CIBO Estimated Capital Costs For Air Pollution Control Equipment For Biomass-Fired Industrial Boilers and Process Heatersⁱ

Pollutant	Particulate Matter (PM)	Hydrogen Chloride (HCl)	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Dioxin/Mercury (Hg)
Likely	Fabric Filter (FF)	Scrubber (e.g., spray dryer or	Catalytic Oxidation (CATOX) or	Carbon Injection (CI)
Additional		wet scrubber)	other combustion improvement	
Control			projects	
Required				
# of Biomass-	352 of the 466 biomass-fired units	10 of the 466 biomass-fired	333 of the 466 biomass-fired	401 of the 466 biomass-fired
Fired Boilers	will need a new FF or an upgrade to	units need scrubbers or upgrades	units need CATOX or	units need CI (cost of required
and Process	their current FF or electrostatic		combustion improvements	PM control device included in
Heaters	precipitator (ESP).			PM column as necessary)
Comments/	• If a unit did not already have a FF	• If there was information in the	• If there was information in the	• If there was information in the
Assumptions	or ESP and there was information	EPA database that indicated	EPA database that indicated the	EPA database that indicated
	in the EPA database that indicated	the unit cannot meet the limit,	unit cannot meet the limit or if	the unit cannot meet the limit
	the unit cannot meet the limit or	we assumed either a scrubber	there was no emissions	for either mercury or dioxin,
	there was no emissions	upgrade or new scrubber	information in the EPA	we added carbon injection.
	information, we assumed a new FF	depending on whether the unit	database and the boiler is not a	• If there was no Hg emissions
	based on EPA baseline emission	currently had a scrubber.	fluidized bed unit or dry	information in the database,
	factors for various control devices	• If there was no emissions	biomass fuel cell, then we	we assumed the unit would
	for coal fired boilers ⁱⁱ .	information in the EPA	assumed that capital would be	meet the mercury limit
	• If the unit already had a FF or ESP	database, we assumed the unit	necessary to either perform	without additional control. ii
	and there was information in the	would meet the HCl limit	combustion/fuel feed	• If there was no DF emission
	EPA database that indicated the	without additional control. ii	improvements or other boiler	information in the database,
	unit cannot meet the limit, we	• Scrubber base capital cost \$8	improvement projects to reduce	we assumed that dutch oven
	assumed an upgrade to the existing	million; scrubber base upgrade	CO or install a CO catalyst.	and stoker units would need
	FF or ESP.	capital cost \$4 million.iv	• Base capital cost of \$3 million	CI, based on EPA baseline
	• If unit had a FF and no emissions		was assumed for CO controls	emission factor memo. ii
	information, we assumed no		(either projects to improve	• A fixed cost of \$1 million was
	upgrade necessary.		combustion or fuel feed or	assumed for installation of a
	• If unit had ESP and no emissions		installation of a CO catalyst). iv	Carbon Injection system for
	information, we assumed upgrade		• NOTE: It is uncertain whether	Hg and/or dioxin control, as
	to ESP was necessary based on		a CO catalyst can be applied	these systems do not vary
	EPA baseline emission factors.		effectively and efficiently to	much in cost by boiler size.
	• FF base capital cost \$7 MM ⁱⁱⁱ ;		biomass-fired industrial boilers.	
	FF/ESP base upgrade capital cost			
	\$4 MM. ^{iv}			
Total Capital	\$1.6 billion	\$92 million	\$792 million	\$401 million
Cost to				
Biomass-				
Fired Units:				
<u>\$2.86 billion</u>				

Pollutant	Particulate Matter (PM)	Hydrogen Chloride (HCl)	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Dioxin/Mercury (Hg)
Capital Cost	• Range of Costs Per Unit: \$797k	Range of Costs Per Unit:	Range of Costs Per Unit:	• \$1 million per unit
Per Unit	to 21.3MM	\$4.5 to 17.1MM	\$435k to 9.1MM	
	Average Per Unit Cost:	Average Per Unit Cost:	Average Per Unit Cost:	
	\$4.5MM ^v	\$9.2MM	\$1.7MM	

¹ The chart includes data for 466 biomass-fired units >10 MMBtu/hr. The 466 units are derived from 457 units in the biomass MACT subcategory in EPA's Boiler MACT survey database available here: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/boiler/boilerpg.html#TECH and 9 units in the forest products industry that are biomass fired boilers at major sources but were not in EPA's database. Capital cost estimates are not intended to represent a worst case analysis. Rather, they represent typical retrofit costs for the various scenarios based on published reports, industry information on specific project costs, EPA reports or control device fact sheets, or actual BACT or BART analyses submitted to permitting agencies. A primary resource was the document "Evaluation of Air Pollution Control Costs for the Pulp and Paper Industry," prepared by National Economic Research Associates (NERA) in May 2003. Note that costs were not scaled from the date of the reference used to 2011 dollars as the intent was to develop an order of magnitude estimate for each control scenario.

Where no emissions data were available in the EPA database for a particular type of unit, EPA's baseline emission factors identified in the memorandum "Revised Development of Baseline Emission Factors for Boilers and Process Heaters at Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional Facilities," January 2011, Appendix D were used to determine if typical emissions from the type of unit (fuel/design/control device) would meet the MACT limits.

iii MM stands for million

^{iv} The base cost assumes a size of 250 MMBtu/hr, the boiler specific cost was calculated using a 0.6 power function and the actual boiler size in MMBtu (e.g., for a 100 MMBtu/hr boiler or process heater, the cost is the base cost times (100/250)^{0.6}).

^v Average cost was calculated by adding up the per unit cost for every unit requiring controls to get the total cost for all units and then dividing the total cost by the number of units requiring controls.