

## Novel Methods for Sour Gas Treatment

Robert M. Baldwin<sup>1</sup>, Bruce R. Palmer<sup>1</sup>, and J. Douglas Way<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Chemical Engineering Program, The Petroleum Institute, PO Box 2533, Abu Dhabi, UAE

<sup>2</sup>Chemical Engineering Department, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA  
*rbaldwin@pi.ac.ae*

### 1. Introduction

Sour natural gas is currently treated to remove CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S and the concentrated H<sub>2</sub>S stream is sent to a Claus process to convert the H<sub>2</sub>S to elemental sulfur. However, the per-pass H<sub>2</sub>S conversion is only 93-96%, resulting in some “slip” of the H<sub>2</sub>S from the catalytic reaction stage of the process [1]. This stream contains small quantities of H<sub>2</sub>S which must be further treated. An efficient solution to this environmental separation problem would be to continuously remove and concentrate the H<sub>2</sub>S from the tail gas, and then recycle this concentrated H<sub>2</sub>S stream back to the Claus process. While this research project is tailored for process gas streams that contain small amounts of H<sub>2</sub>S, the developments will also apply to streams containing high concentrations of this component.

#### *Carbon molecular sieves*

Activated carbon materials are commonly used industrially to remove H<sub>2</sub>S from gas streams via fixed bed adsorption and high adsorption selectivities of H<sub>2</sub>S over N<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> have been demonstrated [2,3,4]. However, it would be more efficient if the small amount of H<sub>2</sub>S could be removed using a continuous process such as a membrane separator, rather than a cyclic process such as adsorption. Microporous carbon membranes often exhibit “reverse selectivity,” where more strongly adsorbed penetrants permeate faster than less strongly adsorbed species [5]. However, the strength of binding of the H<sub>2</sub>S to the CMS membrane is likely to be too strong, resulting in pore blocking and very low surface diffusivities of the adsorbed H<sub>2</sub>S. Consequently, in order to prepare a CMS membrane capable of removing dilute H<sub>2</sub>S from gas streams, strategies to reduce the strength of H<sub>2</sub>S binding with the carbon surface will be explored, including operating the membrane at elevated temperatures, surface modification of the carbon to make the carbon surface hydrophobic [7] and/or to remove surface oxygen groups such as carboxylic or phosphonic acids [3].

#### *Solid adsorbents*

Claus-process tail gas at 200°C consists of N<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>O, and CO<sub>2</sub> and minor amounts of H<sub>2</sub>S and SO<sub>2</sub> in equilibrium with gaseous S<sub>8</sub>. Solid adsorbents remove sulfur-bearing species through either physical adsorption or chemisorption. Physical adsorption would be affected with a porous solid such as a molecular sieve or activated carbon. Prior to adsorption, the gas stream would be cooled using the Cold-Bed Adsorption Process to condense elemental sulfur. This step prevents condensed sulfur from blocking adsorbent pores in the physical adsorption process. Both SO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S would then be removed with the solid adsorbent to attain desired residual sulfur levels. Adsorbed sulfur compounds would be desorbed thermally yielding hydrogen sulfide and sulfur dioxide, and probably some gaseous sulfur, at concentrations suitable for conventional Claus processing.

Chemisorption has the potential to yield lower residual sulfur concentrations than physical adsorption. One especially promising technique involves SO<sub>2</sub> oxidation with O<sub>2</sub> to yield adsorbed SO<sub>3</sub>. This process occurs readily under modest conditions on selected types of activated carbon. The SO<sub>3</sub> is bound very strongly to the activated carbon surface which insures effective sulfur removal. This process has been examined for sulfuric acid manufacture but has not been tested as a sulfur removal technique. We would examine this process for SO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S removal in the proposed research program. We further propose regenerating the activated carbon by SO<sub>3</sub> reduction with gaseous sulfur (S<sub>2</sub> or S<sub>8</sub>), H<sub>2</sub>S, CO or similar reducing gases. Gases from desorption would be recycled to the Claus furnace for sulfur recovery.

The purpose of the present research is to identify a suitable adsorbent system for H<sub>2</sub>S and SO<sub>2</sub> in Claus process tail gas. In a proposed research extension, we would obtain data to thoroughly define the processing conditions and understand the underlying science for adsorption and desorption. Finally we would examine the proposed technique in pilot-scale and plant-scale testing.

## 2. Key Features

Key features of the poster will be preliminary results of the theoretical adsorbent screening activities, with equilibrium conversions shown. For reasons of confidentiality, all results will be shown in terms of relative activities, and the exact compounds screened will not be specifically identified on the poster.

## 3. Conclusions

Conclusions to date include theoretical screening of a number of potential solid adsorbents for chemisorption of sulfur. Thermodynamic calculations concerning equilibrium conversion of the sulfur/adsorbent reaction has allowed a suite of materials to be identified which all have promise to achieve high activity and selectivity for sulfur removal from the Claus tail-gas. Results of these calculations will be presented.

## 4. References and Bibliography

1. Kohl, A., and Riesenfeld, F., 1979, "Gas Purification," 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Gulf Publishing, Houston, TX.
2. Calgon Carbon Corporation, "Fuels," <http://www.calgoncarbon.com/industry/fuels.html>
3. Bandosz, T.J., 1999, Carbon, vol. 37, pp. 483-491.
4. Burchell, T.D., Judkins, R.R., Rogers, M.R., and Williams, A.M., 1997, Carbon, vol. 35, pp. 1279.
5. Rao, M.B., and Sircar, S., 1993, J. Membrane Sci, vol. 85, pp. 253-264.
6. Ash, R., Barrer, R.M., and Lowson, R.T., 1973, J. Chem. Soc, Far. Trans. 1, vol. 69, pp. 2166.
7. Cosnier, F., Celzard, A., Furdin, G., Bégin, D., Maréché, J., and Barrés, O., 2005, Carbon, 43, pp. 2554.
8. Zhang, L., Gilbert, K., Baldwin, R.M., and Way, J.D., 2004, Chem. Eng. Comm., vol. 191, pp. 665-681.
9. Soffer, A., Koresh, J.E., and Saggy, S., 1987, U.S. Patent 4,685,940.
10. Lafyatis, D.S., Tung, J., and Foley, H.C., 1991, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., vol. 30, pp. 865.

## Acknowledgements

This work is funded by ADNOC/GASCO and ADGAS. The authors gratefully acknowledge this support.

## Author Biographies

**Dr. Robert M. Baldwin** (Principal Investigator) is Professor and Program Director of Chemical Engineering at The Petroleum Institute (PI), Abu Dhabi, UAE.

**Dr. Bruce R. Palmer** (co-Principal Investigator) is Professor of Chemical Engineering at the PI, and has 20 years experience in industrial chemistry applications. He served as Gas Research Institute advisor for 10 years and worked on sulfur recovery at Texasgulf Sulfur, Inc.

**Dr. J. Douglas Way** is Professor of Chemical Engineering at the Colorado School of Mines, USA, and has published extensively in the area of membrane research. Professor Way heads one of the most active and prestigious membrane research groups in the world and is an internationally-recognized expert in membrane synthesis and evaluation.