

**PROCESS MODELING OF
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES
UNDER UNCERTAINTY**

H. Christopher Frey, Edward S. Rubin, and Urmila M. Diwekar
Center for Energy and Environmental Studies
Carnegie Mellon University
Baker Hall 129
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890

Prepared For Presentation at:
AIChE 1992 Spring National Meeting
New Orleans, Louisiana
March 29-April 2, 1992

Session No. 58: Process Modeling and Simulation II

Copyright © 1992. All rights reserved.

March, 1992

UNPUBLISHED

AIChE shall not be responsible for statements or opinions
contained in papers or printed in its publications.

ABSTRACT

Uncertainties in the performance, emissions, and cost of advanced process technologies in early stages of development pose a challenge to process modelers. The failure to properly account for uncertainties in process evaluation may result in misleading estimates that are then used for making decisions about technology selection and research planning. A new stochastic modeling capability has been developed for the ASPEN chemical process simulator that allows uncertainties in any process technology to be represented using probability distributions. This capability is briefly described. A detailed case study of an advanced integrated coal gasification combined cycle (IGCC) system is presented to illustrate the application of this capability. The case study involves identification and characterization of uncertainties in model inputs, propagation of uncertainties through the model, and interpretation of model results. The value of stochastic modeling is in the ability to evaluate the *simultaneous* effect of multiple uncertainties in a process technology, and to develop more realistic estimates of process performance and cost than would otherwise be obtained from deterministic (point-estimate) analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Advanced process concepts tested only at bench- or pilot-scales lack the large-scale commercial operating experience required to verify predictions of performance and cost. In spite of this, performance and costs of new technologies often are estimated as deterministic point-values, without regard to their uncertainty. Thus, estimates that may be accurate only within a factor of 2 or 3 are often misrepresented as single point-values with several decimal places. Deterministic estimates of both performance and cost for advanced technologies are also known to have a systematic bias toward optimism. An important challenge for process modeling, therefore, is to explicitly characterize and simulate the uncertainties that lead to risks of cost growth and performance shortfall in new process concepts.

Process modeling of advanced technologies must be able to address questions regarding: the uncertainty in key measures of plant performance and cost used as a basis for decision making; identification of robust design solutions under uncertainty; identification of key problem areas that should be the focus of further research to reduce the risk of technology failure; comparison of competing technologies on a consistent basis to determine the risks associated with advanced technology; and evaluation of the effects that additional research might have on comparisons with conventional technology

A probabilistic process modeling approach is described in this paper which allows the explicit and quantitative representation of uncertainties inherent in advanced technologies. As part of this work, a probabilistic modeling capability has been added to the publicly available version of ASPEN, a chemical process simulator. Both methodological and practical issues related to probabilistic process modeling are illustrated using a detailed case study of a coal-based advanced integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) concept. The case study illustrates the application of probabilistic process simulation to estimation of uncertainty in plant performance and cost, prioritization of key uncertainties for further research, and design analysis under uncertainty. The data requirements for probabilistic analysis are discussed. This method is shown to be a versatile tool for technology evaluation, cost estimating, process design, risk assessment, research planning, and technology selection.

NEED FOR UNCERTAINTY ANALYSIS

Conventional chemical process simulation models, such as FLOWTRAN, PROCESS, CHEMSHARE, and ASPEN, typically employ a Fortran code which produces deterministic (point estimate) results for a particular set of input assumptions. Such an approach can be overly

simplistic, however, because it ignores uncertainties often known to exist in process performance or design, particularly for advanced technologies.

Nearly all analyses of process technologies that are in early phases of research involve uncertainties. According to the Rand Corporation (Hess and Myers, 1989):

Accurate assessment of the costs of advanced technologies has always been one of the most difficult and uncertain tasks facing an R&D planner.

Predictions of the future commercial-scale performance of a new technology are often based on limited experimental data from small-scale testing. Predictions of future cost are typically expressed as deterministic point-value estimates based on assumed values of key performance and design variables, without regard to their uncertainty. Such performance and cost estimates of a new technology, however, are inherently uncertain because of the lack of large-scale experience to verify expectations.

Rand and others have identified a systematic tendency for the performance of advanced process technologies to be overestimated and for costs to be underestimated (Merrow, *et al.*, 1981). Misleading estimates of the performance and cost of new processes can have deleterious implications for research planning and the allocation of resources to the development of alternative technologies.

Thus, the ability to analyze uncertainties is especially important in the context of ongoing research and development, where technical and economic parameters for individual processes and system designs are not well-established. Uncertainties also are important in comparing advanced system designs with baseline systems reflecting currently commercial technology. To analyze uncertainty, the capability to perform sensitivity analysis through a series of multiple runs is usually available. Typically, however, only one or two parameters at a time are varied in a simulation framework which may contain a large number of independent variables. Thus, important interactions or cases may be overlooked. Furthermore, the combinatorial explosion of possible sensitivity scenarios (e.g., one variable "high", another "low", and so on) may make results cumbersome or difficult to interpret and/or display. Furthermore, sensitivity analysis provides no information as to the *likelihood* of different outcomes. In short, the process analysis of real systems requires both stochastic and deterministic modeling capabilities.

Though uncertainty analysis techniques are gaining attention in the literature, none of the well-known process simulators have the capability to handle uncertainties systematically (Diwekar and Rubin, 1991).

STOCHASTIC MODELING OF CHEMICAL PROCESSES USING ASPEN

A new stochastic modeling capability for uncertainty analysis has been added by Rubin and Diwekar (1989) to the public version of the ASPEN simulator developed for the U.S. Department of Energy (MIT, 1982). To implement the stochastic modeling capability, ASPEN's modular nature (consisting of unit operation modules or blocks) has been utilized. The stochastic simulation module is based on the public domain programs by Iman *et al.* (Iman and Shortencarier, 1984; Iman *et al.*, 1985). A new unit operation block, called STOCHA, has been added to the ASPEN unit operation library. The structure of this block and its use are briefly described. Details are provided elsewhere (Rubin and Diwekar, 1989).

The unit operation block, STOCHA, characterizes the uncertainty in model input parameters in terms of probability distributions, and analyzes their effect on selected output variables. To link STOCHA to the ASPEN flowsheet, two Fortran blocks are needed. The stochastic modeling approach involves:




Figure 1. Basic Operation of the Stochastic Simulation Method.

1. Specification of uncertainties in key input parameters in terms of probability distributions;
2. Specification of the correlation structure of any interdependent parameters;
3. Sampling of the distributions in an iterative fashion, using random Monte Carlo simulation or Latin Hypercube sampling (see Ang and Tang, 1984; Iman and Shortencarier, 1984; or Morgan and Henrion, 1990);
4. Propagation of the effects of uncertainties through the process flowsheet; and
5. Application of graphical and statistical techniques to analyze the results.

Figure 1 shows the use of the stochastic block for uncertainty analysis of a flowsheet. The cycle for stochastic simulation consists of: (a) the stochastic block, STOCHA, for generating i samples from the probability distributions for n uncertain flowsheet variables selected by the user; (b) the Fortran block, STCTAIL, for accessing the uncertain flowsheet variables at the beginning of a repetition and assigning to them the sample values from their associated probability distributions; and (c) the Fortran block, STCREC, for data output collection and recycling to the next repetition.

A variety of types of probability distributions for characterizing uncertainties are available in the Fortran program developed by Iman and Shortencarier (1984). Examples of some of these distributions are shown in Figure 2. Details regarding the basis for using various types of probability distributions are given by Morgan and Henrion (1990), Frey (1991), and Frey and Rubin (1992).

Once the input samples have passed through the flowsheet and all the sample runs are completed, the stochastic block can be used to quantify the sensitivity of an output to each input parameter. Four techniques are available for this purpose, all based on multivariate linear regression analysis. These include partial correlation coefficients, standardized regression coefficients, partial rank correlation coefficients, and standardized rank regression coefficients. These are discussed in detail by Iman *et al.*, 1985 and summarized by Diwekar and Rubin (1991) and Frey (1991).




Figure 2. Examples of Probability Distribution Functions Available for Stochastic Simulation in ASPEN.

A DETAILED CASE STUDY

The stochastic modeling capability for the ASPEN simulator is applied here to a detailed case study of an advanced IGCC concept. The case study illustrates the use of stochastic modeling for characterizing uncertainty in key measures of process viability, identifying key uncertainties that can be prioritized for further research, and comparison of alternative process designs.

IGCC Technology

IGCC systems are emerging technologies for the cleaner and more efficient use of coal for power generation. These systems feature: conversion of coal to a fuel gas by reaction with steam and oxygen in a pressurized reducing atmosphere; cleanup of the fuel gas to remove particulates, sulfur compounds, and other contaminants; and combustion of the fuel gas in a gas turbine combined-cycle system. IGCC systems are capable of higher thermal efficiency and lower gaseous, liquid, and solid discharges than conventional pulverized coal-fired power plants (Pietruszkiewicz *et al.*, 1988). However, few IGCC systems have been commercially demonstrated. Those that have been demonstrated feature entrained-flow gasifiers using "cold" (100 °F) wet fuel gas cleanup technology (Cool Water, 1988; Hager and Heaven, 1990). For many other IGCC concepts that are in early stages of development, there are uncertainties regarding process performance, emissions, and cost that may not be resolved until a commercial-scale demonstration plant is built. Uncertainties are particularly important for many advanced concepts featuring high temperature "hot" (e.g., 1,000 °F) dry fuel gas cleanup technology. Hot gas cleanup offers the potentially key advantages of higher plant thermal efficiencies and lower costs due to the elimination of fuel gas cooling and associated heat exchangers (Bajura, 1989).

A promising hot gas cleanup configuration is an air-blown Kellogg-Rust-Westinghouse (KRW) IGCC system (SCS, 1990). A schematic of this technology is shown in Figure 3. The hot gas cleanup system features in-bed desulfurization in the fluidized bed gasifier with limestone or dolomite, subsequent sulfur removal from the fuel gas with a zinc ferrite sorbent, and high efficiency cyclones and ceramic filters for particulate removal. The off-gas from the zinc ferrite reactor, which contains sulfur compounds, is recycled to the gasifier. The advantages of such a system, compared to a base case oxygen-blown system with cold gas cleanup, are: (1) it does not




Figure 3. Simplified Schematic of the Air-Blown KRW Gasifier IGCC System with Hot Gas Cleanup

require an expensive and energy consuming oxygen plant, (2) it eliminates the capital costs associated with sulfur recovery (all sulfur is disposed with the spent limestone or dolomite), and (3) it reduces the amount of fuel gas cooling required prior to combustion in the gas turbine, thereby improving the plant thermal efficiency.

Testing of an air-blown KRW-based system with hot gas cleanup at the process development unit (PDU) level has been conducted (Haldipur *et al.*, 1988). M.W. Kellogg has presented some results of a conceptual performance and cost analysis of such a system, although no detail was provided on costs (Banchik and Cover, 1988). M.W. Kellogg and Bechtel, under a cooperative agreement with DOE as part of the clean coal technology program, began design of a 63.5 MW demonstration plant of a KRW gasifier IGCC system with hot gas cleanup using the fixed-bed zinc ferrite process, although actual construction and testing has not occurred (Haldipur *et al.*, 1988; Gallaspy *et al.*, 1990). Conceptual performance and cost estimates of similar systems have also been prepared by Southern Company Services (1990) and Fluor Daniel (Earley and Smelser, 1988).

Modeling Performance and Cost

The performance, emissions, and cost of the IGCC system are modeled using detailed engineering models. A performance model was originally developed by DOE's Morgantown Energy Technology Center (DOE/METC) using the ASPEN chemical process simulator. The performance models has been significantly modified to more completely and accurately represent process performance and emissions (Frey, 1991). For example, a new performance model of

selective catalytic reduction (SCR) NO_x control has been added to the IGCC model (Frey, 1992). Furthermore, a new cost model was developed (Frey and Rubin, 1990; Frey, 1991). This cost model has been recently revised based on more recent data regarding the costs of the gasification process area (Diwekar, Frey, and Rubin, 1992). The cost model is briefly described.

The cost model was developed based on approximately 30 design studies of IGCC systems. Direct capital costs are estimated for approximately one dozen major process areas. Typically, several performance and design variables are included in the direct cost models. Indirect and other capital costs are estimated based on approximately 60 cost model parameters. These include process area contingencies, project contingency, indirect construction costs, sales tax, allowance for funds used during construction, environmental permitting costs, spare parts inventory costs, costs for initial inventories of fuels and chemicals, land cost, and startup costs. Fixed and variable operating costs are estimated based on 40 to 50 parameters. Fixed operating costs include maintenance material and labor for each process area, plant operating labor, and administrative and support labor. Variable operating costs include consumables (e.g, water treatment chemicals, zinc ferrite sorbent), ash disposal, fuel, and byproduct credit. Total leveled costs are calculated using the financial assumptions and methodology of the Electric Power Research Institute (1986).

INPUT UNCERTAINTY ASSUMPTIONS

There are several types of uncertainty in trying to predict the commercial-scale performance and cost of a new process technology. These include statistical error, systematic error, variability, and lack of an empirical basis for concepts that have not been tested. Uncertainties may apply to different aspects of the process, including performance variables, equipment sizing parameters, process area capital costs, requirements for initial catalysts and chemicals, indirect capital costs, process area maintenance costs, requirements for consumables during plant operation, and the unit costs of consumables, byproducts, wastes, and fuel. Model parameters in any or all of these areas may be uncertain, depending on the state of development of the technology, the level of detail of the performance and cost estimates, future market conditions for new chemicals, catalysts, byproducts, and wastes, and so on (Frey, 1991).

It may not always be possible to develop estimates of uncertainty based on classical statistical analysis, nor would such an approach be appropriate in many cases. Particularly for new process technologies, data may be lacking regarding some types of uncertainty. For example, the effect of scale-up on process performance may not be fully understood. Thus, analysis of bench-scale test data alone may be an insufficient basis for estimating the total uncertainty in a variable. When data are lacking, estimates of uncertainty must rely on the informed judgments of technical experts. Judgments regarding uncertainties can be encoded as probability distributions, using techniques discussed elsewhere (Morgan and Henrion, 1990).

Uncertainties in specific performance and cost parameters were explicitly characterized using probability distributions. Identification of parameters that should be treated probabilistically, and the estimates of uncertainties for these parameters, were based on literature review, data analysis, and elicitation of expert judgments from METC process engineers involved in technology development.

The characterization of performance uncertainties focused on five major process areas: gasification, sulfation, zinc ferrite desulfurization, gas turbine, and SCR. Uncertainties in additional cost model parameters also were characterized, including direct and indirect capital costs, operating and maintenance costs, financial assumptions, and unit costs of consumables, byproducts, and wastes. These assumptions are given in Table 1. For details see Frey (1991).

Table 1. Summary of the Base Case Deterministic Values and Uncertainties for the Advanced IGCC System with Hot Gas Cleanup.

| Description and Units | Deter. Value | Distribution and Parameters ^a | | | |
|---|--------------|--|--|--|---------|
| <u>GASIFIER</u> | | | | | |
| Gasifier Pres., psia | 465 | | | | |
| Gasifier Temp., °F | 1,900 | T | 1,900 | to 1,950 | (1,900) |
| Overall Carbon Conversion, wt-% | 95 | T | 90 | to 97 | (95) |
| O ₂ /C Molar Ratio | 0.46 | T | 0.45 | to 0.47 | (0.46) |
| H ₂ O/O ₂ Molar Ratio, | 0.45 | | | | |
| Sulfur Capture, mol-% inlet sulfur | 90 | T | 85 | to 95 | (90) |
| Ca/S Molar Ratio | 2.6 | T | 2 | to 2.8 | (2.6) |
| Ammonia Yield % of coal N | 0.10 | T | 0.005 | to 0.10 | (0.10) |
| <u>SULFATION</u> | | | | | |
| SO ₂ Emissions, lb /MMBtu | 0.01 | T | 0.01 | to 0.05 | (0.01) |
| NO _x Emissions, lb /MMBtu | 0.15 | T | 0.10 | to 0.20 | (0.15) |
| Conversion of CaS to CaSO ₄ , % | 60 | U | 30 | to 90 | |
| Carbon Conv., % | 95 | T | 90 | to 98 | (95) |
| <u>ZINC FERRITE DESULFURIZATION</u> | | | | | |
| Residual Sulfate After Oxidative Regen. mol-% of captured S | 7.5 | T | 3 | to 11 | (7.5) |
| Residual Sulfide After Reductive Regen. mol-% of S in sulfate | 85 | | | | |
| Sorbent Sulfur Loading, wt-% S in sorbent | 17 | N | 2.16 | to 31.84 | (17) |
| Sorbent Attrition Rate, wt-%/cycle | 1.0 | F | 5%: 0.17 20%: 0.34 25%: 0.5 25%: 1 20%: 1.5 5%: 5 | to 0.34 to 0.5 to 1 to 1.5 to 5 to 25 | |

(Continued)

Table 1. Continued.

| Description and Units | Deter. Value | Distribution and Parameters ^a | | | |
|---|--------------|--|--------|-----------|--------|
| Absorber Pres. Drop psi/ft bed height | 0.4 | | | | |
| Absorption Cycle, hrs | 30 | | | | |
| Max. Vessel Dia., ft | 12.5 | | | | |
| Max. Vessel Ht., ft | 37.5 | | | | |
| <u>GAS TURBINE</u> | | | | | |
| Pressure Ratio | 13.5 | | | | |
| Turbine Inlet Temp, °F | 2,300 | | | | |
| Exhaust Flow, lb/s | 938 | | | | |
| Thermal NO _x , frac. air N fixated x10 ⁻⁵ | 4.25 | U | 1.0 | to 7.5 | |
| Fuel NO _x , % conv. NH ₃ to NO _x | 90 | T | 50 | to 100 | (90) |
| Converted CO, wt-% CO in fuel gas | 0.9885 | U | 0.9772 | to 0.9999 | |
| <u>SELECTIVE CATALYTIC REDUCTION</u> | | | | | |
| NO _x Removal, % | 80.0 | | | | |
| Temp., °F | 717 | | | | |
| No. Catalyst Layers | 3 | | | | |
| Layer Replacement Interval, hrs | 11,388 | U | 5,694 | to 17,082 | |
| NH ₃ Slip, ppmv | 10 | U | 10 | to 20 | |
| Catalyst Activity Uncertainty Factor ^d | 0.5 | U | 0 | to 1 | |
| Dilution Steam Ratio, H ₂ O:NH ₃ | 19 | | | | |
| Pressure Drop, psi | 4.0 | U | 1.9 | to 6.1 | |
| <u>CAPITAL COST PARAMETERS, fractions</u> | | | | | |
| Engineering and Home Office Fee | 0.10 | T | 0.07 | to 0.13 | (0.10) |
| Indirect Construction Cost Factor | 0.20 | T | 0.15 | to 0.25 | (0.20) |
| Project Uncertainty | 0.175 | U | 0.10 | to 0.25 | |
| General Facilities | 0.20 | | | | |

(Continued)

Table 1. Continued.

| Description and Units | Deter. Value | Distribution and Parameters ^a | | | |
|---|--------------|--|-----|-------|-------|
| <u>DIRECT COST CONTINGENCIES AND UNCERTAINTIES</u> % of estimated direct cost ^b | | | | | |
| Coal Handling | 5 | | | | |
| Limestone Hdlg. | 5 | | | | |
| Oxidant Feed | 10 | | | | |
| Gasification | 20 | T | 0 | to 40 | (20) |
| Sulfation | 40 | T | 20 | to 60 | (40) |
| Zinc Ferrite | 40 | U | 0 | to 80 | |
| Sulfuric Acid Plant | 10 | | | | |
| Boiler Feed Water | 0 | | | | |
| Gas Turbine | 25 | U | 0 | to 50 | |
| HRSG | 2.5 | | | | |
| SCR | 10 | T | 0 | to 20 | (10) |
| Steam Turbine | 2.5 | | | | |
| General Facilities | 5 | U | 0 | to 10 | |
| <u>MAINTENANCE COSTS</u> , % of process area total cost ^c | | | | | |
| Coal Handling | 3 | | | | |
| Limestone Hdlg. | 3 | | | | |
| Oxidant Feed | 2 | | | | |
| Gasification | 4.5 | T | 3 | to 6 | (4.5) |
| Sulfation | 4 | T | 3 | to 6 | (4) |
| Zinc Ferrite | 3 | T | 3 | to 6 | (3) |
| Boiler Feed Water | 0 | | | | |
| Gas Turbine | 2 | T | 1.5 | to 6 | (2) |
| HRSG | 1.5 | | | | |
| SCR | 2.0 | T | 1.5 | to 3 | (2) |
| Steam Turbine | 1.5 | | | | |
| General Facilities | 1.5 | | | | |

(Continued)

Table 1. Concluded.

| Description and Units | Deter. Value | Distribution and Parameters ^a | | | |
|---|--------------|--|-------|----------|--------|
| <u>OTHER FIXED OPERATING COST PARAMETERS</u> | | | | | |
| Labor Rate, \$/hr | 19.70 | N | 17.70 | to 21.70 | |
| <u>VARIABLE OPERATING COST PARAMETERS</u> | | | | | |
| Limestone, \$/ton | 18 | T | 18 | to 25 | (18) |
| Zinc Ferrite, \$/lb | 3.00 | T | 0.75 | to 5.00 | (3.00) |
| SCR Catalyst, \$/ft ³ | 250 | U | 250 | to 840 | |
| Ammonia, \$/ton | 150 | U | 150 | to 225 | |
| Ash Disp., \$/ton | 10 | T | 10 | to 25 | (10) |
| <u>DIRECT COST REGRESSION MODEL</u> | | | | | |
| <u>ERROR TERMS</u> , \$ million | | | | | |
| HRSG | 0 | N | -17.3 | to 17.3 | |
| SCR | 0 | N | -0.13 | to 0.13 | |
| Steam Turbine | 0 | N | -15.8 | to 15.8 | |

^a F=Fractile distribution; N=Normal distribution; T=Triangular distribution; U=Uniform distribution. For Uniform distributions, the lower and upper bounds are given. For the triangular distribution, the mode is given in parentheses. For the fractile distribution, the lower and upper bounds for each range are given, along with the probability of sampling within that range. For normal and lognormal distributions, the 99.8 percent probability range is given.

^b For direct costs, the deterministic values represent "contingency factors" as defined by EPRI (1986) and others. For probabilistic studies, uncertainty in capital cost is represented by an uncertainty factor, which is described by a probability distribution.

^c Includes indirect capital costs and contingency costs prorated to each process area

^d Catalyst activity is calculated as follows:

$$A(t) = A_{\min} + A_{\text{inc}} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\tau_a}\right)$$

See Frey (1992) for details. The uncertainty factor is used to calculate A_{\min} :

$$A_{\min} = 0.5 + 0.4 f_u$$

and to calculate τ_a based on a reference activity level $A(t_1)$:

$$A(t_1) = 0.75 + 0.2 f_u; t_1 = 8760 \text{ hours}$$

where $A(t)$ = relative catalyst activity, t = time, A_{\min} = minimum catalyst activity, A_{inc} = incremental activity loss over time, τ_a = activity loss time constant, f_u = uncertainty factor.

Technical experts at METC provided judgments regarding uncertainties in the zinc ferrite desulfurization process area. Because the experience of the METC experts was strongly performance-oriented, and less cost-oriented, the focus of the uncertainty elicitation was on performance. A briefing packet was developed and distributed to each METC expert. The packet consisted of three parts: (1) a nine-page introduction to uncertainty analysis; (2) a ten-page technical background paper on the zinc ferrite process area, with focus on specific aspects that may be uncertain; and (3) a written questionnaire asking for uncertainty judgments for specific model parameters. After the questionnaires were returned, a follow-up phone interview was used to clarify some responses. The responses were then encoded into the model as probability distributions (Frey, 1991).

The IGCC models were run on a DEC VAXStation 3200 mini-computer using the public version of ASPEN with the new stochastic modeling capability (Rubin and Diwekar, 1989). A deterministic analysis may take approximately 20 to 30 minutes to run, including input translation and other steps. For a probabilistic simulation, the flowsheet is executed many times, with a different set of values (samples) assigned to uncertain input parameters each time. Thus, a probabilistic analysis with a sample size of 100 may take 12 hours to run. However, while stochastic simulation requires an initial computer-intensive phase, the interpretation of results is much easier and more meaningful compared to sensitivity analysis.

MODELING RESULTS

The engineering models were exercised in the probabilistic modeling environment to characterize uncertainties in key measures of plant performance, emissions, and cost, based on the uncertainties assigned to model input parameters. Model results are given in Table 2 for both deterministic point-value and probabilistic simulations. All results reported here are based on a plant size of approximately 730 MW using Illinois No. 6 coal. A few of these results are discussed in more detail.

Uncertainty in Performance and Cost

The uncertainty in the plant thermal efficiency covers a 90 percent probability range of less than 2 percentage points, and the mean, median, and deterministic values approximately coincide. The distribution is slightly skewed toward lower values. This result is expected due to the negative skewness of the uncertainty in carbon conversion. Conversely, the plant heat rate, which is inversely related to plant thermal efficiency, has a slight positive skewness, as illustrated in Figure 4. While this result shows close agreement between the deterministic estimates and the central values from the probabilistic simulation, such findings are not typical of all technologies. For example, for other IGCC systems, the deterministic estimate may substantially over-predict plant efficiency (see Frey, 1991 for examples).

The advanced IGCC system with hot gas cleanup has very low SO₂ emissions compared to conventional coal-fired power plants with flue gas desulfurization (Frey and Rubin, 1992). This system, which is equipped with SCR for NO_x control, also has lower NO_x emissions than typical coal-fired power plants. From Table 2, the median NO_x emission rate is lower than the deterministic estimate. This result is obtained because of the negative skewness of the uncertainties in both the formation rate of ammonia in the gasifier and in the conversion rate of fuel-bound nitrogen (ammonia) to NO_x in the gas turbine combustor.

In Figure 5, the uncertainty in total capital cost is compared to the deterministic estimate. In this case, the deterministic estimate, which includes process and project contingency factors, coincides with the median value of the probabilistic simulation. Thus, there is approximately a 50 percent chance of cost overrun associated with the deterministic estimate of \$1,515/kW. Because the performance parameter uncertainties were symmetric or only moderately skewed, and because all of the cost related uncertain parameters affecting capital cost were assumed to be symmetrically

Table 2. Summary of Results from Deterministic and Probabilistic Simulations of a 730 MW Air-Blown KRW-based IGCC System with Hot Gas Cleanup and SCR.^a

| Parameter ^b | Units ^c | "Best Guess" ^d | | | | | f _{.05} - f _{.95} |
|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-------|----------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | f _{.50} | μ | σ | f _{.05} | f _{.95} | |
| <u>Plant Performance</u> | | | | | | | |
| Thermal Efficiency | %, HHV | 40.9 | 41.0 | 40.9 | 0.5 | 39.9 - 41.7 | |
| Coal Consumption | lb/kWh | 0.743 | 0.741 | 0.743 | 0.009 | 0.727 - 0.760 | |
| Process Water Consump. | lb/kWh | 0.768 | 0.768 | 0.768 | 0.015 | 0.742 - 0.793 | |
| <u>Plant Discharges</u> | | | | | | | |
| SO ₂ Emissions | lb/MMBtu | 0.013 | 0.014 | 0.014 | 0.001 | 0.013 - 0.016 | |
| NO _x Emissions | lb/MMBtu | 0.148 | 0.104 | 0.104 | 0.028 | 0.058 - 0.147 | |
| CO Emissions | lb/kWh | 0.005 | 0.005 | 0.005 | 0.003 | 0.005 - 0.009 | |
| CO ₂ Emissions | lb/kWh | 1.72 | 1.71 | 1.72 | 0.021 | 1.69 - 1.76 | |
| Solid Waste | lb/kWh | 0.230 | 0.228 | 0.228 | 0.012 | 0.205 - 0.247 | |
| <u>Plant Costs</u> | | | | | | | |
| Total Capital Cost | \$/kW | 1,515 | 1514 | 1,513 | 79 | 1,392 - 1,636 | |
| Fixed Operating Cost | \$/kW-yr | 51.4 | 54.4 | 54.7 | 4.6 | 46.8 - 63.0 | |
| Variable Operating | mills/kWh | 19.9 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 0.7 | 19.9 - 22.1 | |
| Coal | | 15.3 | 15.2 | 15.3 | 0.2 | 15.0 - 15.6 | |
| Other | | 4.7 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 0.6 | 4.8 - 6.7 | |
| Cost of Electricity | mills/kWh | 56.5 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 2.1 | 54.4 - 61.3 | |

^a The notation in the table heading is defined as follows: $f_n = n^{\text{th}}$ fractile (f_{.50} = median), μ = mean; and σ = standard deviation of the probability distribution. The range enclosed by f_{.05} to f_{.95} is the 90 percent probability range. All costs are January 1989 dollars.

^b Coal consumption is on an as-received basis. Water consumption is for process requirements including makeup for steam cycle blowdown, gasifier steam, zinc ferrite steam, and SCR. Solid waste includes gasifier bottom ash and nonrecycled fines from fuel gas cyclones.

^c HHV = higher heating value; MMBtu = million Btu.

^d Based on a deterministic simulation in which median or modal values of uncertain variables are assumed as "best guess" inputs to the model

distributed, the uncertainty in capital cost is approximately symmetric. The 90 percent probability range for capital cost is \$244/kW, or approximately \pm \$120/kW from the nominal estimate.

In spite of the agreement between the deterministic and probabilistic results for capital cost, the two analyses do not agree with respect to the cost of electricity, as seen in Figure 6. There is more than a 75 percent probability that the cost will be higher than the deterministic estimate. In the probabilistic analysis, the uncertainties in the maintenance cost of the gas turbine, zinc ferrite, sulfation, and SCR process areas were assumed to be positively skewed, reflecting the lack of commercial experience with these systems for this application. Also, the unit costs of limestone, zinc ferrite sorbent, SCR catalyst, and ash disposal were assumed to be positively skewed, representing uncertainties in market conditions and environmental regulations. These assumptions affect fixed and variable operating cost and, in turn, the cost of electricity.




Figure 4. Comparison of Deterministic and Probabilistic Results for the Plant Net Heat Rate.




Figure 5. Comparison of Deterministic and Probabilistic Results for Total Capital Cost.




Figure 6. Comparison of Deterministic and Probabilistic Results for the Cost of Electricity.

Table 3. Key Uncertainties for Air-Blown KRW-based IGCC Based on Partial Correlation Coefficients.

| Selected Output Parameter ^{a,b} | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Efficiency | Total Capital Cost | Levelized Cost of Electricity |
| Gasifier Carbon Conv. (-.990) | Project Unc. (.999) | Project Unc. (.998) |
| CaS Sulfation Rate (-.998) | Gas Turbine DC (.999) | Gas Turbine DC (.996) |
| Oxygen/Carbon Ratio (.996) | Gasification DC (.998) | Gasification DC (.994) |
| Gasifier Temperature (-.987) | Indirect Const. (.997) | Indirect Const. (.991) |
| Gas Turbine CO Conv (-.972) | SE HRSG (.994) | Gas Turbine Maint. (.989) |
| Gasifier NH ₃ Yield (.913) | SE Steam Turbine (.993) | Gasifier Maintenance (.985) |
| Ca/S Ratio (-.826) | Engr & Home Fees (.993) | Ash Disposal Cost (.981) |
| Sulfator Carbon Conv. (-.757) | CaS Sulfation Rate (-.955) | Engr & Home Office (.978) |
| Thermal NO _x (.659) | Sulfation DC (.954) | SE HRSG (.978) |
| Fuel NO _x (.639) | General Facilities DC (.953) | SE Steam Turbine (.974) |
| Sulfur Capture (-.560) | Zinc Fer. Unit Cost (.952) | CaS Sulfation Rate (-.968) |
| — | SCR Catalyst Cost (.951) | Ca/S Ratio (.965) |
| — | Zinc Ferrite DC (.941) | SCR Catalyst Cost (.964) |
| — | Gasifier Carbon Conv. (.930) | Zinc Ferrite Unit Cost (.937) |
| — | Ca/S Ratio (.874) | Limestone Unit Cost (.920) |
| — | Gasifier NH ₃ Yield (.825) | Gasifier NH ₃ Yield (.891) |
| — | Gasifier Temperature (-.725) | Sulfation DC (.891) |
| — | SCR Activity (-.592) | SCR Replacement Rate (-.868) |
| — | Thermal NO _x (.546) | Sulfation Maint. Cost (.847) |
| — | SCR DC (.421) | General Fac. DC (.834) |

^aAbbreviations for uncertain parameters: DC = direct cost; HRSG = heat recovery steam generator; SE = standard error; SCR = selective catalytic reduction.

^bOnly results that are statistically significant are shown, up through the 20th most sensitive input uncertainty. For plant efficiency, correlation coefficients after the 11th most important are not longer statistically significant.

Key Uncertainties

The primary advantage of probabilistic simulation over traditional sensitivity analysis is the *simultaneous* incorporation of uncertainties in multiple model inputs. The resulting interactions among uncertain variables results in uncertainties in measures of process viability. Research can provide additional information about the uncertain input variables, resulting in changes in their uncertainty distributions (such as the mean or standard deviation) and, in turn, in the overall uncertainties of the technology. Therefore, it may be fruitful to reduce the uncertainties of key variables that contribute most to the risk of technology failure.

The key input uncertainties resulting in uncertainty in plant efficiency, total capital cost, and the cost of electricity are shown in Table 3. These results are based on partial correlation coefficient analysis.

The plant efficiency is most strongly influenced by uncertainty in the gasifier carbon conversion efficiency. However, uncertainties related to the sulfation unit are also significantly correlated with efficiency. In the air-blown KRW system, limestone is used as a sorbent to remove sulfur during gasification. Because of the reducing atmosphere in the gasifier, the spent sorbent contains sulfur in the form of calcium sulfide. The calcium sulfide must oxidized to calcium sulfate in a fluidized bed boiler prior to landfilling the spent sorbent. A high sulfide concentration would result in a solid waste which would be classified as hazardous under RCRA.




Figure 7. Sources of Uncertainty for the Cost of Electricity.

However, the conversion rate of calcium sulfide to calcium sulfate in the boiler is uncertain. The energy released from this exothermic reaction is used to generate steam for the plant steam cycle, and is thus recovered as an energy credit.

The total capital cost is strongly influenced by uncertainties in indirect capital costs, process area direct costs, and the error terms of two direct cost regression models (see Frey, 1991, for details). For this technology, uncertainty in capital cost is not strongly influenced by performance uncertainties. Similarly, uncertainty in the cost of electricity is influenced primarily by capital, fixed operating, and variable operating cost uncertainties, with weaker influences from performance-related uncertainties. Of the skewed uncertainties affecting the cost of electricity, the gas turbine and gasifier maintenance costs are the most highly correlated. The ash disposal, SCR catalyst, zinc ferrite sorbent, and limestone unit costs are also significantly correlated.

Many of the key uncertainties identified here, such as carbon conversion efficiency and maintenance costs, can be addressed by targeted research and development efforts.

Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis

Another approach to identifying key uncertainties is probabilistic sensitivity analysis. Insight into the sensitivity of output variable uncertainties to the assumptions regarding uncertainties in input variables can be obtained by comparing the effect that different assumptions have on the result. One type of useful insight is the relative importance of uncertainties in performance parameters versus cost parameters. Another is the relative contribution to uncertainty from different process areas. Through probabilistic sensitivity analysis, it is possible to characterize the effect that specific uncertainties or groups of uncertainties have on a given output variable. In cases where uncertainties are excluded from a case study, the probability distribution for the parameter is replaced by its deterministic value.

An example of a probabilistic sensitivity analysis is shown in Figure 7 for the cost of electricity. As shown in the figure, the range of uncertainty in the cost of electricity solely attributable to uncertain performance-related parameters is narrow. The 90 percent probability range attributable to performance only is less than 2 mills/kWh, from 55.2 to 56.7 mills/kWh. Uncertainties in capital cost are shown to substantially increase the variance in the cost of electricity without shifting the central value of the distribution significantly. The 90 percent probability range in this case covers 5.8 mills/kWh from 53.1 to 58.9 mills/kWh.

The interaction between uncertainty in O&M costs with performance uncertainties results in an upward shift in the central value of almost 2 mills/kWh and an increase in the variance. As seen in Figure 7, the difference between the case with uncertainties in performance and O&M costs and

Table 4. Impact of SCR on Performance, Emissions, and Cost of a 730 MW Air-Blown KRW-based IGCC System with Hot Gas Cleanup.^a

| Parameter | Units ^b | "Best | f _{.50} | μ | σ | f _{.05} - | f _{.95} |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------|----------|--------------------|------------------|
| | | Guess" ^c | | | | | |
| Change in Heat Rate | BTU/kWh | 48 | 23 | 24 | 6 | 14 - | 33 |
| NO _x Emissions | lb/MMBtu | 0.566 | 0.384 | 0.383 | 0.111 | 0.201 - | 0.546 |
| NH ₃ Emissions | 10 ⁻³ lb/MMBtu | 9.97 | 14.7 | 14.8 | 2.9 | 10.4 - | 19.2 |
| Total Capital Cost | \$/kW | 24 | 28 | 29 | 7 | 19 - | 41 |
| Fixed Operating Cost | \$/kW-yr | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.5 - | 0.8 |
| Variable Operating | mills/kWh | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 - | 1.2 |
| Cost of Electricity | mills/kWh | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0.8 - | 2.0 |

^a All values shown are *differences* between a system with SCR and one without SCR. The notation in the table heading is defined as follows: $f_n = n^{\text{th}}$ fractile ($f_{.50}$ = median), μ = mean; and σ = standard deviation of the probability distribution. The range enclosed by $f_{.05}$ to $f_{.95}$ is the 90 percent probability range. All costs are January 1989 dollars.

^b MMBtu = million Btu.

^c Based on a deterministic simulation in which median or modal values of uncertain variables are assumed as "best guess" inputs to the model

the "all uncertainties" case is in the variance, not the median. The difference between these two is the inclusion of the symmetric capital cost uncertainties in the "all uncertainties" case. When all performance parameters are held at their deterministic "best guess" values, and all cost-related uncertainties are included in the probabilistic simulation, the result is very similar to that obtained when all uncertainties are simulated.

Thus, from the probabilistic sensitivity analysis, it is clear that performance-related uncertainties are a relatively minor component of overall uncertainty in cost for this technology. Furthermore, while the variance in the result is strongly influenced by uncertainties in capital cost, it is the uncertainties in O&M costs that are responsible for the shift in the central tendency of the distribution for the cost of electricity. Therefore, the risks of cost growth for this particularly technology are shown to be embodied in the annual operating and maintenance costs. Uncertainties in O&M costs are often overlooked in conceptual design studies, which tend to focus more on capital costs.

Comparing Designs Probabilistically

An example of probabilistic design analysis is considered here. The design assumption concerns whether an SCR NO_x control system is employed. Such a system is likely to be required to meet local environmental permitting requirements. To evaluate the effect of SCR on the IGCC system, two probabilistic simulations were executed: one with SCR (the base case) and one without. The results from these two simulations were then paired, and the probability distributions for the *differences* between them were estimated. Similarly, two deterministic analysis were performed, and the differences between them were calculated.

The impact of the SCR system on selected measures of plant performance, emissions, and cost is summarized in Table 4, based on both deterministic and probabilistic simulations. The SCR system increases the plant heat rate (decreases plant efficiency) due to increased gas turbine backpressure, steam consumption required for ammonia vaporization and injection upstream of the SCR catalyst, and electric power consumption required for process area auxiliaries. The heat rate penalty estimated from the deterministic simulations is substantially higher than the range estimated




Figure 8. Comparison of Deterministic and Probabilistic Estimates of the Levelized Total Cost for Selective Catalytic Reduction NO_x Control.

from the probabilistic simulations. This is due to the negative skewness of uncertainties in the uncontrolled NO_x emission rate, which in turns influences the ammonia injection requirement, steam requirement, and auxiliary electric power consumption. This skewness also results in a higher estimate of NO_x emission reduction from the deterministic simulation than from the probabilistic simulations.

A pollutant of potential concern is ammonia. A portion of ammonia passes through the SCR system unreacted, and is vented to the atmosphere. Many design studies assume that this ammonia "slip" may be approximately 10 ppm, and thus this value was used as the "best guess" in the deterministic simulation. However, values up to 20 ppm are not uncommon (Schorr, 1991). Thus, the deterministic estimate is at the low end of the range of probabilistic results. For the IGCC system without SCR, ammonia is assumed not to be emitted.

The capital cost associated with the SCR system is uncertain by a factor of over 2, due primarily to uncertainties affecting catalyst requirement and to uncertainty in the catalyst unit cost. A comparison of the deterministic and probabilistic estimates of the levelized total cost of the SCR system is shown in Figure 8. The disparity between the estimates is due primarily to uncertainty in the unit cost of the catalyst. There is over an 80 percent probability that the levelized cost will be higher than the "best guess" estimate. Furthermore, the levelized cost is uncertain by a factor of nearly 5.

Thus, while the SCR system will substantially reduce the NO_x emissions of the IGCC system, it has associated problems due to ammonia emissions and catalyst disposal, and it is likely to increase the capital cost by approximately \$30/kW and levelized cost by 1.4 mills/kWh. It may increase levelized costs by as much as 2.5 mills/kWh. In this example, deterministic estimates of both capital and levelized cost are lower than the central values from the probabilistic estimates. However, without SCR, and in lieu of other NO_x control measures such as advanced rich/lean or catalytic combustors, the NO_x emissions from this IGCC system are likely to be unacceptably high.

Analysis of design trade-offs probabilistically thus provides explicit insights into the risks of potentially high cost or potential poor performance associated with specific options. Other examples of this type of analysis are reported by Frey (1991).

OTHER APPLICATIONS

Other applications of the probabilistic evaluation method not discussed here include: (1) evaluation of the reductions in uncertainty that may be obtained from further process research; (2) evaluation of alternative judgments regarding model parameter uncertainties by different experts as they affect model results; (3) evaluation of the importance of correlation structures in model parameter uncertainties; (4) comparative analysis of competing technologies under uncertainty; and (5) the use of decision analysis techniques to interpret modeling results. These types of applications are discussed by Frey (1991).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

A new capability for stochastic analysis has been developed for the ASPEN chemical process simulator. This capability can be applied to analyze uncertainties in any process that can be modeled using ASPEN. A detailed case study has been presented to illustrate the application of the capability and the types of results that may be obtained.

Compared to deterministic analysis, the probabilistic modeling approach requires that more effort be devoted to characterizing the range and likelihood of values assigned to performance and cost parameters in an engineering model. The time required to develop estimates of uncertainty is usually higher than the time that would be required to make a single "best guess" estimate. However, by systematically thinking about uncertainties in specific parameters, an analyst is more likely to uncover potential sources of cost growth or performance shortfalls that are historically overlooked in analyses of new technologies.

As shown in many of the case studies, the influence of skewed distributions on model results can be important. Skewness in model input parameters tends to shift the central tendency of performance and cost results, and can lead to distributions with long tails representing unfavorable outcomes. These types of interactions cannot be evaluated systematically in deterministic analysis. While the information requirements for probabilistic analysis may be more demanding, the estimates of performance and cost are likely to be more realistic. Thinking about uncertainties is an important way to gain understanding into the key factors that drive the risk of failure or likelihood of success.

Thus, while traditional approaches to technology evaluation inadequately account for uncertainties and often lead to over-optimistic estimates of performance and cost, the probabilistic evaluation method advanced here permits the effect of uncertainties to be evaluated systematically. Furthermore, the "surprises" that often account for "cost growth" can be captured by the use of sufficiently detailed engineering models coupled with specification of uncertainties in specific model parameters. Probabilistic modeling is an important and versatile technique for developing realistic estimates of process viability and for prioritizing further research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC21-88MC24248. However, the authors are solely responsible for the content and assumptions of this paper.

LITERATURE CITED

Ang, A. H.-S., and W.H. Tang (1984). *Probability Concepts in Engineering Planning and Design. Volume 2, Decision, Risk and Reliability*. John Wiley and Sons. New York. 1984.

- Bajura, R. (1989). "Gasification and Gas Stream Cleanup Overview". In: *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Gasification and Gas Stream Cleanup Systems Contractor's Review Meeting*; Johnson, R.A., Dorchak, T.P., Eds.; DOE/METC-89/6107 (DE89011706); U.S. Department of Energy, Morgantown, WV, 1989; Vol. 1, pp 3-11.
- Banchik, I.N., and A.E. Cover (1988). "IGCC Economics Using the KRW Gasifier With Hot Gas Cleanup." Presented at the Fifth Annual International Pittsburgh Coal Conference. Pittsburgh, PA. September 12-16.
- Cool Water (1988). *Cool Water Coal Gasification Program: Fifth Annual Progress Report*. Prepared by Cool Water Coal Gasification Program, Bechtel Power Corporation, and Radian Corporation for the Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA. EPRI AP-4832. October.
- Diwekar, U.M., and E.S. Rubin (1991), "Stochastic Modeling of Chemical Processes," *Computers Chem. Engng.*, 15(2):105-114.
- Diwekar, U.M., H.C. Frey, and E.S. Rubin (1992), "Synthesizing Optimal Flowsheets: Applications to IGCC System Environmental Control," submitted to *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Research*.
- Earley, P.I., and S.C. Smelser (1988). *Design and Economics of a Plant to Convert Eastern Bituminous Coal to Pipeline Gas or Power Using KRW Gasifiers with In-Bed Desulfurization*. Prepared by Fluor Technology, Inc. for Gas Research Institute. Chicago, Ill. GRI-86/0166. September 1988.
- EPRI (1986). TAG(tm) - Technical Assessment Guide, Volume 1: Electricity Supply - 1986. EPRI P-4463-SR. Electric Power Research Institute, Inc. December.
- Frey, H.C. (1991), *Probabilistic Modeling of Innovative Clean Coal Technologies: Implications for Research Planning and Technology Evaluation*, Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Engineering and Public Policy, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, May 1991.
- Frey, H.C., and E.S. Rubin (1991), *Development and Application of a Probabilistic Evaluation Method for Advanced Process Technologies*, Final Report, prepared by Carnegie-Mellon University for the U.S. Department of Energy, Morgantown, West Virginia, DOE/MC/24248-3015, NTIS DE91002095, April 1991, 364p.
- Frey, H.C. and E.S. Rubin (1990), *Stochastic Modeling of Coal Gasification Combined Cycle Systems: Cost Models of Selected Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) Systems*, Topical Report, prepared by Carnegie-Mellon University for the U.S. Department of Energy, Morgantown, West Virginia, DOE/MC/24248-2901, NTIS DE90015345, June 1990, 307p.
- Frey, H.C., and E.S. Rubin (1992), "Account for Uncertainties in Advanced Process Technologies," *Chemical Engineering Progress* (in press, May).
- Frey (1992). "Performance Models of Selective Catalytic Reduction NO_x Control Systems," Draft, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Gallaspy, D.T., T.W. Johnson, and R.E. Sears (1990). *Southern Company Services' Study of a KRW-Based GCC Power Plant*. Prepared by Southern Company Services for the Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA. EPRI GS-6876.
- Hager, R.L., and D.L. Heaven (1990). *Evaluation of a Dow-Based Gasification-Combined-Cycle Plant Using Bituminous Coal*. Prepared by Fluor Daniel for the Electric Power Research Institute. Palo Alto, CA. EPRI GS-6904.

Haldipur, G.B., K.J. Smith, S. Datta, and P. Cherish (1988). "Fluidized Bed Coal Gasification with Hot Gas Cleanup," *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Gasification and Gas Stream Cleanup Systems Contractors Review Meeting, Volume I*. V.P. Kothari and J.R. Longanbach, Eds. U.S. Department of Energy Morgantown Energy Technology Center. Morgantown, WV. DOE/METC-88/6092. May 1988.

Hess, R.W., and C.W. Myers (1989). *Assessing Initial Cost Growth and Subsequent Long-Term Cost Improvement in Coal-to-SNG Processes*. Prepared by RAND Corporation for the Gas Research Institute. Santa Monica, CA. GRI Publication GRI-89/0129. June.

Iman, R.L., and M.J. Shortencarier (1984). *A Fortran 77 Program and User's Guide for the Generation of Latin Hypercube and Random Samples for Use With Computer Models*. Sandia National Laboratories. Albuquerque, NM. Report No. SAND83-2365. March.

Iman, R.L., M.J. Shortencarier, and J.D. Johnson (1985). *A Fortran 77 Program and User's Guide for the Calculation of Partial Correlation and Standardized Regression Coefficients*. Sandia National Laboratories. Albuquerque, NM. Report No. SAND85-0044. June.

Marrow, E.W., K.E. Phillips, and C.W. Myers (1981). *Understanding Cost Growth and Performance Shortfalls in Pioneer Process Plants*. Prepared by the Rand Corporation for the U.S. Department of Energy. Santa Monica, CA. Rand Publication No. R-2569-DOE. September.

MIT (1982). *ASPEN User Manual, Volumes 1 and 2*. Prepared by Massachusetts Institute of Technology for U.S. Department of Energy, Morgantown Energy Technology Center, Morgantown, West Virginia. May 1982, Revised 1987.

Morgan, M.G., and M. Henrion (1990). *Uncertainty: A Guide to Dealing with Uncertainty in Quantitative Risk and Policy Analysis*. Cambridge University Press. New York.

Pietruszkiewicz, J., R.J. Milkavich, G.S. Booras, et al. (1988). *An Evaluation of Integrated Gasification-Combined-Cycle and Pulverized-Coal-Fired Steam Plants*, AP-5950, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA, 1988.

Rubin, E.S. and U.M. Diwekar (1989). *Stochastic Modeling of Coal Gasification Combined Cycle Systems*, Topical Report, prepared by Carnegie-Mellon University for the U.S. Department of Energy, Morgantown, West Virginia, DOE/MC/24248-2900, NTIS DE90015570, November, 1989.

Schorr, M.M., "NO_x Emission Control for Gas Turbines: A 1991 Update on Regulations and Technology," *Energy Engineering*, 88(6):25-54, 1991

Southern Company Services (1990), *Assessment of Coal Gasification/Hot Gas Cleanup Based Advanced Gas Turbine Systems*, Contract No. DE-FC21-89MC26019, U.S. Department of Energy, Morgantown Energy Technology Center, Morgantown, WV, December 1990.

