of feedstock supply cost with increasing fraction of sludge becomes dominant in evaluating the overall cost of production. Moreover, the overall efficiency for biocrude and LNG production, and therefore the main income to the plant, is comparable for mass fractions of the sludge in the raw feedstock ranging between 0 and 50%. Based on direct-contact superheated steam dryers for the pretreatment of sludge, the residual heat recovered from the main conversion process is sufficient to co-process up to 50% mass fraction of sludge in the raw feedstock with moisture content up to 80%.

1. INTRODUCTION

The combustion of fossil fuels for transportation is a main contributor to the total greenhouse gas emissions related to human activities, accounting for about 23% worldwide [1], 23% in Europe [2], 26% in the US [3] and 33% in Norway [4]. In this context, the use of biofuels in the transport sector has been proposed as part of wider global strategies for moving into low-carbon
societies through replacement of fossil fuels [5]. The role of biofuels has been particularly emphasized for the heavy-duty transport sectors, i.e. aviation, maritime and long-haul trucks, which do not have in the near future viable alternatives to reduce fossil carbon emissions other than using liquid biofuels.

Among several technological options [6, 7] for producing liquid biofuels that meet or exceed current market specifications, Entrained flow gasification (EFG) of biomass followed by the catalytic Fischer-Tropsch synthesis (FTS) exhibits several technological advantages that makes it attractive for achieving full commercial deployment: 1) the high-energy density as well as the high cold gas efficiency in the entrained flow gasification [8,9] and 2) the high quality of the product from the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, which is compatible with conventional refinery processes for upgrading to marketable biodiesel-type fuels (with lower sulphur content and better cetane number than fossil-based diesel) and aviation fuels [10]. However, the progress in commercialization of this technology route has been limited mainly due to the large scales required in order to achieve the economic viability [10,11]. Large plant capacities impact significantly in the economics of liquid biofuels production due to the financial risks associated with large capital investments and on the complex logistics and high cost of feedstock supply. The effect of feedstock supply may be even more critical for countries like Norway where the costs of biomass transport is especially significant.

In this context, decentralized production of biocrude with further upgrading in conventional refineries is a relevant strategy for improving the overall economics of liquid biofuels production since it reduces the capital investment by utilizing existing petrochemical infrastructure and thus reduces the viable plant capacity. The authors have already addressed the techno-economics of decentralized production of biocrude based on conversion of dried and torrefied woodchips via
EFG and FTS with utilization of excess heat for coproduction of hot water and electricity [12]. This work showed that, under Norwegian conditions, the cost of production of Fischer Tropsch biocrudes and co-producing only heat for district heating can be in the range of 30 to 24 $/GJ for plant capacities between 150 and 600 MW. It also showed that co-production of electricity in Norway increases the cost of biocrude production up to 40% due to the high capital cost of the power production system and the low electricity prices. However, although co-production of heat theoretically improves the economics of biocrude production, there is a practical limitation in the amount of heat that can be exported to district heating networks, since biocrude production plants would be located close to the forest. On the other hand, when considering the conversion of biomass to biocrude with plant capacities in the range of 150 to 600 MW, the costs of feedstock supply become significant and can represent about 26-38 % of the total operating cost of the plant [12].

The present work evaluates the decentralized production of Fischer-Tropsch biocrudes by co-processing woody biomass and dewatered sludge in an entrained flow gasifier. This represents a new strategy, not addressed in the literature before, that can potentially improve the economics of biocrude production by reducing the cost of feedstock supply and through a better utilization of the residual heat recovered from the overall conversion process. The co-processing strategy also adds a higher-degree of flexibility in the plant operation based on variations of the feedstock availability and prices. Sludge residues from anaerobic digestion are an abundant, continuously available and renewable feedstock. Based on official statistical data, the availability of sludge from urban waste water plants, food processing industry and biogas production in Norway is approximately 4.8 millions tons per year, respectively, which represent approximately 5.8 TWh.
Depending on the composition, sludge residues are spread on soils for agricultural purposes with zero cost at production site or diverted to incineration also subject to gate fees.

The methodology used in the present work involves a parametric analysis of the biocrude production plant, with derivation of explicit expressions to evaluate the overall techno-economic performance under variable plant scales. The parameters considered in the analysis include process design and operation, dimensioning and costing of the main equipment. Both the process and economics are described in terms of the scale of the plant and the operational limits of the gasification system. The scale of the plant has been described as the input feedstock energy flow to the gasification system. This analysis included in this work reports explicit parametric expressions to evaluate the overall process and economic performance of the proposed technological route, which are not currently available in the literature.

2. PROCESS DESIGN AND MODELLING

Figure 1 shows the overall process block diagram of the biocrude production plant based on co-processing wood and organic waste, including the main mass and energy flows, with $M$, $H$ and $Q$ denoting mass flow rate, total enthalpy flow and heat flow, respectively. The main process steps include thermal pretreatments of the woody biomass and the organic waste, for reducing the moisture content and the particles size of the feedstock, high-temperature oxygen-enriched entrained flow gasification (EFG) followed by syngas cooling and conditioning and Fischer-Tropsch synthesis (FTS) with separation of hydrocarbon products. The main product of the plant is the so-called biocrude, which is here defined as the mixture of hydrocarbons produced from the FTS with carbon number above 3. The plant includes co-production of liquefied natural gas (LNG) from the gas stream after separation, which is composed of hydrocarbon with carbon number 1-3. Further refining of the bio-crude to marketable liquid biofuels, based on
conventional refinery processes, has been excluded from the analysis in this work. Available heat from the syngas cooling and the FTS is here recovered for production of superheated steam, which is utilized for pretreatment of the feedstock as well as for the gasification and WGS processes. The net excess heat from the plant is exported for district heating. The main parameter considered to describe the scale of the plant is the input feedstock power to the EFG, denoted by $\dot{H}_f^G$. A more detailed description of the main systems, including main process design and operational parameters, is presented in the following sections.

2.1. FEEDSTOCK PROPERTIES

This work considers three types of feedstock: logwood containing stem wood and bark, woodchips derived from forest residues, mainly tops and branches, and dehydrated sludge from anaerobic digestion. All woody biomass is based on spruce, which is the most common species in the Norwegian forest industry. Each input feedstock to the plant is characterized by the mass flow rate $\dot{M}_f^p$, the Net Calorific Value per dry basis $NCV_f^p$, the volatiles, moisture, ash and fix carbon content (proximate analysis), $y_{f,v}$, $y_{f,H2O}$, $y_{f,a}$ and $y_{f,fc}$ respectively, the elemental composition (ultimate analysis) $y_{f,i}$, and the particle size $d_{p,f}$. The moisture content is here considered a variable parameter depending on the specific characteristics of each feedstock supply chain. Table 1 shows the characteristics, including proximate and ultimate analysis and heating values, of the feedstock considered in this work under representative Norwegian conditions. It has been assumed that the logwood consists on 90% stem wood and 10% bark. The moisture content of the green logwood varies in the range of 40-60% depending on the wood species, forest location and season of harvesting. The particle size of woodchips is in the range of is 30 to 50 mm. Dehydrated sludge is assumed to have a moisture content in the range of 60-80 % wt.
2.2. FEEDSTOCK PRETREATMENT

The process flow diagram of the complete feedstock pretreatment system is shown in Figure 2. Pretreatment of the logwood include chipping and screening, drying, torrefaction and milling. Bark, which has a higher ash content compared to stem wood, is not separated before chipping in order to increase the overall ash content in the input biomass to the entrained flow gasification. Fines, containing particles with size below 1 mm, are collected and introduced directly into the gasifier. Torrefaction of the woody biomass improves the grindability and energy density of the input feedstock to gasification leading to a better economic performance of the overall biocrude production compared to pretreatment based on conventional drying only, as it has been proven already in a previous work by the authors [12]. Pretreatment of the sludge includes drying and grinding. Steam produced from the heat recovery system of the plant is utilized as the heating medium for drying both the woodchips and the sludge. The heat produced from combustion of the volatiles released from torrefaction is used both for heating the feedstock in the torrefaction reactor and the steam after the sludge dryer and prior the woodchips dryer.

Logwood chipping and screening

Chipping and screening is described based on the output particle size distribution, shown in Table 2, according to data from Laitila et al. [14], and the total power consumption $W^{CS}$ calculated from

$$W^{CS} = w^{CS} M_s^{CS},$$

(2.1)

where $M_s^{CS}$ is the input mass flow rate of raw logwood and $w^{CS}$ is the specific energy consumption per unit input mass, assumed to be constant and equal to 6.9 kWh/ton based on experimental results with disc chippers by Spinelli et al. [15]. Screening is performed for particle...
size in the range of 1 and 45 mm. Particles above 45 mm are recycled back to the chipper, while fines below 1 mm are fed directly in the EFG.

**Dryers**

Direct-contact steam dryers has been considered for pretreatment of both the woody biomass and the sludge. The overall process performance of the drier is described in terms of the required input thermal power of the drying agent $Q_D^g$, which is calculated from

$$Q_D^g = \dot{M}_s^D [q_s^D + \Delta y_{H_2O}^D h_{g,o}^D]/(1 - h_{g,o}^D/h_{g,i}^D),$$

(2.2)

where $\dot{M}_s^D$ is the mass flow rate of feedstock entering the dryer, $q_s^D = \Delta y_{H_2O}^D h_{H_2O}^g + c_{p,s}^D \Delta T_s^D$ is the heat transfer per unit mass of feedstock, $\Delta y_{H_2O}^D = (y_{H_2O}^F - y_{H_2O}^D)$ and $\Delta T_s^D = (T_s^F - T_s^D)$ are the variation in the moisture content and the temperature in the feedstock, $h_{g,i}^D$ and $h_{g,o}^D$ are the specific enthalpies of the drying agent at the inlet and outlet, $h_{H_2O}^g$ is the vaporization enthalpy of water and $c_{p,s}^D$ is the average specific heat capacity of the feedstock. It has been assumed that the outlet temperature of the feedstock is equal to the saturation temperature of water at the dryer pressure and the outlet temperature of the drying agent is 20 °C above the saturation point.

Dimensioning of the drier has been described in terms of the volume $V_r^D$ and external surface area $A_r^D$, which are evaluated using a lumped capacity approximation for the solid particles based on a heat transfer area between the drying agent and the solid particles, which is evaluated from

$$A_{gs}^D = V_r^D (1 - \phi_s^D)/d_p,$$

and

$$V_r^D = \dot{M}_s^D [\Delta y_{H_2O}^D h_{H_2O}^g + c_{p,s}^D \Delta T_s^D]/[4 U_{gs} LMTD_{gs}^D (1 - \phi_s^D)/d_p]$$

(2.3)

and

$$A_r^D = 2q_s^D /[LMTD_{gs}^D U_{gs} (1 - \phi_s^D)^{3/2}/d_p] [\dot{M}_s^D/[v_s^D \rho_s^D (1 - \phi_s^D)\pi]]^{1/2}$$

(2.4)
where $\rho_s^D$, $\phi_s^D$ and $v_s^D$ are, respectively, the average density, specific heat capacity, bed porosity and velocity of the biomass in the dryer, \( LMTD_{gs}^D = \left[ (T_{g,i}^D - T_s^D) - (T_{g,o}^D - T_s^D) \right] \ln \left[ \frac{(T_{g,i}^D - T_s^D)/(T_{g,o}^D - T_s^D)}{} \right] \) is the log mean temperature difference and \( U_{gs} = (k_g/d_p)[1 + (4/\phi_s^D)(1 - \phi_s^D)]\left[ (1 - \phi_s^D)^{1/2}Pr^{1/3}Re_{dp}^{0.6} \right] \) is the overall gas to solid heat transfer coefficient \( U_{gs} \) obtained by Kuwahara et al. [16] for packed beds with porosities in the range of 0.2 to 0.9, where \( Re_{dp} = 4\rho_s^D v_s^D (1 - \phi_s^D)(\dot{M}_g^D/\dot{M}_s^D)d_p/(\mu_g\phi_s^D) \) is the characteristic Reynolds number based on the particle size and the average velocity of the solid in the dryer $v_s^D$, which is assumed to be constant and equal to 0.02 m/s.

**Torrefaction**

The torrefaction process for each type of feedstock is described in terms of experimental results obtained by Tapasvi et al. [13] of the proximate and ultimate composition, the heating value and the density of the solid product as a function of the temperature $T_s^T$ and the residence time $t_s^T$ of the solid particles inside the torrefaction reactor. The design of the torrefaction reactor is based on a vertical tower with a height to diameter ratio equal to 2, where the volume of the torrefaction reactor is calculated from

\[
V_s^T = t_s^T \frac{\dot{M}_j^D (1 - \Delta y_{j,H_2O}^D)}{[\rho_s^T (1 - \phi_s^T)]},
\]

where \( \Delta y_{j,H_2O}^D \) is the variation in moisture content of the feedstock in the drying process prior torrefaction, $\rho_s^T$ and $\phi_s^T$ are the average feedstock density and gas to solid volume ratio in the torrefaction reactor. In this work, it is assumed that $\phi_s^T$ is constant and equal to 0.82.
Particle size reduction

Particle size reduction is performed by grinding in hammer mills. The characterization of the particle size reduction is based on the output particle size distribution $f^{SR}(d_p)$ and the total electric power consumed $W_e^{SR}$ which is calculated from

$$W_e^{SR} = \dot{M}_S^{SR} w_e^{SR}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

where $\dot{M}_S^{SR}$ is the input feedstock mass flow rate and $w_e^{SR}$ is the specific electric energy consumed per unit input mass, dependent on the particle size and the process condition in the torrefaction process. In this work, we have assumed a linear decrease of the grinding energy with increasing values of the torrefaction temperature in the range of 200 to 300 °C given by the empirical formula $w_e^{SR} = 125 - (T_s^T - 200)$ based on experimental data Govin et al. [17].

Mass and energy yields for the overall pretreatment system

Considering the integrated pretreatment of woody biomass and organic waste shown in Figure 2, explicit expressions for the total mass and energy yields, denoted by $f_s^{PR}$ and $\epsilon_s^{PR}$, can be obtained in terms of the input and output composition and calorific value of the feedstock and the conditions of the drying agent, giving

$$f_s^{PR} = \sum (y_j^F f_j^{PR})$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

and

$$\epsilon_s^{PR} = \sum (y_j^F LHV_j^F \epsilon_j^{PR}) / \sum (y_j^F LHV_j^F), \hspace{1cm} (2.8)$$

Where

$$f_j^{PR} = 1 - \Delta y_{j,H_2O}^{PR} - (1 - y_j^{F,H_2O})\Delta y_{j,v}^{PR} \hspace{1cm} \text{and} \hspace{1cm} \epsilon_j^{PR} = 1 + \left[\Delta y_{j,H_2O}^{PR} h_{H_2O}^F + c_{j,s} \Delta T_{s}^{PR} - (1 - y_j^{F,H_2O})[LHV_{j,drv} - (1 - \Delta y_{j,v}^{PR})LHV_{j,drv}^{PR}] / LHV_j^F \right]$$

are the mass and energy yields from the pretreatment of each feedstock, with $\Delta y_{j,H_2O}^{PR}$, $\Delta y_{j,v}^{PR}$ and
\( \Delta T_{SP} \) denoting respectively the variation of the feedstock moisture, volatiles and temperature during pretreatment.

2.3. GASIFICATION, COOLING AND CONDITIONING

Figure 3 shows the process flow diagram for the gasification and the syngas cooling and conditioning systems. Thermochemical conversion of the biomass to syngas is performed in an entrained flow gasifier operated with oxygen-enriched air and steam. The syngas from the EFG reactor is cooled with recovery of heat for production of superheated steam. The process design for the syngas cooling includes a radiative and convective water-tube evaporation of saturated water, super-heating of saturated steam, gas-tube boiler and economizer for preheating the temperature of the feed water. After cooling, removal of particulate matter is performed with bag filters. Increase of the \( H_2 \) to \( CO \) molar ratio of the syngas to the value required by FT synthesis is performed by complete water-gas shifting of a fraction \( f_{wgs} \) of the total syngas flow. Heat recovery after the WGS reactor is performed in a boiler with production of saturated steam. The temperature of the syngas in the boiler is kept above the saturation temperature to avoid water condensation. Removal of \( CO_2 \) and \( H_2S \) from the shifted syngas is performed in a Selexol system. This technology is suitable for the range of \( CO_2 \) removal efficiencies required, which varies within 82-90% depending on the initial syngas composition, and exhibits low \( H_2 \) and \( CO \) losses [18]. Selexol also allows pure pressure-swing process configurations and minimize the energy consumption for thermal regeneration in the range of \( CO_2 \) removal efficiencies considered. The Selexol system includes syngas cooling with free condensed water removal in a water knock-out drum, the absorber where the syngas is in direct contact with the lean Selexol solvent, and the solvent regeneration unit. Regeneration of the Selexol is performed in three flash drums, operating at 10, 6.5 and 1.1 bar. The flash gas from the first two flash drums contains
considerable amounts of H₂ and CO, and is therefore recycled to the absorber to minimize the losses of these components. The flashed gas from the near-atmospheric regeneration stage is a high-purity CO₂ stream which is further compressed and cooled for storage in liquid phase. After regeneration, the lean Selexol is cooled by fresh water before entering the absorber.

EFG reactor

The EFG process has been assumed to be adiabatic and is described in terms of the input feedstock energy flow, composition and calorific value, denoted by \( \dot{H}^G_S \), \( y^G_{S,i} \) and \( LHV^G_S \), the lambda value or air-fuel equivalence ratio \( \lambda_g \), here defined as the ratio of the actual molar flow rate of oxygen used for gasification to the total stoichiometric molar flow rate needed for complete combustion, the total steam to carbon molar ratio \((S/C)_g\), the oxygen concentration in the gasification air \( X_{O_2}^{ASU} \) and the reactor pressure \( p^G_g \). The calorific value and composition of the input feedstock are evaluated from

\[
LHV^G_S = \sum (e^P_j y^P_j (1 - y^F_{j,H_2O}) LHV^F_{j,dry}) / \sum (y^P_j (1 - y^P_{j,H_2O}) f^P_j),
\]  
(2.9)

\[
y^G_{S,i} = \sum [y^P_j f^P_j (1 - y^P_{j,H_2O}) y^P_{j,i}] / \sum [y^P_j f^P_j (1 - y^P_{j,H_2O})]
\]  
(2.10)

and

\[
y^G_{S,H_2O} = \sum (y^P_j y^P_{j,H_2O}) / \sum (y^P_j f^P_j),
\]  
(2.11)

where \( e^P_j \) and \( f^P_j \) are the mass and energy yields from the pretreatment of each feedstock, \( y^G_{S,i} \) denotes the dry composition with the subscript \( i \) representing volatiles, fixed carbon, ash and atomic composition and the superscripts \( F \) and \( \text{PR} \) denoting conditions of raw feedstock and after pretreatment, respectively. The total input mass flow rate of feedstock and the molar flow rate of gasification air and steam to the EFG can then be obtained from \( \dot{M}^G_S = \dot{H}^G_S / LHV^G_S \), \( \dot{N}^G_{air} = (\dot{H}^F_S / LHV^F_S) n^G_{air} \) and \( \dot{N}^G_{stm} = (\dot{H}^F_S / LHV^F_S) n^G_{stm} \), where

\[
n^G_{air} = (\lambda_g / X_{O_2}^{ASU})(1 - y^G_{S,a} - y^G_{S,H_2O})(1 + x/4 - y/2)/(W_c + y W_o + x W_H),
\]  
(2.12)
and

\[ n_{stm}^G = \left[ \frac{(S/C)_g}{\left(1 - y_{S,a}^G - y_{S,H_2O}^G\right)/\left(W_c + yW_O + xW_H\right) - y_{S,H_2O}^G/W_{H_2O}} \right]. \tag{2.13} \]

are the moles of gasification air and steam per unit mass of input feedstock. The outlet syngas flow from the EFG is described in terms of the molar flow rate \( \dot{N}_g^G = \dot{M}_g^G n_g^G \), temperature \( T_g^G \) and composition, \( x_g^G \), where \( n_g^G \) are the moles of syngas per unit input mass of feedstock to the EFG calculated from

\[ n_g^G = \frac{1}{W_g^G} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{x_g}{x_{O_2}} \right) \frac{x_{ASU}^{ASU} W_{O_2} + (1 - x_{ASU}^{ASU}) W_{N_2}}{W_c + yW_O + xW_H} + \frac{W_{H_2O} (S/C)_g}{W_c + yW_O + xW_H} \right]. \tag{2.14} \]

In equations (2.12-2.14), \( W_g^G \) is the mean molecular weight of syngas and \( x = \frac{(W_c y_{S,H}^G)}{(W_H y_{S,C}^G)} \) and \( y = \frac{(W_c y_{S,O}^G)}{(W_O y_{S,C}^G)} \) are, respectively, the H/C and O/C atomic ratios of the input feedstock, with \( W_l \) denoting the atomic weight. Calculation of the outlet temperature and the syngas composition has been done by simulating the gasification process in Aspen using thermochemical equilibrium based on Gibbs free energy minimization applied to the elemental gas composition (C, H, O, N, and S) of the input solid, subject to char gasification and water-gas reactions [19]

\[ C_{(s)} + H_2O \rightarrow CO + H_2 \] \hspace{1cm} (R1)
\[ C_{(s)} + CO_2 \rightarrow 2CO \] \hspace{1cm} (R2)
\[ C_{(s)} + 0.5O_2 \rightarrow CO \] \hspace{1cm} (R3)
\[ C_{(s)} + 2H_2 \rightarrow CH_4 \] \hspace{1cm} (R4)
\[ S + H_2 \rightarrow H_2S \] \hspace{1cm} (R5)
\[ CO + H_2O \leftrightarrow CO_2 + H_2 \] \hspace{1cm} (R6)

together with the energy conservation equation
\[n_g^G \left[ \varepsilon_{p,g}^G (T_g^G - T^0) + \sum (x_{g,i}^G \overline{LHV}_i) \right] + n_{air}^G \varepsilon_{p,air}^G (T_{air}^G - T^0) + n_{stm}^G w_{H_2O} h_{stm}^G + y_{S,a}^G [c_a^G (T_a^G - T^0) + y_{a,c}^G \overline{LHV}_C^G] - \overline{LHV}_S^G = 0, \quad (2.15)\]

where \(\varepsilon_{p,g}^G, \varepsilon_{a}^G, T_i^G\) denotes the specific heat and temperature of the syngas, gasification air and ash, \(T^0 = 298 K\) is a reference temperature, \(y_{a,c}^G\) and \(\overline{LHV}_C = 34.1 \text{ MJ/kg}\) are the carbon content in the ash and the calorific value per unit mass of carbon, \(\overline{LHV}_i\) are the calorific value per unit mole of each component of the syngas and \(h_{stm}^G\) is the specific enthalpy of the steam. Slag is quenched and transported to a silo by chain and band conveyors. It is assumed that 95% of the ash content in the feedstock is in the slag, the remaining 5% being transferred as particulate matter to the output syngas flow.

**Air separation and compression**

The air separation unit (ASU) shown in Figure 3 represent a complete package including fresh air heating and compression, cryogenic cooling and separation, specified in terms of the total flow rate of \(O_2\) that needs to be separated, \(N_{O_2}^{ASU} = (H_S^G / \overline{LHV}_S^G)n_{air}^G (X_{O_2}^{air} - X_{O_2}^{ASU})\), with \(n_{air}^G\) given by equation (2.12). Assuming that the outlet pressure from the ASU unit is atmospheric, the compressor for the oxygen-enriched air to the EFG reactor is specified based on the total electric power required for compression to the EFG pressure, calculated from

\[w_{air}^G = (H_S^G / \overline{LHV}_S^G)n_{air}^G (R/W_{O_2})(T_{air}^G / T^0)P_{atm} \left[ \left( P_g^G / P_{atm} \right)^{n-1)} - 1 \right] n / (n - 1) \quad (2.16)\]

where \(T_{air}^G\) is the outlet air temperature from the separation unit and \(n\) is the polytropic coefficient of the compressor.

**Gas cooling train**

The overall syngas cooling train is described in terms of the pressure and temperature conditions of the superheated steam produced, denoted by \(P_{stm}^G\) and \(T_{stm}^G\), and the outlet temperature of the
syngas $T_{g,i}^{WGS}$, here specified as the minimum inlet temperature to the water-gas shifting required for activation of the catalysts. The total steam power produced from the syngas cooling can then be calculated from

$$
\dot{Q}_{stm}^{sc} = \left( \dot{H}_s^C / LHV_s^C \right) n_g^C ( h_g^C - h_g^{WGS} ) / \eta_{th}^{sc},
$$

(2.17)

where $h_g^C$ and $h_g^{WGS}$ are the thermal enthalpy of syngas at the EFG outlet conditions and at the WGS inlet conditions, respectively, and $\eta_{th}^{sc}$ is the thermal efficiency of the overall cooling train.

Dimensioning of each section $j$ of the gas cooling train is based on the total heat transfer area $A_{th}^j$, calculated from $A_{th}^j = \dot{M}_g^C c_{p,g} ( T_{g,i}^j - T_{g,o}^j ) / ( U_g^j LMTD_j )$, where, for each section, $c_{p,g}^j$ is the average specific heat of the syngas, $T_{g,i}^j$ and $T_{g,o}^j$ are the inlet and outlet syngas temperature, $LMTD_j$ is the log mean temperature difference and $U_g^j$ is the overall heat transfer coefficient calculated from

$$
U_g^j = \left[ \left( Nu_g k_g / d_\ell + \sigma F_g e_g ( \bar{T}_g^2 + \bar{T}_t^2 ) ( \bar{T}_g + \bar{T}_t ) \right)^{-1} + \left( d_\ell / 2k_\ell \right) \ln \left( d_\ell / (d_\ell - 2t) \right) + ( d_\ell - 2t ) / N u_i k_i \right]^{-1}.
$$

In this equation, $\bar{T}_g$ and $\bar{T}_t$ represent the average temperature for the gas and the bundles surface temperature, $Nu_g$, $k_g$, $Nu_i$ and $k_i$ are the Nusselt number and the thermal conductivity for the syngas and the cooling medium respectively, and $d_\ell$, $t$ and $k_\ell$ are the tube diameter, thickness and thermal conductivity for each bundle section. Table 3 shows the bundle configuration and Nusselt number expressions used in this work.

**Bag filters**

Cleaning of the particulate matter in the syngas is based on fabric-bag filters, specified in terms of the total inlet syngas flow rate $\dot{V}_g^{BF} = \dot{H}_s^C / LHV_s^C n_g^C / \nu^0_N$, with $\nu^0_N$ denoting the normal gas volume per unit mole, and the total electric power consumption $\dot{W}_e^{BF} = \dot{V}_g^{BF} \nu_e^{BF}$, where $\nu_e^{BF}$ is
the specific electric power consumption, which is assumed to be constant and equal to 1.63-10^{-3} kWh/Nm^3 [22]

**Water gas shifting**

Water Gas Shifts of the syngas is assumed to be performed in adiabatic reactor, under the assumption of having simpler designs with lower fabrication and maintenance costs. Also, adiabatic WGS leads to higher gas temperatures which allow more efficient heat recovery with lower heat transfer area. The fraction of the total syngas flow going to WGS is calculated from

\[ f_{\text{wgs}} = \frac{[(H_2/CO)^{\text{FT}}/(H_2/CO)^{G}](\alpha_{CO}^{G}/\alpha_{H_2}^{G}) - 1)}{([H_2/CO]^{\text{FT}}/(H_2/CO)^{G}](\alpha_{CO}^{G}/\alpha_{H_2}^{G}) + 1)} \] (2.18)

where \((H_2/CO)^{\text{FT}}\) and \((H_2/CO)^{G}\) are the \(H_2\) to CO molar ratio after gasification but before FTS and \(\alpha_{CO}^{G}\) and \(\alpha_{H_2}^{G}\) are the outlet to inlet molar ratio of CO and \(H_2\) in the Selexol system. The WGS process is modelled as one single overall reaction, CO (+H_2O) to CO2 (+H2), in presence a catalyst bed. Assuming one single operating train, dimensioning of the WGS reactor is based on the total reactor volume calculated from

\[ V_{\text{wgs}} = V_{\text{cat}}^{\text{WGS}} k_v^{\text{WGS}} \]

where the parameter \(k_v^{\text{WGS}}\) represents the total reactor to catalyst bed volume ratio, assumed to be 1.2 [23], and \(V_{\text{cat}}^{\text{WGS}} = (H_s^{G}/LHV_s^{G}) v_{\text{cat}}^{\text{WGS}}\) is the catalyst bed volume with \(v_{\text{cat}}^{\text{WGS}}\) calculated from

\[ v_{\text{cat}}^{\text{WGS}} = f_{\text{wgs}} \{ 1 + x_{\text{CO}}^{G}(MW_{H_2O}/MW_g^{G})(S/CO)^{WGS} - (S/CO)^{WGS} \} \]

\[ (S/CO)^{WGS} = \frac{MW_{wgs}(T_{wgs}^{G}/T_{wgs}^{G}) v_{\text{wgs}}^{WGS} k_v^{WGS}}{V_{\text{wgs}}^{WGS}} \] (2.19)

Here, \((S/CO)^{WGS}\) is the steam to CO molar ratio required by the WGS, which is assumed to be 1.1 based on available data in the literature on the performance of commercial WGS catalysts [27]. \(T_{wgs}^{G}\) is the average gas temperature in the WGS reactor, and \(t_{\text{cat}}^{WGS}\) is the residence time in the catalyst bed, assumed to be constant equal to 36 sec [24]. Considering adiabatic reactors, the
gas temperature in the WGS process must be kept below a maximum limit $T_{\text{max}}^{\text{WGS}}$ so that the WGS reaction rate is sufficiently high to achieve complete CO conversion with short residence times. If the temperature in the WGS reactor is above $T_{\text{max}}^{\text{WGS}}$, a second operating reactor is required with intermediate syngas cooling between the reactors. Using the equilibrium constant for the WGS, $K_{\text{eq}}^{\text{WGS}} = \exp(-4.33 + 4557.8/T_g)$ derived by Moe [25] for commercial catalysts and assuming $K_{\text{eq}}^{\text{WGS}} > 10$ to ensure complete CO conversion, $T_{\text{max}}^{\text{WGS}}$ needs to be below 700 °C. Above this temperature, an additional stage is required to achieve complete WGS shifting. Dimensioning of the heat recovery boiler after the WGS reactor is based on the thermal duty $\dot{Q}_{x,t,m}^{\text{WGS}}$ calculated from

$$\dot{Q}_{x,t,m}^{\text{WGS}} = \left(\frac{H^G_s}{LHV_G^G}\right)n_G^f f_{\text{WGS}} x_{t,0}^G \bar{q}_{\text{WGS}},$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.20)

with $\bar{q}_{\text{WGS}} = 41.09 \text{kJ/mol}$ denoting the heat of the WGS reaction per unit mole of CO, and

$$\text{LMTD}_{\text{WGS}}^{\text{WGS}} = \left(T_{\text{WGS}}^{\text{WGS}} - T_{\text{D}}^{\text{D}}\right)\ln\left(\left(T_{\text{D}}^{\text{D}} - T_{\text{W}}^{\text{WGS}}\right)/(T_{\text{D}}^{\text{D}} - T_{\text{W}}^{\text{WGS}})\right)$$

is the logarithmic mean temperature difference. Here, $T_{\text{W}}^{\text{WGS}}$ is the saturated temperature of the water in the boiler and the outlet gas temperature from the WGS reactor is estimated from $T_{g,o}^{\text{WGS}} = T_{g,i}^{\text{WGS}} + x_{g,\text{CO}} \bar{q}_{\text{WGS}} / c_p^{\text{WGS}}$ assuming a constant specific heat capacity of the gas in the reactor.

**Selexol system**

The Selexol system has been specified in terms of the CO$_2$ concentration in the syngas entering the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, denoted by $x_{g,\text{CO}_2}^{\text{FT}}$. The overall CO$_2$ capture ratio, defined as the output to input CO$_2$ molar flow rate, can then be calculated in terms of the syngas composition after the EFG from

$$\alpha_{c,0}^{c} = \left[x_{g,\text{CO}_2}^{\text{FT}} / (1 + x_{g,\text{CO}_2}^{\text{FT}})\right],$$

$$\left[1 - \alpha_{c,0}^{c} x_{g,\text{H}_2} (1 - f_{\text{WGS}}) - \alpha_{c,0}^{c} x_{g,\text{CO}} (1 - f_{\text{WGS}})\right] / \left(x_{g,\text{CO}_2}^{G} + x_{g,\text{CO}}^{G} f_{\text{WGS}}\right),$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.21)
where $\alpha_{H_2}^{CC}$ and $\alpha_{CO_2}^{CC}$ are the capture ratios for H$_2$ and CO. Based on the definition of $\alpha_{CO_2}^{CC}$, the total volumetric flow rate of CO$_2$ capture in the Selexol system is calculated from

$$
\dot{V}_{CO_2}^{CC} = \left( \frac{H_S^G}{LHV_S^G} \right) v_N^G n_{CO_2}^{G} \alpha_{CO_2}^{CC} \times 
$$

$$
\left[ x_{g,CO_2}^G + x_{g,CO}^G \left( \frac{(H_2/CO)^{FT} - (H_2/CO)^G}{1 + (H_2/CO)^{FT}} \right) \right]
$$

(2.22)

Dimensioning of the absorption column is based on the total input flow rate of syngas and solvent, which can be calculated from in terms of the concentration of the syngas from the EFG reactor from

$$
\dot{V}_g^{CC} = \left( \frac{H_S^G}{LHV_S^G} \right) v_N^G n_{g}^{G} x_{CO_2}^{G} \left[ 1 + (H_2/CO)^{FT} \right]
$$

(2.23)

and

$$
\dot{V}_{sel}^{ABS} = \gamma \dot{V}_{CO_2}^{CC} / \left( p_{g,ABS}^{ABS} \chi_{S-CO_2,o}^{ABS} - \gamma p_{g,FL}^{FL} \chi_{S-CO_2,o}^{FL} \right)
$$

(2.24)

where $\chi_{S-CO_2,o}^{ABS}$ and $\chi_{S-CO_2,o}^{FL}$ are the solubility of CO$_2$ in Selexol at the outlet of the absorber and flash tank, respectively, and $\gamma = 1.26 \left( 1 - \alpha_{CO_2}^{CC} \right)^{0.07} - 0.0000138 P_g^{ABS}$ is the ratio of the actual flow ratio of Selexol relative the flow rate required to reach equilibrium. Here, we have considered a linear dependence for the selectivity of CO$_2$ in Selexol [26, 27] given by $\chi_{S,CO_2} = 5.26 \cdot 10^{-7} - 1.064 \cdot 10^{-8} T_{sel}$ based on correlations from experimental results. The temperature of the Selexol at the absorber outlet is calculated considering energy conservation for the total flow of Selexol in the absorber, giving

$$
T_{s,0}^{ABS} = T_{s,i}^{ABS} + \left[ \dot{Q}_{g,CO_2}^{ABS} + q_{sel,CO_2} \dot{V}_{CO_2}^{CC} / v_N \right] / \left( \rho_{sel} c_{sel} \dot{V}_{sel}^{ABS} \right)
$$

(2.25)

where $q_{sel,CO_2}$ is the heat release per unit mole of CO$_2$ dissolved in the Selexol, assumed to be constant and equal to 221 kJ/mole for CO$_2$ mass fraction in the range of 0.37–0.383 [28] and $\dot{Q}_{g,CO_2}^{ABS} = A_{gs}^{ABS} U_{gs}^{ABS} LMTD_{gs}^{ABS}$ is the total convective heat transfer from the syngas to the Selexol. Here, $A_{gs}^{ABS}$ is the total heat transfer area from syngas to Selexol which is calculated in terms of
the volume faction of Selexol in the absorber $\phi_l^{ABS}$ and the Selexol droplet diameter $d_{set}$ from $A_{gs}^{ABS} = V_{set}^{ABS} \phi_l^{ABS} / d_{set}$. The heat transfer coefficient between the gas and the solvent is calculated from $U_{gs}^{ABS} = \left( \frac{k_g}{d_p} \right) \left( 2 + 0.6 Re_{d_p}^{0.5} Pr^{1/3} \right)$ based on correlations from Ranz et al. [29]. Using the flow rate of Selexol from Eq. (2.28), the capture ratio for H₂ and CO can be obtained from

$$\alpha_{H_2}^{CC} = \dot{V}_{set}^{ABS} \left( p_g^{ABS} x_{S-H_2,0}^{ABS} - p_g^{FL} x_{S-H_2,0}^{FL} \right) / \left[ \dot{v}_N^0 N_g^G (x_{g,H_2}^G + x_{g,CO}^G f_{WGS}) \right]$$

(2.26)

and

$$\alpha_{CO}^{CC} = \dot{V}_{set}^{ABS} \left( p_g^{ABS} x_{S-CO,0}^{ABS} - p_g^{FL} x_{S-CO,0}^{FL} \right) / \left[ \dot{v}_N^0 N_g^G x_{g,CO}^G (1 - f_{WGS}) \right]$$

(2.27)

where $x_{S-i,0}^{ABS}$ and $x_{S-i}^{FL}$ are the solubility of gas species in Selexol (H₂ and CO), based on the outlet conditions in the absorber and the flash tank. In this analysis, we have assumed that the solubility of both H₂ and CO is proportional to the solubility of CO₂, with a constant proportionality factor [23] equal to 0.01 and 0.028, respectively, not dependent on pressure and temperature.

2.4. FISCHER-TROPSCH SYNTHESIS AND SEPARATION

Figure 4 shows the process design for FT synthesis and separation. The syngas stream after CO₂-capture is compressed by a booster compressor and fed into the FTS reactor. The overall FTS process is here specified based on the pressure and temperature along the catalyst bed, denoted by $P_r^{FT}$ and $T_r^{FT}$, the CO conversion factor $y_r^{FT}$ and as well the catalyst reactivity and selectivity to the different hydrocarbons products. Cooling of the FTS reactor is performed through evaporation in saturated-water tubes to achieve uniformity of the temperature inside the reactor. This avoids problems with catalyst deactivation due to sintering and coking as well as formation of significant amounts of undesirable methane in the product through methanation [30-
After synthesis, waxes, with carbon number equal to or above C\textsubscript{20}, are separated directly from the FTS reactor. Middle distillate and naphtha, with carbon number C\textsubscript{12}-C\textsubscript{19} and C\textsubscript{5}-C\textsubscript{11}, respectively, are separated sequentially using water coolers. The remaining C\textsubscript{4} hydrocarbons and the LNG mixture, C\textsubscript{1}-C\textsubscript{3}, are separated based on refrigeration and cryogenic cooling, respectively. The cooling water after separation of middle distillates and naphtha is used as feed water for the heat recovery system.

The total rate of energy production of each hydrocarbon \( C_n H_m \) produced from the FTS and the total thermal power production from synthesis and separation can be calculated in terms of the input power to the EFG from

\[
\dot{N}_{C_n H_m}^{FT} = \left( H_s^G / LHV_s^G \right) n_{C_n H_m}^G \left[ x_{C_0}^G \left( 1 - f_{wgs} \right) \alpha_{C_0}^{CC} / n_{C_0}^{FT} \right] w_{C_n H_m} LHV_{C_n H_m}
\]

and

\[
\dot{Q}_{th}^{FT} = \left( H_s^G / LHV_s^G \right) (q_{C_n H_m}^{SEP} + q_{pw}^{FTS})
\]

where \( n_{C_0}^{FT} = \sum_{n=1}^{N_p} \sum_{s=1}^{S_m} \nu_{C_0} w_{C_n H_m} \) is the molar consumption of CO per unit total molar production from FTS, \( LHV_{C_n H_m} \) is the lower heating value per unit mole of \( C_n H_m \) and \( q_{C_n H_m}^{SEP} \), \( q_{pw}^{FTS} \) are the heat recovered from the FTS reactor, from separation of the FTS hydrocarbons and from the process water, calculated respectively from

\[
q_{C_n H_m}^{FTS} = n_{C_0}^G \left[ x_{C_0}^G \left( 1 - f_{wgs} \right) \alpha_{C_0}^{CC} / n_{C_0}^{FT} \right] \sum_{n=1}^{N_p} \sum_{s=1}^{S_m} w_{C_n H_m} \left( h_{C_n H_m}^f + \nu_{H_2O}^n \bar{h}_{H_2O}^f - \nu_{C_0}^n \bar{h}_{C_0}^f \right),
\]

\[
q_{C_n H_m}^{SEP} = \sum_{n=1}^{N_p} n_{C_0}^G \left[ x_{C_0}^G \left( 1 - f_{wgs} \right) \alpha_{C_0}^{CC} / n_{C_0}^{FT} \right] w_{C_n H_m} \left( h_{C_n H_m}^{FTS} - h_{C_n H_m}^S \right)
\]

(2.31)

and

\[
q_{pw}^{FTS} = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{N_p} \nu_{H_2O}^n w_{C_n H_m} \right] \left( h_{sat}^{FT} - h_{pw,o} \right)
\]

(2.32)
Here, $h_i^f$ is the molar formation enthalpy for each species, $v_{H_2O}^{n,m}$ and $v_{CO}^{n,m}$ are the stoichiometric factors in the overall synthesis of $C_nH_m$, and $h_{C_nH_m}^{iT}$ and $h_{C_nH_m}^S$ are the thermal enthalpy of each hydrocarbon from the FTS reactor and at separation, respectively, and $h_{\text{sat}}^{FT}$ and $h_{\text{pw,o}}$ are the thermal enthalpy of the saturated steam and outlet condensed water, respectively.

Evaluation of the product selectivity in the FTS has been described using the ASF (Anderson-Schulz-Flory) model, where the molar distribution for all the hydrocarbons with carbon number $n$ are calculated in terms of the chain growth probability factor $\alpha$, independent of $n$, from $\sum_m w_{C_nH_m} = n\alpha^{n-1}(1 - \alpha)^2$. In this work, low-temperature FTS in a slurry phase reactor with conventional cobalt catalyst has been considered. This technology has been proven at commercial-scale to achieve up-to 80% CO conversion [32, 33], using syngas $H_2/CO$ ratio typically in the range 1.9-2, and to maximize the production of waxes [34], which is desirable for the production of high-quality diesel fuels [35]. Co-based catalysts also exhibit high resistance to deactivation. For cobalt-based catalysts in low temperature FTS, $\alpha$ is assumed to be a function of the concentration of $H_2$ and CO and the temperature given by $\alpha = [0.633 + 0.232 x_{CO}^{FTS} / (x_{CO}^{FTS} + x_{H_2}^{FTS})][1 - 0.039(T^{FT}_r - 533)]$ based on the results from Song et al. [36].

For the production of liquid biofuels, particularly diesel-type, the factor $\alpha$ needs to be above 0.8 to promote formation of longer-chain hydrocarbons, which, for cobalt-based catalysts, requires temperatures in the FTS above approximately 175 °C. Dimensioning of the FTS reactor is described in terms of the total input syngas flow rate, calculated from

$$\dot{V}_g^{FT} = \left(\dot{H}_s^G / LHV_s^G\right)n_g^G v_N^0 x_{CO}^G (1 - f_{wgs}) \alpha_{C_0}^{CC} / Y_t^{FT}(T_r^{FT} / T^0)(P^0 / P_g^{FT}) \tag{2.33}$$

3. PLANT PROCESS ANALYSIS
Calculation of the complete process for the biocrude production plant has been performed in ASPEN PLUS using built-in models for standard equipment complemented with user-defined routines in FORTRAN for dedicated process models described in Section 2. Table 4 lists the process parameters considered in the analysis of the biocrude production plant. The analysis is performed for a reference plant capacity of 150 MW based on the input feedstock power to the EFG reactor. Tables 5 and 6 show the overall mass and energy balances for the biocrude production plant calculated for the reference plant capacity as a function of the main input parameters of the analysis, i.e., the mass fraction of the sludge in the raw feedstock, the gasification lambda value and the gasification temperature.

**Dryers sizing**

Figure 5 shows the variation of the thermal duty of drying agent per unit mass of evaporated water and the dryer volume per unit mass flow rate of feedstock as a function of the moisture content reduction in the dryer for feedstock particle size of 10, 15, 20 mm. The smallest particle size are here assumed to be more representative of dehydrated sludge, while the whole range are representative of the particle size after chipping of the logwood. The values for the thermal power of the drying agent are not very dependent on the particle size and are in accordance with reported results on the performance of direct-contact steam dryers [37, 38]. However, the required volume of the dryer increases both linearly with the total water evaporation and strongly with the particle size due to the reduction of the total heat transfer area and Nusselt number.

**Mass and energy yields for the overall pretreatment system**

Figure 6 shows the variation of the energy and mass yields for the overall pretreatment system as a function of the mass fraction of the sludge relative to the total input raw feedstock to the plant, evaluated from equations (2.7)-(2.8) and results from torrefaction experiments [13]. For all
cases, the energy yield is above 1 since the evaporation energy decrease in the drying process is greater that the energy losses due to release of combustible volatiles during torrefaction. This effect increases as the mass fraction of sludge in the raw feedstock increases. The mass yield decreases with increasing values of the torrefaction temperature due to the increased loss of combustible volatiles from the feedstock. As the fraction of sludge in the raw feedstock increases, the total mass yield decreases when the moisture content in the sludge is 80%. If the moisture content in the sludge decreases to 60%, the increase of the mass fraction of sludge in the raw feedstock is not affecting significantly the overall mass yield after pretreatment.

**Operational limits for the EFG reactor**

Figure 7(a) shows the operational limits of the EFG process for variable values of the mass fraction of wood relative to the total input raw feedstock. The operational limits are here represented as the variation of the S/C ratio with the lambda value for the lower and upper temperature limits. The lower temperature limit is assumed to be 1300°C in order to ensure complete ash melting [39]. The upper temperature limit is specified to be 1600°C, sufficient to achieve complete conversion of hydrocarbons to CO and H₂. The lambda value is considered to be within the range of 0.2-0.4 [40]. The S/C ratio is then calculated within the lambda value range to achieve the upper and lower temperature limits. As shown in Figure 7(a), the S/C ratio increases linearly with increasing lambda value for all cases. For constant lambda value, the required steam amount increases with increasing fractions of the woody biomass relative to organic waste, due to the higher calorific value of the former, and decreases with the gasification temperature. Figure 7(b) shows the variation of the H₂ to CO molar ratio of the syngas leaving the EF gasification for the operational limits. These results show that lower gasification temperatures lead to higher H₂/CO molar ratio. This figure also shows that increasing values of the mass fraction of sludge leads to
higher H₂/CO ratios, this effect being stronger at lower temperatures and lambda values. This can be explained due to the higher H/C ratio of the organic waste as compared to woody biomass.

**Cold-gas efficiency and output thermal power of the EFG process**

Figure 8 shows the variation of the (a) cold-gas efficiency and (b) the output thermal energy per unit feedstock energy in the EFG process as a function of the lambda value for variable values of the mass fraction of wood relative to the total input raw feedstock, evaluated from

\[ e_{cg}^G = n_g^G x_{g,CO}^G \left[ \frac{LHV_{CO} + LHV_{H_2}(H_2/CO)^G + \sum (x_{g,i}^G LHV_i)/x_{g,CO}^G}{LHV_s^G} \right] \tag{3.1} \]

and

\[ e_{th}^G = n_g^G x_{g,CO}^G \left[ \frac{\bar{e}_{p,H_2} + \bar{e}_{p,CO}(H_2/CO)^G + \sum (x_{g,i}^G \bar{e}_{p,i})/x_{g,CO}^G}{LHV_s^G} \right] \left[ T_i^G - T^0 \right] / LHV_s^G, \tag{3.2} \]

where \( LHV_i, \bar{e}_{p,i} \) and \( x_{g,i}^G \) represent the molar low heating value, specific heat and concentration for each molecular species at the EFG reactor outlet. The cold gas efficiency decreases linearly with the lambda value, due to increase combustion of the gas, and with decreasing values of the mass fraction of wood in the raw feedstock. This can be explained since the sludge has significantly higher ash content as compared to the wood, which decreases the total mass flow rate of syngas. The output thermal energy increase linearly with lambda value, the rate of increase being higher with higher mass fraction of wood in the raw feedstock.

**Biocrude and LNG production efficiency**

The net production efficiency of biocrude and LNG, here defined respectively as the mixture of hydrocarbons from FTS with carbon number above 3 and between 1 and 3, are calculated relative to the input feedstock power to the EFG from

\[ \epsilon_{bc} = \left( \frac{LHV_{bc}}{LHV_s^G} \right) n_g^G x_{C_0}^G \left[ \frac{1 - f_{WGS}}{n_{CO}^{FT}} \right] \tag{3.3} \]

and
\[
\epsilon_{\text{LNG}} = \left( \frac{LHV_{\text{LNG}}}{LHV_S^G} \right) n_g^G \left[ x_{CO}^G (1 - f_{wgs}) \alpha_{CO}^{CC} / n_{CO}^{PT} \right] 
\]  

(3.4)

where \( LHV_{bc} \) = \( \sum_{n=4}^{N_p} \sum_m w_{c_n h_m} LHV_{c_n h_m} \) and \( LHV_{\text{LNG}} \) = \( \sum_{n=1}^{3} \sum_m w_{c_n h_m} LHV_{c_n h_m} \) are the molar lower heating value of the biocrude and the LNG, respectively. Figure 9 shows the variation of the efficiency for the biocrude (a) and LNG (b) power production relative to the input biomass power to the gasification unit, calculated from equations (7.3)-(7.4), as a function of the lambda value in the EFG for wood to sludge mass ratio of 100, 75 and 50%. In general, the biocrude and LNG production decreases with increasing values of the gasification lambda value due to increased oxidation of the syngas. With increasing fraction of sludge in the input feedstock, the biocrude production decreases due to the lower carbon content in the sludge compared to the wood. However, the influence of the gasification temperature on the biocrude production exhibit different trends depending on the input feedstock composition. For 100% wood, the biocrude production decreases with increasing temperatures in the EFG for equivalence ratios lower than approximately 0.25, but this trend becomes opposite as the equivalence ratio increases above approximately 0.30. This opposite trend of the biocrude production with EFG temperature disappears as the sludge fraction in the feedstock increases above 25%, where lower values of the EFG temperature lead to higher biocrude power production.

**Heat balance for the overall plant**

The net thermal power production for the overall plant is calculated from

\[
\epsilon_{\text{th}} = \left(1 / LHV_S^G \right) \left( q_{\text{th}}^{G\text{CC}} + q_{\text{th}}^{\text{FTS}} + q_{\text{pw}}^{G\text{CC}} + q_{\text{pw}}^{\text{FTS}} - q_{g}^{\text{PR}} \right) 
\]  

(3.5)

where all the heat terms inside the second parenthesis are per unit feedstock energy input to the EFG. Here, \( q_{\text{th}}^{G\text{CC}} = q_{g}^{G\text{CC}} - q_{\text{stm}}^{G\text{CC}} \) represents the net heat recovered from gasification and syngas cooling and conditioning, where \( q_{g}^{G\text{CC}} = n_g^G \left[ e_{p,g}^G (T_g^G - T_g^{CC}) + f_{wgs} x_{CO}^G \bar{q}_{wgs} \right] \) is the thermal
energy recovered from the syngas cooling and conditioning and \( q_{stm}^{GCC} = (S/C)_g n_{x,C} - y_{g,H2O}^G/W_{H2O} - n_g^G f_{WGS} x_{CO}^G ([S/CO]^{WGS} - x_{H2O}^G/x_{CO}^G) \) is the steam energy required by gasification and WGS, \( q_{th}^{FTS} = q_{r}^{FTS} + q_{cnm}^{SEP} \) is the net heat recovered from Fischer Tropsch synthesis and separation with \( q_{r}^{FTS} \) and \( q_{cnm}^{SEP} \) denoting the thermal energy recovered from the FTS process and from separation of FTS products calculated from Equations (2.30) and (2.31), \( q_{pw}^{GCC} = n_g^G x_{H2O}^G (1 - f_{WGS}) - f_{WGS} x_{CO}^G ([S/CO]^{WGS} (h_{sat}^{GCC} - h_{pw,o}) \) is the heat recovered from process water from gasification and syngas cooling and conditioning, \( q_{pw}^{FTS} \) is the heat recovered from the process water in the Fischer Tropsch and separation system calculated from Equation (2.32), and \( q_g^{PR} = \sum (y_j^F q_j^{PR}) \) is the total heat consumed by the overall pretreatment system, with \( q_j^{PR} = (\Delta h_g^D / h_{g,i}) \) \( [\Delta y_{j,H2O}^P (h_{H2O} + h_{g,o}) + c_{j} \Delta T_s^{PR}] - (1 - y_{j,H2O}^P) [LHV_{j,dray} - (1 - y_{j,v}^P) LHV_{j,dray}^{PR}] \) denoting the heat consumed for each feedstock.

Table 7 shows the main heat flows for the biocrude production plant calculated for the reference plant capacity as a function of the main input parameters of the analysis, i.e., the mass fraction of the sludge in the raw feedstock, the gasification lambda value and the gasification temperature.

Figure 10 shows the variation of the net thermal power production relative to the input biomass energy flow to the gasification unit, calculated from equation (3.7), as a function of the operating conditions in the EFG reactor and the raw feedstock composition, for a steam temperature in the dryers equal to 150 (a) and 200 °C (b). The moisture content in the input raw wood and sludge to the plant has been assumed to be 50 and 60% respectively. Operating the EFG in the upper temperature limit, the net thermal power production exhibits a general monotonic increase with the lambda value in the EFG due to increased combustion of the syngas, which leads to increased
steam production from the syngas cooling. In the lower temperature limit in the EFG, the net thermal power decreases with the equivalence ratio due to increased consumption of steam in the gasification. With increasing fraction of sludge in the input feedstock, the net thermal production reduces significantly due to higher heat requirement for drying the sludge compared to the wood. When using steam at 150 °C for drying and operating the EFG at the lower temperature limit, the net production of heat from the syngas cooling, conditioning and synthesis approximately equals the heat requirement for the feedstock pretreatment. Increasing the steam temperature in the dryers reduces the heat consumption for pretreatment leading to positive net thermal production for the overall plant.

4. PLANT ECONOMICS

The economic performance of the biocrude production plant has been evaluated in terms of the capital and operating costs and the total cost of biocrude production. The results are presented for plant scales in the range of 150-600 MW, based on the input feedstock power to the EFG system, and as a function of the composition of the input raw feedstock.

4.1. CAPITAL COST

The capital cost of the plant has been evaluated in terms of the total permanent investment, which is calculated from

\[ C_{TPI} = \sum_i C_{P_i} \left[ 1 + f_{site} + f_{building} + f_{land} \right] \left[ 1 + f_{cont} + f_{eng} \right] \left[ 1 + f_{dev} + f_{com} \right], \quad (4.1) \]

where \( C_{P_i} \) is the total purchase and installation cost for a specific equipment \( i \), and \( f_i \) represents additional costs factors including civil work associated with site preparation and process-equipment building, offsite accessibility and services, contingency margin, contractors, land, royalties and patents. Representative values for \( f_i \) [41, 42] are listed in Table 8.
Equipment purchase and installation costs have been calculated using a modification of the base-cost method proposed by Guthrie-Ulrich [42], given by

\[
C_{p,k} = N_t C_{p,l_b} \left( \frac{S}{N_{t,op}} \right) f_p f_{mat} f_{BM} f_{inst} k_t^{N_t},
\]

(4.2)

where \( C_{p,l_b} \left( S / N_{t,op} \right) \) is the equipment purchase cost calculated as a function of the actual equipment size \( S_k \) and the number of operating units \( N_{t,op} \) at the cost index \( I_b \) related to a reference year, \( N_t \) is the total number of units, \( I \) is the cost index for the actual year, \( f_{mat} \) and \( f_p = (P/P_b)^{k_p} \) are factors accounting for a different material and pressure than the one considered in the purchase cost function \( C_{p,l_b} \), with \( k_p \) being assumed to be constant and equal to 2.208 [26], \( f_{inst} \) is the installation factor, \( f_{BM} \) is the bare module factor which accounts for the cost of auxiliary equipment and piping associated to the main equipment, and \( k_t^{N_b} \) is the train cost factor [43] where the parameter \( k_t \) is assumed to be constant and equal to 0.9 [44]. The train cost factor considers that the cost of multiple units reduces due to share of auxiliaries and installation costs. The cost index used in this study is based on the Chemical Engineering Plant Cost Index (CEPCI). Values for \( f_{inst} \) are based on individual installation factors per type of process equipment developed by Woods [45] with an updated labor correction factor under Norwegian conditions of 1.47.

The purchase cost functions for the main process equipment that has been considered in this work are based on data published by the authors in a previous work [12], with modifications as presented below. The cost of feedstock storage at the plant is calculated from \( C_p^{ST} = \sum_j c_{j,ST} M_j^F \rho_j \), where \( t_{ST} \) is the storage time capacity, assumed to be one week, and \( c_{j,ST} \) is the storage cost per unit volume, which is assumed to be constant and equal to 5.3 \( \text{€/m}^3 \) not dependent on the type of feedstock. The purchase cost of the direct-contact steam dryers (MS) has been estimated in terms of the total surface area of the drier \( A_r^D \) using the cost function \( C_p^D = \)}
2.55(A_s)^{0.6} based on industrial data. The purchase cost of the torrefaction reactor is evaluated as a function of the volume from the correlation \( C_p^T = 5.1(V_r^T / 100)^{0.735} \) obtained from the reported values [47] of 5.65 and 6.70M\$ for 115 and 145 m\(^3\) reactor volume, respectively. Purchase cost of the bag filter house is \( C_p^{BF} = 1.1(\dot{V}_g^{WGS} / 50000)^{0.798} \). Purchase cost of the cryogenic unit for the LNG is evaluated based on the input normal flow rate from \( C_p^{LNG} = 9.1(\dot{V}_N^{LNG} / 765)^{0.7} \). Figure 11 shows the total permanent investment as a function of the feedstock input power to the EFG of a) the overall pretreatment system for variable fraction of wood in raw feedstock and b) the gasification and syngas cooling and conditioning and the Fischer Tropsch and separation systems. As shown in Figure 11, increasing the amount of sludge in the raw feedstock has a different effect on the investment cost depending on the plant scale. For smaller scales below 200 MW, co-processing sludge lead to an increase in the total capital cost of pretreatment relative to pretreating 100% wood due to a dominant effect of the additional investment in driers, conveyors and grinding. Increasing the fraction of sludge reduces this effect due to smaller the size of the pretreatment train of the wood. For higher plant scales, above 200 MW, co-processing sludge lead to lower investment cost due to lower scale factor for the pretreatment train of sludge compared to the wood. Figure 12 shows the variation of the specific capital cost of the biocrude production plant as a function of the plant scale and the composition of the input raw feedstock to the plant. The plant specific capital cost is here defined as the total permanent investment divided by the input feedstock power to the EFG. The moisture content of the wood and the sludge are assumed to be 50 and 80%, respectively, which correspond to the upper values in the specified range. For each plant capacity, the capital cost for the gasification, cooling and conditioning system and for the FTS and separation system are constant and equal to the maximum values based on the process parameters specified in Table 8, while the capital cost
for the pretreatment varies with the composition of the input feedstock. These results show an increase in the specific capital cost of the plant with increasing mass fraction of sludge in the raw feedstock, due to the higher moisture content of the sludge which requires larger drying capacity and thus higher capital cost for the pretreatment system.

4.2. OPERATING COST

The total operating cost for the biocrude production plant is calculated per annual basis from

\[ C_{\text{PROD}} = C_F + C_{\text{op,d}} + C_{\text{op,i}} + C_{\text{maint}}, \quad (4.3) \]

where \( C_F \) is the total cost of feedstock supply, \( C_{\text{op,d}} \) represents the variable direct operational cost dependent on the annual processing of feedstock, \( C_{\text{op,i}} \) are the fixed indirect operational costs required for having the plant in activity, and \( C_{\text{maint}} \) are the maintenance costs.

**Feedstock supply cost**

The total cost of supply feedstock is then calculated from

\[ C_F = \sum_j (\dot{M}_j^F \tau_{\text{prod}} / \rho_j) \left[ c_{j,pr} + c_{j,\text{tr-f}} + c_{j,\text{tr-l}} L_j \right] \quad (4.4) \]

where \( \tau_{\text{prod}} \) is the annual production time, \( \rho_j \) is the raw feedstock density, \( c_{j,pr} \) is the feedstock production cost per unit volume and \( c_{j,\text{tr-f}} \) and \( c_{j,\text{tr-l}} \) are the fixed and distance-dependent transport costs per unit volume. The average feedstock transport distance is here estimated from

\[ L_j = 2 (\dot{M}_j^F \tau_{\text{prod}} / m_{j,S})^{1/2} \]

where \( m_{j,S} \) is the feedstock availability per unit area. Table 9 shows the assumed values for biomass density, annual production and unit costs under Norwegian conditions [48]. In equation (4.4), \( \dot{M}_j^F \) is the total mass flow rate of each raw feedstock supplied to plant, which is calculated in terms of the total input power to the EFG \( \dot{H}_{\text{in}}^G \) from

\[ \dot{M}_j^F = Y_j^F \dot{H}_{\text{in}}^G / \sum (Y_j^F NCV_{s,j} e_j^{PR}) \quad (4.5) \]
where \( Y_j^F \) is the mass fraction of the feedstock and \( \epsilon_j^{PR} \) is the overall energy yield after pretreatment of the feedstock. Figure 13 shows the variation of the cost of feedstock supply per unit feedstock input power as a function of moisture content in the input wood and for sludge to wood mass ratio equal to 0, 0.25 and 0.5 and for a gate fee of the sludge at source of 0 and 10$/ton. It has been assumed that the sludge is produced at one location at a distance of 100 km from the plant while the wood is uniformly distributed around the plant. The cost of feedstock supply is strongly dependent on the gate fee (negative production cost) of sludge. As the gate fee increases from zero to 10 $/ton, the cost of feedstock supply decreases approximately by 35% when increasing the fraction of sludge to 50%.

**Direct operational costs**

Evaluation of the direct operational cost are evaluated from

\[
C_{op,a} = C_{chem} + C_{em} + C_{res} + C_{ef} + C_{fw},
\]

where \( C_{chem}, C_{em}, C_{res}, C_{ef}, C_{fw} \) are annual cost of chemicals, emissions to air, disposal of solid residues, treatment and disposal of effluents and supply of fresh water, calculated based on individual rates of consumption or production obtained from the mass and energy balances, the unit cost values of each specific item, and the plant annual operating time. The costs of catalyst consumption are estimated from

\[
C_{cat}^J = n_{cat}^J \left( \dot{V}_g^J / c_{cat}^J \right) \left( 1 / \tau_{cat}^J \right)
\]

with \( J \) denoting the WGS and FT reactors, \( \dot{V}_g^J \) and \( 1 / \tau_{cat}^J \) representing the volumetric gas flow rate and the characteristic space velocity in the catalyst bed, respectively, \( c_{cat}^J \) denoting the unit cost of catalyst per unit volume and \( n_{cat}^J \) denoting the catalyst replacements per year or aging factor. Volume is sized by assuming constant gas hourly space velocity (GHSV) of 100 per hour for both WGS and FT catalysts respectively [24]. One catalyst bed replacement after the first operating year is
assumed, and then replacement every three years after that. Physical solvent (Selexol) is the only consumable for gas cleaning that has been considered in this work, the associated cost being estimated from $c_{\text{chem}}^{\text{GC}} = n_{\text{set}} \dot{V}_{\text{set}}^{\text{CC}} \rho_{\text{set}} c_{\text{set}} \tau_{\text{set}}$, where $\dot{V}_{\text{set}}^{\text{CC}}$ is the flow rate of Selexol, $\tau_{\text{set}}$ is the total residence time of Selexol in the gas cleaning system, $n_{\text{set}}$ is the number of Selexol replacements per year and $c_{\text{set}}$ is the cost per unit mass of Selexol. Table 10 summarizes the reference unit values for the direct operational costs considered in this work.

**Indirect operational costs**

The annual indirect operational costs have been evaluated from

$$C_{\text{op},i} = C_{\text{labor}} + C_{\text{adm}} + C_{\text{insur}} + C_{\text{tax}},$$

where $C_{\text{labor}}$, $C_{\text{adm}}$, $C_{\text{insur}}$ and $C_{\text{tax}}$ are, respectively, labour, administration, insurance and taxes. The total annual labor cost $C_{\text{labor}}$ has been estimated from

$$C_{\text{labor}} = c_{\text{rh}} \sum_j N_j \left[ f_{r,j}(1 + f_{lb}) + f_{OH,j} c_{OH} \right]$$

where $c_{\text{rh}}$ denotes the average hourly rate in Norway, the subscript $j$ denotes the personnel categories, and $N_j$, $f_{r,j}$, $f_{lb}$, $f_{OH,j}$ and $c_{OH}$ represent the annual man-hour of personnel required, the hourly rate factor, the labour burden factor, the overhead factor and the overhead cost factor, respectively. In this work, the personnel categories considered are regular operator, skilled operator and lab technician. The number of personnel required has been estimated based on individual main systems, i.e. feedstock pretreatment, syngas production and cooling, gas cleaning and conditioning, FT synthesis and separation, air separation unit and process water treatment areas. It is assumed that each area requires equal number of personnel per category, two regular operators, one skilled operator, one foreman and two lab technicians. Table 11 provides the values for labor cost parameters considered in Equation (4.8) according to Norwegian conditions. This work only considers overhead for regular and skilled operators.
associated to unplanned plant shutdowns due to equipment failures. Costs for administration and insurance are evaluated as a percentage of the total permanent investment according to Table 5. The taxes for net plant income are evaluated based on standard tax rate of 28% in accordance to company tax law and additionally 2% inflation are also accounted for.

**Maintenance cost**

The annual maintenance cost has been calculated from

\[ c_{\text{maint}} = t_{\text{prod}} [c_{\text{sares}} + c_{\text{shut}} f_{\text{shut}}], \tag{4.9} \]

where \( t_{\text{prod}} \) is the plant annual production time, \( c_{\text{sares}} \) is overall cost of spare parts, including procurement, storage and replacement, per unit time of operation, \( c_{\text{shut}} \) and \( f_{\text{shut}} \) denotes the cost per unit time and the fraction of the total annual production time associated to unplanned shutdowns. This work has assumed that the total cost of spare parts is proportional to the total purchase and installation cost, \( t_{\text{prod}} c_{\text{sares}} = f_{\text{sares}} \sum_i c_{S,i,i} \), where \( f_{\text{sares}} \) is a constant proportionality factor equal to 2%. The unit cost for shutdown \( c_{\text{shut}} \) is calculated as the net annual income divided by the planned annual hours of operation of the plant and \( f_{\text{shut}} \) is assumed to be also constant and equal to 2%.

Table 12 shows the distribution of the annual direct and indirect operating costs per unit biocrude energy produced (S/GJ) for a base plant capacity of 150 MW for mass fraction of wood in the feedstock of 100, 75 and 50%. The major contributors to the annual operating costs are biomass feedstock, labor cost and maintenance which, for 100% of wood, contribute approximately 34, 22 and 18% of the total annual operating costs. As the gate fee of sludge increases, the feedstock supply cost decreases significantly.
4.3. COST OF BIOCRUDE

The cost of biocrude, here defined as the average biocrude price per unit energy produced required so that the overall net present value (NPV) of the plant over its lifetime becomes zero, is calculated from

\[
C_{\text{biocrude}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \frac{(C_{\text{TPL},i} + C_{\text{PROD},i}) - C_{\text{COP},i}}{(1+r)^i} \right] / \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \frac{t_{\text{prod},i} C_{\text{bc}}}{(1+r)^i} \right]
\]

(4.10)

where \( r \) is the expected return of investment, \( C_{\text{TPL},i} \), \( C_{\text{PROD},i} \) and \( C_{\text{COP},i} \) are, respectively, the distribution of the annual total investment, the operating cost and income from co-products over the plant life time. The co-products considered are the exported heat and the CO\(_2\) credits. The financial assumptions and the values for co-products in the Norwegian market are shown in Table 13. All the plant costs are updated to 2016 CEPCI index. Figure 14 shows the variation of the cost of biocrude as a function of the plant scale, the raw feedstock composition and the gate fee for the sludge. The moisture content of the wood and the sludge are assumed to be 50 and 80\%, respectively. The plant capital cost correspond to the values shown in Figure 12. Considering 100\% wood as a reference case, the cost of biocrude production ranges between 32 and 30 $/GJ. As the fraction of sludge increases, the cost of biocrude is very dependent on the gate fee. For zero cost of sludge at source, the cost of biocrude is above the reference values obtained by considering 100\% wood and increases with the fraction of sludge. In this case, the increase of investment in pretreatment for treating the sludge becomes dominant compared to the lower feedstock cost obtained by increasing the fraction of sludge in the raw feedstock. As the gate fee increases, above approximately 12 $/ton, the reduction in feedstock supply cost by increasing the fraction of sludge has a dominant effect compared to the higher investment cost for pretreatment, which leads to lower cost of biocrude. For a gate fee of about 50$/ton and a mass fraction of sludge in the raw feedstock of 50 %wt., the cost of biocrude is in the range of
23-25 $/GJ for plant capacities in the range of 150-600 MW based on the input feedstock energy to the EFG.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Co-processing sludge residues from anaerobic digestion with woody biomass in an entrained flow gasification has been proven to improve the overall cost of biocrude production from Fischer-Tropsch synthesis when considering gate fees for the sludge above 20 $/ton. For this gate fee, although the sludge has lower calorific value and higher moisture, which require higher capital investment for pretreatment, the reduction of feedstock supply cost with increasing fraction of sludge becomes dominant in evaluating the overall cost of production. For gate fees of 50 $/ton, which are realistic for the current waste market, the cost of biocrude ranges between 18 and 22 $/GJ for plant scales between 150 and 600 MW based on the input feedstock energy to the entrained flow gasifier. Moreover, the overall efficiency for biocrude and LNG production, and therefore the main income to the plant, is comparable for mass fractions of the sludge in the raw feedstock ranging between 0 and 50%. Based on direct-contact superheated steam dryers for the pretreatment of sludge, the residual heat recovered from the main conversion process is sufficient to co-process up to 50% mass fraction of sludge in the raw feedstock with moisture content of 80%. The parametric results presented in this work can be integrated in wider mathematical models to evaluate the economic performance of liquid biofuels production in a value chain perspective. Moreover, the parameterization approach allows a probabilistic analysis of the biocrude production plant, particularly to evaluate how uncertainties and variabilities affect the economic performance. This analysis will be the subject of future work by the authors.
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Tables and Figures

Table 1: Measured feedstock properties (Proximate and ultimate analysis, heating values and yields) for raw Norwegian stem wood, bark and top and branches from spruce [13] and sludge from anaerobic digestion. The measured composition of the sludge was based on samples provided by one of the industrial partners participating in the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedstock</th>
<th>Woodchips (spruce)</th>
<th>Stem wood (spruce)</th>
<th>T&amp;B (spruce)</th>
<th>Bark (spruce)</th>
<th>Sludge from anaerobic digestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volatiles (% wt. dry)</td>
<td>79.97</td>
<td>72.43</td>
<td>69.82</td>
<td>70.62</td>
<td>14.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Carbon (% wt. dry)</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>24.49</td>
<td>26.85</td>
<td>50.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash (% wt. dry)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>34.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHV (MJ/kg dry)</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (% wt. dry)</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>51.53</td>
<td>49.09</td>
<td>33.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (% wt. dry)</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O (% wt. dry)</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>46.10</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>56.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (% wt. dry)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (% wt. dry)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl (% wt. dry)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Particle size distribution from drum chipper, based on experimental data from Laitila et al. [14]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle size (mm)</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>16-45</th>
<th>8-16</th>
<th>1-8</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass fraction (%)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Nusselt numbers used for calculating the convective heat transfer coefficient from the syngas to the cooling medium for each section of the syngas cooling train, where $Re_{dt}$ represents the Reynolds number based on the average cross section velocity and the tube diameter in each section [20,21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of the cooling train</th>
<th>Bundle configuration</th>
<th>Syngas side Nusselt Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radiation chamber</td>
<td>Vertical tubes</td>
<td>$Nu_{dt}^{PP} = Re_{dt}^{0.8}Pr^{1/3}(0.026(S/d_t) - 0.006)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporator, super-heater and</td>
<td>Horizontal,</td>
<td>$Nu_{dt}^{CP} = Re_{dt}^{1/2}Pr^{1/3}\left(0.61S_{T}^{0.001}S_{L}^{0.091}\right)[1 - 2\exp(-1.09S_{T})]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke tube boiler</td>
<td>Vertical tubes (internal flow)</td>
<td>$Nu_{dt}^{P} = 0.023Re_{dt}^{4/9}Pr^{0.3}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Specification of process design parameters considered for evaluating the process and economics performance of the biocrude production plant based on the design shown in Figures 1-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total input power, $P_{in}$</td>
<td>150-600 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody biomass to organic waste weight mass ratio, $M_{\text{wood}}^{P}/M_{\text{waste}}^{P}$</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture in woody biomass (max), $y_{\text{w,H}_{2}O}^{P}$</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture in organic waste (max), $y_{\text{w,H}_{2}O}^{P}$</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryer pressure, $P_{d}$</td>
<td>1.01 bar-g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steam temperature to dryer, $T_{\text{dry}}^D$  
150-200 °C

Gas to total volume ratio in dryer, $\phi_{\text{dry}}^D$  
0.9

Torrefaction temperature, $T_{\text{T}}^T$  
225 – 275 °C

Torrefaction pressure, $P_{\text{T}}^T$  
1.01 bar-g

Torrefaction residence time, $t_{\text{T}}^T$  
30-60 min.

Gas to total volume ratio in torrefaction, $\phi_{\text{T}}^T$  
0.82

Feedstock moisture after pretreatment, $y_{\text{PR}}^{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$  
< 10%

Solid particle size after pretreatment, $d_{\text{f}}^{\text{R}}$  
< 1 mm

Fuel input power in EFG, $H_{\text{in}}^G$  
150-600 MW

EFG Pressure, $P_{\text{G}}^G$  
25 bar-g

EFG Temperature, $T_{\text{G}}^G$  
1300-1600 °C

Gasification lambda value, $\lambda_{\text{G}}$  
0.2-0.4

ASU outlet O2 concentration, $x_{\text{O}_2}^{\text{ASU}}$  
95%

Inlet syngas temperature to WGS, $T_{\text{G,WGS}}^{\text{in}}$  
160 °C

Maximum Temperature WGS, $T_{\text{G,WGS}}^{\text{WGS}}$  
600 °C

Max. temperature difference in heat exchangers  
10 °C

Syngas CO2 concentration after CO2 capture, $x_{\text{CO}_2}^{\text{CCS}}$  
5 % vol.

Inlet syngas temperature to CO2 capture absorber, $T_{\text{G,ABS}}^{\text{ABS}}$  
15-35 °C

Inlet Selexol temperature to CO2 capture absorber, $T_{\text{G,ABS}}^{\text{ABS}}$  
30 °C

Selexol absorber pressure, $P_{\text{G,ABS}}$  
10 bar-g

Temperature Selexol flash tank, $T_{\text{FL,sel}}$  
100 °C

CO2 supply pressure, $P_{\text{CO}_2}^{\text{CCS}}$  
100 Bar-g

CO2 supply temperature, $T_{\text{CO}_2}^{\text{CCS}}$  
30 °C

FT Reactor Temperature, $T_{\text{F}}^{\text{FT}}$  
250 °C

FT Reactor Pressure, $P_{\text{F}}^{\text{FT}}$  
25 bar-g

FT CO conversion factor $\gamma_{\text{F}}^{\text{FT}}$  
40-80%

Pressure at separation of biocrude products, $P_{\text{bc}}^S$  
25 bar-g

Temperature at separation of LNG, $T_{\text{LNG}}^S$  
-195 °C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pressure at separation of LNG, $P_{LNG}^S$</td>
<td>1.01 bar-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet feed water temperature, $T_{fw}$</td>
<td>15 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlet process water, $T_{pw}$</td>
<td>25 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Pressure, $P_{stm}$</td>
<td>25 bar-g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Temperature (superheated), $T_{stm}$</td>
<td>250 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Intermediate Pressure (IP), $P_{IP}^{IP}$</td>
<td>25 bar-g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Low Pressure (LP), $P_{LP}^{IP}$</td>
<td>10 bar-g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Main mass flow rates for the biocrude production plant, as shown in Figure 1, calculated for a reference plant capacity of 150 MW as a function of the main input parameters of the analysis, i.e., the mass fraction of the sludge in the raw feedstock $y_{sludge}^w$, the gasification lambda value $\lambda_g$ and the gasification temperature $T_g^G$. The moisture content of the logwood and the sludge are assumed to be 50 and 60% wt. respectively, with torrefaction temperature and residence time equal to 30 minutes and 225 °C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$y_{sludge}^w$ w/w</th>
<th>$\lambda_g$</th>
<th>$T_g^G$ °C</th>
<th>$M_S^F$ kg/h</th>
<th>$M_S^G$ kg/h</th>
<th>$M_{WGS}^G$ kg/h</th>
<th>$M_{CO_2}^G$ kg/h</th>
<th>$M_{H_2O}^G$ kg/h</th>
<th>$M_{bc}$ kg/h</th>
<th>$M_{LNG}$ kg/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>40908</td>
<td>54210</td>
<td>6328</td>
<td>40877</td>
<td>15221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>47710</td>
<td>53143</td>
<td>6017</td>
<td>36212</td>
<td>12504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>54310</td>
<td>54182</td>
<td>5975</td>
<td>33201</td>
<td>11130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>60810</td>
<td>60717</td>
<td>6550</td>
<td>33533</td>
<td>10800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>67204</td>
<td>67164</td>
<td>7115</td>
<td>33614</td>
<td>10329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>35648</td>
<td>53773</td>
<td>6271</td>
<td>42483</td>
<td>13651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>41328</td>
<td>54830</td>
<td>6205</td>
<td>39923</td>
<td>12677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>46924</td>
<td>53769</td>
<td>5919</td>
<td>35903</td>
<td>11121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>52456</td>
<td>51891</td>
<td>5576</td>
<td>31773</td>
<td>9511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>57959</td>
<td>57386</td>
<td>6038</td>
<td>32287</td>
<td>9274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>57595</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>48613</td>
<td>48617</td>
<td>5562</td>
<td>30043</td>
<td>11050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>57595</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>54805</td>
<td>54778</td>
<td>6111</td>
<td>30436</td>
<td>10788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>57595</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>60906</td>
<td>60892</td>
<td>6653</td>
<td>30588</td>
<td>10381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>57595</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>66927</td>
<td>67799</td>
<td>7280</td>
<td>31066</td>
<td>9992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>57595</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>72926</td>
<td>73858</td>
<td>7817</td>
<td>31117</td>
<td>9425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>57595</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>41334</td>
<td>48983</td>
<td>5594</td>
<td>33028</td>
<td>11269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>57595</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>46563</td>
<td>47199</td>
<td>5249</td>
<td>29087</td>
<td>9614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>57595</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>51753</td>
<td>51463</td>
<td>5592</td>
<td>29066</td>
<td>9247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>57595</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>56906</td>
<td>56595</td>
<td>6026</td>
<td>29408</td>
<td>8953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>56394</td>
<td>30763</td>
<td>62044</td>
<td>61743</td>
<td>6460</td>
<td>29635</td>
<td>8591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>64425</td>
<td>33678</td>
<td>52706</td>
<td>52713</td>
<td>6016</td>
<td>29041</td>
<td>10977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>64425</td>
<td>33678</td>
<td>58128</td>
<td>58126</td>
<td>6498</td>
<td>29193</td>
<td>10626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>64425</td>
<td>33678</td>
<td>63483</td>
<td>64399</td>
<td>7074</td>
<td>29751</td>
<td>10309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>64425</td>
<td>33678</td>
<td>68821</td>
<td>69789</td>
<td>7552</td>
<td>29838</td>
<td>9814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>64425</td>
<td>33678</td>
<td>73575</td>
<td>74594</td>
<td>7963</td>
<td>29765</td>
<td>9311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>64425</td>
<td>33678</td>
<td>44438</td>
<td>45573</td>
<td>5187</td>
<td>27917</td>
<td>9874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Main energy flows for the biocrude production plant, shown in Figure 1, calculated as a function of the main input parameters of the analysis, i.e., the mass fraction of the sludge in the raw feedstock \( y_{sludge} \), the gasification lambda value \( \lambda_g \) and the gasification temperature \( T_g^G \). The moisture content of the logwood and the sludge are assumed to be 50 and 60% wt. respectively, with torrefaction temperature and residence time equal to 30 minutes and 225 °C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( y_{sludge} )</th>
<th>( \lambda_g )</th>
<th>( T_g^G )</th>
<th>( H_f^S )</th>
<th>( H_c^S )</th>
<th>( H_c^G )</th>
<th>( H_g^G )</th>
<th>( H_g^G )</th>
<th>( H_f^G )</th>
<th>( H_f^G )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Main heat flows for the biocrude production plant, shown in Figure 1, calculated as a function of the main input parameters of the analysis, i.e., the mass fraction of the sludge in the raw feedstock $Y_{\text{sludge}}$, the gasification lambda value $\lambda_g$ and the gasification temperature $T_g^*$. The moisture content of the logwood and the sludge are assumed to be 50 and 60% wt. respectively, with torrefaction temperature and residence time equal to 30 minutes and 225 °C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Y_{\text{sludge}}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_g$</th>
<th>$T_g^*$</th>
<th>$Q_{\text{PR}}$</th>
<th>$Q_{\text{ft}}^*_{\text{th}}$</th>
<th>$Q_{\text{ft}}^*_{\text{pw}}$</th>
<th>$Q_{\text{ft}}^*_{\text{th}}$</th>
<th>$Q_{\text{ft}}^*_{\text{pw}}$</th>
<th>$Q_{\text{ft}}^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/w</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>31,6</td>
<td>0,45</td>
<td>43,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>0,19</td>
<td>25,9</td>
<td>0,37</td>
<td>40,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>30,6</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td>23,1</td>
<td>0,33</td>
<td>40,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>31,5</td>
<td>0,36</td>
<td>22,4</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td>40,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>32,4</td>
<td>0,46</td>
<td>21,4</td>
<td>0,30</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>31,8</td>
<td>0,09</td>
<td>28,4</td>
<td>0,40</td>
<td>47,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>32,6</td>
<td>0,15</td>
<td>26,3</td>
<td>0,37</td>
<td>45,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>36,0</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>23,1</td>
<td>0,33</td>
<td>45,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>40,9</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td>19,7</td>
<td>0,28</td>
<td>47,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>42,8</td>
<td>0,33</td>
<td>19,2</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>48,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>26,5</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td>33,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>27,2</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td>21,7</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td>33,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>27,9</td>
<td>0,40</td>
<td>21,0</td>
<td>0,30</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>28,9</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td>20,2</td>
<td>0,29</td>
<td>33,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>19,1</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>33,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>30,7</td>
<td>0,18</td>
<td>22,6</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td>37,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td>19,3</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>38,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>37,0</td>
<td>0,29</td>
<td>18,6</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Cost associated factors to estimate the total permanent investment [46]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost associated factors</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site preparation</td>
<td>$f_{site}$</td>
<td>0.05-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>$f_{building}$</td>
<td>0.05-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$f_{land}$</td>
<td>0.05-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of contingency</td>
<td>$f_{cont}$</td>
<td>0.05-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$f_{eng}$</td>
<td>0.02-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project development and licenses</td>
<td>$f_{dev}$</td>
<td>0.02-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td>$f_{com}$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Parameters' values to estimate the feedstock supply cost, based on data from Trømborg et al. [48] and assuming a exchange rate of 8 Norwegian Krone (NOK) per dollar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biomass supply variables</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Logwood density, $\rho_{lw}$  
400 kg/m$^3$

Logwood availability, $m_{lw,s}$  
10 tons/ha

Production cost logwood deliver at road, $c_{lw,pr}$  
25-31.25 $/ m^3$

Cost of chipping and storage, $c_{chip}$  
6.05 $/ m^3$

Production cost sludge, $c_{sl,pr}$  
-50 - 0 NOK/ m$^3$

Transportation cost (fixed), $c_{tr,f}$  
3 $/ m^3$

Transportation cost (variable), $c_{tr,L}$  
0.075 $/ m^3$/km

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Unit cost associated to direct operating cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Operational Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slag disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGS catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical solvent (Selexol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process water disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Indirect operational cost and reference values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (Fixed) Operational Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average labor hourly rate, $c_r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labor burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead factor (operators only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor overhead charge rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Insurance  
\[ 1\% C_{\text{TPP}} \]

Income tax rate  
\[ 30\% \]

**Table 12:** Unit operating costs, per unit output bioenergy energy, for the base 150 MW plant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logwood to sludge ratio</th>
<th>100 %</th>
<th>75 %</th>
<th>50 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedstock supply (sludge at 0 $/ton)</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedstock supply (sludge at 10 $/ton)</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedstock supply (sludge at 50 $/ton)</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>-8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalysts</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastes disposal (solid, effluents)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor cost</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13:** Financial assumptions considered for evaluating the cost of biocrude production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial parameter</th>
<th>Values/assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt equity ratio</td>
<td>70-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation model</td>
<td>Straight line depreciation model, depreciation period 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and commissioning duration</td>
<td>3 year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% required capital during construction and commissioning</td>
<td>30% year 1, 50% year 2 and 20% year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of Investment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Loan repayment period 10 years
Interest rate 7 %
Currency US $
Plant cost update CEPCI 2016
Heat price 78 $/ MWh
LNG price 24 $/MWh
CO₂ credits 50-70 $/ton

**Figure 1:** Overall process block diagram for the Fischer-Tropsch biocrude production plant based on co-processing woody biomass and wet organic waste, including the main mass and energy flows.
Figure 2: Process flow diagram for the integrated pretreatment of the woody biomass and the organic waste
Figure 3: Process flow diagram for the EFG and the syngas cooling and conditioning systems with integration of the heat recovery and steam generation
Figure 4: Process Flow Diagram of the FTS system and products separation

Figure 5: Variation of (a) the thermal power of steam used for drying per unit mass of evaporated water and (b) the dryer volume per unit mass flow rate of feedstock as a function of the moisture content reduction in the dryer for feedstock particle size of 10, 15, 20 mm.
Figure 6: Variation of the energy and mass yields for the overall pretreatment process as a function of the mass fraction of sludge in the input raw feedstock, for torrefaction temperature of 225 and 275 °C, moisture content in the wood of 40% and moisture content in the sludge of 60 and 80 %wt.
Figure 7: a) Operational limits of the EFG process for variable values of the mass fraction of wood relative to the total input raw feedstock; b) Variation of the H₂ to CO molar ratio of the syngas leaving the EF gasification for the operational limits

Figure 8: Variation of the (a) cold-gas efficiency and (b) the output thermal energy per unit feedstock energy in the EFG process as a function of the lambda value for variable values of the mass fraction of wood relative to the total input raw feedstock, evaluated from equations (3.3) and (3.4)
Figure 9: Variation of the biocrude (a) and LNG (b) production efficiency as a function of the gasification lambda value and the raw feedstock composition, evaluated from equations (3.5) and (3.6).

Figure 10: Variation of the net thermal power production relative to the input biomass power to the gasification unit as a function of the operating conditions in the EFG reactor and the raw feedstock composition.
feedstock composition, for steam temperature in the dryers equal to 150 °C (a) and 200 °C (b). The moisture content in the wood and the sludge is assumed to be, respectively, 50 and 60 % wt.

Figure 11: Variation of the total permanent investment as a function of the input feedstock power to the EFG of the pretreatment system, for values of the mass fraction of wood in the input raw feedstock of 0, 25 and 50%, and for the gasification and syngas cooling and conditioning and the Fischer Tropsch and separation systems. The moisture content of the wood and the sludge are assumed to be, respectively, 50% and 80%.
Figure 12: Variation of the specific capital cost of the biocrude production plant as a function of the input feedstock power to the EFG and for values of the mass fraction of wood in the input raw feedstock of 0, 25 and 50%. The moisture content of the wood and the sludge are assumed to be, respectively, 50% and 80%.
Figure 13: Variation of total cost of feedstock supply per unit input feedstock energy flow to the plant as a function of the plant capacity for values of the mass fraction of wood in the input raw feedstock of 0, 25 and 50%, assuming a moisture content in the sludge of 60% wt. and a constant price of logwood at road of 20$/ton, a sludge production cost of 0 and -10 $/ton and moisture content in the logwood of 40 and 60% wt.
Figure 14: Variation of the cost of biocrude produced from co-processing logwood and sludge from anaerobic digestion as a function of the plant scale, for values of the mass fraction of sludge in the total raw feedstock of 0, 25 and 50% and for gate fees for the sludge at source of 0, 10 and 50 $/ton. It is assumed that the moisture content of the logwood and the sludge are constant and equal to 50 and 60% wt., respectively, and that the price of logwood delivered at road is also constant and equal to 20 $/ton.