

AN ANALYTICAL REVIEW ON UNDERGROUND COAL GASIFICATION IN INDIA AND ABROAD

Rohit Kodewar¹, Dr. Rajni Kant², Gurram Dileep³ and Shailendra Bommanwar⁴

¹Research Scholar, Department of Mining Engineering, BIT, Ballarpur, (MS), India

²Principal, Ballarpur Institute of Technology Ballarpur Dist. - Chandrapur (MS)-442701

^{3,4}Assistant Professor, Department of Mining Engineering, BIT, Ballarpur (MS)

ABSTRACT

Underground Coal Gasification (UCG) is an innovative technology that converts in-situ coal into a usable syngas, offering a cleaner and more economical alternative to conventional coal mining. The resulting syngas can be utilized for power generation, industrial heating, or as a feedstock for chemical synthesis. Extensive laboratory-scale experiments have been conducted by academic institutions and industries to better understand the complex processes involved in UCG. These studies often use ex-situ reactor setups to explore various gasification techniques, the influence of different oxidizing agents, their flow dynamics, operating pressures, and control mechanisms aimed at maximizing efficiency and syngas yield. This review presents a comprehensive summary of recent laboratory-scale research on UCG, highlighting the optimization of operational parameters, comparative performance with lignite and hard coals, and the associated environmental considerations.

Keywords: Underground Coal Gasification (UCG); Syngas; Clean Coal Technology; Laboratory Studies; Gasification Parameters; Environmental Impact.

1. INTRODUCTION

Underground Coal Gasification (UCG) is a promising technique that enables the utilization of coal reserves by converting them into usable gaseous fuels directly within the coal seam. The process essentially involves the in-situ combustion of coal using an oxidizing agent - typically air or oxygen, sometimes supplemented with steam. This combustion occurs under controlled conditions, where only partial oxidation takes place due to limited oxygen availability, resulting in the generation of a synthesis gas, or syngas.

The gasification process operates at high temperatures, which are sustained by the combustion of part of the coal itself. Water from the seam, seepage, or injected steam contributes to the formation of gas products. The resulting syngas is composed mainly of carbon monoxide (CO) and hydrogen (H₂), but also includes varying amounts of carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), carbonyl sulfide (COS), and heavier hydrocarbons or tars, depending on coal composition and process conditions.

When air is used as the oxidant, nitrogen becomes a major component of the syngas, thereby lowering its calorific value to roughly one-eighth of natural gas. Alternatively, using pure oxygen or oxygen-enriched air improves the heating value, raising it to about one-fourth to one-third of that of natural gas. Post-production, the gas is treated to remove impurities and can be utilized for power generation or as a raw material in chemical and liquid fuel manufacturing.

UCG offers a unique opportunity to harness energy from coal deposits that are otherwise uneconomical or technically challenging to mine using traditional mining methods. Successful commercialization of UCG could significantly enhance global estimates of exploitable coal reserves.

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

The feasibility of UCG depends heavily on appropriate site selection, particularly the geological suitability of the coal seam. The standard operational setup includes at least two boreholes drilled into the seam: an injection well for delivering the gasifying agent and a production well for extracting the syngas. These wells can be either vertical or angled and are connected through a pathway that allows for gas flow.

Interestingly, in some configurations, these wells may interchange their roles to maintain the continuity and efficiency of the underground gasification zone. On a larger scale, commercial UCG systems involve multiple such well pairs operating simultaneously to meet industrial-scale syngas demands.




Figure 1 Schematic of the components of the UCG process collocated with electricity generation (UCG Engineering, Ltd., 2006)

2. SURFACE REQUIREMENTS

Underground Coal Gasification (UCG) operations may lead to surface subsidence, which can limit the suitable locations for its practical application. Although typically a slow process - often amounting to only a few centimeters annually - subsidence depends on factors such as the coal seam's depth and thickness, the quantity of coal gasified, and the geological characteristics of the overlying rock layers.

UCG is most suitable in regions where the surface land is open, undeveloped, and of relatively low economic value. Certain UCG techniques involve creating a widespread network of boreholes, which are gradually relocated as gasification advances. Other techniques that use inclined or in-seam boreholes may reduce surface disruption, although the risk of subsidence remains comparable.

All UCG projects require surface infrastructure, including facilities to inject oxidants (such as oxygen and steam), ignite the coal seam, and process the resulting syngas. This infrastructure may also involve power generation units or chemical/liquid fuel production systems, as well as administrative offices and laboratory facilities.

The syngas produced from UCG can be utilized in various applications, including:

- Combustion in a gas turbine connected to an electric generator. The hot gas from the turbine can be used to make steam, which in turn can be used to drive a steam turbine or steam engine, connected to an electric generator;
- Combustion in a boiler to make steam which can drive a steam turbine or a steam engine

connected to an electric generator;

- Direct feed to a fuel cell that can tolerate carbon monoxide to generate low voltage electrical current, which can be stepped up and fed to a power grid;
- The gas can be “shifted” to make a mixture of hydrogen and carbon dioxide, with very low levels of carbon monoxide, and then fed to a low-temperature fuel cell to generate low voltage current;

3. COAL SEAM PROPERTIES AFFECTING UCG

While the coal seam properties are important, as can be seen from the list below, it is the geological setting which determines the potential application of UCG.

Key features which affect the use of UCG are:

- The geological structures both above and below the coal seam. Particularly the properties of the roof materials above the seam, and of the hydrogeology of the area. If there is an impermeable seal between the coal seam and the surface, then the environmental implications are very different compared with those for a roof consisting of permeable shales or sandstones;
- The amount of water available long-term to provide a seal around the reactor cavities to minimize the risk of gas escape, where this is necessary;
- The deposit/seam depth, thickness and inclination;
- Seam continuity and its physical strength;
- The nature of the coal (and in particular its rank and reactivity, together with its ash, moisture, Sulphur and methane contents);
- The permeability of the seams, based on the pore structure and the presence of cleats (or cracks). In addition, the presence of fracture planes or shear zones in or near the seam is of significance as these might provide leakage paths for the syngas formed;
- An UCG activity expects some goafing (collapse) of the immediate overlying strata into the cavities created during gasification, and planning this forms part of the process. The extent and nature of subsidence through to the surface depends on the nature of the overlying strata and varies from site to site;
- Most of the ash in the coal remains underground and acts as a buffer to reduce subsidence developments on the surface. UCG requires a largely temporary infrastructure of wellheads and pipelines on the surface. A power generation unit and/or chemicals production facility to clean and use the syngas would occupy a relatively small area, but would be there for the life of the project, which might be 20 to 30 years. Carrying out UCG will be much easier under land which is undeveloped and where a small amount of subsidence is likely to be acceptable. It may also prove to be possible to recover energy from coal resources under the sea.

4. OBJECTIVE OF UCG

Underground Coal Gasification (UCG) is a coal development technology that involves an industrial process wherein coal is converted into a combustible product gas through thermal and chemical reactions. This technique enables the clean and efficient utilization of coal resources.

5. UCG CHEMISTRY

During gasification, the in-seam coal is heated by hot gases to a very high temperature and is consumed by oxidation reactions. Then in a region where the oxygen content is depleted, the gasification reactions take place. A flame front is initiated within the passage linking the injection and production wells, and as the gases pass through the various reactions approach equilibrium conditions before they leave via the production well at temperatures which will probably be between 200°C and 400°C.




Figure 2 Schematic of the processes involved in UCS

Figure 2 is a schematic showing the various reactions taking place using the basic Russian methodology, with linked vertical wells (LVWs). As the coal is heated (throughout the length of the combustion/gasification cavity and the linkage routes), the coal starts to lose the moisture held in the pore structure, and then undergoes pyrolysis at temperatures above 400°C, during which hydrogen-rich volatile matter is released, together with tars, phenols and hydrocarbon gases. Simultaneously, at higher temperatures, the char is gasified, releasing gases, tar vapors and solid residues.

6. GLOBAL EXPERIENCE IN COAL GASIFICATION

Global coal gasification market is expected to reach around 3,89,825 MW by 2026, growing at a CAGR of approximately 10.8%. Fertilizer segment is anticipated to hold the major market share. Ammonia production by coal gasification has increased the demand for fertilizers. Another segment with a good growth rate, above 10.5%, is power generation. Growing trend of Integrated Coal Gasification Combined

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

Cycle (IGCC) power plants worldwide has increased the opportunities. Demand for coal gasification technology has increased in fuel gas production, owing to the increased use of synthetic natural gas. By region, the global coal gasification market is segmented into North America, Asia Pacific, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East and Africa. a) Region dominating the coal gasification market is Asia Pacific. China contributed the highest market share in 2017. Other countries, such as India and Japan, are also promising markets for coal gasification. b) North America is likely to show a good rate of growth. The U.S. contributed the majority market share in the year 2017. c) Moderate market growth is likely to be registered in the European region. Germany contributed the majority share in 2017. d) The Middle East and Africa and Latin America are likely to witness good market growth

6.1 China

The Chinese government's initiatives in its 11th and 12th five-year plans have boosted the gasification industry in the country. China produces more than 90% of its ammonia through coal gasification. China is expected to increase the uptake of large-scale coal-to-SNG projects and possibly scale up various coal-to-oil technologies projects, which in turn, would supplement the gasification market.

6.2 United States

Coal gasification projects started in the 1990's in the US, however, it did not have a very successful experience. Efforts to gasify coal for power generation have failed, technologically and financially. Only two of the 25 coal gasification electricity generating plants proposed in the U.S. since 2000 have ever come online: Southern Company's Kemper plant in Mississippi and Duke Energy's Edwardsport plant in Indiana. Under pressure from the Mississippi Public Service Commission for having logged billions of dollars in cost overruns at Kemper and one of the reasons being the technological problems with the gasifier, the Southern company affiliate, Mississippi Power which started operations in 2014 had announced in 2017 that it will halt burning the coal at its facility, leaving Edwardsport as the only plant gasifying coal. Edward sport, which started operations in 2013, has been plagued by technological problems and is still not running properly. Because of its operational problems and huge construction cost overruns, Edwardsport's electricity is wildly expensive. Most importantly, the natural gas prices in the US crashed post the shale oil and gas revolution which meant that the cost of producing electricity using natural gas was lower than that for coal. With abundant oil and gas reserves, sufficient production of oil and gas and declining cost of renewables – solar and wind, US is unlikely to gasify coal for power generation or for producing chemicals in the future since natural gas provides a much cheaper and technologically established option for the same.

6.3 Indonesia

In 2022, Indonesian President Joko Widodo initiated the construction of a \$2.3 billion coal gasification plant to reduce the country's liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) imports and optimize its coal resources. The plant is designed to use 6 million tonnes (Mt) of low-rank coal to produce 1.4 tonnes of dimethyl ether (DME) annually, reducing Indonesia's LPG import by 1 Mt per year, according to state coal miner Bukit Asam (PTBA).

6.4 Japan

Japan has done quite a lot of research on coal gasification, especially IGCC technology and is continuing its R&D efforts in the clean coal technology space. The reliance on coal plants increased more after the Fukushima disaster in 2011. Many Japanese corporations such as Mitsubishi, Nakoso and others have developed IGCC technologies because of which Japan supports clean coal technology. According to the Ministry of Economy, Industry and Trade (MEITY), Japan will retire the inefficient older coal plants by 2030 but will continue to use Ultra supercritical and IGCC plants. There have been two IGCC plants in operation with a total capacity of 800 MW. And another plant is likely to be added with a capacity of 543 MW this year. Therefore, Japanese have not shunned the coal gasification projects like the US, they are gradually moving ahead with this technology.

7. METHODS FOR UCG OPERATION

Generally, two types of standard method for preparing a coal seam for in-situ gasification have been used successfully, namely shaft and shaftless methods. The adoptability of UCG methods is dependent on parameters such as natural permeability of the coal seam, geochemistry of the coal, seam thickness, depth, width and inclination, proximity of urban development and amount of mining desired (Wiatowski et al., 2012). The UCG process involves four steps: drilling, linking, ignition and gasification.

7.1 Shaft Method

Shaft method uses coal mine galleries and shafts to transport gasification reagents and products. Sometime it becomes necessary to make a shaft and drill large-diameter openings through underground (Wiatowski et al., 2012). Currently, the shaft method is only employed in closed coalmines due to economic and safety reasons (Wiatowski et al., 2012). Shaft method has been shown in Figure 3.

There are four common UCG shaft methods, namely

1. Chamber or warehouse method,
2. Borehole producer method,
3. Stream method,
- and 4. Long and Large tunnel gasification method




Figure 3 Process of shaft method

7.1.1 Chamber or Warehouse Method


This method utilizes constructed underground galleries with brick walls separating coal panels. Gasification agents are supplied to a previously ignited coal face on one side of the wall and the syngas is removed from a gallery on the other side. This method strongly relies on the natural permeability of the coal seam to allow for sufficient oxidant flow through the system. The syngas composition may vary during operation and the gas production rates are often low. To improve system output, coal seams are often outfitted with explosives for rubblisation prior to the reaction zone. The process of chamber method has been illustrated in Figure 4.

7.1.2 Borehole Producer Method

For this method, parallel underground galleries are created within a coal seam with sufficient distance between them. Galleries are connected by drilling boreholes from one gallery to other. Coal in each borehole is remotely ignited using electric current to initiate the gasification process. This method is designed to gasification considerably flat-lying seams. Some variations exist where linking of the galleries is accomplished through hydraulic and electric linking.

7.1.3 Stream Method

This method is designed for sharply inclined coal beds. Parallel pitched galleries following the contour of coal seam are constructed and are connected at the bottom of the seam by a horizontal gallery also known as a firedrift. To initiate gasification, fire is introduced within the horizontal gallery. The hot coal face moves up the seam slope with oxidant fed through one inclined gallery and syngas leaving through the other. The main advantage of this method is that ash and roof material drop down to fill the void created during the process, which prevents suffocating the gasification process at the coal front.

**Figure 4** Overview of stream process

7.1.4 Long and Large Tunnel (LLT) Gasification Method

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

The shaft method utilizes existing coal mine galleries and vertical shafts to transport gasification agents and retrieve the resulting syngas. In some cases, it becomes necessary to construct a shaft and drill large-diameter underground openings to facilitate the process (Wiatowski et al., 2012). Due to economic and safety considerations, this method is typically applied only in abandoned or closed coal mines (Wiatowski et al., 2012). An illustration of the shaft method is shown in Figure 5.

Among various UCG shaft methods, the Long and Large Tunnel (LLT) gasification technique stands out. It employs mined tunnels or specially constructed underground roadways to connect the injection and production wells. A typical LLT setup (as shown in the relevant figure) comprises a gasification channel, two auxiliary boreholes, and two auxiliary tunnels. These boreholes are placed between the injection and production wells and are used either to inject air and steam or to discharge gas, enhancing gasifier control.

Additionally, the LLT system includes a brick-lined auxiliary tunnel for air injection, which helps to avoid clogging in the main gasification channel. The surrounding mined tunnels are sealed using partition walls to prevent leakage of combustible gases. The position and elevation of oxidant injection and gas outlet points are adjustable, enabling two-dimensional control of the gasification process.




Figure 5 Overview of long and large tunnel gasification method

7.2 Shaftless Method

In recent times, most of the focus of research has been on the shaftless methods which employ directional drilling techniques (Hammond, 2000). With shaftless methods, all preparation and operational processes are carried out through a series of boreholes drilled from the surface into a coal seam. Preparation of a reactor for the directional drilling technique consists of creation of dedicated in-seam boreholes for oxidant injection and product collection using drilling and completion technology that has been adapted for oil and gas production. The approach generally includes drilling inlet and outlet boreholes into a coal seam, increasing coal permeability between the inlet and outlet boreholes, igniting the coal seam, introducing an oxidant for gasification, and extraction of product gases from the outlet well. There are four methods of shaftless UCG, namely linked vertical well (LVW), controlled retractable injection point

(CRIP), single well integrated flow tubing (SWIFT) and steeply dipping seams (SDS). However, LVW and CRIP methods are generally used in UCG due to their added advantages.

7.2.1 Linked vertical well method

LVW method is one of the oldest methods for UCG. The method was derived from technology developed in the former Soviet Union (Shafirovich and Varma, 2009). Vertical wells are drilled into a coal seam, and internal pathways in the coal are utilized to direct the oxidant and product gas flow from the inlet to outlet borehole. Internal pathways can be naturally occurring or constructed (Liang et al., 1999; Self et al., 2012). Inlet and outlet boreholes are separated by typically 500 m and linked by one co-incident horizontal well. Well 1 and well 2 are defined as oxidant supply and syngas producer respectively. Control of reactivity cavity is in reactor by oxidant rate. In its simplest form, LVW method has inlet and outlet borehole locations that are static for the life time of the system. During operation, the coal face migrates and it is found that system's control, performance, and syngas quality are affected negatively as the distance from the coal face to the oxidant injection point increases (Roddy and Younger, 2010). This factor greatly reduces the usefulness of simple LVW systems. Schematic view of LVW method has been displayed in Figure 6.




Figure 6 schematic view of linked vertical well method

7.2.2 Controlled Retractable Injection Point Method

The CRIP (Controlled Retraction Injection Point) method was developed by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) during field trials in the United States. This technique uses a movable injection point, which is shifted once the surrounding coal seam has been exhausted. Gases come in contact with coal when the liner is burnt away by ignition. This method provides greater control over gasification reactor, improves resource recovery, and requires comparatively fewer wells. Two variations of CRIP technology have been practiced over the years. In case of linear CRIP a number of cavities are formed in series until they are separated typically 10–30 m apart. It utilizes a burner which is used to ignite the coal and positional control of oxygen injection while the coal seam is consumed. But, in parallel CRIP the cavity continuously grows along the coal. Figures show series and parallel CRIP methods respectively. A vertical section of injection well is drilled to a predetermined depth, after which direction drilling is used to

expand the hole and drill along the bottom of the coal seam creating a horizontal injection well. Coiled tubing is inserted into oxygen delivery well. Horizontal sections




Figure 7 schematic view of different CRIP method

7.2.3 Swift Method

Developer Portman Energy company used single vertical well for both syngas recovery and oxidant delivery. Single casing of tubing strings enclosed and filled with an inert gas to allow for leak monitoring, corrosion prevention and heat transfer. A series of horizontally drilled lateral oxidant delivery lines into the coal and a single or multiple syngas recovery pipelines allowed for a larger area of coal to be combusted at one time. Syngas production by SWIFT method may increase up to ten times by prior design approaches and the single well design.




Figure 8 schematic diagram of swift method

7.2.4 Steeply Dipping Seams

This method is applied to SDS with inclined injection. In this method, injection well is drilled in lower part of the seam and production well is located at upper side of coal seam. In horizontal coal seams, inert roof material falls and remains unreacted as gases tend to move upward; while in SDS, more char is accumulated around injection well that results in improved quality of produced gas (oxidation zone remains close to injection well), whereas reduction and pyrolysis zone are extended along the path of gas

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

(Jones and Thune, 1982). A few trials were performed on steeply dipping bed (SDB) which resulted in higher gas qualities compared to horizontal seams (Shirazi, 2012). However, this method can only be conducted in certain seams and process control is a major challenge for this method. Seam dip angle has a significant effect on UCG performance. As discussed earlier, SDS provides higher quality of syngas. However, the method creates some challenges in process control and stability. Thickness of the coal seam changes the behavior of UCG reactor, as interaction with overburden in thin seams considerably affects UCG performance. Based on the Soviet Union UCG trials, the thickness of the coal seam should be at least 2 m to be economically feasible. UCG practice is possible in all ranks of coal; however, previous trials have shown that low-rank coals that shrink upon heating are the most suitable for use in UCG. Higher-rank coals swell after pyrolysis resulting in blockage of the link path.




Figure 9 SDS method

8. ADVANTAGES OF UNDERGROUND COAL GASIFICATION

Underground Coal Gasification offers multiple benefits over traditional coal mining methods. It can be employed in areas where surface or underground mining is unable to exploit coal deposits. For example, at greater depths where surface or underground mining is unacceptable, at places where structure exploitation is not possible, and deposits that would normally be unworkable. It is also cost-effective and environmentally friendly. Clean power generation through UCG-integrated gasification combined cycle (UCG-IGCC) and repowering older coal-based plants are the primary markets for underground coal gasification technology in the future. Coal-based IGCC power generation is expected to achieve a large electric market share due to its domestic abundance and relatively low and stable price. UCG-IGCC is predicted to share the ultimate and dominant market for gasification.

9. POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS AND CONCERNS FOR UCG

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

Although Underground Coal Gasification (UCG) offers several advantages, the technology still faces multiple challenges. Its path to large-scale commercialization demands continued research and development efforts to address its current limitations.

- UCG can have significant environmental consequences: aquifer contamination, and ground subsidence. While a framework can be constructed from current knowledge that can eliminate or reduce these environmental risks, as is discussed at length later in this report, it is important to proactively address this constraint on siting and operation of any future UCG projects;
- While UCG may be technically feasible for many coal resources, the number of deposits that are suitable may be much more limited because some may have geologic and hydrologic features that increase environmental risks to unacceptable levels;
- UCG operations cannot be controlled to the same extent as surface gasifiers. Many important process variables, such as the rate of water influx, the distribution of reactants in the gasification zone, and the growth rate of the cavity, can only be estimated from measurements of temperatures and product gas quality and quantity;
- The economics of UCG has major uncertainties, discussed later in this report, that are likely to persist until such times as a reasonable number of UCG-based power plants are built and operated;
- UCG is inherently an unsteady-state process, and both the flow rate and the heating value of the product gas will vary over time. Any operating plant must take this factor into consideration

10. DESCRIPTION OF KEY SCIENTIFIC CONCERNS

At the least, storage in evacuated cavities must occur with supercritical CO₂ in order to store substantial volumes of CO₂. This will limit coupled storage to UCG projects below 800m of hydrologic head, and in some cases deeper. This will also limit the timing of injection to sometime after quenching of the cavity. If not, the active or residual thermal anomalies could cause the CO₂ to expand to gaseous state or at the least increase cavity pressure and attendant risk.

Unfortunately, if injection occurs after the cavity is filled with brine, any VOCs in the cavity may be forced out with the expelled water. This suggests that at a minimum hydrologic flow be confined to saline formations with good top-seals. Fortunately, the expelled water should not be buoyant and is likely to remain near the target.

Before a substantial program of intra-cavity CO₂ injection begins, a number of key scientific concerns should be addressed. This initial list delineates some of the larger concerns and attempts to bound the necessary science to address them:

- T-P constraints: The cavity temperature at a given pressure must be sufficiently low to avoid flashing or boiling of CO₂ at injection pressures. Similarly, the injection pressure must be sufficient to remain supercritical and ideally to prevent flashing. The risk of sudden phase change

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

must be well understood as an initial condition for cavity injection, and will require both experiments and simulation;

- Geomechanical response: The injection pressure must exceed hydrostatic pressures in order to displace cavity water. This will prompt a number of geomechanical responses, such as fracture dilation, crustal uplift, and potentially inducing fracture. These will vary as a function of stress tensor and fracture geometry, which may be difficult to characterize in this setting. This risk may be accentuated by the collapse of the cavity roof or walls. In contrast, coal swelling will cause fracture closure. Valid geomechanical models for stress and rock deformation are required, as are coupled geomechanical / fluid-flow simulators;
- Ground-water displacement risk: Cavity injection above hydrostatic pressures will displace cavity brines into the coal seam and adjoining formation. This may flush VOCs or high metal concentrations from the cavity into saline aquifers or coals. The nature of these materials should be circumscribed, and the concentrations and fate of these materials reasonably well characterized through experiments and simulations;
- Geochemical response: CO₂ injection will form carbonic acid in the cavity, which may react quickly with the coal, rock, ash, or slag in the cavity. This could leach metals into the cavity water elevating risk of groundwater contamination. Similarly, injection could mobilize sulfur from these materials to form sulfuric acid, further altering the local chemistry and increasing risk. VOCs could dissolve into the CO₂ and move with mobile phases. The key suite of reactive species for typical coals should be studied experimentally as a basis for reactive transport simulation;
- CO₂ fate: Free-phase CO₂ would remain supercritical and buoyant. This would create its own upward pressure on the cavity, and lead to the same set of risks commonly considered for conventional CO₂ storage. In this environment, the geomechanical, fault migration, and well-leakage risks may be greater due to the thermal stresses and shocks of heating and quenching. The specific leakage risks for cavity storage should be further delineated and considered in concert with conventional processes (e.g., coal-gas adsorption). The magnitude of these scientific tasks is great, and the system both non-linear and poorly constrained. As such, a substantial research effort would be required to being addressing chief concerns.

11. CASE STUDY

11.1 Existing Coal Gasification Plants in India

(i) BHEL has set up a pilot plant in Trichy and has produced 6.2 MW power but the plant has faced many issues in handling high ash coal.

(ii) CO and H₂ of Syn gas are important reducing agent for steel making and are environment friendly method of steel making through DRI route. Jindal Steel & Power Limited has installed world's first DRI plant based on Coal gasification technology by using domestic coal which is already operating in Angul District of Orissa for steel making. The Syn Gas project started in 2007 and commissioned in 2014. It is a technology demonstrator and can be very important for expanding the way for Sustainable and Green

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

Development of India. With NSP of 300 Mt crude steel by 2030, the adoption of Coal Gasification technology will create a new segment of capacity addition in India, therefore minimizing the need of imported coking coal.

(iii) M/s Thermax has also set up a pilot plant in 2014 for coal to methanol production with DST funding under the aegis of NITI Aayog in Pune.

(iv) L&T has commissioned many gasifiers in China and are in the business of erection and commissioning of gasifiers.

11.2 UGC Trials in India

The first pilot project for Underground Coal Gasification in India was implemented at the Vastan mine block in Surat, Gujarat, through a collaboration between ONGC and Gujarat Industries Power Company Ltd. The project received environmental clearance from the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), Government of India, following the final review meeting held with the Expert Appraisal Committee on January 15, 2010. UGC is the only feasible technology which has the potential to convert coal resources to coal reserves. ONGC has now taken up Vastan Mine block site belonging to GIPCL in Naninaroli, Surat district, Gujarat as an R&D Pilot Project to establish UGC technology in collaboration with M/s National Mining Research Center-Skochinsky Institute of Mining (NMRC-SIM), Russia. Agreement of Collaboration (AOC) to co-operate in the Services, Operations, Development and Research related to Under Ground Coal Gasification (UGC) in India with ONGC has further been extended up to March 4, 2020. Mining lease with respect to the Vastan Pilot Project has already been awarded to GIPCL. Moreover, a number of sites have been jointly identified by ONGC and Neyveli Lignite Corporation Limited (NLC) for studying their suitability to UGC. These are Tadkeshwar in Gujarat and Hodu-Sindhari & East Kurla in Rajasthan. One more site was jointly identified by ONGC & GMDC viz. Surkha in Bhavnagar district, Gujarat. The data of all the fields have already been analysed for evaluating the suitability of these sites for UGC. All the sites have been found suitable for UGC exploration.

11.3 Ongoing Surface Coal Gasification Projects

Setting up of coal gasification plant is a capital-intensive work. Further, the experience of coal gasification in India is limited. As such the success of initial coal gasification projects is very important for the national mission. It has been planned to set up two gasification projects on pilot basis one on high ash coal blended with pet coke and the other from low ash coal for the purpose of establishing technology.

Details of these Two Projects are as Mentioned Below:

11.3.1 Talcher Fertiliser Plant

A joint Venture Company named Talcher Fertilizers Limited (TFL) comprising of RCF, CIL, GAIL and FCIL has been constituted (2016) to set up a Surface Coal Gasification based integrated fertilizer complex using high ash coal from nearby Talcher Coalfields mixed with pet coke from Talcher refinery with an Investment of Rs 13277 cr. Coal blended with pet-coke up to 25% shall be gassified to produce syngas, which shall be converted into Ammonia and subsequently to 1.27 Mt tonnes of neem coated Urea

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

annually. TFL Board approved coal gasification technology of M/s Air Products (earlier M/s Shell) for the proposed plant. Exclusive subsidy policy for urea produced through coal gasification route by TFL has been approved by the cabinet in 2021. This will ensure concession rate/subsidy for the urea produced through coal gasification route by TFL for a period of 8 years from the date of start of production and will be determined by providing 12% post tax IRR on equity. Hon'ble Prime Minister of India had laid the Foundation Stone of the plant at Talcher on 22.09.2018. M/s Projects & Development India Limited (PDIL) is the Project Management Consultant (PMC) for this project. The project is being implemented on partial Lump Sum Turn Key (LSTK) basis. LSTK tenders for major plants (Coal Gasification & Ammonia-Urea) are under evaluation. NIT for Captive Power Plant and other Off-sites & Utilities are under preparation by the consultant. Currently, all pre-project works such as Commissioning of Water System, Supply-cum-Erection for Power Works, Land Development etc. are progressing in full swing.

11.3.2 Dankuni Coal to Methanol Plant

In pursuance to initiatives towards development of Clean Coal Technology and alternate use of coal, CIL has floated a tender for engagement of an agency on BOO basis for setting -up a coal-based Methanol plant of a 2050 MTDA (0.676) capacity in the premises of Dankuni Coal Complex (DCC) near Kolkata. Coal sourced from Raniganj coalfields shall be gassified to produce syngas which shall be subsequently converted into methanol. The project will come up with an investment of about Rs 5800 Crs and 1.5 MT Coal will be supplied from Sonapur Bazari Mines of ECL.

11.3.3 Other Proposed Projects

CIL has further identified four different coal gasification projects in ECL, SECL, WCL and CCL wherein methanol, ammonia, ammonium nitrate and urea are expected to be produced. The pre-feasibility report has been prepared by PDIL and CMPDI has been engaged as a principle implementing agency for the project getting completed. NLCIL has also taken up one lignite to methanol project at Neyveli.

11.4 Indian Strategy for the Future of Coal Gasification

Honorable Prime Minister had announced a vision of 100 MT Coal Gasification by 2030. At present most of the coal produced in India is utilized in thermal power plants for power generation. Due to environmental concerns, in all likelihood, the requirement of coal for thermal power generation will reduce in long run. Accordingly, there is a need to find an alternative use of coal to prolong the life of coal and utilize the natural resources available in the country.

12. RESULT AND CONCLUSIONS

UCG has the potential to unlock vast amounts of previously inaccessible energy in unmineable coal resources. However, there are formidable obstacles to be overcome before this is possible, many of which are associated with the fact that the process takes place deep underground in a context where it is difficult (or impossible) to monitor and control the conditions. It seems probable that each potential UCG site will be unique as, in many senses, is every underground mining site. Conventional mining techniques developed over several decades and the necessary rules governing the conditions for safe extraction were heavily influenced by the results of serious accidents involving loss of life. While UCG involves entirely different risks, particularly in terms of the possibilities of water contamination, there will be no men

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

working underground. However, the uncertainties need to be properly assessed, based on the emerging experience gained from the current projects.

UCG requires a multi-disciplinary integration of knowledge from exploration, geology, hydrogeology, drilling, and of the chemistry and thermodynamics of gasification reactions in a cavity in a coal seam. This involves rethinking almost all past experience connected with coal utilization because there is commonly little contact and technical understanding between those who mine coal and others who use it. Even at an academic level, there are few experts who can cut across the boundaries between the geologists and mining engineers responsible for coal extraction, and the chemical and process engineers largely responsible for its use. In addition, many coal experts have developed an in-depth knowledge and understanding of their own coals and of their geological settings, but have limited practical knowledge of the coals and their associated geology which occur in other places. Where coal is mined, geological expertise is focused on its impact on conventional mine design, construction and operation, and in many places, this is based on decades of experience. The behavior of an UCG reactor/cavity is quite different and there is as yet very limited experience of what happens. UCG has the potential to provide access to vast coal resources and unlock a significant new source of energy for the future. While there are challenges to overcome, the benefits of UCG make it a promising technology for the energy and chemical industries. With careful planning and management, UCG can be carried out safely and sustainably, providing a pathway to a cleaner energy future.

REFERENCES

1. Aiman, W. R., Cena, R. J., Hill, R. W., Thorsness, C. B., & Stephens, D. R. (1980). "Highlights of the LLL Hoe Creek No. 3 underground coal gasification experiment." *Situ*, 4(2), 153-163.
2. Allen, J. R. L. (1990). "The formation of coastal peat marshes under an upward tendency of relative sea-level." *Journal of the Geological Society*, 147(5), 743-745.
3. Ambrožič, T., & Turk, G. (2003). "Prediction of subsidence due to underground mining by artificial neural networks." *Computers & Geosciences*, 29(5), 627-637.
4. Amy, P. S. (2018). *Microbiology of the terrestrial deep subsurface*. CRC press..
5. Bartle, K. (1991). "Solubilities of solids and liquids of low volatility in supercritical carbon dioxide." *Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data*, 20(4), pp.713–756.
6. Beauboeuf, R.T., McLaughlin, P.P., Bohacs, K.M., Suter, J.R. and Devlin, W.J. (1995). "Sequence stratigraphy of coal-bearing strata, Upper Cretaceous, Washakie basin, southwest Wyoming (abs.)." *AAPG Annual Meeting Abstracts*, pp.7–8.
7. Bechtel and General Electric (2005) About IGCC Power.
<http://www.cleanenergy.us/facts/igcc.htm>
8. Beyer, L., et al. (1986). "Large Scale Apparatus for Simulating UCG". *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Underground Coal Gasification Symposium*, DOE/FE/60922-H1.

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

9. Binley, A., Henry-Poulter, S. and Shaw, B. (1996). "Examination of solute transport in an undisturbed soil column using electrical resistance tomography." *Water Resources Research*, 32(4), pp.763–769.
10. Blinderman, M. S., & Jones, R. M. (2002). "The Chinchilla IGCC Project to Date: Underground Coal Gasification and Environment. Gasification Technologies Conference, San Francisco, USA, October 27-30, 14." *Situ*, 13, 1-53.
11. Blinderman, M.S. (2003a, 2003b, 2005a) UCG History.
http://www.ergoexergy.com/eUCG_his.htm
12. Blinderman, M.S. (2005b) UCG. <http://www.ergoexergy.com/eucg.htm>
13. Blinderman, M.S. and Friedmann, S.J. (2006). "Underground coal gasification and carbon capture and storage: Technologies and synergies for low-cost, low-carbon syngas and secure storage." *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, UCRL-ABS-218560*.
14. Bradshaw, J.B. and Dance, T. (2005) "Mapping geological storage prospectivity of CO₂ for the world sedimentary basins and regional source to sink matching." *In: 7th International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Technologies (GHGT-7), Vancouver, Canada, Sept 5–9, 2004*. Vol. I, pp.583–592.
15. Breault, R.W. (2010). "Gasification processes old and new: a basic review of the major technologies." *Energies*, Vol. 3, pp.216–240. DOI: 10.3390/en3020216.
16. British Geological Survey (2014) Underground Coal Gasification [online].
17. Britten, J. A., & Thorsness, C. B. (1988). "A mechanistic model for axisymmetric cavity growth during underground coal gasification." *Preprints of Papers, American Chemical Society, Division of Fuel Chemistry;(USA)*, 33(CONF-8806317-).
18. Britten, J. A., and Thorsness, C. B. (1987). *Further development of an axisymmetric global UCG (underground coal gasification) cavity growth simulator* (No. UCRL-96461; CONF-8708106-2). Lawrence Livermore National Lab., CA (USA).
19. Burton, E.A., Upadhye, R., Friedmann, S.J., Leif, R., McNab, W., Knauss, K., Ezzedine, S. and Smith, J.R. (2004). "Assessment of UCG site locations. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Internal report."
20. Campbell, J.H., Pellizzari, E. and Santor, S. (1978). "Results of a Groundwater Quality Study Near an Underground Coal Gasification Experiment" (Hoe Creek I). UCRL-52405.
21. Campbell, J.H., Wang, F.T., Mead, S.W. and Busby, J.F. (1979). "Groundwater quality Near an underground coal gasification experiment." *Journal of Hydrology*, 44, pp.241–266.

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.07.40

22. Cena, R.J., Hill, R.W., Stephens, D.R. and Thorsness, C.B. (1984). "The Centralia Partial Seam CRIP underground coal gasification experiment." UCRL-91252.
23. Couch, G. (2009) Underground Coal Gasification. 4th International Conference on Clean Coal Technology, IEA Clean Coal Centre. Available at: http://www.tu-freiberg.de/sites/default/files/media/professurfuer.und./2009_couch.pdf
24. Creedy, D.P., Garner, K., Holloway, S., Jones, N. and Ren, T.X. (2001). "Review of Underground Coal Gasification Technological Advancements." COAL R211, DTI/Pub URN 01/1041.
25. Daggupati, S., Mandapati, R.N., Mahajani, S.M., Ganesh, A., Pal, A.K., Sharma, R.K. and Aghalayam, P. (2011). "Compartment modeling for flow characterization of underground coal gasification cavity." *Industrial Engineering and Chemical Research*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp.277–290.
26. Davis, B.E. and Beath, A. (2006). "History of UCG in the USA". *Carbon Energy Associate USA & CSIRO*.http://www.fossil.energy.gov/international/Publications/ucg_1106_history.pdf
27. Dryburgh, P. (2013). "Status of underground coal gasification (UCG) as a commercial technology. Wardell Armstrong International." <http://wardell-armstrong.com>
28. Gregg, D.W., Hill, R.W. and Olness, D.U. (1976). "An overview of the Soviet effort in underground gasification of coal." *UCRL-52004, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory*.
29. Hammond, G.P. (2000). "Energy, environment and sustainable development: a UK perspective." *Trans IChemE, Part B: Process Safety and Environmental Protection*, Vol. 78, No. 4, pp.304–323. <http://www.bgs.ac.uk/research/energy/UCG.html> (accessed 18 November 2014).
30. Mitchum, R.M., Vail, P.R. and Thompson III, S. (1977). "Seismic stratigraphy and global changes of sea level." *In: C.E. Payton (ed.), AAPG Memoir 26*, pp.53–62.