

**ALASKA LEGISLATURE**

**2607**

**HOUSE and SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE FILES, 2003-2004**

# How a Rapid Profitable H<sub>2</sub> Transition would work



**Buildings use 2/3  
of US electricity**



# How a rapid, profitable H<sub>2</sub> transition would work

gas or  
electricity




fuel cell  
in building  
for co/trigen  
and UPS

H<sub>2</sub> ready  
Hypercars

Buildings use 2/3  
of US electricity



# How a rapid, profitable H<sub>2</sub> transition would work




**Buildings use 2/3 of US electricity**  
Hydrogen appliance is sized for peak building loads that seldom occur

**Marginal investment in H<sub>2</sub> compression, storage, and fueling, car-to-grid connection, and more durable fuel cell**  
**US fleet has potential of 5–10 TW (6–12x US capacity)**



# How a rapid, profitable H<sub>2</sub> transition would work




**Buildings use 2/3  
of US electricity**

**Marginal investment  
in H<sub>2</sub> compression, storage, and  
fueling, car-to-grid connection,  
and more durable fuel cell  
US fleet has potential of 5-10 TW  
(6-12x US capacity)**



# How a rapid, profitable H<sub>2</sub> transition would work




Buildings use 2/3 of US electricity

Marginal investment in H<sub>2</sub> compression, H<sub>2</sub> fueling and grid connection  
US fleet has potential of 5-10TW (6-12x US capacity)



# How a rapid, profitable H<sub>2</sub> transition would work



## Hydrogen-ready cars + integrated with buildings = hydrogen transition

- ◇ No technological breakthroughs required (*e.g.*, onboard reformers) — just durable and cheaper fuel cells
- ◇ Can market fuel-cell cars as soon as durable fuel cells become available, and can do so profitably many years earlier than inefficient vehicles would allow
- ◇ Meanwhile, engine or engine-hybrid Hypercar vehicles would impress (*e.g.*, ~70+ mpg for a midsize SUV)
- ◇ No need for new liquid-fuel infrastructure (methanol, ultrapure gasoline,...) nor for liquid hydrogen
- ◇ Integrating mobile and stationary deployment makes the transition profitable at each step (>10%/y real return)
- ◇ It doesn't matter whether durable stacks come first (favoring buildings) or cheap stacks (favoring cars); whichever comes first accelerates both markets



## New supply strategy for B.C., California, and the Pacific NW?

- ◇ Import oil for transportation
- ◇ Heat with electricity and BC gas
- ◇ Electricity from hydro and thermal (coal being phased out, gas combined-cycle phased in)
- ◇ Minor renewables
- ◇ Key energy carrier is *grid* electricity
- ◇ Import no oil
- ◇ Fuel-cell vehicles, buildings, most industries
- ◇ Hydrogen as main energy carrier, from gas, "Hydro-Gen," wind, and PVs
- ◇ Minor direct gas use for heat, mainly industrial
- ◇ Minor central *hydroelectric* supply; still onpeak el. sales; mostly onsite gen.; fish water

Intensive integrated superefficiency + distributed-generation experiments are emerging: Iceland, NZ, Yakushima, Vanuatu, Utsira, ... Vancouver Island?



## Do we have enough primary energy to make the hydrogen we need?

( $\eta$   $\equiv$  efficiency)

- ◇ If fueling  $5\eta$  light and  $2\eta$  heavy vehicles,  $\sim 50$  MT/y  $H_2$  could displace all U.S. highway-vehicle fuel
- ◇ U.S. refineries use  $\sim 7$  MT/y  $H_2$  — enough to displace 1/4 of U.S. gasoline (2x Gulf share)
- ◇  $\sim 10$  MT/y  $H_2$  could be made from 2.0 TCF of natural gas freed up by efficient end-use of gas and electricity and by electric load management
- ◇ Alternatively, 50 MT/y  $H_2$  could be made by the Dakotas' cost-effective windpower potential, with turbines on a few percent of the windiest available lands, leaving the rest for farming/ranching/wildlife



## **"Won't we just run out of natural gas even faster? Or of capital?"**

- ◇ GM thinks U.S. use of natural gas would be *lower* with a miniature-gas-reformer H<sub>2</sub> transition
- ◇ RMI is checking, but can see how any net increase in natural-gas use could at worst be very small
  - Natural gas used to make H<sub>2</sub> could be approximately offset by gas saved in power plants, in boilers and furnaces, and in making H<sub>2</sub> for gasoline
  - Peak electricity demand is served by extremely inefficient gas-fired turbines...so shaving peak electric loads by 5% would save around 9% of the total U.S. use of natural gas
- ◇ Sandy Thomas ([www.h2gen.com](http://www.h2gen.com)) argues that global capital investment in a gas-based H<sub>2</sub> hydrogen fueling infrastructure over the next 40 y would be ~\$1 trillion less than for gasoline, saving ~\$600 of investment per car served; RMI is refining this estimate too



## **"Hydrogen is just a shill for nuclear power and fossil fuels"**

- ◇ Even if electrolysis were a competitive way to make  $H_2$ , new nuclear plants are a hopelessly uncompetitive way to make electricity — forget it
  - Delivered cost of new nuclear el. would be  $\sim 2-3\times$  new wind-power,  $5-10\times$  gas cogen/trigen,  $10-30+\times$  end-use efficiency — so nuclear-el.  $H_2$  would cost  $2-3\times$  more/mi than record oil price
  - Far from saving nuclear power,  $H_2$  will hasten its extinction
- ◇ It's OK to use responsibly extracted fossil fuels to make hydrogen...
  - Temporarily to make  $H_2$  from natural gas without carbon sequestration, because  $CO_2$  released per mile would fall by  $\sim 2-5\times$  (DOE:  $2.5\times$ )...
  - And long-run to make  $H_2$  *with* carbon sequestration (at large or probably, with emerging methods, small scale) — or its backstop technologies, which don't require geological success



## Renewables will compete well too — even better with hydrogen

- ◇ As already noted, H<sub>2</sub> boosts renewables' economics
- ◇ Fuel cells' distributed benefits are synergistic with those of renewables such as photovoltaics
- ◇ Reversible fuel cells go especially well with PVs
- ◇ DOE should fully fund both H<sub>2</sub> *and* renewables — not swipe H<sub>2</sub> funding from renewables as now
- ◇ Huge stranded renewables, such as Dakotas wind, will require substantial delivery investments (but will still be very worthwhile).
- ◇ Synergies from combining H<sub>2</sub> with renewables
  - *All Danish energy* — not just el. — could be cost-effectively, reliably obtained from windpower with two weeks' H<sub>2</sub> storage




# The Oil Endgame *Is Here*

- ◆ The chairs of 4 oil majors and 3 car majors have said so
- ◆ The cost of securing and protecting oil supply lines raises national security concerns

◆ Oil will probably become uncompetitive even at low prices before it becomes unavailable even at high prices

◆ Like uranium already and coal increasingly, oil will become not worth extracting — good mainly for holding up the ground — because other ways to do the same tasks are better and cheaper



## More profitable for hydrocarbon owners too? Just try this quiz...

- ◇  $(H - C) > (H + C)$ ?
  - ◇ Is the hydrogen worth more without the carbon than with the carbon?
  - ◇ Is hydrogen plus negacarbon (which someone may pay you *not* to put into the air) worth more than hydrocarbon? What if carbon is worth zero?
  - ◇ Is a hydrocarbon worth more feeding a refinery or a reformer?
  - ◇ Should refineries become merchant  $H_2$  plants?
- (Left as an exercise for the reader. Then run, do not walk, to the hydrogen economy.)



## The dawn of the hydrogen era has begun

- ◇ Hydrogen-fueled superefficient vehicles will be safer and cleaner, cost less to drive, cost about the same to buy, and offer the potential to repay most or all of their cost from power sell-backs
- ◇ Fuel cell and vehicle technology enablers are within reach
- ◇ Enough hydrogen can be made cost-effectively from North American energy sources (even from just regional renewables) to eliminate gasoline and diesel use — creating real security
- ◇ A fast transition to a hydrogen economy is already starting and can be profitable at each step

# It's time — we just need leadership

"People and nations behave wisely —  
once they have exhausted all other alternatives."  
— Churchill

"Sometimes one must do what is necessary."  
— Churchill

"We are the people we have been waiting for."  
— Hopi Elders

[www.rmi.org](http://www.rmi.org)

[www.hypercar.com](http://www.hypercar.com)




U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY



# OFFICE OF FOSSIL ENERGY - HYDROGEN PROGRAM PLAN

*Hydrogen from Natural Gas and Coal: The Road to a Sustainable Energy Future*



HYDROGEN COORDINATION GROUP  
JUNE 2003

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Executive Summary .....  | 1           |
| Introduction .....   | 8           |
| Key Drivers .....  | 10          |
| FE Hydrogen from Fossil Fuels – Today’s Technology .....                               | 13          |
| Hydrogen from Fossil Fuels-The RD&D Program .....                                      | 17          |
| Hydrogen Demand Scenarios .....  | 17          |
| FE Program Goal .....  | 20          |
| Hydrogen from Natural Gas .....  | 20          |
| Hydrogen from Coal.....  | 24          |
| Spotlight on FutureGen .....   | 24          |
| Delivery .....   | 27          |
| Hydrogen from Fossil Fuels – A Budget for the Hydrogen from Fossil Fuels Program ..... | 29          |
| Future Technologies to Produce Hydrogen from Natural Gas .....                         | 32          |
| Future Technologies to Produce Hydrogen from Coal .....                                | 35          |
| FE Associated Programs .....   | 38          |
| Integrated Program Management and Coordination.....                                    | 40          |
| Acronyms .....   | 41          |
| Appendix .....   | 43          |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The President's National Energy Policy calls for conducting a review of funding for alternative energy supplies, including hydrogen. In response, the Office of Fossil Energy (FE) established a Hydrogen Coordination Group to develop the FE Hydrogen Program Plan. The coordination group was comprised of FE personnel from the Offices of Coal & Power Systems and Natural Gas & Petroleum Technology in Germantown, MD and Washington, DC and the NETL Pittsburgh and Tulsa offices. The FE Hydrogen Program Plan, along with input from the Offices of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Nuclear, and Science and the two documents – *A National Vision of America's Transition to a Hydrogen Economy – to 2030 and Beyond* and the *National Hydrogen Energy Roadmap* – provided the input to the Department of Energy's (DOE) Hydrogen Posture Plan. The Posture Plan, with the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) as lead, was DOE's response to the NEP recommendations, which was used to support DOE's FY04 budget to Congress.

Hydrogen is seen by many as the energy carrier of the future that will lead to efficient and clean fuel for use by utilities and especially in transportation systems. The use of hydrogen in fuel cells to electrochemically produce electricity and for combustion in heating and/or engine systems is seen as a means to provide an important part of the Nation's need for power, heat, and transportation while achieving very low emissions of criteria pollutants as well as greenhouse gases.

This FE Hydrogen Program Plan focuses on the research, development and demonstration (RD&D) activities that are required to develop advanced hydrogen production, storage and delivery technologies from fossil fuels. The result of these activities will improve current technology and make available new, innovative technology that can produce and deliver affordable hydrogen from natural gas and coal with significantly reduced or near-zero emissions.

Natural gas and coal have the potential to be affordable resources that can produce the large amounts of hydrogen needed in the near to mid term for the Nation to begin the transition to a hydrogen economy. Hydrogen produced from these resources and used in advanced technologies, especially in efficient fuel cell vehicles (FCVs), will improve energy security by reducing the United States' oil imports by over 3 million barrels per day for every 100 million FCVs or nearly half of the U.S. fleet. Even without sequestration, production and use of coal-derived hydrogen in 100 million FCVs is estimated to also reduce carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas (GHG), by 278 million tons per year, a reduction of 24 percent of the carbon dioxide emissions associated with the current U.S. light-duty vehicle fleet. Nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions will be reduced by about 100,000 tons per year, while sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>) and particulate matter emissions would be reduced by 43 thousand tons and 40 thousand tons, respectively. Criteria pollutants and carbon dioxide emissions would be reduced by about the same or a greater amount for natural gas-derived hydrogen in FCVs.

When hydrogen production from fossil fuels is combined with carbon sequestration, carbon dioxide emissions will be reduced by over 530 million tons per year for each 100 million FCVs, a reduction

of 45 percent for the current U.S. light-duty vehicle fleet. Also, the use of the Nation's domestic natural gas, its huge potential resource of methane hydrates (estimated at 320,000 trillion cubic feet), and 250-year supply of coal to produce hydrogen ensures that there will be a clean and affordable alternative to imported oil. This will enable the transition to a hydrogen economy until other sustainable energy resources for hydrogen production become economic.

### ***Where do we get hydrogen?***

Molecular hydrogen does not occur on Earth but must be produced from other hydrogen-containing materials. This process requires a primary energy source, such as fossil fuels, nuclear, or renewables. Fossil fuels (e.g., natural gas and coal) as that energy source can provide the transition to a hydrogen economy by delivering a near- to mid-term source of hydrogen. With sequestration, it is envisioned that natural gas and coal could be used to produce hydrogen for many decades. A sustainable hydrogen supply in the future may come from renewables and nuclear energy-supplied heat and electricity used to split water into hydrogen and oxygen.

### ***Need for hydrogen research***

While some hydrogen production technologies are commercial now and others are making rapid progress, hydrogen faces many technical, economic, and infrastructure challenges before it can become a significant energy carrier. The Bush Administration has initiated major efforts in research and development that will lead to a hydrogen economy. The President's budget calls for increases in funding for hydrogen-related research, development and demonstration (RD&D) activities, with a shift in emphasis to higher risk, longer term issues. This includes, for example, the FreedomCAR program, the FutureGen project, and the Hydrogen Fuel Initiative.

The FreedomCAR program is focused on the development of fuel cell technology for automobiles to efficiently convert hydrogen's electrochemical energy into electric power. Hydrogen fuel cell vehicles consume only one-third the energy of a current gasoline internal combustion engine per mile driven while achieving zero emissions. Natural gas and coal can provide the most affordable source of abundant hydrogen to allow early introduction of fuel cell vehicles in the FreedomCAR program and can continue to provide hydrogen as an energy carrier until hydrogen from renewable and nuclear energy becomes affordable. In this way, the Nation's imports of petroleum can be reduced and our air and environment can become cleaner.

FutureGen is a \$1 billion, 10-year verification project that will build the world's first, coal-based, near zero-emission electricity and hydrogen plant integrated with sequestration. FutureGen will enable cutting-edge technologies, such as revolutionary separation membranes, to leapfrog mature technologies to lower the cost to separate hydrogen from mixed gas streams while demonstrating greenhouse gas capture and sequestration technologies.

The long-term vision of a hydrogen economy looks attractive for a number of reasons including: (1) the gradual transformation of the U.S. economy from one that currently relies on significant

quantities of imported energy, primarily oil for the transportation sector, to one that will be able to harness domestic resources to a greater and greater extent, while being less damaging to the environment; (2) the potential for significant reductions in criteria pollutants (e.g., particulate matter, oxides of nitrogen, and oxides of sulfur) and corresponding improvements in air quality; and (3) the potential for reduced emission of greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide.

### ***Fossil Fuel Research***

Fossil fuels are an obvious choice as energy resources from which the large quantities of hydrogen needed to begin the transition to a sustainable hydrogen economy can be produced. Currently, hydrogen for industrial and commercial use is produced from steam reforming of natural gas with attendant water-gas shift reactions. This is a mature technology widely used in the petroleum processing industry. Significant opportunities exist for development of new technologies with potential to reduce the costs of hydrogen production from natural gas. Another fossil fuel, coal, is the Nation's largest domestic energy resource, and can also be an energy source for producing hydrogen. With associated carbon dioxide capture and sequestration technologies, hydrogen from natural gas and coal can make significant contributions toward achieving an improved environment.

### ***Hydrogen from Natural Gas Program***

This program will develop new technologies that lower the cost of producing hydrogen from natural gas and allow capture of associated carbon dioxide. In keeping with the National Energy Policy and relevant climate change initiatives, research will develop those technologies that will provide a primary source of hydrogen in the near to mid term, allowing development of infrastructure and end-use applications that will transition the Nation to a sustainable hydrogen economy. One technology, membrane reactors, will revolutionize the way hydrogen is produced from natural gas. When developed, this technology will simplify the process of producing hydrogen from natural gas by combining the process of air separation to produce oxygen with partial oxidation of natural gas to produce synthesis gas into a single step that will lower costs and increase efficiencies.

### ***Hydrogen from Coal Program***

Coal resources offer a viable mid-term energy resource for producing the large quantities of hydrogen that will be required to fuel the Nation's needs. Initially, hydrogen would be produced via coal gasification-based facilities also capable of co-producing electric power, reformable liquid fuels, and high-value chemicals. These multiple-product, co-production plants will be less costly, competitive, more efficient, and less polluting than current technology. Additionally, they will produce a concentrated stream of carbon dioxide that will facilitate its economic capture and sequestration.

To accelerate the development of hydrogen from coal production technologies, President George W. Bush and Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham announced on February 27, 2003, a \$1 billion, 10-year government/industry integrated sequestration and hydrogen research initiative titled

FutureGen. FutureGen would be designed, built, and operated as a large-scale, prototype plant that will serve as an engineering verification test-bed for many cutting-edge coal technologies, including technologies such as advanced catalysts and reactors and membrane separation units developed in the hydrogen from coal program. The prototype plant will become a model for future hydrogen from coal production facilities that will produce the necessary amount of hydrogen for the transportation sector.

### ***Commonalities and Differences***

There appears to be much similarity in the technology and processing concepts used to produce hydrogen from natural gas or hydrogen from coal, and indeed there is a need for coordination in the effort to develop the respective technologies.

At the same time, there are significant system differences in these concepts that make R&D planning and implementation more effective on a resource-specific basis. A synthesis gas mixture from coal is carbon monoxide-rich and the synthesis gas mixture from natural gas is hydrogen-rich, making it necessary to explore whether the same production/separation membranes will be effective. Coal-derived synthesis gases, even after a primary clean-up stage, have more impurities than their natural gas counterparts that may require different clean-up systems. In addition, integration of the hydrogen separation technology into the coal gasification-based hydrogen production facility is more complex, requiring different system integration efforts.

### ***Hydrogen Delivery***

Today, most hydrogen used in refineries and chemical facilities is produced on site. In addition, merchant hydrogen producers who supply the refining and chemical industries locate generation facilities near end-users, use dedicated hydrogen pipelines and storage facilities, and, for low-volume users at greater distances from the supplier, use on-road trucks for delivery. The unique properties of hydrogen may make the use of existing natural gas delivery infrastructure difficult because of potential material and valve incompatibility resulting in hydrogen leakage and embrittlement of components. Therefore, systems analyses and research are needed to determine the viability of using natural gas pipelines to transport hydrogen. From a larger perspective, this same approach must be extended to other options to determine the most optimum system that can be used to deliver hydrogen. The analyses should consider the trade-off between large capital investments in central location hydrogen plants, associated pipelines, and delivery versus the use of liquid and natural gas infrastructure to deliver hydrogen-rich fuels that can be converted on site.

One promising option for the delivery of hydrogen uses the current fuel infrastructure to transport synthesis gas-derived liquids. At or near the point of end use, the hydrogen can be produced from the liquid by a reforming process. The technologies for producing these liquids from natural gas are commercial or near commercial. However, for the conversion of coal-derived synthesis gas to a liquid, R&D is necessary to make the process economically viable for deployment in this country. In addition, for these hydrogen-carrier liquids, whether produced from coal or natural gas, further

research is needed to determine the optimum fuel(s) for reforming and the associated reaction chemistry database required to develop economic, small-scale reforming systems for mobile and small-scale distributed power generation.

### ***Associated Programs***

The successful development of low-cost, affordable hydrogen production from fossil fuels, with sequestration of carbon dioxide, is dependent on technologies being developed in a number of ongoing associated RD&D programs within the Office of Fossil Energy (FE). These technologies are needed for:

- carbon dioxide capture and sequestration;
- advanced coal gasification, including feed handling systems;
- efficient gasifier design and materials engineering;
- advanced synthesis gas clean-up technologies;
- advanced membrane separation technology to produce a lower-cost source of oxygen from air; and
- fuel cell modules that can produce electric power at coal-fired integrated gasification combined-cycle power plants.

### ***Key Hydrogen R&D Milestones***

A future hydrogen economy will require multiple energy supply sources. Natural gas and coal will provide the transition to a sustainable energy supply. The key milestones of FE's Hydrogen Program are:

- By 2011, an alternative hydrogen delivery system utilizing hydrogen-rich synthesis gas-derived liquid fuels will be optimized and available,
- By 2013, modules to reduce the cost of hydrogen and synthesis gas production from natural gas by 25 percent will be available,
- By 2015, a zero-emission, coal-based plant that co-produces hydrogen and electric power with sequestration to reduce the cost of hydrogen by 25 percent when compared to existing coal-based technology will be demonstrated.

Testing of coal-based technologies developed by the program in the FutureGen prototype plant will significantly reduce the technical and economic risk associated with program RD&D activities, helping the FE hydrogen program achieve its key goals and milestones.

## **Benefits**

Hydrogen from fossil fuel energy sources is an obvious near- to mid-term economic and technically feasible method to transition from fossil fuel to hydrogen as an energy carrier. Specific benefits of the Office of Fossil Energy's Hydrogen Program activities are discussed below.

- Production of lower cost hydrogen from natural gas could provide the earliest transitional source of hydrogen for the FreedomCAR program. It can provide the transition between the current economy and a hydrogen economy.
- Production of low-cost hydrogen from coal or synthesis gas-derived liquid fuels will reduce reliance on imported oil, increase the proportion of domestic energy resources used in the total domestic energy mix, and provide a cost-effective source of hydrogen for the FreedomCAR program.
- The production of hydrogen from domestic coal and natural gas along with natural gas from secure foreign energy resources and from abundant methane hydrates will be a significant step towards achieving energy security in the near term as well as the long term.
- The use of hydrogen in fuel cells and other efficient applications will reduce pollution compared to other alternatives and substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This technology will improve human health and the environment.
- The hydrogen from coal technology integrates long-range R&D goals for innovative technology development of a co-production, highly efficient facility for the combined production of power and hydrogen while achieving the objectives of a zero-emissions fossil energy plant.
- Successful development and implementation of carbon dioxide sequestration technology, an R&D effort supporting the hydrogen from natural gas and coal effort, will ensure the continued availability of coal and natural gas as viable sources of hydrogen while moving toward a sustainable hydrogen economy.

Hydrogen could eventually be produced from fossil energy resources, renewables, including biomass, and nuclear energy. Analyses have shown that an aggressive fossil fuel-based hydrogen production program can yield a sufficient supply of hydrogen to meet projected market demand for fuel cell vehicles. When utilized in these vehicles, hydrogen will substantially reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), Volatile organic compounds (VOC), and particulate matter 10 microns in diameter (PM10). In this way, hydrogen from natural gas and coal provides a near- and mid-term transitional fuel source until the long-term goal of producing hydrogen from nuclear and renewable energy is realized. Successful development of carbon dioxide capture and sequestration technology will eliminate public concerns over projected

increases of greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuels and will make coal an option for the longer term.

In conclusion, within DOE, the Office of Fossil Energy already has considerable expertise in the production, separation, storage, delivery and end-use applications of hydrogen from natural gas and coal. This expertise includes production of clean synthesis gas from coal and natural gas, gas separations and purification, fuel cells, and novel hydrogen storage and delivery technologies. However, there are significant technical and economic barriers that must be surmounted before hydrogen can seriously be considered as a candidate energy carrier in the United States. This document discusses the rationale for using hydrogen as an energy carrier, reviews the current and future technology options, and provides a strategic framework for overcoming the current barriers to large-scale hydrogen production and utilization.

As a result of synergism in R&D activities, the currently ongoing and planned fossil energy associated programs (gasification, carbon sequestration, and fuel cells) will reduce the development time and cost of the proposed hydrogen initiative and will greatly contribute to the ultimate development of more efficient, less costly, environmentally preferred, hydrogen production and delivery processes from natural gas and coal.

increases of greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuels and will make coal an option for the longer term.

In conclusion, within DOE, the Office of Fossil Energy already has considerable expertise in the production, separation, storage, delivery and end-use applications of hydrogen from natural gas and coal. This expertise includes production of clean synthesis gas from coal and natural gas, gas separations and purification, fuel cells, and novel hydrogen storage and delivery technologies. However, there are significant technical and economic barriers that must be surmounted before hydrogen can seriously be considered as a candidate energy carrier in the United States. This document discusses the rationale for using hydrogen as an energy carrier, reviews the current and future technology options, and provides a strategic framework for overcoming the current barriers to large-scale hydrogen production and utilization.

As a result of synergism in R&D activities, the currently ongoing and planned fossil energy associated programs (gasification, carbon sequestration, and fuel cells) will reduce the development time and cost of the proposed hydrogen initiative and will greatly contribute to the ultimate development of more efficient, less costly, environmentally preferred, hydrogen production and delivery processes from natural gas and coal.

## INTRODUCTION

Two of the major concerns in the U.S. energy sector today are energy security and the environmental impact of energy use. To address these issues, the President's 2001 National Energy Policy and the U.S. Department of Energy's Strategic Plan call for expanding the development of new and diverse energy supplies. Hydrogen - a promising solution for the future - holds the potential to provide a virtually limitless carrier of clean energy supplies in the long term.

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is implementing an initiative that could eventually lead to domestic energy sustainability for the transportation and power sectors through the widespread use of hydrogen. Hydrogen is the ultimate clean fuel with a wide range of uses - from direct combustion to efficient fuel cells. The conversion/combustion by-product of hydrogen is essentially water. An economy that uses hydrogen derived from domestic fossil (with carbon dioxide capture and sequestration), nuclear, and renewable resources will have increased energy security and reduced emissions.

To begin the implementation of the hydrogen initiative, DOE convened meetings among representatives from industry, the National Laboratories, public interest groups and the Federal Government to develop *A National Vision of America's Transition to a Hydrogen Economy - to 2030 and Beyond* and the *National Hydrogen Energy Roadmap*. These documents introduce actions that will be needed to implement a national hydrogen economy, one in which hydrogen is used for both mobile and stationary applications. Subsequently, using these documents as a guide, DOE's Offices of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Fossil Energy, Nuclear Energy and Office of Science prepared a Hydrogen Posture Plan. The Hydrogen Posture Plan encompasses all elements in the hydrogen energy system - production, delivery, storage, conversion, and application. This Office of Fossil Energy Hydrogen Program Plan includes the contributions that the Office of Fossil Energy will make in the implementation of the National Hydrogen Vision, the Roadmap, and the DOE Hydrogen Posture Plan.

Before the vision of producing hydrogen from nuclear and renewable energy becomes a reality, a technology bridge must be developed to connect near- to mid-term technology to the technologies of the future. Hydrogen is not a primary source of energy, but an energy carrier. Consequently, it must be produced from a primary energy source, such as fossil fuels, nuclear, or renewables, and subsequently converted to energy at or by the utilization device.

Fossil fuels are the obvious transitional source of hydrogen for the near and mid term. Natural gas has the lowest carbon intensity of all fossil fuels and is the cleanest burning. Its existing infrastructure and its current economic availability are important factors to ensure successful development and public acceptance of a hydrogen energy system. Development of the large potential resource of methane hydrates can provide a stable, domestic supply of natural gas that will enhance energy security. Utilization of our abundant, domestic supply of coal resources to produce hydrogen will reduce U.S. reliance on foreign imports of petroleum. When utilized in FCVs,

hydrogen from fossil fuel resources will reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and criteria pollutants such as NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>).

Of the five elements of a hydrogen energy system - production, storage, conversion, delivery, and applications - the Office of Fossil Energy's Hydrogen Program Plan focuses on the development of advanced production, storage, and delivery technologies. These developments will be coordinated and collaborated with the Office of EERE and other appropriate DOE organizations including co-sponsorship and funding. These activities will improve current technology and develop new innovative technology that can produce, store, and deliver affordable hydrogen from natural gas and coal while achieving significantly reduced or near-zero emissions. Successful development of carbon dioxide capture and sequestration technology will remove public concern over greenhouse gas emissions and will also make coal an option for the longer term.

Testing and evaluation of these advanced technologies in the FutureGen prototype plant will help the FE Hydrogen Program reduce the technical and economic risk associated with new, innovative technology development. The FutureGen project will design, build, and operate a large-scale, integrated, coal-based prototype plant that will provide the opportunity to test new, cutting-edge, clean power and hydrogen from coal technologies along with carbon capture and sequestration.

## KEY DRIVERS

The FE Hydrogen Program strives to create public benefits for the Nation by addressing three key drivers: energy security, the Clear Skies Initiative that addresses air pollution, and global climate change. Each of these drivers has or potentially could have a significant impact on the Nation and the economy. The FE Hydrogen Program will address these drivers by performing RD&D that will:


- develop advanced clean and efficient technologies that will produce hydrogen from natural gas and coal, enhancing the use of domestic energy resources;
- eliminate environmental concerns associated with the production of hydrogen from fossil fuels; and
- partner with industry to promote the commercialization of these technologies.

By developing new and innovative technology to produce hydrogen from natural gas and coal, the FE Hydrogen Program will benefit the public by enhancing U.S. energy and environmental security in a cost-effective manner through the use of domestic resources.

### Energy Security

The Nation's energy consumption is directly linked to economic growth. However, the Nation's production of domestic fossil fuels, particularly petroleum, is expected to be insufficient to meet the needs of our growing economy. Therefore, a secure supply of affordable energy is critical for the continued economic growth and prosperity of the United States. Maintaining energy security in the future may be difficult because: 1) the United States is forecast to increase the volume of already large oil imports in the coming years, and 2) there is concern expressed by some analysts that world conventional oil production may peak in the next few decades before it begins a long decline.

Figure 1: Historic and Projected Domestic Crude Oil Supply and Imports (1960 – 2020)




Source: EIA

Currently, the United States imports about nine million barrels per day of crude oil. Natural gas imports are increasing as well. By 2020, the Energy Information Administration (EIA) projects that imports will rise to 11 million barrels per day of crude oil, excluding petroleum products, accounting for nearly 67 percent of supply (see Figure 1). Over this period, world oil consumption is projected to rise from 76 to 119 million barrels per day. In China and India alone, consumption is expected to increase by over nine million barrels per day during this period, with a corresponding increase in imports in those countries.

Conventional petroleum is a finite resource and its production will eventually peak and irreversibly decline in the face of predicted increasing demand. Some analysts estimate that the world's average ultimately recoverable conventional oil resource is 2,700 billion barrels, which implies that the peak world conventional oil production would occur around the year 2015. Even if the remaining recoverable resource of conventional oil were nearly double this estimate so that the ultimately recoverable resource was 4,700 billion barrels, the production peak would occur only about 20 years later (Figure 2). For both estimates, alternative energy resources need to be available to ensure the Nation's future energy security.

Figure 2: World Conventional Oil Production.




Source: J.H. Laborer, *Oil and Gas Journal*, February 1999.

### Environment

Other challenges facing energy use are the issues surrounding emissions from fossil fuel utilization (e.g., combustion, conversion), increased levels of greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide, and their impact on urban/regional air pollution and climate.

Figure 3: Transportation and Stationary Power Contributions to Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions



Source: ORNL, *Transportation Energy Data Book*, Edition 22.

### Air Pollution

Of the man-made emissions, U.S. transportation and power production are responsible for over 84 percent of the carbon monoxide, 95 percent of the NOx, 48 percent of the VOCs, and over 92 percent of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Figure 3). There have been improvements in emissions, as the NEP states: "An individual car meeting 2004 Federal requirements will emit 95 percent less carbon monoxide, 94 percent fewer NOx emissions, and 98 percent fewer hydrocarbons than an average car did before laws limiting such vehicle pollution were implemented." Even so, these remaining emissions can have a significant impact on human health and the environment.

### *Climate Change*

Fossil fuels account for over 70 percent of the electricity generated in the United States and nearly all of the fuel consumed in the transportation sector. The continued use of fossil fuels in these sectors presents many environmental challenges, particularly global climate change. To address this environmental challenge, the President has proposed the Climate Change Research and National Climate Change Technology Initiatives to improve scientific understanding of the global climate system and to work toward long-term reductions of carbon dioxide emissions resulting from the use of fossil fuels. The production of hydrogen from domestically available and economic fossil fuels and subsequent capture and sequestration of carbon dioxide directly respond to these initiatives.

## FE HYDROGEN FROM FOSSIL FUELS — TODAY'S TECHNOLOGY

Today's hydrogen production technologies are adequate to produce and deliver hydrogen in sufficient quantities to meet refining and chemical industries' needs. However, before large-scale hydrogen use can be a clean, affordable option, there is a need for considerable cost reduction and technical improvements throughout the entire hydrogen system - production, delivery, storage, conversion, and application.

It is anticipated that coordination among Office of Fossil Energy R&D programs will be needed to lower cost, improve efficiency, and accomplish carbon dioxide capture and sequestration when fossil resources are used to produce hydrogen. The most economic and environmentally responsive process for the production of hydrogen will be one utilizing the potential of advanced technologies now in, or being proposed as part of, the FE RD&D programs. Table 1 compares the cost to produce hydrogen from selected technologies and resources. A more detailed version of Table 1 and the analyses cited can be found in the Appendix (Table A-1). Table 1 shows that natural gas and coal are the most economical choices to provide the hydrogen necessary to begin the transition to a sustainable energy system. If the technology development objectives of the FE Hydrogen Program are achieved, the production cost of hydrogen from natural gas and coal, including carbon capture and sequestration, will be about \$4.00 per million Btu or lower by 2020.

*Table 1: Cost Comparison of Selected Hydrogen Production Technologies*

| Resource     | Technology  | Hydrogen Cost<br>(\$/MMBtu) / (\$/kg) | Year Technology is<br>Available |
|--------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Natural Gas* | Steam Methane Reforming, PSA, No Sequestration  | 5.54 / 0.75                           | Current                         |
| Natural Gas* | ITM Synthesis Gas Generation, Advanced Membrane Separation, CO <sub>2</sub> capture               | 4.15 / 0.56                           | 2013                            |
| Coal         | Gasification, Shift, PSA, No Sequestration  | 6.83 / 0.92                           | Current                         |
| Coal         | Advanced Gasification, Membrane Separation, CO <sub>2</sub> Sequestration                         | 5.89 / 0.79                           | 2015+                           |
| Coal**       | Advanced Gasification, Membrane Separation, Co-Production of Power, CO <sub>2</sub> Sequestration | 3.98 / 0.54                           | 2015+                           |
| Biomass      | Pyrolysis to bio-oil followed by steam reforming  | (9 - 16) /<br>(1.21 - 2.16)           | 2015+                           |
| Nuclear      | Sulfur-Iodine Cycle (Thermochemical Process)  | 9.70 / 1.31                           | 2020+                           |
| Electrolysis | Electricity Cost at 4 cents/kWh   | (19 - 22) /<br>(2.56 - 2.97)          | Current                         |

\*These two cases are based upon a natural gas price of \$3.15/MMBtu. Hydrogen costs will increase or decrease from these values at roughly 1.5 times the change in natural gas price above or below \$3.15/MMBtu.

\*\*The hydrogen cost in this case is based upon achievement of the associated Vision 21 Program goals. The value of power produced in the process is assumed to be 53.6 mils/kWh.

It should be noted also that the success of the R&D effort to economically utilize fossil fuels as a source of hydrogen is dependent upon successfully achieving the goals of a number of associated R&D efforts of the FE program. These associated programs include, but are not limited to:

- carbon dioxide capture and sequestration,
- conversion of hydrogen to power through fuel cells, and
- improvements in gasification technologies to improve efficiency of producing synthesis gas.

### ***Hydrogen Industry Today***

It has been estimated by Air Products and Chemicals, Inc. that the U.S. demand for hydrogen currently is about 9 million tons per year.<sup>1</sup> Of this amount, about 1.5 million tons is merchant hydrogen production that is sold to refineries and chemical plants.

In refineries, hydrogen is produced as a by-product of naphtha reforming, and any supplemental hydrogen is produced from steam reforming of natural gas. The chemical industry also utilizes hydrogen, mostly in the manufacture of ammonia and other nitrogen-based fertilizers. Hydrogen for the chemical industry is also produced from steam reforming of natural gas, although some chemical plants use coal gasification (i.e., partial oxidation) to produce hydrogen. In total, about 95 percent of U.S. hydrogen production for supplemental refinery needs and in the chemical industries is produced from natural gas utilizing steam reforming technology.


### ***Current Technology — Steam Reforming of Natural Gas***

Steam reforming is a catalytic process that involves a reaction between natural gas or other light hydrocarbons and steam (Figure 4). The result is a mixture of hydrogen, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and water that is produced in a series of three reactions. The first reforming step catalytically reacts methane with steam to form hydrogen and carbon monoxide in an endothermic reaction. The carbon monoxide is then "shifted" with steam to form additional hydrogen and carbon dioxide in an exothermic reaction. The carbon dioxide is removed using one of several adsorption processes. Trace amounts of carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide are removed by exothermically reacting the compounds with hydrogen to form methane and water. Finally, hydrogen is separated in preparation for its final use.

---

<sup>1</sup> Katsaros, Arthur. Air Products and Chemicals, Inc. *U.S. Industrial Hydrogen Infrastructure Presentation*. November 2001.

Figure 4: Steam Methane Reforming Technology




### ***Current Coal Technology – Gasification and Conversion***

Today, hydrogen is produced from coal by gasification and the subsequent processing of the resulting synthesis gas, and is used primarily to produce ammonia for fertilizer. Another market is being developed whereby coal-derived synthesis gas is being converted to methanol for use as an intermediate for chemical production, but which could also be used as a hydrogen carrier for subsequent reforming applications. This methanol production technology is being demonstrated successfully at the Eastman Chemical Complex in Kingsport, Tennessee.

In its simplest form, the overall technology used to produce hydrogen from coal is shown schematically in Figure 5. The coal is first gasified with oxygen and steam to produce a synthesis gas consisting essentially of carbon monoxide and hydrogen. This synthesis gas is cleaned to remove all impurities and shifted to produce additional hydrogen. The clean gas is then sent to a separation system to recover hydrogen. The residual gas from this separation can be recycled or combusted for its heat. The synthesis gas can also be converted into hydrocarbons and oxygenates for upgrading to liquid transportation fuels, or reformable fuels to produce hydrogen for fuel cell applications.

Figure 5: Current Hydrogen from Coal Production Process



## **HYDROGEN FROM FOSSIL FUELS — THE RD&D PROGRAM**

### ***Hydrogen Demand Scenarios***

Hydrogen derived from fossil fuels and consumed in advanced fuel cell vehicles (FCVs) will have a significant benefit to the Nation's energy security and the environment. When light duty FCVs reach 50 million vehicles, petroleum imports will be reduced by 1.5 million barrels per day, and by 3 million barrels per day when FCVs reach 100 million vehicles. The Nation currently has about 210 million light duty vehicles that consume about 8.1 million barrels per day of petroleum in the production and use of gasoline and diesel fuels.

Emissions will be reduced significantly with fossil fuel-derived hydrogen use in these advanced hydrogen-powered FCVs, which are estimated to use one-third the energy per mile traveled compared with future gasoline internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles. For example, even without carbon sequestration, domestic hydrogen from coal production and use in FCVs is estimated to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 278 million tonnes per year for every 100 million FCVs. This reduction is equal to about 24 percent of the Nation's current carbon dioxide emissions associated with all of today's light duty vehicle fleet. When combined with sequestration, this same hydrogen from coal production and use in FCVs is estimated to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 537 million tonnes per year, an amount that equals about 45 percent of current carbon dioxide emissions associated with today's light duty vehicles.

These estimates are based on a comparison of the production of the fuel (either hydrogen or petroleum products) and delivery to the service station, followed by use in either advanced FCVs or advanced gasoline ICE vehicles. This system pathway therefore includes the manufacture, transportation and consumption of fuel in these two transportation system technologies (FCV and ICE).

Table 2 shows the impact that centrally produced hydrogen from coal and natural gas, used in FCVs, will have on criteria pollutants, imports of oil, greenhouse gas emissions, energy use, and other criteria. For the case in which FCVs reach 100 million vehicles, if all hydrogen is produced from natural gas, SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) are estimated to be reduced by 68,000 metric tonnes per year, 96,000 metric tonnes per year, and 28,000 metric tonnes per year, respectively. In the case of coal-derived hydrogen, reductions of SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> are estimated to be 22,000 metric tonnes per year, 51,000 metric tonnes per year, and 20,000 metric tonnes per year, respectively.

The Nation currently consumes about 1,050 million tons of coal per year, all of which is produced domestically. Coal demand is estimated to increase only 14 percent, or 145 million tons annually, to produce the 20 million tons of hydrogen needed to fuel 100 million FCVs. In this case, energy

savings are estimated at nearly \$35 billion annually as coal is used instead of 3 million barrels per day of petroleum imports to fuel these light duty vehicles.

Energy savings estimated at \$23 billion annually could be realized with efficient natural gas-to-hydrogen production and use in FCVs. The natural gas needed to produce 20 million tons of hydrogen per year to fuel 100 million advanced FCVs is 3.1 trillion cubic feet (tcf). However, natural gas consumption will be reduced by about 1.6 tcf/year in the refining sector and fuel production/blending operations. As a result, net annual natural gas consumption is estimated to increase by 1.5 tcf, or about 7 percent of the Nation's current annual natural gas demand of 23 tcf.

This analysis assumes hydrogen from natural gas plants have a nominal capacity of about 150 million standard cubic feet (MMscf) per day. The technology used is efficient steam methane reforming (SMR) with heat recovery but without sequestration. A total of 148 SMR plants are estimated to be needed to produce 20 million tons of hydrogen needed to fuel 100 million FCVs. In the case of hydrogen from natural gas with sequestration, advanced ITM syngas reactors are assumed to have equal thermal efficiency with SMR technology, but with sequestration. The size of these ITM syngas reactor hydrogen plants is assumed the same as SMR hydrogen plants.

Hydrogen from coal technology benefits analysis assumes that hydrogen plants also have a capacity of about 150 MMscf/day. These efficient 3,000 tons of coal per day plants use integrated gasification combined-cycle (IGCC) technology with carbon capture and sequestration, as shown in Table 4, Case 2 (p. 35). A total of 156 of these hydrogen from coal plants would be required to provide enough hydrogen to fuel 100 million advanced FCVs.

Assumptions for both advanced FCVs and ICE vehicle operation efficiency and fuel delivery are from Argonne National Laboratory's Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET) model, version 1.5a. Technology assumptions are based on "Long-Term Technologies" in the model, instead of current technology. In addition, this model estimates each portion of the full fuel-cycle energy use and emissions associated with various transportation fuels and advanced vehicle technologies applied to motor vehicles. The GREET model has been used in numerous joint government and industry studies, such as the June 2001 study "Well-to-Wheel Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Advanced Fuel/Vehicle Systems – North American Analysis".

The emission reductions and benefits shown in Table 2 and previously discussed, are based mainly on the GREET 1.5a model. In that model, FCVs are three times as efficient as future gasoline ICE vehicles. Using these estimates, 20 million tons of hydrogen would be consumed annually to fuel 100 million FCVs. Since FCV technology has not yet been developed, there is uncertainty in its ultimate efficiency. Some have estimated that FCVs may only have twice the energy efficiency of future ICE vehicles. If that scenario were to occur, some benefits shown in Table 2 would be reduced, but petroleum imports would still decrease by the same amount when hydrogen is produced from natural gas or coal. However, if FCVs were only twice as efficient as ICE vehicles, hydrogen demand would increase to 30 million tons per year for each 100 million FCVs. Criteria

pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel-derived hydrogen use in FCVs would increase by 50 percent, but they would still be significantly lower than gasoline use in future ICE vehicles, even without sequestration. With carbon capture and sequestration, these emissions will be virtually eliminated. Table A-2 in the Appendix provides more detail on the emissions reductions and benefits associated with FCVs that have twice the energy efficiency of future ICE vehicles.

*Table 2: Impact of Centrally-Produced Hydrogen from Natural Gas and Coal and Use in Light-Duty FCVs that are Three Times as Efficient as ICE Vehicles in the Long Term (a)*

|  | Hydrogen from Coal |              | Hydrogen from Natural Gas |              |
|--|--------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|
|  | 50 million         | 100 million  | 50 million                | 100 million  |
| Number of Light Duty FCVs                                      | 50 million         | 100 million  | 50 million                | 100 million  |
| Number of Hydrogen Plants                                      | 78                 | 156          | 74                        | 148          |
| Hydrogen Production, million short tons per year               | 10.1               | 20.2         | 10.1                      | 20.2         |
| Capital Cost of Hydrogen Plants; \$ billion (current dollars)  | 33                 | 66           | 11                        | 21           |
| <b>Emissions Reductions</b>                                    |                    |              |                           |              |
| SO <sub>x</sub> , thousand tonnes per year                     | 22                 | 43           | 34                        | 68           |
| NO <sub>x</sub> , thousand tonnes per year                     | 51                 | 102          | 48                        | 96           |
| PM10, thousand tonnes per year                                 | 20                 | 40           | 14                        | 28           |
| CO <sub>2</sub> , million tonnes per year (no sequestration)   | 139                | 278          | 189                       | 377          |
| CO <sub>2</sub> , million tonnes per year (with sequestration) | 269                | 537          | 278                       | 555          |
| <b>Other Impacts</b>   |                    |              |                           |              |
| Energy Savings, \$ billion per year (current dollars)          | 17                 | 35           | 12                        | 24           |
| Reduce Petroleum Imports, million barrels per day              | 1.5                | 3.0          | 1.5                       | 3.0          |
| Natural Gas Displaced trillion cubic feet per year             | 0.8 decrease       | 1.6 decrease | 0.8 increase              | 1.5 increase |

(a) Based on a system analysis from a central hydrogen plant, pipeline delivery of hydrogen to refueling stations and use in efficient FCVs, compared with oil refining, delivery of gasoline and use in ICE vehicles.

**Sources:**

Argonne National Laboratory GREET 1.5a model, Per-Mile Fuel-Cycle Energy Use and Emissions for long-term technology light duty vehicles, assumed to be 55% passenger cars, 25% Light Duty Truck Class 1, and 20% Light Duty Truck Class 2. The GREET 1.5a model provides Btu/mile use of energy, broken down by fossil energy, petroleum energy and non-fossil energy, and SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM10, among other emissions, on a fuel-cycle basis. Except for the hydrogen from coal plant analysis, GREET 1.5a assumptions were used in the above table, including the assessment that FCVs use one third the energy per mile driven as ICE vehicles.

*Hydrogen from Coal*, Mitretek Technical Paper, MTR 2002-31, July 2002. This case is also used in this Office of Fossil Energy Hydrogen from Natural Gas and Coal Program plan as Case 2 in Table 4 (p. 35). This case defines the quantity of coal, and therefore carbon, used to produce hydrogen.

SAIC, March 2003 presentation, which indicates advanced coal-fired IGCC plants emit 0.09 lbs NO<sub>x</sub>/MMBtu of coal, and 0.08 lbs of SO<sub>2</sub>/MMBtu at 98 percent recovery. Estimates used in the above analysis assume SO<sub>2</sub> recovery is 99 percent with emission of only 0.04 lbs SO<sub>2</sub>/MMBtu through more severe operation of a Rectisol unit.

*Hydrogen Production Facilities Plant Performance and Cost Comparisons*, Parsons Infrastructure and Technology Group, Final Report, March 2002. Use of current steam methane reforming technology case. This case defines the quantity of natural gas, and therefore carbon used to produce hydrogen. Since both the Parsons and GREET 1.5a natural gas to hydrogen energy efficiency were essentially identical, the GREET 1.5a assumptions were selected for use.

### ***FE Program Goal***

The overall goal of the Hydrogen from Natural Gas Program and the Hydrogen from Coal Program is to demonstrate the capability and viability of producing hydrogen from our domestic natural gas and coal resources in an economic, reliable, safe, and environmentally sound manner. In addition, the program will evaluate the options available to achieve the most efficient and effective low-cost methods for distribution of the produced hydrogen.

To reach these overarching program goals, the FE hydrogen from natural gas and coal programs have set the following three significant long-range goals:

- By 2011, an alternative hydrogen delivery system will be optimized and available,
- By 2013, natural gas-based hydrogen systems will be capable of producing hydrogen with capture of carbon dioxide at 25 percent lower costs than current commercial means, and
- By 2015, coal-based hydrogen systems including carbon dioxide capture will be capable of producing hydrogen at 25 percent lower costs than current coal-based commercial means.

The achievement of these goals will result in technologies and processes for affordable hydrogen from fossil fuels in adequate volumes to provide a pathway to a long-term, hydrogen-fueled infrastructure, subsequently reducing urban and regional air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

### ***Hydrogen from Natural Gas***

#### ***Goal***

2013 - Natural Gas Technology Modules Reduce the Cost of Hydrogen Produced from Natural Gas by 25 percent

#### ***Milestones***

Major milestones are presented below. Figure 6 provides all intermediate and final milestones for the Hydrogen from Natural Gas Program.

- 2005: A 0.5 million standard cubic feet per day (MMscfd) hydrogen ITM production unit demonstrated
- 2010: Pre-commercial ITM technology unit producing 15 MMscfd of hydrogen demonstrated
- 2011: Low-cost, small-footprint plant for hydrogen production demonstrated
- 2013: Modules to reduce cost of hydrogen (and synthesis gas) production from natural gas by 25 percent available

### *Barriers*

Steam reforming of natural gas is a mature technology, operating at or near the theoretical limits of the process that is used to produce nearly all the hydrogen (in the form of synthesis gas, a mixture of hydrogen and carbon monoxide) in the chemical industry and for supplemental hydrogen production in refineries. Once synthesis gas is produced and shifted, hydrogen is separated from the mixed gas stream using another mature technology, pressure swing adsorption (PSA). The associated cost to produce and deliver hydrogen with these technologies is too high for it to compete economically with conventional liquid fuels, such as gasoline or diesel fuel. Also, these hydrogen production system technologies are mature, and there is limited opportunity for cost and/or efficiency improvements.

During the steam reforming process, some natural gas is burned with air (80 percent nitrogen and 20 percent oxygen) in the furnace to produce the high temperatures required in the reactor. The furnace flue carries the combustion by-products of carbon dioxide, NO<sub>x</sub>, and inert nitrogen through the stack where it is emitted into the atmosphere. Capture of carbon dioxide from the mixed flue gas stream would be expensive. The development of novel technologies that could reduce the cost to produce hydrogen or capture carbon dioxide are not undertaken by industry without government joint support because of the associated high financial risk and the absence of promising candidate technologies.

### *Solutions*

The economic barrier represented by the current use of steam methane reforming and PSA separation is being reduced and/or eliminated through the development and potential use of the Ion Transport Membrane (ITM) syngas reactor system. In a single reactor, these systems are capable of separating air to produce oxygen and subsequently use the oxygen in the partial oxidation of natural gas to generate synthesis gas. This technology offers the potential to be scalable without an associated significant increase in the unit cost. With the advanced ITM syngas reactor systems, after shifting and hydrogen separation, the remaining concentrated carbon dioxide can be captured or sequestered or used for industrial or other applications.

The mature steam reforming process, by contrast, burns a portion of the natural gas feed with air to generate the high temperatures needed for the process, which produces a mixed carbon dioxide, nitrogen and NO<sub>x</sub> gas stream that is emitted to the air through the flue. Separation of carbon dioxide from this flue gas stream is too costly to be an economic alternative. In addition, PSA hydrogen separation is an expensive technology that can be avoided if advanced membrane separation of synthesis gas technology is developed. Joint government/industry research is needed to identify, design, demonstrate, and commercialize these new and advanced technologies. An alternative technology with potential applications in small plants also being considered is advanced autothermal reforming.


### *Benefits*

Development of technologies to lower the cost of hydrogen from natural gas will enable the early transition to use clean hydrogen technologies, such as fuel cell vehicles (FCVs). The benefits of using low-cost hydrogen from natural gas and, in the future, potential resources of methane hydrates in advanced hydrogen utilization technologies would be improved energy security due to reduced petroleum imports, reduced criteria pollutants and reduced greenhouse gas emissions. Advanced FCVs powered by natural gas-derived hydrogen can replace gasoline internal combustion engine vehicles. For every 100 million FCVs fueled by natural gas-derived hydrogen, oil imports will be reduced by 3 million barrels per day and carbon dioxide emissions will be reduced by over 375 million tonnes per year, with carbon capture, 550 million tonnes. Criteria pollutants such as SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> will also be reduced by significant amounts (see Table 2, page 18).

Introduction of small-scale, lower capital cost hydrogen plants will allow earlier production of low-cost hydrogen. Because of the small footprint, construction time is shorter than for large hydrogen plants. Use of small-footprint facilities will reduce the need for significant delivery and transportation infrastructure. Large hydrogen plants that use novel ITM reactor systems will have even lower costs to produce hydrogen because of the economy-of-scale benefits and can become a significant source of hydrogen in the near to mid term.

The low-cost hydrogen production from natural gas technology can be the bridging technology to enable not only early transition to the hydrogen economy but also provide a platform for wider distribution of hydrogen production facilities that will support technologies such as fuel cell vehicles in a shorter period of time. For example, both large-scale and small-footprint plants producing hydrogen from natural gas can provide the earliest, low-cost transitional source of hydrogen for the FreedomCAR program reducing the Nation's energy consumption and reducing pollution compared to transportation alternatives. It is the integration of this innovative technology with the results of associated technology that allows capture of carbon dioxide and reduces NO<sub>x</sub>.

Figure 6: Hydrogen from Natural Gas Program – Major Technical Milestones



**Associated Fossil Energy Programs**

\* Carbon dioxide sequestration.

## ***Hydrogen from Coal***

### ***Goal***

2015 - 60 Percent Efficient, Zero Emissions, Coal-Fueled Hydrogen and Power Co-production Facility Operational

### ***Milestones***

Major milestones are presented below. Figure 7 provides all intermediate and final milestones for the Hydrogen from Coal Program.

- 2006: Advanced hydrogen separation technology including membranes tolerant of trace contaminants identified
- 2011: Hydrogen modules for coal gasification combined-cycle co-production facility demonstrated
- 2015: Zero-emission, coal-based plant producing hydrogen and electric power (with sequestration) which reduces cost of hydrogen by 25 percent compared to current coal-based plants demonstrated

### **Spotlight on FutureGen**

On February 27, 2003, Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham announced the \$1 billion FutureGen initiative to design, build, and operate the world's first coal-fired, zero emissions plant integrated with carbon sequestration. The goal of the project is to produce electricity at a cost increase no greater than 10 percent higher than non-sequestered systems, and hydrogen at a cost of \$4.00/MMBtu. The FutureGen prototype plant may provide a venue in which project researchers have the opportunity to gain large-scale, real-world experience for technologies developed by the Hydrogen from Coal Program. This experience can help reduce the technical and economic risks associated with developing new, innovative technologies while successfully meeting the program's goals and milestones. The advanced technologies developed under the Hydrogen from Coal program will support the FutureGen initiative.

### ***Barriers***

Partial oxidation of coal is a promising technology for the production of electric power that uses integrated gasification combined-cycle (IGCC) technology. However, there currently are no commercial demonstrations of these joint power and hydrogen production plants. Partial oxidation, or gasification, combines coal, oxygen and steam to produce synthesis gas that is cleaned of impurities such as sulfur or mercury. To produce hydrogen, this synthesis gas is shifted using mature water-gas shift reactor technology to generate additional hydrogen and convert carbon monoxide to carbon dioxide. Hydrogen is subsequently separated from the gas stream. Currently, this separation is accomplished through the use of mature PSA technology which operates near its theoretical limit. In order to reduce costs, novel and advanced technology must be developed in all phases of the gasification/hydrogen production and separation process. Carbon dioxide produced in the hydrogen production process would be removed utilizing capture and sequestration technology now being developed in an associated program.

### *Solutions*

Within the Hydrogen from Coal Program, R&D activities are focused on the development of novel processes that include:

- advanced water-gas shift reactors using sulfur-tolerant catalysts to produce more hydrogen from synthesis gas at lower cost;
- novel membranes for advanced, lower cost separations of hydrogen from carbon dioxide and other contaminants;
- advanced technology concepts that combine hydrogen separation and the water-gas shift reaction; and
- technologies that utilize fewer steps to separate carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, and other impurities from hydrogen.

Novel catalysts and materials must be developed for this to succeed. Technology and engineering studies are also required for co-production and integration of coal gasification for power production with hydrogen production and separation. At the same time, cost reduction and process efficiency improvement are dependent upon R&D successes in a number of associated coal gasification technologies. These include:

- advanced ITM technology for oxygen separation from air;
- advanced cleaning of raw synthesis gas;
- improvements in gasifier design, materials and feed systems, and
- carbon dioxide capture and sequestration technology.


Joint government/industry research is needed to identify, design and demonstrate these new and advanced technologies if an economic alternative to current, mature technology is to be realized.

### *Benefits*

Low-cost, hydrogen from coal technologies will allow the Nation's 250-year supply of domestic coal to replace imported oil and improve the Nation's energy security when used in advanced hydrogen technologies such as fuel cell vehicles (FCVs). The benefit of producing enough hydrogen in efficient coal-to-hydrogen technologies to power 100 million FCVs will be a reduction of 3 million barrels per day of imported oil. Even without carbon sequestration, carbon dioxide emissions will be reduced by over 275 million tonnes per year, and nearly 540 million tonnes per year with sequestration. Criteria pollutants of SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> will be reduced significantly (see Table 2, page 18).

Production of low-cost hydrogen from coal will reduce reliance on imported oil, increase the proportion of domestic energy resources that compose the Nation's energy mix, and provide a cost-effective source of hydrogen for the transportation sector and the associated FreedomCAR program. In this way, hydrogen from coal provides a mid-term transitional source of energy until the long-term goal of producing hydrogen from renewable and nuclear energy is realized. Successful development of carbon dioxide capture and sequestration technology will eliminate public concerns over any greenhouse gas emissions that may be generated by this technology.

Figure 7: Hydrogen from Coal Program – Major Technical Milestones



**Associated Fossil Energy Programs**

- Incorporates technology being developed under the associated Advanced IGCC Technology and Sequestration for carbon dioxide capture and storage programs

## ***Delivery***

### *Goal*

2011 - Alternative Hydrogen Delivery System Optimized and Available

### *Milestones*

- 2005: Identify and evaluate the most promising approaches and options for economic storage, handling and delivery of hydrogen
- 2008: Complete bench-scale tests of storage, handling and delivery technologies that, when integrated with the entire fuel production and delivery cycle, provide a cost to the consumer of no greater than \$1.50 per gallon of gasoline equivalent (gge) by 2015.
- 2011: Complete tests and evaluations of the most promising hydrogen-rich, synthesis gas-derived liquid fuel candidates for reforming applications.

### *Barriers*

Currently, hydrogen delivery infrastructure exists only for the small merchant hydrogen market that currently exists in the chemical and refining industries. This limited system lacks the scope or scale needed to deliver hydrogen outside of these limited industrial areas to potential large-volume end-user applications such as the FreedomCAR program. The existing liquid fuel (e.g., gasoline, diesel fuel, and jet fuel) delivery infrastructure is an entrenched, capital-intensive network that consists of pipelines, intermediate product storage, import terminals, and rail, barge and on-road truck delivery to end-use distribution stations that links the entire Nation. The existing natural gas delivery infrastructure is also a capital-intensive network that consists of import LNG terminals; significant storage to build inventory during low-demand, off-peak seasons; and pipelines to deliver product to end-users. Hydrogen has physical properties that may cause embrittlement of some high-strength steel piping materials and components (e.g. compressors and valves) currently used for natural gas. These systems would require modification for use in the delivery and distribution of hydrogen. In addition, natural gas pipelines may not be available or able to handle the additional volume. Therefore, it is likely that significant capital investment in dedicated hydrogen delivery infrastructure will be required before a hydrogen economy can be realized. The evaluation of options and the identification of the most optimum delivery system to include an alternative liquid fuel as consideration for a hydrogen carrier is a critical issue. In any consideration of advanced or modified hydrogen delivery systems, the unique characteristics of hydrogen must be considered.

### *Solutions*

Computational studies and analysis of optimal, early-introduction hydrogen carriers is required in order to evaluate the most promising reaction catalysts and chemical process routes. Analysis is also needed to evaluate the trade-off between massive capital investments in central location hydrogen plants, associated pipelines, and delivery in a dedicated hydrogen infrastructure against the use of

liquid and natural gas infrastructure to deliver hydrogen-rich fuels. It may be the case that these fuels can be reformed at end-use locations, instead of central locations, and the cost of small-scale, on-site reforming must be evaluated against the large capital costs of a dedicated hydrogen infrastructure.

### *Benefits*

Identification and development of the best alternatives to produce and deliver hydrogen in the near term is needed to achieve the early introduction of efficient fuel cell technology. The efficient fuel cell will reduce the overall amount of fossil fuels consumed, thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions and pollution from conventional fossil fuels. Utilization of synthesis gas to produce liquid hydrocarbons as hydrogen carriers will enable the use of abundant coal resources and reduce oil imports. Some synthesis gas-derived liquids can use existing refined liquid fuel infrastructure, which will reduce the need for significant capital investments in dedicated hydrogen infrastructure. The combination of carbon dioxide removal at the production site of the liquid hydrogen carrier with the significantly higher potential efficiency of fuel cell vehicle technology could result in substantially lower emissions per mile in the transportation sector.

## HYDROGEN FROM FOSSIL FUELS — A BUDGET FOR THE HYDROGEN FROM FOSSIL FUELS PROGRAM


### Office of Fossil Energy Hydrogen Program Budget

The budget for the FE hydrogen program for FY04 as currently planned is \$11.6 million, with \$5.0 million provided to the Hydrogen from Coal Program and \$6.6 million to the Hydrogen from Natural Gas Program. Table 3 and Figure 8 show the breakout of the FE hydrogen budget for FY04 by category and what percentage has been allocated for each of these categories.

Table 3: FE Hydrogen Budget Breakout for FY04 (\$million)


| FE Hydrogen Budget | Category   |          |          |       |
|--------------------|------------|----------|----------|-------|
|                    | Production | Delivery | Outreach | Total |
| Coal               | 4.3        | 0.5      | 0.2      | 5.0   |
| Natural Gas        | 5.4        | 0.6      | 0.6      | 6.6   |
| Total              | 9.7        | 1.1      | 0.8      | 11.6  |

Figure 8: FE FY04 Hydrogen Budget Breakout Percentage by Category



Figures 9 and 10 are Gantt charts that show a more detailed program planning breakout for the hydrogen from natural gas and coal programs, which is required to meet the program milestones and metrics. These charts also show some of the potential areas for research that will be conducted by the programs.

Figure 9: Hydrogen from Natural Gas Program






## FUTURE TECHNOLOGIES TO PRODUCE HYDROGEN FROM NATURAL GAS<sup>2,3,4</sup>

Steam reforming of natural gas is a mature process approaching its maximum theoretical process efficiency and is the primary one used to produce hydrogen from natural gas. However, there are advanced technologies, currently in various stages of development, which have the potential to reduce the cost to produce hydrogen from natural gas on both large and small scale.

One of the promising technologies under development that shows significant potential in reducing the cost of producing hydrogen from natural gas is the application of ITM technology to generate synthesis gas. This technology combines the processes of oxygen separation from air and partial oxidation of natural gas into one, compact step (Figure 11). ITM synthesis gas generation technology utilizes non-porous ceramic membranes fabricated from multicomponent metallic oxides that conduct both electrons and oxygen ions at temperatures greater than 700°C. During operation, oxygen from a hot air stream is reduced by catalysts at one surface of the membrane to create oxygen ions. The oxygen ions flow through the membrane under a chemical gradient to the opposite membrane surface where they partially

Figure 11: Schematic of the ITM Synthesis Gas Generation Process



oxidize a pre-reformed hot mixture of steam and natural gas to form synthesis gas, a mixture of carbon monoxide and hydrogen. The ratio of hydrogen to carbon monoxide is partly dependent upon the amount of steam that is used. The synthesis gas then proceeds to a water-gas shift reactor where additional steam is added to convert the steam and carbon monoxide to more hydrogen and carbon dioxide. This mixture of hydrogen, carbon dioxide, and trace amounts of carbon monoxide is subsequently separated to produce a hydrogen product stream and a concentrated carbon dioxide stream. The carbon dioxide can be captured and eventually sequestered. Currently, the comparatively expensive PSA technology is used to separate hydrogen from synthesis gas. However, advanced membrane technologies that are under development have the potential to reduce the cost of this process step. Figure 12 is a schematic of the advanced technology process.

<sup>2</sup> Office of Fossil Energy and the National Energy Technology Laboratory Project Factsheets, 2002.

<sup>3</sup> Air Products and Chemicals, Inc. technical literature, 2002.

<sup>4</sup> Proceedings of the 2000 to 2002 DOE Hydrogen Program Reviews.


There are several key challenges that the ITM synthesis gas generation technology needs to address to reach its potential as a compact, low-cost hydrogen production process alternative to steam reforming. The membrane material used must show long-term stability in both reducing and oxidizing environments. The membrane must also allow large fluxes of oxygen to pass through so that optimal oxidation of the natural gas occurs. Long-term compatibility between the oxidation and reforming catalysts along the surface of the membrane must be exhibited. Reliable, leak-proof, metal-ceramic seals are also required.

In addition to the potential cost benefits of ITM synthesis gas generation technology, another benefit is its versatility due to its compact size. The technology has the potential to be used in small-footprint plants for distributed hydrogen generation purposes, as well as in large-scale industrial plant applications.

Distributed generation of hydrogen from small-footprint plants allows hydrogen to be produced near the end-user for fuel cell vehicle applications or industrial uses. The benefit of producing hydrogen near the end-user is that hydrogen delivery capital costs can be avoided. A small-footprint plant based on ITM synthesis gas reactor technology that produces 0.5 MMscfd of hydrogen at 5,000 pounds per square inch (psi) for FCVs was compared to trucked-in liquid hydrogen. Including the costs of hydrogen compression, storage, and dispensing, a recent industry study estimated that the small-footprint ITM plant could save 27 percent of the high-pressure hydrogen production costs compared to trucked-in liquid hydrogen.

Large-scale hydrogen production using ITM synthesis gas generation technology also has the potential to achieve cost benefits. An ITM synthesis gas generation process that produces 760 MMscfd of hydrogen at 100 bars (1,450 psi) and 14,000 tonnes/day of carbon dioxide at 80 bars (1,160 psi) for sequestration was compared to a conventional oxygen-blown autothermal reformer with a cryogenic air separation unit to supply oxygen. The comparison indicated that the ITM synthesis gas generation process could potentially save over 30 percent of the capital cost of synthesis gas generation and over 20 percent of the capital cost for the overall process. In addition, the process has a predicted thermal efficiency of 74 percent compared to 71 percent for the autothermal reformer process.

Figure 12: Schematic of Technology Process for Hydrogen Production from Natural Gas



## FUTURE TECHNOLOGIES TO PRODUCE HYDROGEN FROM COAL<sup>5</sup>

At the present time, no coal-based facilities based on modern entrained gasification have been constructed that produce both hydrogen and electric power. Conceptual commercial plants have been simulated using computer models to estimate the technical performance and economics of a co-production plant producing hydrogen and power, based on current technology. Computer simulations have also been developed for conceptual plants that produce hydrogen and some excess power, based on advanced technologies that are presently not available for commercial deployment. The status of these advanced technologies varies. Some are already close to commercialization and others are further back in the R&D pipeline. Table 4 summarizes the information developed from two of these computer simulations. A more detailed evaluation of additional co-production cases can be found in the Mitretek report (5), and these cases are included in the hydrogen production cost table in the Appendix.

*Table 4: Summary of Hydrogen from Coal Cases*

|                            | CASE 1    | CASE 2     |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Carbon Sequestration       | YES (87%) | Yes (100%) |
| Hydrogen (MMscfd)          | 119       | 158        |
| Coal (Tons/day) (AR)       | 3000      | 3000       |
| Efficiency (%HHV)          | 59        | 75.5       |
| Excess Power (MW)          | 26.9      | 25         |
| Power Value (mills/kWh)    | 53.6      | 53.6       |
| Capital (\$million)        | 417       | 425        |
| RSP of Hydrogen (\$/MMBtu) | 8.18      | 5.89       |


Notes:

- 1) Coal cost is \$29/ton (and is assumed to de-escalate at 1.5 percent below general inflation), and the assumed plant capacity factor is 85 percent.
- 2) For carbon sequestration, the co-produced power is assumed to have a value of \$53.6/MWh, based on an additional cost of power production from Natural Gas Combined-Cycle (NGCC) plants with sequestration of 18 mills/kWh (reference EPRI report 1000316).
- 3) For sequestration, it is assumed that \$10 per ton of carbon is added for sequestration after the concentrated carbon dioxide stream has been isolated, and the carbon dioxide stream is compressed to 200 bars (2,900 psi).
- 4) Financial assumptions used for these simulations: 25-year plant life; 67/33% debt/equity financing; 15% return on equity; 8% interest for a 16-year term; 3% inflation with coal de-escalation of 1.5% per annum below general inflation; 16-year double declining balance depreciation; 40% combined Federal and State tax rate; 3-year construction with 50% output in start-up year; carbon sequestration cost of \$10/ton.

<sup>5</sup> Hydrogen from Coal, Mitretek Technical Paper MTR 2002-31, July 2002.

Case 1, shown schematically in Figure 13, is a process to produce hydrogen based on conventional technology utilizing carbon sequestration. The process assumes that a Texaco quench gasification system with conventional acid removal and a PSA system for hydrogen recovery is used. All of the carbon dioxide is removed prior to the PSA unit, is compressed to 200 bars (2,900 psi), and is assumed to be sequestered for an additional cost of \$10 per ton of carbon. In this configuration, 87 percent of the carbon in the feed is sequestered. The capital cost of the plant is estimated at \$417 million with a retail selling price (RSP) of the hydrogen at \$8.18/MMBtu. The amount of hydrogen produced is 119 MMscfd, and there is 27 MW of excess power.


*Figure 13: Schematic of Current Technology to Produce Hydrogen from Coal with Carbon Sequestration*



Case 2 represents a process for hydrogen production from coal that uses advanced gasification technology, advanced membrane technology for hydrogen separation with carbon dioxide removal, and carbon sequestration. A schematic of the process is shown in Figure 14. In this configuration, advanced F-gas gasification with hot gas cleanup is used in combination with a ceramic membrane system operating at nearly 600°C that is capable of filtering and separating hydrogen from clean synthesis gas. It is assumed that 90 mole percent of the synthesis gas is converted in this membrane system, assumed to be similar to the K25 system under development by Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL). The hydrogen produced is separated at low pressure and must be compressed. The remaining synthesis gas, containing mostly carbon dioxide with some carbon monoxide and hydrogen, is then combusted with oxygen in a gas turbine to provide power for the plant. Oxygen is used so that a concentrated stream of carbon dioxide is produced for sequestration. Heat is recovered from both the gas turbine exit gas and from the hot hydrogen in heat recovery steam generators (HRSGs) where the steam produced is sent to a steam turbine to provide additional power. The capital cost for the facility is \$425 million, with the required selling price of hydrogen estimated at \$5.89/MMBtu.

Advanced concepts are planned to be developed after 2015 which would employ advanced gasification, combustion and turbine systems, membrane separation, and carbon capture and sequestration in a co-production plant producing hydrogen and electric power. These highly efficient, hydrogen and electricity co-production plants could provide significant additional reductions in the cost of hydrogen, reducing the cost to \$4.00/MMBtu.

Figure 14: Schematic of Advanced Technologies to Produce Hydrogen from Coal



## **FE ASSOCIATED PROGRAMS**

The successful development of low-cost, affordable hydrogen production from fossil fuels with sequestration of carbon is dependent on successful completion of several associated RD&D programs within the Office of Fossil Energy. The technologies are discussed below.

### ***Gasification***

Advanced coal gasification technologies will reduce the cost to produce electric power from coal using Integrated Gasification Combined-Cycle (IGCC) technology. The initial IGCC process technology produces synthesis gas that is cleaned and used to efficiently produce electric power in advanced combined-cycle turbines. Hydrogen from coal is produced from the synthesis gas generated by IGCC technology. Improved technologies developed in RD&D in the FE program will complement, and are necessary to produce, low-cost hydrogen from coal. These technologies include: improved feed handling systems, efficient gasifier design and materials engineering, advanced synthesis gas clean-up technologies, and advanced membrane separation technology to produce a lower cost source of oxygen from air.

### ***Carbon Dioxide Sequestration***

While hydrogen is a clean fuel with water as essentially its only by-product, emissions of greenhouse gases will be generated during its production from natural gas and coal. The hydrogen from natural gas program will investigate technologies to capture carbon dioxide as part of its activities to augment the carbon dioxide sequestration program where appropriate, because there is a difference in the concentration and pressures of the carbon dioxide in its effluent streams compared to process streams of coal-derived hydrogen systems. The Hydrogen from Coal Program will separate carbon dioxide from mixed hydrogen streams and will collaborate with, and take advantage of, the capture technologies being developed by the Office of Fossil Energy carbon sequestration program. Both the Hydrogen from Natural Gas Program and the Hydrogen from Coal Program, however, will utilize these sequestration technologies.

The FE carbon sequestration program is currently investigating technologies to inject carbon dioxide into enhanced oil and gas production systems and enhanced coalbed methane projects; to store carbon dioxide in underground reservoirs; to utilize the natural ability of vegetation and soils to store carbon; and to convert carbon dioxide into safe, harmless minerals. Development of carbon sequestration technology will also benefit the FE hydrogen program by sequestering carbon dioxide that is removed from the concentrated product streams that result during hydrogen production.

The goals of the FE carbon sequestration program are to provide economically and environmentally safe sequestration technologies. These technologies will offset projected growth in carbon dioxide emissions by 2015 at a cost of \$10/ton of avoided carbon, with the potential to eventually offset at

least one-half of any required reductions in emissions of global greenhouse gases. The development of cost-effective, safe sequestration methods will provide the United States with the opportunity to fully utilize its domestic fossil fuel resources to produce hydrogen during the Nation's transition to a sustainable hydrogen economy.

### ***Fuel Cells***

Solid State Energy Conversion Alliance (SECA) fuel cell technology is in its initial stages of development and requires improvements in all aspects of system technology. In distributed generation, a primary market for stationary fuel cell applications, the market risk and market potential are higher because of uncertainty surrounding the slow deregulation of the U.S. electric power industry.

No fuel cell type has been successfully commercialized. Early fuel cell marketers have had to rely on high-price, limited-niche markets to support the high cost of the technology. The SECA program is a joint government/private cost-shared program that has low fuel cell cost targets. SECA has identified fuel cell technologies to meet those low-cost targets that include: fuel processing, manufacturing, controls and diagnostics, power electronics, modeling and simulations, and materials. Successful development of novel and advanced low-cost processes will allow the SECA industry partners to have a wider, deeper market penetration from the start. In SECA, a 5- to 10-fold cost reduction and mass-customization manufacturing are required over existing technology to achieve widespread national deployment of fuel cells.


The key milestones for the SECA fuel cell program are: by 2010, 3 to 10 kW SECA fuel cells at \$400/kW with target efficiencies of 40 to 60 percent demonstrated, and by 2015, hybrid SECA fuel cell/turbines that meet \$400/kW system requirements with 70 to 80 percent efficiencies demonstrated.

## INTEGRATED PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

The Hydrogen from Natural Gas Program and the Hydrogen from Coal Program will be managed separately by their respective program managers. However, the programs will be coordinated so that the potential for duplication of efforts is eliminated and better leveraging of resources occurs. It is expected that coordination of the hydrogen from natural gas and coal programs within FE will occur through the Hydrogen Coordination Group.

In addition, the hydrogen from natural gas and coal programs will coordinate their efforts with associated programs within the Office of Fossil Energy. Success of the FE hydrogen program is directly tied to the success of the following FE programs: coal gasification, carbon sequestration, and fuel cell development. Each of these programs will play a vital role in achieving the overall economic and environmental goals of the hydrogen energy system. To ensure a smooth and successful transition to a hydrogen energy system, it is important that there is communication between these programs. Figure 15 shows a schematic of one option that these programs may use to coordinate.

Figure 15: Coordination of Relevant FE Programs



The FE hydrogen program will also need to coordinate its activities with the hydrogen programs in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, the Office of Nuclear Energy, and the Office of Science within DOE. Coordination of efforts and sharing of information and experience will help ensure the successful transition to a hydrogen energy system.

## ACRONYMS

gge – gallon gasoline equivalent

kg – kilogram

kW – kilowatt

kWh – kilowatt-hour

mills – one-tenth of one cent

psi – pounds per square inch

tcf – trillion cubic feet

tpy – tons per year

ATR – autothermal reforming

CO – carbon monoxide

CO<sub>2</sub> – carbon dioxide

DOE – Department of Energy

EIA – Energy Information Administration

EPRI – Electric Power Research Institute

FCV – fuel cell vehicle

FE – Office of Fossil Energy

FY – fiscal year

GHG – greenhouse gas

REET – The Greenhouse gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy use in Transportation model

H<sub>2</sub> – hydrogen

HHV – higher heating value

HRSG – heat recovery steam generator

ICE – internal combustion engine

IGCC – integrated gasification combined-cycle

ILWG – Interlaboratory Working Group

ITM – ion transport membrane

LNG – liquefied natural gas

MW – megawatt

MWh – megawatt-hour

MMBtu – million British thermal units

MMscfd – million standard cubic feet per day

NEMS – National Energy Modeling System

NEP – National Energy Policy

NETL – National Energy Technology Laboratory

NGCC – natural gas combined-cycle

NL – National Laboratories

NO<sub>x</sub> – nitrogen oxides

ORNL – Oak Ridge National Laboratory

PM10 – particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or less  
PSA – pressure swing adsorption  
R&D – research and development  
RD&D – research, development, and demonstration  
RSP – retail selling price  
SBIR – Small Business Innovative Research  
SECA – Solid State Energy Conversion Alliance  
SMR – steam methane reforming  
SO<sub>2</sub> – sulfur dioxide  
SOx – sulfur oxides  
SOFC – solid oxide fuel cell  
STTR – Small Business Technology Transfer  
TPD – tons per day  
U.S. – United States  
VOC – volatile organic compounds

**APPENDIX**

## HYDROGEN PRODUCTION COST COMPARISON

The following table provides a summary of hydrogen production cost comparisons for various resources and technologies and an estimate of when these technologies could be available. References to the sources of the information and notes on some of the relevant assumptions used for each resource and technology are also included at the end of the table. These tables are representative only, and other analyses of these costs might be found for the same pathway, which could be lower or higher.

*Table A-1: Hydrogen Production Cost Comparisons from Various Sources*

| Resource | Technology   | Efficiency (%HHV) | Cost (\$/MMBtu) | Notes   | Estimated Timeframe | Data Source  | Notes |
|----------|--|-------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|--------------|-------|
| Coal     | Gasification/Shift/PSA                             | 63                | 6.83            | Current Technology<br>No Sequestration                | Current             | Mitretek (1) | 1,2,3 |
|          |  | -                 | 6.20            | •   | •                   | Williams (2) | 4     |
|          | Gasification/Shift/PSA                             | 59                | 8.18            | Current Technology<br>Sequestration                   | 2005+               | Mitretek (1) |       |
|          |  | -                 | 7.90            | •   | •                   | Williams (2) | 5     |
|          |  | 60                | 6.91            | •   | •                   | Parsons (3)  |       |
|          | Advanced Gasification/Shift/PSA                    | 62                | 5.42            | Co-production of Hydrogen & Power<br>No Sequestration | 2005                | Mitretek (1) |       |
|          | Advanced Gasification/Shift/PSA                    | 56                | 5.64            | Co-production of Hydrogen & Power<br>Sequestration    | 2015+               | Mitretek (1) |       |
|          | Advanced Gasification/Membrane Separation          | 59                | 3.98            | Co-production of Hydrogen & Power<br>Sequestration    | 2015+               | Mitretek (1) | 6     |
|          | Advanced Gasification/Membrane Separation          | 75                | 5.89            | Production of Hydrogen<br>Sequestration               | 2015+               | Mitretek (1) |       |
|          |  | 80                | 5.06            | •   | 2015+               | Parsons (3)  |       |
|          | Advanced Gasification/SOFC/<br>Membrane Separation | 65                | 2.40            | Co-production of Hydrogen & Power<br>Sequestration    | 2020+               | Mitretek (1) | 7     |

HYDROGEN FROM NATURAL GAS AND COAL: THE ROAD TO A SUSTAINABLE ENERGY FUTURE

| Resource       | Technology  | Efficiency (%HHV) | Cost (\$/MMBtu) | Notes   | Estimated Timeframe | Data Source                   | Notes |
|----------------|---|-------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| Coal           | Water Electrolysis from electric power derived from Advanced IGCC                   | 40                | 14.00           | No sequestration                                      | 2005                | Mitretek (1)                  |       |
|                | Water Electrolysis from electric power derived from Advanced IGCC                   | 35                | 17.50           | Sequestration   | 2015+               | Mitretek (1)                  |       |
| Petroleum Coke | Current Gasification/Shift/PSA  | 54                | 4.50            | Co-production of Hydrogen & Power<br>No Sequestration | Current             | Mitretek (4)                  | 8     |
| Natural Gas    | Steam Methane Reforming (SMR)/PSA   | 83                | 5.54            | Includes export steam<br>No Sequestration             | Current             | Parsons (3)                   | 9     |
| Natural Gas    | Steam Methane Reforming (SMR)/PSA   | 78                | 5.93            | Sequestration   | 2015+               | Parsons (3)                   | 10    |
| Natural Gas    | ITM Synthesis Gas Generation, Advanced Membrane Separation, CO <sub>2</sub> capture |                   | 4.15            | Sequestration   | 2015+               | FE Hydrogen Program Plan Goal | 11    |
| Gravity        | Hydropower<br>Water electrolysis  | -                 | 21.90           | Hydropower capital cost of \$3260/kW                  |                     | Ogden (5)                     | 12    |
| Nuclear        | Water electrolysis  | -                 | 14.50           | Assuming capital cost of nuclear \$1620/kW            |                     | Ogden (5)                     | 13    |
|                | Sulfur-Iodine cycle   | 45-55             | 9.70            | Preliminary estimate                                  | 2020+               | General Atomics (6)           | 14    |
| Biomass        | Gasification  | -                 | 9 - 18          | Feedstock cost range: \$1.0 - \$2.7 per MMBtu         |                     | NREL Survey (7)               |       |
|                | Pyrolysis to bio-oil/Steam reforming  | -                 | 9.4 - 16.3      | Bio-oil cost of \$7.1 per MMBtu                       |                     | NREL Survey (7)               |       |
| Wind           | Wind<br>Water electrolysis  | -                 | 21              | 1998 estimate for the year 2000                       | Current             | NREL Survey (7)               |       |

| Resource              | Technology                             | Efficiency (%HHV) | Cost (\$/MMBtu) | Notes   | Estimated Timeframe | Data Source                | Notes |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-------|
| Wind                  | Wind Water electrolysis                | -                 | 11.6            | Assumes technology improvements that will reduce the cost | 2010                | NREL Survey (7)            |       |
| Geothermal            | Geothermal Water electrolysis          | -                 | 25 - 45         | Based on current electricity cost of 5 to 8 cents/kWh     | Current             | EERE/TMS estimates (8)     | 15    |
|                       | Geothermal Water electrolysis          | -                 | 13 - 15         | Based on electricity cost of 3 cents/kWh                  | 2010+               | EERE/TMS estimates (8)     | 16    |
| Sunlight              | Photovoltaics Water electrolysis       | -                 | 44              | 1998 estimate for the year 2000                           | Current             | NREL Survey (7)            |       |
|                       | Photovoltaics Water electrolysis       | -                 | 20              | Assumes technology improvements that will reduce the cost | 2010                | NREL Survey (7)            |       |
|                       | Concentrated Solar Water electrolysis  | -                 | 43 - 68         | Ambient Temperature Electrolysis                          | 2010                | Glatzmaier et al, 1998 (9) |       |
| Sunlight              | Concentrated Solar Water electrolysis  | -                 | 36 - 64         | Ambient Temperature Electrolysis                          | 2020                | Glatzmaier et al, 1998 (9) |       |
|                       | Concentrated Solar Water electrolysis  | -                 | 52 - 66         | High-Temperature Electrolysis                             |                     | Glatzmaier et al, 1998 (9) |       |
| Water and Sunlight    | Photobiological - Algal growth process | -                 | 10.6            | Highly speculative preliminary estimate                   | 2020+               | Benemann (10)              |       |
| Secondary Electricity | Electrolysis                           | -                 | 10 - 13         | Electricity cost at 2 cents/kWh                           | Current             | NREL Survey (7)            | 17    |
|                       | Electrolysis                           | -                 | 19 - 22         | Electricity cost at 4 cents/kWh                           | Current             | NREL Survey (7)            | 17    |
|                       | Electrolysis                           | -                 | 41 - 45         | Electricity cost at 8 cents/kWh                           | Current             | NREL Survey (7)            | 17    |

Data Source:

- 1) Hydrogen from Coal, Mitretek Technical Paper MTR 2002-31, July 2002
- 2) Hydrogen Production Costs with Alternative Technologies, Robert H. Williams, Princeton Environmental Institute, Presentation, Washington, D.C. July 17, 2002
- 3) Hydrogen Production Facilities Plant Performance and Cost Comparisons, Parsons Infrastructure and Technology Group, Final Report, March 2002
- 4) Opportunities for Petroleum Coke Gasification under Tighter Sulfur Limits for Transportation Fuels, Mitretek Paper MP 2000-61, December 2000
- 5) Ogden, Joan, M. & Williams, Robert. H., Solar Hydrogen, Moving Beyond Fossil Fuels, World Resources Institute Report, October 1989.
- 6) Schultz, Ken, General Atomics, Economic Production of Hydrogen from Nuclear Energy, Presentation to DOE, September 2002.
- 7) Padro, C.E.G. & Putsche, V., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Survey of the Economics of Hydrogen Technologies. Technical Report, September 1999.
  - a. Note: This survey includes information from the following sources: Larson, 1992; Mann et al, 1995; Mann et al, 1998; Andreassen 1998.
- 8) EERE Geothermal Program Website (<http://www.eren.doe.gov/geothermal/>); Williams, Hydrogen Production Costs with Alternative Technologies, 2002; and Technology & Management Services, Inc., Hydrogen Production Cost Comparison Spreadsheet Estimates, 2002.
- 9) Glatzmaier, Greg (Peak Design), Blake, Dan (National Renewable Energy Laboratory), & Showalter, Steve (Sandia National Laboratory), Assessment of Methods for Hydrogen Production Using Concentrated Solar Energy, January 1998.
- 10) Benemann, John R., Consultant, Process Analysis and Economics of Biophotolysis of Water, IEA Report, March 1998.

Notes:

- 1) Coal cost is \$29/ton (and is assumed to de-escalate at 1.5 percent below general inflation) and the assumed plant capacity factor is 85 percent.

- 2) For those cases with no sequestration, the co-produced power value is assumed to be \$35.6/MWh, based on the cost of power production from Natural Gas Combined-Cycle (NGCC) plants if natural gas costs \$3.75/MMBtu. In cases where there is carbon sequestration, the co-produced power is assumed to have a value of \$53.6/MWh, based on an additional cost of power production from Natural Gas Combined-Cycle (NGCC) plants with sequestration of 18 mills/kWh (reference EPRI report 1000316).
- 3) For cases with sequestration, it is assumed that \$10 per ton of carbon is added for sequestration after the concentrated carbon dioxide stream has been isolated and the carbon dioxide stream is compressed to 200 bars.
- 4) Coal cost is \$0.95/ MMBtu (\$20/ton with coal at 20.8 MMBtu/ton).
- 5) Coal cost is \$0.95/MMBtu. Includes carbon dioxide capture and disposal cost of \$1.70/million, but excludes reported H<sub>2</sub> storage cost of \$0.43/MMBtu (for consistency with Mitretek reported costs).
- 6) Assumes ceramic membrane hydrogen separation device operating at 600 degrees Centigrade.
- 7) Assumes operation of a solid oxide fuel cell (SOFC) topping cycle operating at 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit with an efficiency of 60 percent with a capital cost of the SOFC stack at \$400/kW.
- 8) Assumes current gasification with pet coke at \$10 per ton.
- 9) Assumes natural gas cost of \$3.15/MMBtu.
- 10) Assumes carbon dioxide capture by Amine Process.
- 11) Based upon a natural gas price of \$3.15/MMBtu. Hydrogen costs will increase or decrease from this value as natural gas price fluctuates above or below \$3.15/MMBtu.
- 12) Capacity factor for hydropower assumed to be 47 percent.
- 13) Assumed capacity factor for nuclear of 65 percent.
- 14) Based on using 800 degrees Centigrade nuclear heat for the sulfur-iodine water splitting cycle.

- 15) Based on current geothermal electricity cost of 5 to 8 cents/kWh and electrolysis cost estimates from NREL survey.
- 16) Based on future geothermal electricity cost estimate from EERE and electrolysis cost estimates from NREL survey.
- 17) Based on a plant size of 50 - 250 million standard cubic feet of hydrogen produced per day.

## HYDROGEN FROM FOSSIL FUEL — BENEFITS SENSITIVITY CASE

The benefits of using hydrogen from fossil fuel in advanced hydrogen powered fuel cell vehicle (FCV) technology are discussed throughout the FE Hydrogen Program Plan with specific impacts shown in Table 2. These benefits are based on Argonne National Laboratory's GREET 1.5a model assumption that long-term fuel cell vehicles (FCVs) will use one third the energy per mile driven as future internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles. As a sensitivity case, an analysis has been made to assess the impact if FCVs use only one half the energy per mile driven as future ICE vehicles. Table A-2 below provides a summary of that analysis. The table shows that, even at twice the efficiency of future ICE vehicles, compared to Table 2 in which FCV efficiency is three times an ICE vehicle, centrally-produced hydrogen from natural gas and coal used in light-duty FCVs provides significant benefits.

*Table A-2: Impact of Centrally-Produced Hydrogen from Natural Gas and Coal and Use in Light-Duty FCVs that are Twice as Efficient as ICE Vehicles in the Long Term (a)*

|  | Hydrogen from Coal |              | Hydrogen from Natural Gas |              |
|--|--------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|
|  | 50 million         | 100 million  | 50 million                | 100 million  |
| Number of Light Duty FCVs                                      | 50 million         | 100 million  | 50 million                | 100 million  |
| Number of Hydrogen Plants                                      | 117                | 233          | 111                       | 221          |
| Hydrogen Production, million short tons per year               | 15.1               | 30.3         | 15.1                      | 30.3         |
| Capital Cost of Hydrogen Plants; \$ billion (current dollars)  | 50                 | 99           | 16                        | 31           |
| <b>Emissions Reductions</b>                                    |                    |              |                           |              |
| SO <sub>x</sub> , thousand tonnes per year                     | 10                 | 19           | 26                        | 52           |
| NO <sub>x</sub> , thousand tonnes per year                     | 28                 | 55           | 12                        | 25           |
| PM <sub>10</sub> , thousand tonnes per year                    | 17                 | 33           | 7                         | 14           |
| CO <sub>2</sub> , million tonnes per year (no sequestration)   | 69                 | 139          | 144                       | 288          |
| CO <sub>2</sub> , million tonnes per year (with sequestration) | 264                | 528          | 238                       | 476          |
| <b>Other Impacts</b>   |                    |              |                           |              |
| Energy Savings, \$ billion per year (current dollars)          | 16                 | 32           | 8                         | 16           |
| Reduce Petroleum Imports, million barrels per day              | 1.5                | 3.0          | 1.5                       | 3.0          |
| Natural Gas Displaced trillion cubic feet per year             | 0.8 decrease       | 1.6 decrease | 1.5 increase              | 3.1 increase |

(a) Based on a system analysis from a central hydrogen plant, pipeline delivery of hydrogen to refueling stations and use in efficient FCVs, compared with oil refining, delivery of gasoline and use in ICE vehicles.

Table A-2 Sources:

Argonne National Laboratory GREET 1.5a model, Per-Mile Fuel-Cycle Energy Use and Emissions for long-term technology light duty vehicles, assumed to be 55% passenger cars, 25% Light Duty Truck Class 1, and 20% Light Duty Truck Class 2. The GREET 1.5a model provides Btu/mile use of energy, broken down by fossil energy, petroleum energy and non-fossil energy, and SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>, among other emissions, on a fuel-cycle basis. Except for the hydrogen from coal plant analysis, and adjusting FCV efficiency to twice instead of three times ICE efficiency in the model, GREET 1.5a assumptions were used in the above table.

Hydrogen from Coal, Mitretek Technical Paper, MTR 2002-31, July 2002. This case is also used in this Office of Fossil Energy Hydrogen from Natural Gas and Coal Program Plan as Case 2 in Table 4. This case defines the quantity of coal, and therefore carbon used to produce hydrogen.

SAIC, March 2003 presentation, which indicates advanced Coal fired IGCC plants emit 0.09 lbs NO<sub>x</sub>/MMBtu of coal, and 0.08 lbs of SO<sub>2</sub>/MMBtu at 98 percent recovery. Estimates used in the above analysis assume SO<sub>2</sub> recovery is 99 percent with emission of only 0.04 lbs SO<sub>2</sub>/MMBtu through more severe operation of a Rectisol unit.

Hydrogen Production Facilities Plant Performance and Cost Comparisons, Parsons Infrastructure and Technology Group, Final Report, March 2002. Use of current Steam Methane Reforming Technology case. This case defines the quantity of natural gas, and therefore carbon used to produce hydrogen. Both the Parsons and GREET 1.5a natural gas to hydrogen energy efficiency were essentially identical, the GREET 1.5a assumptions were selected for use.

NATIONALGEOGRAPHIC.COM

HOME | SEARCH | GET E-MAIL UPDATES

NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC  
NEWS

Search news.nationalgeographic.com



Sign up for our free e-mail  
newsletter

Also see: [Today's Top Stories](#)

This Story  
National  
Geographic Today

- [Related Sites &  
Stories](#)

- [E-mail this story](#)

Sponsored in part by



## Hydrogen Cars May Hit Showrooms by 2005

Janet Ginsburg  
for National Geographic Today  
January 29, 2003 (Originally published on October 16,  
2001)

*Viewers of National Geographic Today in the United States can watch an update on hydrogen-car technology in tonight's broadcast, which follows yesterday's announcement by President Bush that he proposes U.S. \$1.2 billion in funding for this research over the next few years.*

In the clean, "green" future envisioned by energy expert Amory Lovins, cars not only get 99 miles per gallon emissions-free, but they may also play a key role in providing electricity to a power-hungry world.

The solution, according to Lovins, is a "hypercar"—a lightweight vehicle powered by a hydrogen fuel cell, with enough style and space to compete with luxury sport utility vehicles (SUVs). Lovins is with the Rocky Mountain Institute, a think tank in Colorado.



Future Trans;

The Revolution, a lightweight powered by a hydrogen fuel cell, is as much as eight times more efficient than most sports car models, according to its designers.

Photograph by  
Clasen/Hypercar Inc.

### National Geographic Today

This story airs on our U.S. television daily news program *National Geographic Today*. For details of how to get the broadcast weekdays at 7 ET/PT, please visit the [Channel 9 Web site](#).

[More News](#)

[Adventure & Exploration](#)

[Archaeology & Paleontology](#)

[TravelWatch](#)

[Kids News](#)

[Animals & Nature](#)

[Science & Technology](#)

[People & Culture](#)

[The Environment](#)

[Travel](#)

[National Geographic Channel](#)

[Special Series](#)  
[Emerging Explorers](#)

[TravelWatch](#)

[National Geographic Out There](#)

[Oceans](#)

[Mount Everest Expedition](#)

and chairman of its corporate spin-off venture Hypercar, Inc.,

Some of the giant car companies are also designing hydrogen-powered cars. Hypercar Inc. hopes to have its first model ready to roll off the production line by 2005.

Today, an estimated 210 million vehicles are stuck in traffic on America's roadways. Collectively they spew nearly a billion and a half tons of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere each year. According to a recent EPA report, the latest conventional models average a little more than 20 miles per gallon—the worst showing since 1980.

While some blame America's love affair with the fuel-hungry SUVs, Lovins says the problem comes down to design.

A decade ago, Lovins was asked to address a National Academy of Sciences meeting about how to build cars with greater fuel efficiency. The general thinking was that fuel efficiency could be increased by only 10 percent because otherwise the car would become too expensive, says Lovins.

He was unconvinced of that assertion, however, and set up an informal team to rethink the automobile from the tires up. "I'm not a car guy, which actually was a bit of an advantage because I didn't know too much about how it ought to be done," said Lovins.

The result is a car that is as much as eight times as efficient as most standard models.



**EMERG  
EXPLOI**

**Will Talk  
You T**



Jimmy Chin, C  
Photograph

CLICK TO  
LEARN MORE

Brought  
O  
Assoc  
with Mi

NATIONALGEOG

Map

Map  
Machine:  
North  
America >>

## Lightweight Parts, Heavy Results

How did the Lovins team do it? They began by "light-weighting" the car.

They started with the body, which is made from a composite of carbon fibers set in a plastic matrix. It's a stronger version of the material used in skis and tennis rackets—and, per pound, five times as strong as steel.

Although carbon composites are a lot more expensive than steel, a smaller quantity is needed. Even more important, Lovins pointed out, "it's cheaper to manufacture."

While the Hypercar weighs less than 2,000 pounds (907 kilograms), it is still tough enough to meet federal safety standards, based on a computer-simulated 30-miles-per-hour fixed barrier crash. In a cyber smash-up with a Ford Explorer—a vehicle twice the weight—all the damage to the Hypercar occurred in the front end.

There are other, less obvious, ways to lightweight. Special low-rolling resistance tires developed with Michelin, not only cut down on friction—which can use up to a third of a car's fuel energy—but are also designed to run flat. If a tire blows, the car can still be driven for another 100 miles, more than enough to get to a gas station. The need to carry a spare is eliminated, further reducing weight.

Soon the savings in weight starts to snowball. A lighter car requires a smaller engine to power it, less braking to stop it, and less suspension to hold it up. And because the Hypercar runs on an electricity-producing fuel cell rather than an internal

### More Information

#### Hydrogen Safety

For many people, of hydrogen as a up images of the Hindenberg expl flames. But hydr actually safer the gasoline and had to do with the 19 disaster. Instead, research has sho the outer membr the dirigible, whi made of a volatil c bination of al and iron oxide co caught fire from i spark—possibly fi lightning or even electricity. Becau hydrogen is light air, it flowed up a of harm's way.

Likewise, recent have shown that hydrogen gas tar would be much le than a gasoline le hydrogen dissipat quickly and dispe upward, while ga tends to pool—re for an explosion.

### More Information

#### RELATED LESSONS

Use this National Geographic News in your classroom the *Xpeditions* le:

...ity producing fuel cell rather than an internal combustion engine, certain parts, including the starter, alternator, clutch, and transmission, are eliminated.

plan: "On the Road Again": Moving Products, and Ide

"The car gets radically simplified. And then it costs less to make," said Lovins.

David Cole, president of the Center for Automotive Research in Ann Arbor, Michigan, said it's important to be cautious about expectations. "The potential on paper looks awfully good," he said. "But getting it into production—things don't necessarily turn out as you might expect."

"If you think of this as a ten-step program, the first step is showing technical feasibility," said Cole. "They still need to do this. Then it's nine more steps to commercial feasibility."


### **"Brains," Not Bulk**

Brains replace bulk in a Hypercar. "Think of it like a computer with wheels, not a car with chips," Lovins explained.

The car can diagnose, upgrade, and, to a certain extent, fix itself. It can also be programmed for a variety of new features, such as recording everything that happened at the time of a crash, like an airplane's "black box."

Two years ago, Hypercar, Inc., was spun off from the Rocky Mountain Institute. The nine-person start-up team, based in Basalt, Colorado, intends to "create the DNA of the next generation of vehicles," according to Hypercar's Michael Brylawski.

To do that, they're trying to sell not only the Hypercar



itself, but also the ideas that make it run so efficiently—the "intellectual property." By working with automakers and suppliers, the company hopes to get the technologies on the road faster.

While none of its fuel-efficient, smart features are unique to Hypercar, what's special is how they're combined and optimized.


For example, at least half a dozen automakers, including Ford, Daimler-Chrysler, and BMW, are developing fuel cell-powered cars. But because those vehicles are still fairly heavy, they need fuel cells, which are about three times bigger and heavier—and three times more expensive—as that used by the Hypercar.

Cole thinks the Hypercar is "a huge step" in the right direction. "My guess is where they [Hypercar Inc.] would make the most contribution is in a few of the ideas," said Cole. "The real role of the Hypercar is unleashing the imagination—that's one of the real values of it."

### **Double Duty**

Perhaps the biggest hurdle to overcome with fuel cell-powered cars is setting up a distribution network to supply the hydrogen gas that runs them.

A fuel cell works by combining hydrogen with oxygen from the air in a chemical process to generate electricity. The only by-products are heat and pure water. Hydrogen can be extracted from natural gas, using a device called a reformer, or through a process called "electrolysis," which splits water into hydrogen and oxygen atoms.



While there are only a handful of hydrogen gas stations in the world, Lovins has a plan for making it easy to fill up. "Many people assume that before you can sell the first hydrogen car, you have to put in \$100 billion worth of hydrogen generating and delivery stations and pipelines," said Lovins. "That's not correct."

He says the first Hypercars should be leased to people who work in buildings where fuel cells have already been installed. The Hypercars could tap into the buildings' supply of hydrogen to refuel. But they could also be hooked up to the grid.

As "portable power plants on wheels," the cars' fuel cells could be put to work during the day when they're parked, generating—and selling—electricity.

"It doesn't take many people wanting to be paid to park, rather than the other way around...to put the coal and nuclear people out of business," said Lovins. And of course, using fuel cells would dramatically decrease the need for oil.

Cole disagrees with Lovins' conclusions, arguing that the hydrogen infrastructure would take billions of dollars to establish. But he does support the direction of the project. "I say, 'More power to them.' My only reservation is to be careful about generating unrealistic expectations," he said.

"It does get people to think out of the box," said Cole. "You don't want to clamp down on these people who are dreaming at the edge."

Eventually, the Hypercar could change ideas about what people come to expect from automobiles. Fittingly, the first model to come off the drawing

boards is called the Revolution.

Watch continued television coverage of this event on National Geographic Today, only on the National Geographic Channel, at 7 p.m. ET/PT in the United States. [Click here to request it.](#)



**SAVE 43%**  
on National Geographic Magazine!



- U.S. price is just \$34
- Order now to receive 12 monthly issues of *National Geographic* magazine
- Act now to save 43 percent off the newsstand price and receive a free gift with your paid order
- Send no money now — you will be billed

Canadian price \$38 (C\$59), and includes GST. Sales tax will be added where applicable. Savings based on annual U.S. newsstand price of \$59.40. While all dues support National Geographic's mission of expanding geographic knowledge, 90 percent is designated for the magazine subscription, and no portion should be considered a charitable contribution.

#### Related Websites

- [Hypercar](#)
- [Rocky Mountain Institute](#)
- [National Hydrogen Association](#)

Comments? Contact the [news desk](#).

**HB**

**512**

**SFIN**

**FILE**

HB 512

was referred to the  
Senate Finance  
Committee

No hearing was held  
on this bill