Comparative analysis of gas and coal-fired power generation in ultra-low emission condition using life cycle assessment (LCA)
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Abstract. Energy consumption and pollutant emission of natural gas combined cycle power-generation (NGCC), liquefied natural gas combined cycle power-generation (LNGCC), natural gas combined heat and power generation (CHP) and ultra-supercritical power generation with ultra-low gas emission (USC) were analyzed using life cycle assessment method, pointing out the development opportunity and superiority of gas power generation in the period of coal-fired unit ultra-low emission transformation. The results show that CO₂ emission followed the order: USC>LNGCC>NGCC>CHP; the resource depletion coefficient of coal-fired power generation was lower than that of gas power generation, and the coal-fired power generation should be the main part of power generation in China; based on sensitivity analysis, improving the generating efficiency or shortening the transportation distance could effectively improve energy saving and emission reduction, especially for the coal-fired units, and improving the generating efficiency had a great significance for achieving the ultra-low gas emission.

1. Introduction

With the energy crisis and environment pollution intensified, power generation with efficiency, clean and low-carbon has gradually become China’s energy development strategies. In June 2015, China submitted Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDC), proposing that carbon intensity would be reduced by 60%-65% in 2030, compared to that in 2005. Due to its clean and efficiency characteristics, gas power generation developed rapidly with the government supports in recent years. As predicted in BP energy outlook (2016 edition), China’s energy mix continues to evolve with coal’s dominance declining from 66% in 2014 to 47% in 2035 and natural gas more than doubling to 11%.

At present, natural gas combined cycle power generation (NGCC), liquefied natural gas combined cycle power generation (LNGCC) and natural gas combined heat and power generation (CHP) are the main modes of nature gas generation. As the ultra-low emission standard was promulgated in 2014, requiring the emission of SO₂, NOₓ and dust respectively below 35 mg/Nm³, 50 mg/Nm³ and 5 mg/Nm³ in coal-fired unit, China’s coal-fired generation will be dominated by ultra-supercritical power generation (USC) with ultra-low emission.
The previous studies show that gas power generation had superiorities in pollutant emission compared with coal-fired generation[1-4]. However, there are rare literatures mentioning the comparison between nature gas generation and coal-fired generation in the ultra-low emission condition. Therefore, it is necessary to further discuss if the nature gas generation has the superiority in energy saving and emission reduction compared with USC with ultra-low emission technology, providing the basic data for the policy making and the technology selection of enterprises.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research subjects
According to the status of gas turbines in China, 9F-level NGCC unit with 390 MW, 9F-level LNGCC unit with 390 MW and 9E-level CHP unit with 180MW was selected to analyze their energy consumption and emission. For USC, an 1000MW coal-fired unit with ultra-low emission was selected. The basic parameters were set and shown in Table 1.

| Types of units | NGCC | LNGCC | CHP | USC |
|----------------|------|------|-----|-----|
| model          | M701F | M701F | PG9171E | /   |
| Heat efficiency (%) | 55%  | 55%  | 66%  | 42.37%a |
| Annual generating hour (h) | 3500 | 3500 | 3500 | 5259 |
| Annual electric production (kWh) | 1.365 billion | 1.365 billion | 0.57 billion | 5.259 billion |
| Annual fuel consumption (kWh) | 0.25×10³ m³ | 0.25×10³ m³ | 0.132×10³ m³ | 1.523×10⁹ kg |
| Operating year (a) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |

*a Calculated by the coal consumption for power generation of 0.29 kg/kWh.

2.2. System boundary
The function unit was 1 kWh, and the energy consumption and emission were calculated in the generation of 1 kWh. The power generation systems included the following stages: (1) fuel mining and processing, (2) fuel transportation, (3) station building, (4) operating and retirement. The system boundary of these four generation technologies was shown in Fig.1.

![Figure 1. The system boundary of NGCC, LNGCC, CHP and USC generation technologies](image)

3. Unit process and life cycle inventory

3.1. Data source and assumptions
Based on the researches and the status of electricity production, the following assumptions were made to simplify the calculation of different power generation technology:(1) The emission from the building of liquidation station and the manufacture of vehicles were ignored. (2) The average distance of pipeline transportation was 519 km, and the shipping distance of LNG was 1781 km [5]. (3) the
ratio of railway, waterway and highway was set to 60%, 25% and 15%, respectively[6]. (4) The secondary emission from steel manufacture and transportation were only considered in the gas pipeline building. Data source of each stage were shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. Data source of each stage.**

| Unit Process                       | Item                        | Data source |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Fuel mining and processing        | Gas mining and liquidation   | [5], [7]    |
|                                   | Coal mining and washing     | [8]         |
|                                   | Gas transportation          | [9]         |
| Fuel transportation               | Gas pipeline building       | [5], [10]   |
|                                   | Coal transportation         | [6], [5, 11]|
|                                   | Building materials          |             |
|                                   | consumption                 |             |
| Power station building and retirement | Building materials transportation |     |
|                                   | retirement                  | [6]         |
| Power station operation           | Gas power generation        | [13], [14]  |
|                                   | Coal-fired generation       | [15, 16]    |

3.2. Indirect energy consumption and emission

In the stage of fuel mining, transportation, power plant construction and retirement, building materials like steels, cements, coppers, aluminum are needed. This part of emission from the use of raw materials belonged to indirect emission, while the emission from those five processes belonged to direct emission. Energy consumption and emission of each material was referred to China’s statistic data in industries [9, 12, 17].

3.3. Unit process

In fuel mining and processing, through seismic exploration, well drilling, workover, gas field gathering and purification, nature gas was sent to the main pipeline. Nature gas was mainly processed by liquidation, and the cascade refrigeration and the mixing refrigeration were the main liquidation techniques. Coal was mainly processed through washing, and coal jigging was the main method. In Fuel transportation process, steel production and transportation were the main considerations in the gas pipeline building. LNG was transported by shipping. Coal transportation included railway, waterway and highway. The inventory at construction stage was mainly from the production and transportation of equipment and building materials, and the energy consumption and emission of installation could be ignored. Energy consumption and emission of retirement were estimated as 10% in power plant construction [6]. As for the operation process, in USC with ultra-low emission, since the real emission concentration in operation was closed to the ultra-low emission standard, the emission concentrations of SO₂, NOₓ and dust were set to 35, 50 and 5 mg/Nm³ respectively.

3.4. Analysis of inventory

Energy consumption and gaseous emissions of each stage in four kinds of power generation system were shown in Table 3, where all the energy consumptions were converted into the one-time energy of standard coal, nature gas and diesel. Energy consumption and CO₂ emission were on the following order: USC > LNGCC > NGCC > CHP. CO₂ emission of each kind of power plant was 773, 461, 416 and 408 gCO₂/kWh, respectively, due to the higher generating efficiency of gas power generation at the operation stage.

Due to the higher efficiency and the characteristics, NOₓ, SO₂ and dust of gas power generation were still lower than those of USC with ultra-low emission, in total. For NOₓ, its emission was on the following order: LNGCC>USC>NGCC>CHP. Due to the ultra-low emission standard, the proportion
of NOX emission in the operation stage was low, and NOX emission was more greatly decided by fuel mining and transportation.

Table 3. Energy consumption and pollutant emissions of electricity generation (1 kWh)

| stages | mode | Coal | Diesel | NG | CO2 | CH4 | NOX | SO2 | PM | CO |
|--------|------|------|--------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|
|        |      |      |        |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |
|        |      | 10.9 | 6.53   | 0.007 | 42  | 0.44 | 0.312 | 0.001 | 0.076 | 0.496 |
| FMP    | NGCC | 11.4 | 6.53   | 0.026 | 42  | 0.44 | 0.312 | 0.001 | 0.076 | 0.496 |
|        | LNGCC| 10.7 | 6.41   | 0.006 | 41  | 0.44 | 0.306 | 0.001 | 0.075 | 0.487 |
|        | CHP  | 12.9 | 0.45   | 0    | 41  | 3.26 | 0.269 | 0.285 | 0.128 | 0.037 |
|        | NGCC | 3.4  | 0.59   | 0.006 | 2   | 0.01 | 0.021 | 0.006 | 0.008 | 0.005 |
|        | LNGCC| 0    | 1.64   | 0    | 47  | 0.75 | 0.255 | 0.11  | 0.046 | 0.01 |
|        | CHP  | 2.3  | 0.39   | 0.004 | 1   | 0.01 | 0.021 | 0.006 | 0.007 | 0.005 |
|        | USC  | 1.8  | 2.25   | 0    | 12  | 0.01 | 0.227 | 0.136 | 0.017 | 0.037 |
|        | NGCC | 0.6  | 0.01   | 0.182 | 2   | 0.07 | 0.012 | 0.018 | 0.047 | 0.062 |
|        | LNGCC| 0    | 0.01   | 0.182 | 2   | 0.07 | 0.012 | 0.018 | 0.047 | 0.062 |
|        | CHP  | 0    | 0.01   | 0.179 | 1   | 0.05 | 0.009 | 0.013 | 0.034 | 0.045 |
|        | USC  | 0.5  | 0.03   | 0    | 1   | 0    | 0.003 | 0.006 | 0.026 | 0    |
|        | NGCC | 0    | 0     | 0.182 | 371 | 0.03 | 0.143 | 0    | 0.006 | 0.009 |
|        | LNGCC| 0    | 0     | 0.182 | 371 | 0.03 | 0.143 | 0    | 0.006 | 0.009 |
|        | CHP  | 0    | 0     | 0.179 | 364 | 0.03 | 0.14  | 0    | 0.006 | 0.445 |
|        | USC  | 289  | 3.11   | 0    | 720 | 0.01 | 0.182 | 0.116 | 0.017 | 0.142 |
|        | NGCC | 14.9 | 7.16   | 0.195 | 416 | 0.55 | 0.488 | 0.025 | 0.137 | 0.573 |
|        | LNGCC| 12   | 8.21   | 0.208 | 461 | 1.29 | 0.721 | 0.129 | 0.175 | 0.577 |
|        | CHP  | 13.5 | 6.83   | 0.19  | 408 | 0.52 | 0.476 | 0.02  | 0.122 | 0.981 |
|        | USC  | 305.0| 5.85   | 0.000 | 773 | 3.27 | 0.681 | 0.542 | 0.189 | 0.217 |

*FMP: Fuel mining/processing; *FT: Fuel transportation; *PPCR: Power plant construction/retirement; *PPO: Power plant operation.

4. Impact assessment

4.1. Energy consumption

Gas power generation had a higher efficiency than coal-fired generation, thus the consumption of onetime energy was lower. However, the scarcity of coal and nature gas was different, and resource consumption of them should be determined through normalization and weighting analysis.

Table 4 shows the one-time resource consumption for generating 1 kWh electricity. After normalization and weighting analysis, the resource consumption of coal-fired generation was lower than that of gas power generation by 47%-52%. Therefore, China’s electricity production should still base on coal-fired power generation, supplemented by the cleaner ways like gas power generation, which was mainly for peak shaving.

Table 4. One-time resource consumption for generating 1 kWh electricity

| stages  | NGCC | LNGCC | CHP | USC |
|---------|------|-------|-----|-----|
|         | SCa  | DSb   | NGc | SCa  |
| WRd     | 1.53 | 2.81  | 6.13 | 1.23E- |
|         | E-04 | E-04  | E-03 | 3.22E- |
|         | 04   | 04    | 03  | 6.54E- |
|         | 04   | 04    | 04  | 1.38E- |
|         | E-03 | E-03  | E-04 | 2.68E- |
|         | 0   | 0     | 0   | 5.96  |
|         | E-04 | E-04  | E-12| 3.12  |
|         | E-03 | E-03  | E-12| 7.39  |
5. Environment impact assessment

The emission inventory was arranged into five environmental impact categories of global warming (GW), acidification (AC), nutrient enrichment (NE), photochemical ozone formation (PO) and soot and ashes (SA). Based on the characterization benchmarks in 2000 [18], the environment impacts of characterization were calculated. Considering difference importance among those environmental impacts, normalization and weighting step was conducted. The weighted environmental potential (WP\((j)\)) was calculated by the following formula:

\[
WP(j) = \frac{EP(j)}{T \cdot ER(j)} WF(j)
\]

where, \(EP(j)\) was the environmental potential of impact category \(j\); \(T\) was the expected lifetime; \(ER(j)\) was the normalization reference of impact \(j\); \(WF(j)\) was the weighting factor of impact \(j\).

![Figure 2. The weighted environmental potentials for each impact in the life cycle.](image)

Figure 2 shows the weighted environmental potentials for each impact in the life cycle of power generation. Global warming had greatest impacts, accounting for 48.97%, 45.05%, 44.85% and 55.24% of total, respectively. PO had secondly greatest impacts, accounting for 27.32%, 26.17%, 34.17% and 19.04% of total respectively. Therefore, in the condition of ultra-low emission, global warming was the most important environment impact, and enhancing the control and management of CO\(_2\) emission would become an important development direction for power generation in the future.

6. Sensitivity analysis

When the generation efficiency changed by 2%, as well as the transportation distance changed by 20%, the rate of gaseous emissions change in power generation were shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4. Compared to gas power generation, coal-fired generation was affected by generation efficiency more greatly. That was because the coal-fired generation had a higher proportion in the operation emission and a lower ratio in the transportation than gas power generation. Therefore, for ultra-supercritical unit with ultra-low emission, promoting the generation efficiency had a greater significance.
7. Conclusion

The results show that CO$_2$ emission followed the order: USC (773.35 gCO$_2$/kWh) > LNGCC (461.18 gCO$_2$/kWh) > NGCC (416.03 gCO$_2$/kWh) > CHP (407.95 gCO$_2$/kWh); the resource depletion coefficient of coal-fired power generation was lower than that of gas power generation, and the coal-fired power generation should be the main part of power generation in China; improving the generating efficiency or shortening the transportation distance could effectively improve energy saving and emission reduction, especially for the coal-fired units, and improving the generating efficiency had a great significance for achieving the ultra-low gas emission.

Based on the Results, China should remain the predominant role of coal-fired generation and strongly support the gas power generation, especially in ultra-low emission conditions. Due to the higher cost in gas power generation and significant impact of fluctuations in gas prices, the government should still support the gas power generation by a series of policies like subsidy. In any case, taking large coal-fired generation as dominant, eliminating medium and small-sized coal-fired power plants and promoting the proportion of gas power generation is the inevitable trend of China’s power generation development. Therefore, using gas power generation to replace the small-sized coal-fired power plants can be the development direction in the next few years.
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