

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BERKSHIRE HATHAWAY ENERGY COMPANY
and PACIFICORP,
Petitioners

v.

BIRCHTECH CORP.
Patent Owner

DECLARATION OF INVENTOR JOHN PAVLISH

I, John Pavlish, declare and say as follows:

1. I am a citizen of the United States and am over 18 years of age. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated in this declaration.
2. I make this declaration to describe the conception and reduction to practice of invention of U.S. Patent No. 10,343,114 (“the ’114 Patent,”) and U.S. Patent No. 10,596,517 (“the ’517 Patent”).
3. Additionally, I have reviewed the Petitions and the Board’s preliminary findings in its institution decision, and I hereby provide responses to certain of the statements and positions made by the Board and the Petitioners.
4. Although I make this declaration on behalf of ME2C, my employer, other than the regular salary I receive from my employment duties, I am not being compensated for this declaration.

Personal Background

5. I have been the Chief Technology Officer and Senior Vice President of Midwest Energy Emissions Corporation since November 16, 2014. Prior to this, I served as an Executive Consultant Advisor to Midwest Energy Emissions Corporation. Prior to joining Midwest Energy Emissions Corporation, I was a Senior Research Advisor and the Director of the Center for Air Toxic Metals Program at the Energy & Environmental Research Center in Grand Forks, North Dakota.
6. I have over 30 years of mercury-related experience and am regarded as an international expert on the topic of mercury. My primary areas of interest and expertise include research, technical consultation and development of mercury control technologies, in particular, for coal combustion and gasification systems. I am an inventor of a number of patented mercury control technologies and have

years of experience in development and testing of these technologies for commercial applications.

7. I have served on numerous professional and technical committees and am a U.S. Representative on the Mercury Emissions from Coal International Experts Working Group on Reducing Emissions from Coal and a member of the United Nations Environment Programme Global Mercury Partnership, Reduction of Mercury Releases from Coal Combustion. I have published over 200 papers, articles, and reports on various mercury-related topics and issues.

8. I also have years of power plant experience and have worked for an engineering/consulting company, Black & Veatch, where I served as Unit Leader/System Engineer. I am a professional engineer, a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and a member of the Air & Waste Management Association (A&WMA).

The EPA Calls for New Mercury Removal Technology in the 1990s

9. The background story for this technology begins with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. That law required the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to study the impact of various hazardous air pollutants, including mercury.¹ To assist in the research, in 1992, the EPA established a National Center for Excellence at the Energy & Environmental Research Center (EERC) referred to as the Center for Air Toxic Metals (CATM). It is through the EERC that my fellow co-inventors and I would eventually discover the inventions claimed in the '114 and '517 patents. Our research focused heavily on developing new methods for detecting, measuring, and ultimately, removing mercury from coal-fired power plant exhaust gas.

¹ Ex. 2025, EPA Clean Air Act Overview, <https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/1990-clean-air-act-amendment-summary-title-iii>.

10. In 1997 and 1998, the EPA issued two reports to Congress: *Mercury Study Report to Congress* (issued December 1997)² and *Study of Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions from Electric Utility Steam* (issued February 1998).³ As an outcome of these studies, the EPA found a pressing need for regulation of mercury pollution from power plants. Unfortunately, EPA also found that no existing technologies were up to the task of significantly reducing the mercury pollution from those plants.⁴

11. In the wake of these reports, various governmental and industry organizations injected millions of dollars into basic scientific research and experimental studies in search for new mercury removal technologies. The EERC was one of those groups.

The EERC's Pilot Test Combustor

12. By the early 2000s, my co-inventors (Edwin Olson and Michael Holmes) and I had already spent several years studying mercury emissions testing and capture technologies at the EERC. As part of this work, we conducted various tests at the EERC's Pilot Test Combustor ("PTC"). The PTC is a coal combustion chamber with emission control equipment similar to that used at coal plants

² Ex. 2026, United States Environmental Protection Agency, "Mercury Study Report to Congress, Volume I: Executive Summary", EPA-452/R-97-003, December 1997, <https://www.epa.gov/mercury/mercury-study-report-congress>

³ Ex. 2024, United States Environmental Protection Agency, "Study of Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions from Electric Utility Steam Generating Units -- Final Report to Congress", United States Office of Air Quality EPA-453/R-98-004a, Environmental Protection Planning and Standards, February 1998, <https://www.epa.gov/mats/study-hazardous-air-pollutant-emissions-electric-utility-steam-generating-units-final-report>

⁴ Ex. 2024, Footnote 3 reference at ES-19, "Regarding potential methods for reducing mercury emissions, the EPA has not identified any demonstrated add-on control technologies currently in use in the U.S. that effectively remove mercury from utility emissions."


through out the United States. This system is designed to simulate the flue gas and emissions controls of much larger commercial scale combustors, and allow for testing of new technologies without posing risks to private coal plants that are connected to the electrical grid. Test experience on the PTC has shown that it produces flue gas that is representative of larger full-scale coal-fired power plants.

13. An image of the PTC is shown below. This is an accurate reflection of at least a portion of the system as it appeared in 2002:⁵



⁵ Ex. 2027, EERC presentation, “Description of Test Facilities Particulate Test Combustor”

14. The diagram below reflects the PTC layout as of 2002.⁷ A process flow diagram is shown below for the PTC, with additional equipment added such as a dry scrubber:



15. As shown above, the PTC included a coal feeder that could feed coal to the combustor. Emission gas from the combustor was channeled through various emission control equipment (*e.g.*, electrostatic precipitator, baghouses, dry scrubber). Various sample ports were placed throughout the PTC to conduct gas measurements (including mercury measurements), and to provide an entry point for injecting materials such as activated carbon sorbent.

16. As described below, my co-inventors and I developed and tested the patented technology using the PTC.

The EERC Kicks Off DOE-Funded Research into Coal Additives and Sorbents

17. By 2001, we had decided to focus on testing and evaluating various sorbents for use in mercury capture. However, PTC testing was relatively expensive, and thus we needed to obtain funding to perform in depth testing. In December 2001, we held a project meeting at the EERC to discuss overall project strategy and funding. The overall project goals were memorialized in the slides below from that meeting:⁶

Background

- Mercury is an Immediate Issue
 - December 2000 EPA decides regulation will be required
 - Regulations to be proposed by December 2003
 - Promulgation of regulations by December 2004
 - Compliance by 2007
 - MACT discussions (EPA) and 3P discussions (Congress)
 - Canadian consultative process for “Canadawide Standards” for mercury emissions from coal-fired electricity generation
- Mercury Emissions from Lignite Coals, More Challenging
 - Higher fraction of elemental mercury
 - Potentially less reactive toward catalysts and sorbents
 - Different flue gas and fly ash characteristics

 **EERC**
Energy & Environmental Research Center

⁶ These slides are attached as Exhibit 2028.

Project Goals

Develop, Test, and Demonstrate Sorbent-Based Technologies for Utilities Burning Lignite Coal

- Increase the scientific understanding of mercury / flue gas interactions leading to more effective design of sorbents
- Test a range of sorbent-based technology options
- Determine and demonstrate optimum conditions and sorbents for Hg capture in pilot facility
- Field demonstrate sorbent-based technology to prove and quantify effectiveness, performance, and cost



Focus on Sorbent-Based Technology

- Most plants are equipped with particulate control devices
- Sorbent injection can be easily added to these plants at relatively low cost as compared to other mercury control options
- Preliminary bench- and pilot-scale tests indicate that carbon-based sorbents may be effective for mercury capture under certain conditions. More data needed under different conditions
- For units equipped with scrubbers, catalytic oxidation may be an option. Some sorbents have the potential to facilitate oxidation.



18. As shown above, by December 2001, we had already determined to focus on sorbent-based technology, and in particular, carbon-based sorbents. Moreover, we had recognized that under certain conditions, a catalyst could be used so that the sorbent would both oxidize and capture mercury.

19. By February 2002, the EERC obtained a commitment from the Department of Energy (“DOE”) to provide funding for the project. This funding was provided pursuant to a Cooperative Agreement with the EERC (No. DE-FC26-98FT40321), and designated for JV Task 45 – Mercury Control Technologies for Electric Utilities Burning Lignite Coal. Based on the success of this project, this work would later be referred to the Phase I bench- and pilot-scale testing. The results of the project were later summarized in a report provided to the DOE.⁷

20. The EERC held a kickoff meeting to discuss the project on February 28, 2002. During this meeting we discussed the project timeline and overall strategy. As shown below,⁸ part of the focus of the project was to identify sorbents and oxidation options. In particular, we had identified a reaction between chlorine⁹ and activated carbon that we intended to study further.¹⁰


⁷ Ex. 2032, “JV TASK 45 – MERCURY CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES FOR ELECTRIC UTILITIES BURNING LIGNITE COAL, PHASE I BENCH- AND PILOT-SCALE TESTING Final Report” (Oct. 2003) (the “October 2003 Report”).

⁸ These slides are attached as Exhibit 2029.

⁹ For ease of reading, references in this declaration to “chlorine” and “bromine” generally use these terms to refer to chemical compounds that contain chlorine and bromine atoms.

¹⁰ These slides are attached as Exhibit 2030.

Mechanism of Mercury Capture with Carbon Sorbents



Sorbent Options

- Sorbents – injection and capture with particulate control
 - Carbons: activated carbons derived from coal, impregnated with iodine, sulfur, and other materials
 - Metal oxides: oxides of iron, manganese, and other metals
 - Calcium silicates – derived from fly ash or slag
 - Lime/activated carbon
 - Na_2S_4 -impregnated activated carbon
 - Activated carbon derived from tires (Wojtowicz and Serio, Patent No. 6,322,613)
 - Iron chloride
 - Titania with added metals/oxides
 - Palladium chloride
 - Noble metals: gold, tin, zinc, copper, lead, cadmium, silver
 - Corn fibers
 - Fly ash reinjection (Knowles, Patent No. 5,787,823).

Oxidation Options

- Oxidizing agents: react with elemental mercury and oxidize for control in a scrubber; little distinction between sorbents and oxidizing agents
 - Transition metals: iron, chromium, nickel, and others
 - Selective catalytic reduction (SCR) catalysts have shown ability to oxidize elemental Hg.
 - Iron oxide: maghemite and HCl
 - Carbon beds
 - Noble metal – gold-coated silica bed and dilute HCl (Meishen and Van Pelt, Patent No. 6,136,281)
 - Permanganate
 - Iron chloride
 - UV radiation and titanium dioxide (Biswas and Wu, Patent No. 6,248,217)




21. Following this kickoff meeting, we tested various sorbents, additives, and other variations at the PTC. Much of this initial work focused on the use of chlorine-based additives and activated carbon sorbents. One of the discoveries consistently demonstrated through that testing was the beneficial effect of combining a coal additive upstream of the combustor, and a sorbent used downstream of the combustor.


22. These results were memorialized, for example, in slides prepared for a post-testing review meeting held on February 3, 2003.¹¹ As shown in the slides below, comparative testing of sorbents and additives demonstrated an improvement over merely using sorbents, and a significant improvement over baseline testing:

¹¹ These slides are attached as Exhibit 2031.

The Effect of Oxidant Addition on Mercury Speciation – Freedom Coal



The Effect of Additives on Mercury Emissions under Different Control Configurations – Freedom Coal



23. The testing described above was conducted during the summer and fall of 2002. I, along with others at the EERC, compiled and analyzed the results of this work into a report provided to the DOE—The October 2003 Report.¹²

24. By the end of the fall of 2002 funding for that PTC testing had been exhausted. Nonetheless, our work had demonstrated sufficiently promising results such that additional funding for PTC testing was procured.

25. Specifically, funding was sought under the CATM program (approval of research at the September 9, 2002 Research Advisory Council meeting for the Center for Air Toxic Metals) and a new round of funding through a North Dakota led initiative to test mercury control technologies. Through this effort a project entitled “Pilot- and Full-Scale Demonstration of Advanced Mercury Control Technologies for Lignite-Fired Power Plants” was funded through an EERC-DOE Cooperative Agreement No. DE-FC26-03NT41897.¹³ This round of funding was used for PTC testing conducted in 2003.

Conception and Initial Reduction to Practice of Bromine as the Coal Additive

26. As described in the October 2003 report, by the time of the 2002 PTC testing, my co-inventors and I had conceived of using a pre-boiler additive to boost the performance of post-boiler, injected activated carbon sorbent.¹⁴ Testing coal additives was just one portion of the work we (the EERC) were doing for the DOE project. At least initially, our work focused on the use of chlorine (chlorides, chlorine, chlorine compounds, chlorine salts, etc.) as the additive. This is because the role of chlorine (chlorides, chlorine, chlorine compounds, etc.) in combustion

¹² Ex. 2032.

¹³ Ex. 2012, “PILOT- AND FULL-SCALE DEMONSTRATION OF ADVANCED MERCURY CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES FOR LIGNITE-FIRED POWER PLANTS,” (Feb. 2004) (the “February 2004 Report”).

¹⁴ Ex. 2032, October 2003 Report at 51.

had already been studied to some degree. Thus, testing with chlorine was viewed as a logical extension of chlorine-related research and a reasonable approach for a government-funded project.

27. However, on some occasions, after we had completed the required testing, we had some additional time with the PTC when we could experiment with more speculative approaches. It is during one of these “after hours” tests that we first tested the use of a bromine-based additive provided on the coal and injecting activated carbon downstream of the combustor. This decision was by no means obvious as I explained in my testimony submitted during prosecution of the ’114 patent.¹⁵ In fact, we were surprised and impressed with the results even if they were based on limited data at the time. However, because this testing was not a part of an officially funded project, we did not keep as detailed records of the testing.

28. I have attempted to locate documents to pinpoint when we conceived of using bromine as the additive, and when we conducted these after-hours tests with bromine. As part of that search, I located a list of potential research ideas that I had compiled in preparation for a September 9, 2002 Research Advisory Council meeting for the Center for Air Toxic Metals. This was an internal document that was used to keep track of potential research projects that I would oversee as Director of the CATM program.¹⁶ The metadata for this document indicates that I last edited it on August 30, 2002:¹⁷

¹⁵ Ex. 1026, ’114 file history at 1775–1819.

¹⁶ This document is attached at Ex. 2015.

¹⁷ An image of this metadata is attached at Ex. 2016.

Properties ▾

Size	78.0KB
Pages	8
Words	2725
Total Editing Time	6 Minutes
Title	Center for Air Toxic Metals
Tags	Add a tag
Comments	Add comments

Related Dates

Last Modified	8/30/2002 5:43 PM
Created	8/30/2002 5:43 PM
Last Printed	8/30/2002 2:10 PM

Related People

Author	J jpavlish Add an author
Last Modified By	JP John Pavlish

29. This document notes our discovery that chlorine (chlorides, chlorine, chlorine compounds, chlorine salts, etc.) or other additives can enhance the effectiveness of sorbents:

1. Evaluate various chlorine (or other) additives for enhancement of sorbent reactivity/effectiveness. Recent pilot and field data suggest that introducing low-cost additives may significantly improve sorbent effectiveness, leading to better sorbent utilization. Additives to the fuel, sorbent, or directly to the flue gas should be considered.

30. It also identifies the need for studying the use of bromine (bromides, bromine, bromine compounds, bromine salts, etc.) to expedite mercury oxidation:

4. Control of Hg Emissions Using Ultraviolet (UV) Light and Ionized Halogens. There is evidence that UV light and halogens (Cl and Br) from sea ice catalyze the oxidation of elemental Hg in the Arctic and Antarctic atmospheres, causing the oxidized form of mercury to deposit on the snow. An investigation of the fundamental mechanism of oxidation needs to be done to validate the hypothesis and to determine the fundamental reaction process and rates, the optimum level of Cl or Br radicals to expedite the reaction, synergisms between the two halogens, and to surmise whether SO_x and NO_x may have any detrimental effects on the oxidation reaction in real combustion flue gas. A novel control technology approach might evolve from this fundamental work.

31. Thus, at least by August 30, 2002, we had conceived of using bromine as the additive to coal combustion systems. As discussed above and throughout, in the months that followed and continuously during this period, we worked dilligently to secure funding to conduct additional PTC tests.

32. Once we had received funding and were able to conduct the next round of testing at the PTC, we planned to perform at least some tests using a pre-boiler bromine-based additive with post-boiler activated carbon sorbent.

Testing Bromine Additive Combined with Activated Carbon Sorbent

33. The next round of PTC testing began in 2003. Of particular relevance here, from September 8, 2003, to September 19, 2003, we tested various coal additives and sorbents, including the combined use of bromine additive and activated carbon sorbent. Those tests were recorded in PTC run logbooks that described and documented the conditions, activities, and procedural steps followed during each test.

34. The purpose of the logbook was to document that a test (or a series of tests) had been performed on the PTC on a specific date and time and to record real time events that accurately described: how the test (s) were conducted, the actual operating conditions of the test unit and any problems or upset that may have occurred as the test (s) proceeded, specific test parameters (such as injection rate of bromine, injection rate of sorbents, etc.), sample collection, data collection, and general observations. The date, operating conditions, test parameters, and events

of testing are important for interpreting and understanding the data acquired from the testing. Access and input to the logbook was limited to the technicians and operators running the test on the PTC. For the September 2003 testing described here, those technicians and operators were working at the direction of myself and my co-inventors. These logbooks are provided at Exhibit 2017.

35. The logbook entry for September 18, 2003, at 18:36 records the addition of sodium bromide to the coal:

TITLE <u>PTC-EM-639</u>		Project No. <u>7-249/7300</u>	Book No. <u>CONFIDENTIAL</u>
from Page No. <u>1836</u>	STARTED SODIUM BROMIDE FEEDER @ 40g/hr 375 SET		
1904	3 lbs coal - 48g Sodium Bromide		
1926	Added <u>204 lbs</u> Coal		
	Added new batch Sodium Bromide Coal to Feeder		
	Same blend 3 lbs C 48g SB @ 40g/hr		
Witnessed & Understood by me,		Date <u>9/18/03</u>	Invented by
			Recorded by

36. The logbook also records several additional times when a halide such as sodium bromide was added. In addition, the logbook records the use of activated carbon sorbent:

11:58	Added <u>196.8 grams</u> of Carbon to the k-tron feeder inlet to the ESP	BR
12:25	Open port, installing Sampling Probe for M-26	RL
12:26	Started M-26 sampling, ESP-inlet T1-9	GF
13:26	Done with M-26	
13:27	Port open to Remove Sampling probe M-26	RL
To Page No. _____		
Witnessed & Understood by me,		Date
		9/18/03
Invented by		Date
Recorded by		

1358	SHUT OFF CARBON + SALT FEEDERS - BYPASSED FLOW TO DROP ASH BOMB	BR
1408	FLOW BACK THROUGH ESP/ANPC - WHILE BYPASSED - DROPPED ASH BOMB - - PULSED/RAPPED ESP + ANPC - BLEW BACK HEAT TRACE LINE, FILTER AND PORT ON S.P. #1 - RESET DATA ACQUISITION	BR/RL
1414	FEEDERS BACK ON	BR

0950	START SODIUM Bromide NaBr 5/65 coal/809 ^{Granite} grms 10 grams/hour Setting 074	DL
1005	BLEW BACK SAMPLE PORT #1	BR/L
10:28	start Norit FGD carbon 149/hr 20rpm	Ve
1106	DRAINED ice bath condenser	JH
1131	Shut off CARBON Feeder	JH/K
1152	Added Coal [270165]	JH/K
11:57	start EERC HCl pre-treat sorbent 149/hr 20rpm (396.1g total Volume added)	Ve
1306	Blew Out sample port #1 Probe - O2's were coming close together O2 on sample port #3 was dropping off indicating A plug ON #1	KJ
To Page No. _____		
Witnessed & Understood by me,		Date
Date 9-19-03		Invented by
		Recorded by

451	Started Carbon Injection 109/hr (Br treated)	Ve
1459	Zero & spanned SO2 sample port #1	KJ
15:18	Increase Br treated carbon to 159/hr	Ve
1542	Added coal [122165]	JH/K
4:59	Started Feeder NaBr, 109/hr	He
		10 gr per hour Sodium Bromide
To Page No. _____		
Witnessed & Understood by me,		Date
Date 9-19-03		Invented by
		Recorded by

PTC-FM-639		Book No.	171
Page No.			
553	Blew out Sample port #1 Probe and static lines		JH/KJ
608	DRAINED Ice bath CONDENSOR		JH
16:22	stop NaBr injection stop br treated carbon injection		

37. Note that the title in this logbook for this test is "PTC-FM-639." As explained below, the results of this testing were later reported to the DOE.

38. Below is an image of the additive apparatus used to supply additive to the coal feeder during these tests:



39. Below is an image of the activated carbon injection system used to inject sorbent during these tests:



40. The results from this September 2003 testing were significant. They confirmed that the use of bromine additive on the coal combined with activated carbon injection downstream from the combustion chamber provided significantly improved mercury capture as compared to methods employing chlorine additive or activated carbon without bromine addition.¹⁸ As a result, the EERC initially

¹⁸ We understood that these results would not only apply to sodium bromide, but that they would be replicated if the sodium bromide were replaced with any other bromine-containing substances, including bromine liquid (*e.g.*, Br₂), bromides (*e.g.*, Br⁻), other bromine compounds (*e.g.*, HBr), and bromine salts (*e.g.*, CaBr₂). We understood that all bromine and bromine-containing compounds have boiling point temperatures much lower than the extremely high temperatures in a coal-fired power plant's boiler combustion and that any bromine containing substance would be reduced to bromine atoms in the high temperature combustion flame zone.

decided to maintain the use of bromine as an in-situ treatment as proprietary intellectual property.

41. The EERC also conducted additional follow up testing in late 2003, early 2004, and spring/summer of 2004. Some samples of log book entries from those tests are shown below:

1715	Started NA BR Feeder 20 g/hr 203 setting	MH
729	Flue GAS Flow Rate 132.56	JH
732	Started ~~EGD~~ CARBON Feeder 10 g/hr	Y2
1759	Pulsed BH 10.5" → 2.3" AP	MH
1805	Lowered NA BR feeder to 10 g/hr 112 setting	MH
1816	Pulsed B4 4.7" → 2.8" AP	MH

Inspected & Understood by me,	Date 12-11-03	Invented by	Date
		Recorded by	

0802	Coal Mix Sorbent Feeder 5 lbs Coal 80 grams NA BR	h
0814	INCREASED ESP CURRENT TO 3.5 mA	JCA
0842	filled Sorbent feeder (10 lbs coal, 160 grams NA BR)	h

Inspected & Understood by me,	Date 2-4-04	Invented by	Date
		Recorded by	

Project No.		Book No.	
PTC-CA-641			
Page No.			
0852	BYPASS ESP - RAPPED ESP + DUMPED ASH		
0853	BACK ON LINE		
0857	Ash weight 4.97 lbs Sample taken T 11		
0902	Started sorbent feeder setting 110 (T 12) 10 grams NaBr/hour		BR
0945	Note! ** Recalculate $CaCl_2$ injection rates from 02/03/01		DME
0950	VIBRATOR QUIT - GOT IT GOING AGAIN		BR/RL
10TE	ABOUT 9:30 WENT OUT TO ID STACK AND RAPPED ON PIPE. THERE WAS QUITE A BIT OF ASH COMING OUT OF STACK.		BR
0958	BYPASS FLOW - RAPPED ESP		
0959	Flow BACK THROUGH ESP Dumped Ash 2.46 lbs Sample Taken (T 12)		BR RL
1028	Started Carbon feeder 44 RPM = 25 grams/hour Started T 13		RL
1031	Adjusted Secondary Air (Lowered) to account for the air going in at the carbon feeder.		RL
11:52	Added Coal 178 lbs		RL BR
1206	changed the carbon feeder to 26 RPM (15 grams/hour) T 14 Started		BR
12:54	Started O-H Sampling inlet and outlet of the ESP.		RL
To Page No.			
Inspected & Understood by me,		Date	Inspected by
2/4/04			
		Date	Reviewed by

Project No. 4884

Book No.

TITLE PTC-CA-641

Page No.

1455	Sorbent feed turned off Done with O-H Sampling T-14	PK K
1512	Bypassed flow, Power off Rapped	MH KJ
1515	ESP back on Line dumped Ash <u>10.75 lbs</u> Took sample	MA/KJ KJ/mth
534	Finished Adding coal <u>1500 lbs</u>	
550	Started Sorbent feed NaBr 5 grams per hour <u>78 set pt</u>	KJ/Dm
1640	Had problems with O ₂ . Found that when Int was repaired they had changed some of the Input signals Reading right now	PK MH JA
1646	Installed probe	GF
1647	Start of T-15 Method 29 inlet	GF/MH
1747	E.O.T. - 15 Method 29 inlet	GF MH
1749	Removed sample probe	GF
1751	Reduced Sorbent feed Na br To <u>60 set pt</u> 2.5 g/hr.	MH
1845	Shut off Sorbent feeder <u>NaBr</u>	KJ/Dm
1857	Cleaned out Sorbent feeder Then put in 1.25 g of Na BR, Ca Cl ₂ lbs/hr Setting on feeder of 110 - 2.85 g/hr of the mix 10 grams Na BR 13.24 g Ca Cl ₂ .2H ₂ O 5 lbs coal	MH KJ

read & Understood by me.

Date

2/4/04

Invented by.

Date

In particular, in February 2004 we performed additional testing with greater variation in the ratios of bromine (bromides, bromine, bromine compounds, bromine salts, etc.) to activated carbon. This additional testing demonstrated that even relatively small amounts of added bromine could significantly improve mercury capture, despite other theorized reactions that could potentially occur and consume bromine in coal combustion flue gas.

EERC Reports the Results to the DOE

42. Following the testing described above, the EERC prepared various reports to the DOE describing tests conducted by the EERC, and interpretation of the data obtained from these tests. My co-inventors and I received support from others at the EERC in preparing these reports. I do not believe that any of those individuals contributed to the actual inventions claimed in the applications that ultimately led to the '114 and '517 patents.

43. In February 2004, the EERC delivered a report to the DOE describing the results of our September 2003 testing (the "Feb. 2004 Report").¹⁹ This report explained that coal and additives were added to the PTC (i.e., upstream of the combustor) and sorbent was injected downstream of the combustor. Mercury levels were monitored both before and after the emission gas passed through an electrostatic precipitator (ESP) by using a continuous mercury monitor (CMM):

¹⁹ See Ex. 2012, Feb. 2004 Report at 12 (providing coal analysis for "PTC-FM-639," the PTC testing identifier from the logbooks described above); *id.* at 17 (explaining that this testing occurred in September 2003).




Figure 4. Injection and sampling schematic of the PTC with an ESP.

44. The report also described the 14 tests conducted during the September tests:


Table 1. Test Matrix for Unscrubbed Systems Equipped with ESPs

Test No.	Mercury Oxidant Additive		Sorbent	
	Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf
T1-1(Baseline)	None	NA	None	NA
T1-2	None	NA	DARCO® FGD	2.75–18.4
T1-3	NaCl	3.76–14.7	None	NA
T1-4	NaCl	3.76–14.7	DARCO® FGD	2.75–4.59
T1-5	SEA 2	1.84–7.34	None	NA
T1-6	SEA 2	1.84	DARCO® FGD	2.57
T1-7	NaCl	7.34–11.0	HCl-Treated FGD	2.57–4.59
T1-8	None	NA	EERC-Treated Carbon	1.84–2.75
T1-9	SEA 2	1.84	EERC-Treated Carbon	2.75
T1-10	Zn	7.34	None	NA
T1-11	Zn and NaCl	7.34–11.0	None	NA
T1-12	None	NA	Na ₂ S ₄ (solution)	0.89–6.67
T1-13	CaCl ₂	11	DARCO® FGD	0–4.59
T1-14	None	NA	ALSTOM Sorbent	1.1–3.1

45. This test matrix indicates that test T-6 employed the additive SEA2 and the sorbent DARCO FGD. DARCO FGD is the trade name for a powdered activated carbon product from Cabot (formerly Norit Americas). “SEA2” was a code name for the sodium bromide additive because, at the time, the EERC maintained the

specific chemical composition of SEA2 as proprietary. Nonetheless, as noted above from the logbook, this additive was sodium bromide.

46. In February 2005, the EERC provided a further report to the DOE with additional analysis of this testing (the “Feb. 2005 Report”).²⁰ It noted: “The significant improvement by DARCO® FGD–SEA2 is not merely an additive effect but more a synergistic response. The SEA2 addition in the combustion zone not only enhances gaseous mercury conversion to particulate-associated mercury, but also improves DARCO® FGD carbon reactivity with mercury species.” It also reported that the combination of SEA2 and activated carbon performed significantly better than alternative approaches:



47. This report also described additional testing performed with SEA2 and activated carbon in December 2003, as noted in the PTC logbook shown below.

²⁰ See Ex. 2013, Feb. 2005 Report at 10 (providing coal analysis for “PTC-FM-639,” the PTC testing identifier from the logbooks described above); *id.* at 9 (explaining that this testing occurred in September 2003).

1715	Started NA BR Feeder 20 g/hr 203 setting	MH
729	Flue GAS Flow Rate 132.56	JH
732	Started ~~EGD~~ CARBON Feeder 10 g/hr	YZ
1759	Pulsed BH 10.5" → 2.3" AP	MH
1805	Lowered NA BR feeder to 10 g/hr 112 setting	MH
1816	Pulsed B4 4.7" → 2.8" AP	MH
		To Page No.
Witnessed & Understood by me,		Date
12-11-03		Invented by
		Date
		Recorded by

The results of the December 2003 tests are shown below (Feb. 2005 Report at 23, 25, 28):




Table 10. Mercury Control Test Matrix

Coal Additive	Feed Rate, lb/Macf	Sorbent	Injection Rate, lb/Macf
None	NA	None	NA
None	NA	DARCO [®] FGD	1.84, 3.67, 7.35, and 11.0
None	NA	EERC-treated FGD	1.84, 3.67, and 7.35
None	NA	Amended Silicate TM	7.35
NaCl	3.67, 7.35, and 11.0	None	NA
NaCl	3.67, 7.35, and 11.0	DARCO [®] FGD	3.67
SEA2	1.84 and 3.67	None	NA
SEA2	1.84 and 3.67	DARCO [®] FGD	1.84
CaCl ₂	3.67, 7.35, and 11.0	None	NA
CaCl ₂	3.67, 7.35, and 11.0	DARCO [®] FGD	3.67

48. The chart below provides an exemplary description of the effect of varying SEA2 and carbon addition rates on mercury capture:




Figure 40. SDA inlet and FF outlet CMM results and SDA-FF Hg(g) removal efficiencies before, during, and after SEA2 additions and DARCO[®] FGD injection into the Center lignite coal and combustion flue gas, respectively.

49. An October 2005 Report described further testing conducted in February 2004 (the “Oct. 2005 Report”):²¹

Table 9-2. Week 1 – Test Matrix

Date	Sampling Inlet	Sampling Outlet	Sorbent	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf	Oxidant	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf
2/2/04	OH M-29	OH	Baseline					
			Baseline					
			DARCO	25.0	7.03			
			DARCO	28.0	7.84			
			DARCO	32.0	8.96			
			DARCO	45.0	12.60			
2/3/04	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	69.0	19.20			
			Baseline					
						SEA1	15.2	4.28
						SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	45.5	12.80
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	59.9	16.73
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	15.2	4.28
2/4/04	OH M-29	OH	Baseline					
						SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	25.0	6.96	SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	15.0	4.18			
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	6.9	1.92
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	4.3	1.20
			DARCO	15.0	4.18			
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA1–SEA2	2.6	0.72
2/5/2004	OH	OH	Baseline					
			EERC carbon	25.0	6.97			
			EERC carbon	35.0	9.76			
			Am. Silicate	25.0	6.91			
			Am. Silicate	50.0	13.82			

Notes:

M-29 = EPA Method 29

EERC carbon = EERC-treated DARCO carbon

Am. Silicate = Amended Silicate

SEA1–SEA2 = 50%–50% blend of SEA1 and SEA2. The total rate for both is given.

²¹ Ex. 2014, Oct. 2005 Report at 20 (“EPA Method 29 was used for trace element sampling of the flue gas during Week 1 (February 2–4, 2004) testing of Caballo coal. Samples were collected at the ESP inlet upstream of the carbon injection location during three different conditions: baseline and SEA1 and SEA2 additions. The objective was to determine the effects of SEA additions on trace metal concentrations and particle–gas partitioning.”); *id.* at 27.

Responses to Statements Regarding Conception and Reduction to Practice

50. I have reviewed the Board’s institution decision, which explained that Patent Owner’s evidence of reduction to practice may be insufficient because Patent Owner did not “explain how disclosure of sodium bromide (NaBr) in its antedating documents supports the full scope of what is claimed, i.e., “Br₂, HBr, a bromide compound, or a combination thereof.” *See* IPR2025-00274, Paper 33 at 46.

51. As explained above, my co-inventors and I understood that the above-described test results would not only apply to sodium bromide, but that they would be replicated if the sodium bromide were replaced with other bromine-containing substances, including molecular bromine (e.g., Br₂), bromides (e.g., Br⁻), or HBr.

52. These other bromine-containing compounds have boiling point temperatures much lower than the extremely high temperatures in a coal-fired power plant’s boiler combustion, and it was understood that they would be reduced to bromine atoms in the high temperature combustion flame zone.

Responses to Statements Regarding Non-Obviousness of the Invention

53. I understand that the Board stated that “the skilled artisan would have had reason to modify the teachings of Vosteen⁵⁸⁹²² with either of Starns²³ or Mass-EPA²⁴” such that, together, those publications teach a representative claim of the ’114 Patent. *See* Paper 33, IPR2025-00274 at 33.

²² “Vosteen589” refers to U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0013589, issued to B. Vosteen. Ex. 1005.

²³ “Starns” refers to Starnes, Travis, et al., *Full-Scale Test of Mercury Control with Sorbent Injection and an ESP at Wisconsin Electric’s Pleasant Prairie Power Plant*, Session AE1-C, Paper No. 43249, AIR & WASTE MANAGEMENT’S ASSOCIATION’S 95TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, June 23–27, 2002. Ex. 1008.

²⁴ “Mass-EPA” refers to Massachusetts Dep. of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Waste Prevention, *Evaluation of the Technological and Economic Feasibility of Controlling and Eliminating Mercury Emissions from the Combustion of Solid Fossil Fuel*, Dec. 2002, available at

54. Respectfully, I disagree. Conventional wisdom would not have drawn others in the coal-fired power plant industry to combine pre-combustion addition of bromine with post-combustion injection of activated carbon.

55. Instead, researchers in the field—including the EPA—explored research into methods for pre-treating sorbents with various additives, including chlorine, and then injecting those pre-treated sorbents downstream of the boiler. *See* Ex. 2043 at 5-33 to 5-34. This approach also ensured that the sorbent additive would have plenty of time to react with the sorbent: the EPA explained that, for many plants, injected sorbents would have only a few seconds to find and react with mercury present in the flue gas, with high and costly carbon-to-Hg ratios needed to achieve adequate mercury removal. *Id.*

56. Thus, at the time my co-inventors and I conceived of and reduced our invention to practice (and subsequently filed a provisional patent application), the conventional wisdom was that pre-treating the sorbent with halogens or halides was a worthy topic of research, but it was not clear that the two-step process would be a promising solution. Indeed, that is why I was so surprised and excited with the test results described above.

Conclusion

57. As explained above, my co-inventors and I conceived of the inventions of the '114 and '517 patents at least as early as August 2002. We reduced those inventions to practice at least by September 2003 as documented in testing logbooks and EERC reports to the DOE.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20030411074158/http://www.state.ma.us/dep/bwp/daq/c/files/mercfeas.pdf> and at <https://www.mass.gov/doc/evaluation-of-technologicaleconomic-feasibility-of-controlling-eliminating-mercuryemissions/download>. Ex. 1009.

58. A claim chart comparing these documents to the claims of the '114 and '517 patents is attached to this declaration.

59. I further declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true, and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by a fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the patents at issue in these proceedings.

Dated: December 12, 2025

By: John Pavlish
John Pavlish

'114 Claim Chart

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
<i>1a</i>	A method of separating mercury from a mercury-containing gas, the method comprising:	The Feb. 2004 Report (Ex. 2012) describes the September 2003 testing (page 10): The pilot-scale test was started on September 8, 2003, and was completed on September 19, 2003. A 550,000-Btu/hr pulverized coal (pc)-fired unit, known as the PTC, was used to fire lignites and test mercury control options. The coal combustion flue gas exiting the PTC was cooled down to a nominal temperature of 149°C (300°F) and then was introduced into a single-wire tubular ESP unit. Figure 4 shows the schematic diagram of the system. Furnace additives were added to coal prior to introduction to the furnace. Mercury sorbents were fed with a K-Tron dual-screw feeder upstream of the ESP. CMMs were used to monitor mercury vapor concentrations at the ESP inlet (Site 1) and outlet (Site 2) 24 h per day for the entire testing period. Several OH method samples (ASTM D6784 Standard Test Method for Elemental, Oxidized, Particle-Bound and Total Mercury in Flue Gas Generated from Coal-Fired Stationary Sources) were collected at the ESP inlet and outlet throughout the testing period as verification of the CMM data. Fourteen tests were completed to evaluate various sorbent and mercury oxidant performance on mercury removal across the ESP as functions of feed rate. A detailed test matrix is listed in Table 1. Ten additional tests were performed to evaluate mercury control with the <i>Advanced Hybrid™</i> filter and are summarized under Task 4 Results and Discussion. The Feb. 2004 Report(Ex. 2012) also describes additional testing in December 2003 (page 14-15):


No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		One week of short-term sorbent (Task 2.2) and furnace additive testing was accomplished in December 2003 to demonstrate mercury removal by sorbent injection combined with various oxidizing additives to simulate a scrubbed baghouse system. The 580 MJ/h (550,000 Btu/h) pulverized coal PTC unit was equipped with a Niro Inc. Produciton Minor Spray Dryer Model I and baghouse and fired with Center lignite coal. Table 4 summarizes the test matrix for the spray dryer–baghouse configuration. Based on previous pilot-scale testing results of ESP mercury removal effectiveness, three additives (NaCl, CaCl₂, and another for which the EERC is assessing the intellectual property issues) were evaluated. CMMs were set up at the inlet to the spray dryer upstream of the sorbent injection port at the outlet of the baghouse to monitor mercury vapor concentrations continuously throughout the 4-day test. Six OH method samples were collected at the same locations to verify CMM measurements and performance of the sorbents and additive injection. A Thermo Environmental Model 15C HCl analyzer was The October 2005 Report describes additional testing in February 2004 (page 20): sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄)–potassium permanganate (KMnO₄) solutions. EPA Method 29 was used for trace element sampling of the flue gas during Week 1 (February 2–4, 2004) testing of Caballo coal. Samples were collected at the ESP inlet upstream of the carbon injection location during three different conditions: baseline and SEA1 and SEA2 additions. The objective was to determine the effects of SEA additions on trace metal concentrations and particle–gas partitioning.
1b	combusting coal in a combustion chamber, to provide	The Feb. 2004 Report explains that coal was combusted in a 550,000-Btu/hr pc-fire combustor (known as the PTC) (page 10):


No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	the mercury-containing gas,	The pilot-scale test was started on September 8, 2003, and was completed on September 19, 2003. A 550,000-Btu/hr pulverized coal (pc)-fired unit, known as the PTC, was used to fire lignites and test mercury control options. The coal combustion flue gas exiting the PTC was cooled down to a nominal temperature of 149°C (300°F) and then was introduced into a single-wire tubular ESP unit. Figure 4 shows the schematic diagram of the system. Furnace additives were added to coal prior to introduction to the furnace. Mercury sorbents were fed with a K-Tron dual-screw feeder upstream of the ESP.
<i>Ic</i>	wherein the mercury-containing gas comprises a halogen or halide promoter comprising HBr, Br⁻, or a combination thereof, wherein the coal comprises added Br₂, HBr, Br⁻, or a combination thereof, added to	The Feb. 2004 Report describes adding coal and additives (including SEA 2) to the combustion chamber during the September 2003 testing (page 18): SEA 2 is noted as NaBr in the PTC logbooks, and when combusted with coal, produces a mercury-containing gas comprised of a bromine halogen or halide promoter.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	the coal upstream of the combustion chamber, or the combustion chamber comprises added Br₂, HBr, Br⁻, or a combination thereof, or a combination thereof;	The diagram illustrates the injection and sampling process for a Pulverized Fuel Combustion (PTC) system equipped with an Electrostatic Precipitator (ESP). Coal and additives enter the PTC. The gas stream then passes through a duct where sorbent is injected. Two sampling sites for OH and CMM are indicated: Site 1 is located in the duct before the ESP, and Site 2 is located in the duct after the ESP. The gas stream finally exits through a stack. The diagram is labeled 'EERC CC22781.CDR' in the top right corner. Figure 4. Injection and sampling schematic of the PTC with an ESP. <i>See also</i> Feb. 2004 Report at 17 (“mercury oxidants including NaCl, SEA 2, and zinc were examined for their impacts on mercury removal.”); 15 (“Based on previous pilot-scale testing results of ESP mercury removal effectiveness, three additives (NaCl, CaCl₂, and another for which the EERC is assessing the intellectual property


No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		issues) were evaluated.”); Final Report at 25 (“SEA2 is a proprietary Hg⁰ oxidizing agent effective at addition rates on the order of 1/10 of those for SEA1.”) The PTC Log Book identifies the SEA2 additive used as sodium bromide, which includes Br⁻. Thus, the mercury-containing gas, the coal, and the combustion chamber comprised HBr, Br₂, and Br⁻. 1836 STARTED SODIUM BROMIDE FEEDER @ 40g/hr 375 SET 3 lbs coal - 48g Sodium Bromide 1904 Added 204 lbs Coal 1926 Added new batch Sodium Bromide Coal to feeder Same blend 3 lbs C 48g SB @ 40gr/hr SEA2 and activated carbon were similarly used during the December 2003 testing. See Feb. 2004 Report at 15: One week of short-term sorbent (Task 2.2) and furnace additive testing was accomplished in December 2003 to demonstrate mercury removal by sorbent injection combined with various oxidizing additives to simulate a scrubbed baghouse system. The 580 MJ/h (550,000 Btu/h) pulverized coal PTC unit was equipped with a Niro Inc. Produciton Minor Spray Dryer Model I

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		and baghouse and fired with Center lignite coal. Table 4 summarizes the test matrix for the spray dryer–baghouse configuration. Based on previous pilot-scale testing results of ESP mercury removal effectiveness, three additives (NaCl, CaCl₂, and another for which the EERC is assessing the intellectual property issues) were evaluated. CMMs were set up at the inlet to the spray dryer upstream of the sorbent injection port at the outlet of the baghouse to monitor mercury vapor concentrations continuously throughout the 4-day test. Six OH method samples were collected at the same locations to verify CMM measurements and performance of the sorbents and additive injection. A Thermo Environmental Model 15C HCl analyzer was <i>See</i> Feb. 2005 Report at 25 (“Pilot-scale Hg control testing was conducted December 8–11, 2003, using a 580-MJ/hr (550,000-Btu/hr) pc-fired unit equipped with a Niro Inc. Production Minor Spray Dryer Model I and baghouse.”); at 27 (“Nine tests were completed to evaluate the effectiveness of potential Hg sorbents (DARCO® FGD, EERC-treated FGD, and Amended Silicate™) and Hg⁰ oxidation and sorbent enhancement additives (NaCl, SEA2, and CaCl₂) to remove Hg using a SDA and FF.”); at 25:

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates a coal gasification process. It begins with 'Coal and Additives' entering a 'Furnace'. A gas stream exits the furnace, passing through a 'Sorbent Injection' point and then through a blue hexagonal unit labeled 'SD'. The gas then enters a yellow cylindrical unit labeled 'FF Baghouse'. Finally, the gas exits the baghouse and goes to a brown trapezoidal unit labeled 'Stack'. Sampling points are indicated: 'GH, HCl, and CMM Sampling' occurs between the furnace and the SD unit, and 'OH and CMM Sampling' occurs between the FF Baghouse and the stack. The text 'EERC KG23081.CDR' is located in the upper right corner of the diagram area. SEA2 and activated carbon were also used in the February 2004 testing. Oct. 2005 Report at 20:

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄)–potassium permanganate (KMnO₄) solutions. EPA Method 29 was used for trace element sampling of the flue gas during Week 1 (February 2–4, 2004) testing of Caballo coal. Samples were collected at the ESP inlet upstream of the carbon injection location during three different conditions: baseline and SEA1 and SEA2 additions. The objective was to determine the effects of SEA additions on trace metal concentrations and particle–gas partitioning. Oct. 2005 Report at 26:  The diagram illustrates the flue gas flow from a boiler to a stack. On the left, a green boiler labeled 'P T C' receives 'Coal and Additives' (indicated by a red box). A horizontal duct carries the flue gas to the right. An arrow labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 1' points down from the duct. Further right, a vertical blue cylinder labeled 'E S P' (Electrostatic Precipitator) is shown. An arrow labeled 'Sorbent Injection' points down into the duct just before the ESP. Below the ESP, an arrow labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 2' points down. The duct continues to the right, ending at a brown stack labeled 'S t a c k'. A red vertical line is positioned to the right of the stack, with the text 'EEHC CC22781.GDR' at the top.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice																																																																																
1d	injecting a sorbent material comprising activated carbon into the mercury-containing gas downstream of the combustion chamber;	The Feb. 2004 Report describes injecting Darco FGD activated carbon into the mercury-containing gas downstream of the combustion chamber during the September 2003 testing (page 11): Table 1. Test Matrix for Unscrubbed Systems Equipped with ESPs <table><tr><th>Test No.</th><th colspan="2">Mercury Oxidant Additive</th><th colspan="2">Sorbent</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>Category</th><th>Injection Rate, lb/Macf</th><th>Category</th><th>Injection Rate, lb/Macf</th></tr><tr><td>T1-1(Baseline)</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-2</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>2.75–18.4</td></tr><tr><td>T1-3</td><td>NaCl</td><td>3.76–14.7</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-4</td><td>NaCl</td><td>3.76–14.7</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>2.75–4.59</td></tr><tr><td>T1-5</td><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84–7.34</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-6</td><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>2.57</td></tr><tr><td>T1-7</td><td>NaCl</td><td>7.34–11.0</td><td>HCl-Treated FGD</td><td>2.57–4.59</td></tr><tr><td>T1-8</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>EERC-Treated Carbon</td><td>1.84–2.75</td></tr><tr><td>T1-9</td><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84</td><td>EERC-Treated Carbon</td><td>2.75</td></tr><tr><td>T1-10</td><td>Zn</td><td>7.34</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-11</td><td>Zn and NaCl</td><td>7.34–11.0</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-12</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>Na₂S₄ (solution)</td><td>0.89–6.67</td></tr><tr><td>T1-13</td><td>CaCl₂</td><td>11</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>0–4.59</td></tr><tr><td>T1-14</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>ALSTOM Sorbent</td><td>1.1–3.1</td></tr></table> <i>See also</i> Feb. 2004 Report at 15 (describing “DARCO® FGD activated carbon, supplied by NORIT Americas, Inc.; an EERC-treated activated carbon”)	Test No.	Mercury Oxidant Additive		Sorbent			Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	T1-1(Baseline)	None	NA	None	NA	T1-2	None	NA	DARCO® FGD	2.75–18.4	T1-3	NaCl	3.76–14.7	None	NA	T1-4	NaCl	3.76–14.7	DARCO® FGD	2.75–4.59	T1-5	SEA 2	1.84–7.34	None	NA	T1-6	SEA 2	1.84	DARCO® FGD	2.57	T1-7	NaCl	7.34–11.0	HCl-Treated FGD	2.57–4.59	T1-8	None	NA	EERC-Treated Carbon	1.84–2.75	T1-9	SEA 2	1.84	EERC-Treated Carbon	2.75	T1-10	Zn	7.34	None	NA	T1-11	Zn and NaCl	7.34–11.0	None	NA	T1-12	None	NA	Na ₂ S ₄ (solution)	0.89–6.67	T1-13	CaCl ₂	11	DARCO® FGD	0–4.59	T1-14	None	NA	ALSTOM Sorbent	1.1–3.1
Test No.	Mercury Oxidant Additive		Sorbent																																																																															
	Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf																																																																														
T1-1(Baseline)	None	NA	None	NA																																																																														
T1-2	None	NA	DARCO® FGD	2.75–18.4																																																																														
T1-3	NaCl	3.76–14.7	None	NA																																																																														
T1-4	NaCl	3.76–14.7	DARCO® FGD	2.75–4.59																																																																														
T1-5	SEA 2	1.84–7.34	None	NA																																																																														
T1-6	SEA 2	1.84	DARCO® FGD	2.57																																																																														
T1-7	NaCl	7.34–11.0	HCl-Treated FGD	2.57–4.59																																																																														
T1-8	None	NA	EERC-Treated Carbon	1.84–2.75																																																																														
T1-9	SEA 2	1.84	EERC-Treated Carbon	2.75																																																																														
T1-10	Zn	7.34	None	NA																																																																														
T1-11	Zn and NaCl	7.34–11.0	None	NA																																																																														
T1-12	None	NA	Na ₂ S ₄ (solution)	0.89–6.67																																																																														
T1-13	CaCl ₂	11	DARCO® FGD	0–4.59																																																																														
T1-14	None	NA	ALSTOM Sorbent	1.1–3.1																																																																														

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates the injection and sampling schematic of a Pulverized Fuel Furnace (PTC) equipped with an Electrostatic Precipitator (ESP). On the left, a green trapezoidal structure labeled 'P T C' represents the furnace. An arrow labeled 'Coal and Additives' points into its base. A horizontal duct extends from the top of the PTC to the right. A vertical arrow labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 1' points down from this duct. Further right, a blue cylindrical structure labeled 'E S P' represents the electrostatic precipitator. A vertical arrow labeled 'Sorbent Injection' (enclosed in a red box) points down into the top of the ESP duct. Below the ESP, another vertical arrow labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 2' points down. To the right of the ESP, a brown trapezoidal structure labeled 'S t a c k' represents the stack. A horizontal duct connects the bottom of the ESP to the stack. The text 'EERC CC22781.CDR' is located in the top right corner of the diagram area. Figure 4. Injection and sampling schematic of the PTC with an ESP. The Feb. 2004 Report also describes injecting activated carbon sorbent during the December 2003 testing.²⁵

²⁵ This table refers to a “December 2004 run,” which is a typo. It should refer to a December 2003 run as noted in the preceding paragraph. Final Report at 14 (“One week of short-term sorbent (Task 2.2) and furnace additive testing was accomplished in December 2003 to demonstrate mercury removal by sorbent injection combined with

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice																																																				
		<table><tr><th colspan="4">Table 4. Spray Dryer Test Sample Matrix (December 2004 run)</th></tr><tr><th colspan="2">Mercury Oxidation Additive</th><th colspan="2">Sorbent</th></tr><tr><th>Type</th><th>Feed Rate, lb/Macf</th><th>Type</th><th>Injection Rate, lb/Macf</th></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>1.84 – 11.02</td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>EERC-Treated FGD</td><td>1.84 – 7.35</td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>Amended Silicate™</td><td>7.35</td></tr><tr><td>NaCl</td><td>3.67 – 11.02</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>NaCl</td><td>3.67 – 11.02</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>3.67</td></tr><tr><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84 – 3.67</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84 – 3.67</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>1.84</td></tr><tr><td>CaCl₂</td><td>3.67 – 11.02</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>CaCl₂</td><td>3.67 – 11.03</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>3.67</td></tr></table> See also Feb. 2005 Report at 25:	Table 4. Spray Dryer Test Sample Matrix (December 2004 run)				Mercury Oxidation Additive		Sorbent		Type	Feed Rate, lb/Macf	Type	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	None	NA	None	NA	None	NA	DARCO® FGD	1.84 – 11.02	None	NA	EERC-Treated FGD	1.84 – 7.35	None	NA	Amended Silicate™	7.35	NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA	NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	DARCO® FGD	3.67	SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	None	NA	SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	DARCO® FGD	1.84	CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA	CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.03	DARCO® FGD	3.67
Table 4. Spray Dryer Test Sample Matrix (December 2004 run)																																																						
Mercury Oxidation Additive		Sorbent																																																				
Type	Feed Rate, lb/Macf	Type	Injection Rate, lb/Macf																																																			
None	NA	None	NA																																																			
None	NA	DARCO® FGD	1.84 – 11.02																																																			
None	NA	EERC-Treated FGD	1.84 – 7.35																																																			
None	NA	Amended Silicate™	7.35																																																			
NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA																																																			
NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	DARCO® FGD	3.67																																																			
SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	None	NA																																																			
SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	DARCO® FGD	1.84																																																			
CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA																																																			
CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.03	DARCO® FGD	3.67																																																			

various oxidizing additives to simulate a scrubbed baghouse system.”). This is also evidence based on the fact that the Final Report was prepared in February 2004.


No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates a coal gasification process. It begins with 'Coal and Additives' entering a green 'Furnace'. From the furnace, a gas stream flows through a blue 'SD' (Sorbent Desorber) unit, where 'Sorbent Injection' occurs. The gas then passes through a yellow 'FF Baghouse' (Fabric Filter Baghouse). Finally, the gas exits through a brown 'Stack'. Sampling points are indicated: 'GH, HCl, and CMM Sampling' at the furnace outlet, and 'OH and CMM Sampling' at the stack outlet. The diagram is labeled 'EERC KG23081.CDR'. The Oct. 2005 Report describes injecting activated carbon sorbent during the February 2004 testing (pages 26-27):

Table 9-2. Week 1 – Test Matrix

Date	Sampling Inlet	Sampling Outlet	Sorbent	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf	Oxidant	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf
2/2/04	OH M-29	OH	Baseline					
			Baseline					
			DARCO	25.0	7.03			
			DARCO	28.0	7.84			
			DARCO	32.0	8.96			
			DARCO	45.0	12.60			
2/3/04	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	69.0	19.20			
			Baseline					
						SEA1	15.2	4.28
						SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	45.5	12.80
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	59.9	16.73
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	15.2	4.28
2/4/04	OH M-29	OH	Baseline					
						SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	25.0	6.96	SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	15.0	4.18			
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	6.9	1.92
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	4.3	1.20
			DARCO	15.0	4.18			
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA1-SEA2	2.6	0.72
			Baseline					
2/5/2004	OH	OH	EERC carbon	25.0	6.97			
			EERC carbon	35.0	9.76			
			Am. Silicate	25.0	6.91			
			Am. Silicate	50.0	13.82			


Notes:

M-29 = EPA Method 29


EERC carbon = EERC-treated DARCO carbon


Am. Silicate = Amended Silicate


SEA1-SEA2 = 50%-50% blend of SEA1 and SEA2. The total rate for both is given.


No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates a coal combustion system. On the left, a green hopper labeled 'P T C' (Pulverized Treated Coal) receives 'Coal and Additives' from below. A duct leads from the top of the hopper to a horizontal pipe. This pipe has a downward branch labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 1'. The main pipe continues to the right, where a red box labeled 'Sorbent Injection' indicates the point of sorbent addition. The pipe then enters a blue cylindrical device labeled 'E S P' (Electrostatic Precipitator). Below the ESP, a duct leads to a brown hopper labeled 'S t a c k' (Stack). This final duct has a downward branch labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 2'. A red vertical line is positioned to the right of the stack. The text 'EEHC CC22781.GDR' is in the top right corner.
Ie	contacting mercury in the mercury-containing gas with the sorbent, to form	Because the coal and sodium bromide were combusted which formed the mercury containing gas, and activated carbon was injecting into the emission gas, the sorbent and mercury formed a mercury/sorbent composition. <i>See, e.g.</i>, Feb. 2004 Report at *** (“Sorbent injection for removing Hg involves adsorption of Hg species by a solid sorbent injected upstream of a particulate control device such as an FF (baghouse) or ESP.”); <i>see also</i> Feb. 2005 Report at 18 (“The significant improvement by DARCO®


No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	a mercury/sorbent composition;	FGD–SEA2 is not merely an additive effect but more a synergistic response. The SEA2 addition in the combustion zone not only enhances gaseous mercury conversion to particulate-associated mercury, but also improves DARCO® FGD carbon reactivity with mercury species.”).
<i>If</i>	separating the mercury/sorbent composition from the mercury-containing gas, to form a cleaned gas;	The mercury/sorbent composition was separated using an electrostatic precipitator during the September 2003 testing. Feb. 2004 Report at 10-11 (“Fourteen tests were completed to evaluate various sorbent and mercury oxidant performance on mercury removal across the ESP as functions of feed rate.”):


No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates the injection and sampling schematic of a Pulverized Fuel Combustion (PTC) system equipped with an Electrostatic Precipitator (ESP). On the left, a green trapezoidal structure labeled 'P T C' represents the PTC, with an arrow labeled 'Coal and Additives' pointing into its base. A horizontal duct extends from the top of the PTC to the right. An arrow labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 1' points downwards from this duct. Further right, an arrow labeled 'Sorbent Injection' points downwards into the duct. The duct then enters a blue cylindrical component labeled 'E S P' (ESP), which is highlighted with a red rectangular border. Below the ESP, an arrow points downwards to 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 2'. To the right of the ESP, a brown trapezoidal structure labeled 'S t a c k' represents the stack, with a duct connecting the bottom of the ESP to its side. The text 'EERC CC22781.CDR' is located in the top right corner of the diagram area. Figure 4. Injection and sampling schematic of the PTC with an ESP. The mercury/sorbent composition was separated using a scrubbed baghouse system during the December 2003 testing. Feb. 2004 Report at 14 (“One week of short-term sorbent (Task 2.2) and furnace additive testing was accomplished in December 2003 to demonstrate mercury removal by sorbent injection combined with various

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		oxidizing additives to simulate a scrubbed baghouse system.”); <i>see also</i> Feb. 2005 Report at 25:  The diagram illustrates a process for simulating a scrubbed baghouse system. It begins with a green 'Furnace' where 'Coal and Additives' are introduced. Gases exit the furnace and pass through a blue 'SD' (Sorbent Desorption) unit and a yellow 'FF Baghouse', which are enclosed in a red box. 'Sorbent Injection' is shown entering the gas stream before the SD unit. Sampling points are indicated for 'GH, HCl, and CMM Sampling' before the SD unit, and 'OH and CMM Sampling' after the FF Baghouse. The gases then exit through a brown 'Stack'. The reference 'EERC KG23081.CDR' is noted in the top right corner.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		The mercury/sorbent composition was separated using an electrostatic precipitator during the February 2004 testing. Oct. 2005 Report at 26 (“ESP Hg removal testing was performed with the PTC firing Caballo subbituminous coal.”): 
Ig	monitoring the mercury content of	The Feb. 2004 Report describes the use of “Continuous Mercury Monitors” during the September 2003 testing and December 2003 testing. Feb. 2004 Report at 8 (“Hg⁰

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	the cleaned gas; and	and total Hg levels will be measured on a nearly continuous basis using a continuous mercury monitor (CMM)"); at 10:  The diagram illustrates the injection and sampling schematic of a PTC (Pulverized Coal Turbine) with an ESP (Electrostatic Precipitator). The process begins with 'Coal and Additives' entering a green PTC. The gas then flows into a blue ESP. A 'Sorbent Injection' point is shown above the ESP. Two sampling sites are identified: 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 1' (located before the ESP) and 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 2' (located after the ESP). The gas finally exits through a brown 'Stack'. The diagram is labeled 'EERC CC22781.CDR'. Figure 4. Injection and sampling schematic of the PTC with an ESP. <i>See also</i> Feb. 2005 Report at 25:

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates a coal gasification process. It begins with 'Coal and Additives' entering a green 'Furnace'. An arrow from the top of the furnace points to a red box labeled 'GH, HCl, and CMM Sampling'. The gas stream then moves to a blue 'SD' (Sorbent Desorber) unit, where 'Sorbent Injection' is added. The stream then passes through a yellow 'FF Baghouse' (Fine Filter Baghouse). Finally, the gas exits through a brown 'Stack'. An arrow from the bottom of the stack points to a red box labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling'. The text 'EERC KG23081.CDR' is located in the top right corner of the diagram area. <i>See also Oct. 2005 Report at 26:</i>

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates a coal gasification process. On the left, a green trapezoidal structure labeled 'P T C' (Pre-Treatment Column) receives an input of 'Coal and Additives' from the left. A horizontal pipe extends from the top of the PTC to the right. An arrow labeled 'Sorbent Injection' points down into this pipe. The pipe then turns downward and then right, entering a blue cylindrical vessel labeled 'E S P' (Exhaust Scrubber). Below the PTC, a red-bordered box labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 1' has an arrow pointing to the horizontal pipe. From the bottom of the ESP, a pipe leads down to another red-bordered box labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 2'. Finally, a pipe exits the ESP to the right, leading to a brown trapezoidal structure labeled 'S t a c k' (Stack). The text 'EEHC CC22781.GDR' is in the top right corner.
1h	controlling, in response to the monitored mercury content of the cleaned gas, an	The Feb. 2004 Report describes adjusting the additive and sorbent injection rate. Both options result in changes to the sorbent composition. Feb. 2004 Report at 9 (“Specific sorbent injection rates will be determined based on the measured Hg concentration in the flue gas.”). Feb. 2004 Report at 10 (“For continuous injection, the feed rate will be varied from 2500–12,000 lb sorbent/lb Hg”). Feb. 2004 Report

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	injection rate of injecting the sorbent into the mercury-containing gas, the sorbent composition, or a combination thereof, so that the mercury content of the cleaned gas is maintained at or below a desired level.	at 10 (“Fourteen tests were completed to evaluate various sorbent and mercury oxidant performance on mercury removal across the ESP as functions of feed rate”). <i>See also</i> Feb. 2005 Report at 15:²⁶

²⁶ This table refers to a “December 2004 run,” which is a typo. It should refer to a December 2003 run as noted in the preceding paragraph. Final Report at 14 (“One week of short-term sorbent (Task 2.2) and furnace additive testing was accomplished in December 2003 to demonstrate mercury removal by sorbent injection combined with various oxidizing additives to simulate a scrubbed baghouse system.”). This is also evidence based on the fact that the Final Report was prepared in February 2004.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice																																																
		Table 4. Spray Dryer Test Sample Matrix (December 2004 run) <table><tr><th colspan="2">Mercury Oxidation Additive</th><th colspan="2">Sorbent</th></tr><tr><th>Type</th><th>Feed Rate, lb/Macf</th><th>Type</th><th>Injection Rate, lb/Macf</th></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>1.84 – 11.02</td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>EERC-Treated FGD</td><td>1.84 – 7.35</td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>Amended Silicate™</td><td>7.35</td></tr><tr><td>NaCl</td><td>3.67 – 11.02</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>NaCl</td><td>3.67 – 11.02</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>3.67</td></tr><tr><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84 – 3.67</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84 – 3.67</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>1.84</td></tr><tr><td>CaCl₂</td><td>3.67 – 11.02</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>CaCl₂</td><td>3.67 – 11.03</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>3.67</td></tr></table> <i>See also Oct. 2005 Report at 27:</i>	Mercury Oxidation Additive		Sorbent		Type	Feed Rate, lb/Macf	Type	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	None	NA	None	NA	None	NA	DARCO® FGD	1.84 – 11.02	None	NA	EERC-Treated FGD	1.84 – 7.35	None	NA	Amended Silicate™	7.35	NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA	NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	DARCO® FGD	3.67	SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	None	NA	SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	DARCO® FGD	1.84	CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA	CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.03	DARCO® FGD	3.67
Mercury Oxidation Additive		Sorbent																																																
Type	Feed Rate, lb/Macf	Type	Injection Rate, lb/Macf																																															
None	NA	None	NA																																															
None	NA	DARCO® FGD	1.84 – 11.02																																															
None	NA	EERC-Treated FGD	1.84 – 7.35																																															
None	NA	Amended Silicate™	7.35																																															
NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA																																															
NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	DARCO® FGD	3.67																																															
SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	None	NA																																															
SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	DARCO® FGD	1.84																																															
CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA																																															
CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.03	DARCO® FGD	3.67																																															
2	The method of claim 1, comprising removing greater than 70 wt % of the mercury in the	This level of mercury capture was achieved during the September 2003, December 2003, and February 2004 testing. <i>See Feb. 2005 Report at 73:</i> – SEA2 and DARCO® FGD. The combination of DARCO® FGD injection at 1.84 lb/Macf and SEA2 addition provided exceptional SDA–FF Hg(g) capture, >90%, even at the lower addition rate of 1.84 lb/Macf. <i>See Oct. 2005 Report at 49:</i>																																																

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	mercury-containing gas.	The effectiveness of SEA2 addition, SEA2 additions combined with DARCO FGD injection, and a 50:50 wt% SEA1 and SEA2 mixture addition combined with ACI to remove Hg_{total} and Hg^0 from Caballo coal combustion flue gas is shown in Figures 11-15, 11-16, and 11-17. SEA2 addition at 1.9 lb/MMacf reduced the ESP outlet Hg_{total} concentration by 70%. When SEA2 was added during ACI, ESP Hg_{total} capture increased moderately to >80%. The Hg speciation results in Figure 11-16 suggest that in addition to Hg^0, some Hg^{2+} exited the ESP during the SEA2 and SEA2–SEA1 addition and ACI tests. The addition of the SEA1–SEA2 mixture at 0.5 lb/MMacf combined with ACI at 2.9 lb/MMacf resulted in a slightly lower ESP Hg_{total} removal as compared to the SEA2 addition and ACI tests.
3	The method of claim 1, comprising removing greater than 70 wt % of the mercury in the mercury-containing gas on the sorbent.	<i>See claim 2.</i>
4	The method of claim 1, wherein the sorbent in the mercury-containing gas comprises	The February 2004 testing used bromine injection rates within this range. <i>See Oct. 2005 Report at 27:</i>

about 1 g to about 30 g of the halogen or halide promoter per 100 g of the sorbent material.

Table 9-2. Week 1 – Test Matrix

Date	Sampling Inlet	Sampling Outlet	Sorbent	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf	Oxidant	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf
2/2/04	OH M-29	OH	Baseline					
			Baseline					
			DARCO	25.0	7.03			
			DARCO	28.0	7.84			
			DARCO	32.0	8.96			
			DARCO	45.0	12.60			
2/3/04	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	69.0	19.20			
			Baseline					
						SEA1	15.2	4.28
						SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	45.5	12.80
2/4/04	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	59.9	16.73
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	15.2	4.28
			Baseline					
						SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	25.0	6.96	SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	9.8	2.73
2/5/2004	OH	OH	DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	6.9	1.92
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	4.3	1.20
			DARCO	15.0	4.18			
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA1-SEA2	2.6	0.72
			Baseline					
			EERC carbon	25.0	6.97			
2/5/2004	OH	OH	EERC carbon	35.0	9.76			
			Am. Silicate	25.0	6.91			
			Am. Silicate	50.0	13.82			
			Am. Silicate					

Notes:

M-29 = EPA Method 29

EERC carbon = EERC-treated DARCO carbon

Am. Silicate = Amended Silicate

SEA1-SEA2 = 50%-50% blend of SEA1 and SEA2. The total rate for both is given.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
		Oct. 2005 Report at 30: Table 9-4. Week 2 – Test Matrix <table><tr><th>Date</th><th>Sampling Inlet</th><th>Sampling Outlet</th><th>Sorbent</th><th>Rate, g/hr</th><th>Rate, lb/MMacf</th><th>Oxidant</th><th>Rate, g/hr</th><th>Rate, lb/MMacf</th></tr><tr><td colspan="9">SDA-ESP 2/17/04</td></tr><tr><td></td><td rowspan="4">OH</td><td rowspan="4">OH</td><td>Baseline</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>25</td><td>5.82</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>35</td><td>8.14</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>45</td><td>10.47</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td rowspan="4">OH</td><td>Baseline</td><td>55</td><td>12.8</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>SEA1</td><td>25</td><td>5.82</td></tr><tr><td colspan="9">SDA-ESP 2/18/04</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Baseline</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td rowspan="4">OH</td><td rowspan="4">OH</td><td>DARCO</td><td>25</td><td>5.82</td><td>SEA1</td><td>25</td><td>5.82</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>25</td><td>5.82</td><td>SEA1</td><td>25</td><td>5.82</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td></td><td></td><td>SEA1</td><td>35</td><td>8.14</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Baseline</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td rowspan="5">OH</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>SEA2</td><td>1</td><td>0.23</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>10</td><td>2.33</td><td>SEA2</td><td>2.5</td><td>0.58</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>10</td><td>2.33</td><td>SEA2</td><td>5</td><td>1.16</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="9">SDA-FF 2/19/04</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>OH</td><td>Baseline</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td rowspan="4">OH</td><td rowspan="4">OH</td><td>DARCO</td><td>10</td><td>2.33</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>25</td><td>5.82</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>55</td><td>12.8</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Baseline</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td rowspan="4">OH</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>SEA1</td><td>10</td><td>2.33</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>10</td><td>2.33</td><td>SEA1</td><td>15</td><td>3.49</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>10</td><td>2.33</td><td>SEA1</td><td>25</td><td>5.82</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="9">SDA-FF 2/20/2004</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Baseline</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>SEA2</td><td>1</td><td>0.23</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td rowspan="4">OH</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>SEA2</td><td>1.5</td><td>0.35</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>10</td><td>2.33</td><td>SEA2</td><td>1.5</td><td>0.35</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>DARCO</td><td>10</td><td>2.33</td><td>SEA2</td><td>0.5</td><td>0.12</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>Baseline</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Am. Silicate</td><td>15</td><td>3.49</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Am. Silicate</td><td>30</td><td>6.98</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Date	Sampling Inlet	Sampling Outlet	Sorbent	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf	Oxidant	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf	SDA-ESP 2/17/04										OH	OH	Baseline							DARCO	25	5.82						35	8.14						45	10.47						OH	Baseline	55	12.8																																		SEA1	25	5.82	SDA-ESP 2/18/04												Baseline							OH	OH	DARCO	25	5.82	SEA1	25	5.82		DARCO	25	5.82	SEA1	25	5.82		DARCO			SEA1	35	8.14		Baseline								OH				SEA2	1	0.23			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	2.5	0.58			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	5	1.16																	SDA-FF 2/19/04											OH	Baseline							OH	OH	DARCO	10	2.33					DARCO	25	5.82					DARCO	55	12.8					Baseline								OH				SEA1	10	2.33			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA1	15	3.49			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA1	25	5.82									SDA-FF 2/20/2004												Baseline												SEA2	1	0.23			OH				SEA2	1.5	0.35			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	1.5	0.35			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	0.5	0.12			Baseline									Am. Silicate	15	3.49							Am. Silicate	30	6.98			
Date	Sampling Inlet	Sampling Outlet	Sorbent	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf	Oxidant	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
SDA-ESP 2/17/04																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	OH	OH	Baseline																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	
			DARCO	25	5.82																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
				35	8.14																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
				45	10.47																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
		OH	Baseline	55	12.8																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
						SEA1	25	5.82																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
SDA-ESP 2/18/04																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
			Baseline																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	
	OH	OH	DARCO	25	5.82	SEA1	25	5.82																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			DARCO	25	5.82	SEA1	25	5.82																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			DARCO			SEA1	35	8.14																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			Baseline																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	
		OH				SEA2	1	0.23																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	2.5	0.58																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	5	1.16																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
SDA-FF 2/19/04																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
		OH	Baseline																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	
	OH	OH	DARCO	10	2.33																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
			DARCO	25	5.82																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
			DARCO	55	12.8																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
			Baseline																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	
		OH				SEA1	10	2.33																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA1	15	3.49																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA1	25	5.82																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
SDA-FF 2/20/2004																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
			Baseline																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	
						SEA2	1	0.23																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
		OH				SEA2	1.5	0.35																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	1.5	0.35																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	0.5	0.12																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
			Baseline																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	
			Am. Silicate	15	3.49																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
			Am. Silicate	30	6.98																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
5	The method of claim 1, wherein the combustion chamber comprises the halogen or halide promoter.	<i>See 1c.</i>
6	The method of claim 1, wherein the coal comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, Br ⁻ , or a combination thereof, added to the coal upstream of the combustion chamber.	<i>See 1c.</i>
7	The method of claim 1, wherein the promoter is	Given the temperatures of coal combustion, the halide additive (NaBr) provides the promoter (Br ² , HBr, Br ⁻)) in gaseous form.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	contacted with the sorbent in vapor form, gaseous form, liquid form, or in an organic solvent.	
12	The method of claim 1, wherein the activated carbon comprises powdered activated carbon, granular activated carbon, or a combination thereof.	See 1d.
13	The method of claim 1, wherein the sorbent material injected into the	See 1d.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	mercury-containing gas is substantially free of halogen and halide promotion.	
14	The method of claim 1, wherein the sorbent material injected into the mercury-containing gas is a promoted sorbent obtained by contacting a base sorbent with another halogen or halide promoter.	The PTC logbook on September 19, 2003 shows the injection of a bromine treated activated carbon and addition of NaBr to the coal.

151	Started Carbon Injection 109/hr (br treated)	Yg JH/KS
459	Zero & Spanned SO2 Sample port #1	Yg
5:18	Increase br treated carbon to 159/hr	Yg
542	Added COAL 122 lbs	JH/KS
4:59	Started Feeder NaBr, 109/hr.	Yg JH/KS

10 gr per hour
Sodium Bromide

To Page No.

read & Understood by me,

Date

9-19-03

Invented by

Date

Recorded by

PTC-FM-639

Project No. 4259/4305

Book No.

171

Page No.

553 Blew out Sample port #1 Probe and static
lines

JH/KS

608 Drained Ice bath condensor

JH

16:22 stop NaBr injection
stop br treated carbon injection

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		<i>See</i> 1d. The Feb. 2004 Report, Feb. 2005 Report, and Oct. 2005 Report describe the combined use of SEA2 with EERC-treated carbon. <i>See</i> Feb. 2005 Report at 24: <i>EERC-Treated FGD.</i> The EERC has developed a more effective activated carbon for capturing Hg using a proprietary chemical pretreatment process. Previous testing of the EERC-treated FGD on North Dakota lignite combustion flue gases has demonstrated that it is a much more effective Hg sorbent than DARCO[®] FGD (23). EERC-treated carbon is Norit FGD activated carbon treated with bromine, as indicated in the PTC log book as “Br treated carbon.”
15	The method of claim 1, wherein the combustion chamber comprises a boiler	<i>See</i> 1a.
16	The method of claim 1, wherein the mercury-	The combustion gases exiting the combustion chamber is a flue gas. Thus mercury-containing gas is a flue gas.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	containing gas is a flue gas.	
17	The method of claim 1, wherein the injection of the sorbent material into the mercury-containing gas occurs upstream of an air pre-heater.	<i>See 1d.</i>
18	The method of claim 1, wherein the injection of the sorbent material into the mercury-containing gas occurs upstream of a particulate	<i>See 1d.</i>

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	separator or a scrubber.	
19	The method of claim 1, wherein the coal comprises added halide sorbent enhancement additive.	<i>See 1c.</i>
20	The method of claim 1, wherein the combustion chamber comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, Br ⁻ , or a combination thereof.	<i>See 1c.</i>
21	The method of claim 1, wherein	<i>See 1c.</i>

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	the coal comprises added sorbent enhancement additive that comprises Br ⁻ .	
22	The method of claim 21, wherein the sorbent enhancement additive comprises a bromide compound.	<i>See 1c.</i>
23a	A method of separating mercury from a mercury-containing gas, the method comprising:	<i>See 1a.</i>
23b	combusting coal in a combustion	<i>See 1b.</i>

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	chamber, to provide the mercury-containing gas, wherein the mercury-containing gas comprises a halogen or halide promoter comprising HBr, Br ⁻ , or a combination thereof, wherein	
23c	wherein the mercury-containing gas comprises a halogen or halide promoter comprising HBr, Br ⁻ , or a combination	<i>See 1c.</i>

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	thereof, wherein the coal comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, Br ⁻ , or a combination thereof, added to the coal upstream of the combustion chamber, or the combustion chamber comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, Br ⁻ , or a combination thereof, or a combination thereof;	
23d	injecting a sorbent material comprising activated carbon	See 1d.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	into the mercury-containing gas downstream of the combustion chamber;	
23e	contacting mercury in the mercury-containing gas with the sorbent, to form a mercury/sorbent composition; and	<i>See 1e.</i>
23f	separating the mercury/sorbent composition from the mercury-containing gas, to form a cleaned gas.	<i>See 1f.</i>
24a	A method of separating mercury	<i>See 1a.</i>

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	from a mercury-containing gas, the method comprising:	
24b	combusting coal in a combustion chamber, to provide the mercury-containing gas, wherein the mercury-containing gas comprises a halogen or halide promoter comprising HBr, Br ⁻ , or a combination thereof, wherein	See 1b.
24c	wherein the mercury-containing	See 1c.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	gas comprises a halogen or halide promoter comprising HBr, Br⁻, or a combination thereof, wherein the coal comprises added Br₂, HBr, Br⁻, or a combination thereof, added to the coal upstream of the combustion chamber, or the combustion chamber comprises added Br₂, HBr, Br⁻, or a combination	

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	thereof, or a combination thereof;	
24d	injecting a sorbent material comprising activated carbon into the mercury-containing gas downstream of the combustion chamber such that the activated carbon reacts with the halogen or halide promoter in the mercury-containing gas to form a promoted sorbent;	See 1d.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
24e	such that the activated carbon reacts with the halogen or halide promoter in the mercury-containing gas to form a promoted sorbent;	The Feb. 2004 Report and Final Report both explain that the tests performed with sorbent and SEA2 demonstrated higher levels of mercury capture as compared to tests performed only with sorbent, and that the reactivity of the sorbent was enhanced when a halide additive (NaBr) was added to the coal. This confirms that the activated carbon sorbent and halogen/halide promoter reacted to form a promoted sorbent that enhanced (improved) its performance to capture mercury.
24f	contacting mercury in the mercury-containing gas with the promoted sorbent, to form a mercury/sorbent composition;	See 1e.
24g	separating the mercury/sorbent composition from the mercury-	See 1f.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	containing gas, to form a cleaned gas;	
24h	monitoring the mercury content of the cleaned gas; and	See 1g.
24i	controlling, in response to the mercury content of the cleaned gas, an injection rate of injecting the sorbent into the mercury-containing gas, a rate of addition to the coal or the combustion chamber of the added Br ₂ , HBr, the	See 1h.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	bromide compound, or a combination thereof, or a combination thereof, so that the mercury content of the cleaned gas is maintained at or below a desired level.	
25a	A method of separating mercury from a mercury-containing gas, the method comprising:	See 1a.
25b	combusting coal in a combustion chamber, to provide	See 1b.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	the mercury-containing gas, wherein	
25c	the coal comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, a bromide compound, or a combination thereof, added to the coal upstream of the combustion chamber, or the combustion chamber comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, a bromide compound, or a combination thereof, or a	<i>See 1c.</i>

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	combination thereof,	
25d	injecting a sorbent material comprising activated carbon into the mercury-containing gas downstream of the combustion chamber;	See 1d.
25e	contacting mercury in the mercury-containing gas with the sorbent, to form a mercury/sorbent composition; and	See 1e.
25f	separating the mercury/sorbent composition from	See 1f.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	the mercury-containing gas, to form a cleaned gas.	
26	The method of claim 25, wherein the coal comprises the added Br ₂ , HBr, the bromide compound, or a combination thereof, added to the coal upstream of the combustion chamber.	<i>See 1c.</i>
27	The method of claim 25, wherein the combustion chamber comprises the added Br ₂ , HBr,	<i>See 1c.</i>

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	the bromide compound, or a combination thereof.	
28a	The method of claim 25, further comprising monitoring the mercury content of the cleaned gas; and	See 1g.
28b	controlling, in response to the mercury content of the cleaned gas, an injection rate of injecting the sorbent into the mercury-containing	See 1h.

No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	gas, a rate of addition to the coal or the combustion chamber of the added Br₂, HBr, the bromide compound, or a combination thereof, or a combination thereof, so that the mercury content of the cleaned gas is maintained at or below a desired level.	
29	The method of claim 25, wherein the mercury-containing gas	<i>See claim 4.</i>


No.	'114 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	comprises about 1 g to about 30 g of the element bromine per 100 g of the sorbent.	
30	The method of claim 25, wherein the mercury/sorbent composition comprises the element bromine, the sorbent material, and mercury.	<i>See 24e.</i>

'517 Claim Chart

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
1a	A method for reducing mercury in a mercury-containing gas, the method comprising:	The Feb. 2004 Report describes the September 2003 testing (page 10): The pilot-scale test was started on September 8, 2003, and was completed on September 19, 2003. A 550,000-Btu/hr pulverized coal (pc)-fired unit, known as the PTC, was used to fire lignites and test mercury control options. The coal combustion flue gas exiting the PTC was cooled down to a nominal temperature of 149°C (300°F) and then was introduced into a single-wire tubular ESP unit. Figure 4 shows the schematic diagram of the system. Furnace additives were added to coal prior to introduction to the furnace. Mercury sorbents were fed with a K-Tron dual-screw feeder upstream of the ESP. CMMs were used to monitor mercury vapor concentrations at the ESP inlet (Site 1) and outlet (Site 2) 24 h per day for the entire testing period. Several OH method samples (ASTM D6784 Standard Test Method for Elemental, Oxidized, Particle-Bound and Total Mercury in Flue Gas Generated from Coal-Fired Stationary Sources) were collected at the ESP inlet and outlet throughout the testing period as verification of the CMM data. Fourteen tests were completed to evaluate various sorbent and mercury oxidant performance on mercury removal across the ESP as functions of feed rate. A detailed test matrix is listed in Table 1. Ten additional tests were performed to evaluate mercury control with the <i>Advanced Hybrid™</i> filter and are summarized under Task 4 Results and Discussion. The Feb. 2004 Report also describes additional testing in December 2003 (page 14-15):


No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		One week of short-term sorbent (Task 2.2) and furnace additive testing was accomplished in December 2003 to demonstrate mercury removal by sorbent injection combined with various oxidizing additives to simulate a scrubbed baghouse system. The 580 MJ/h (550,000 Btu/h) pulverized coal PTC unit was equipped with a Niro Inc. Produciton Minor Spray Dryer Model I and baghouse and fired with Center lignite coal. Table 4 summarizes the test matrix for the spray dryer–baghouse configuration. Based on previous pilot-scale testing results of ESP mercury removal effectiveness, three additives (NaCl, CaCl₂, and another for which the EERC is assessing the intellectual property issues) were evaluated. CMMs were set up at the inlet to the spray dryer upstream of the sorbent injection port at the outlet of the baghouse to monitor mercury vapor concentrations continuously throughout the 4-day test. Six OH method samples were collected at the same locations to verify CMM measurements and performance of the sorbents and additive injection. A Thermo Environmental Model 15C HCl analyzer was The October 2005 Report describes additional testing in February 2004 (page 20): sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄)–potassium permanganate (KMnO₄) solutions. EPA Method 29 was used for trace element sampling of the flue gas during Week 1 (February 2–4, 2004) testing of Caballo coal. Samples were collected at the ESP inlet upstream of the carbon injection location during three different conditions: baseline and SEA1 and SEA2 additions. The objective was to determine the effects of SEA additions on trace metal concentrations and particle–gas partitioning.
1b	combusting coal in a combustion chamber, the coal comprising an	The Feb. 2004 Report explains that coal was combusted in a 550,000-Btu/hr pc-fire combustor (known as the PTC) (page 10):

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	additive comprising Br ₂ , HBr, a bromide compound, or a combination thereof, to form the mercury-containing gas; and	The pilot-scale test was started on September 8, 2003, and was completed on September 19, 2003. A 550,000-Btu/hr pulverized coal (pc)-fired unit, known as the PTC, was used to fire lignites and test mercury control options. The coal combustion flue gas exiting the PTC was cooled down to a nominal temperature of 149°C (300°F) and then was introduced into a single-wire tubular ESP unit. Figure 4 shows the schematic diagram of the system. Furnace additives were added to coal prior to introduction to the furnace. Mercury sorbents were fed with a K-Tron dual-screw feeder upstream of the ESP. The Feb. 2004 Report describes adding coal and additives (including SEA 2) to the combustion chamber during the September 2003 testing (page 18): SEA 2 is noted as NaBr in the PTC logbooks, and when combusted with coal, produces a mercury-containing gas comprised of a bromine halogen or halide promoter.


No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 Figure 4. Injection and sampling schematic of the PTC with an ESP. <i>See also</i> Feb. 2004 Report at 17 (“mercury oxidants including NaCl, SEA 2, and zinc were examined for their impacts on mercury removal.”); 15 (“Based on previous pilot-scale testing results of ESP mercury removal effectiveness, three additives (NaCl, CaCl₂, and another for which the EERC is assessing the intellectual property

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		issues) were evaluated.”); Final Report at 25 (“SEA2 is a proprietary Hg^0 oxidizing agent effective at addition rates on the order of 1/10 of those for SEA1.”) The PTC Log Book identifies the SEA2 additive used as sodium bromide, which includes Br^-. Thus, the mercury-containing gas, the coal, and the combustion chamber comprised HBr, Br_2, and Br^-. 1836 STARTED SODIUM BROMIDE FEEDER @ 40g/hr 375 SET 3 lbs coal - 48g Sodium Bromide 1904 Added 204 lbs Coal 1926 Added new batch Sodium Bromide Coal to Feeder Same blend 3 lbs C 48g SB @ 40gr/hr SEA2 and activated carbon were similarly used during the December 2003 testing. See Feb. 2004 Report at 15: One week of short-term sorbent (Task 2.2) and furnace additive testing was accomplished in December 2003 to demonstrate mercury removal by sorbent injection combined with various oxidizing additives to simulate a scrubbed baghouse system. The 580 MJ/h (550,000 Btu/h) pulverized coal PTC unit was equipped with a Niro Inc. Produciton Minor Spray Dryer Model I


No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		and baghouse and fired with Center lignite coal. Table 4 summarizes the test matrix for the spray dryer–baghouse configuration. Based on previous pilot-scale testing results of ESP mercury removal effectiveness, three additives (NaCl, CaCl₂, and another for which the EERC is assessing the intellectual property issues) were evaluated. CMMs were set up at the inlet to the spray dryer upstream of the sorbent injection port at the outlet of the baghouse to monitor mercury vapor concentrations continuously throughout the 4-day test. Six OH method samples were collected at the same locations to verify CMM measurements and performance of the sorbents and additive injection. A Thermo Environmental Model 15C HCl analyzer was <i>See</i> Feb. 2005 Report at 25 (“Pilot-scale Hg control testing was conducted December 8–11, 2003, using a 580-MJ/hr (550,000-Btu/hr) pc-fired unit equipped with a Niro Inc. Production Minor Spray Dryer Model I and baghouse.”); at 27 (“Nine tests were completed to evaluate the effectiveness of potential Hg sorbents (DARCO® FGD, EERC-treated FGD, and Amended Silicate™) and Hg⁰ oxidation and sorbent enhancement additives (NaCl, SEA2, and CaCl₂) to remove Hg using a SDA and FF.”); at 25:

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates a coal gasification process. It begins with 'Coal and Additives' entering a 'Furnace'. From the furnace, a gas stream flows through a 'Sorbent Injection' point, then through a blue hexagonal unit labeled 'SD', and then through a yellow cylindrical unit labeled 'FF Baghouse'. Finally, the gas exits through a brown trapezoidal unit labeled 'Stack'. Sampling points are indicated: 'GH, HCl, and CMM Sampling' occurs between the furnace and the SD unit, and 'OH and CMM Sampling' occurs between the FF Baghouse and the stack. The text 'EERC KG23081.CDR' is located in the upper right corner of the diagram area. SEA2 and activated carbon were also used in the February 2004 testing. Oct. 2005 Report at 20:

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄)–potassium permanganate (KMnO₄) solutions. EPA Method 29 was used for trace element sampling of the flue gas during Week 1 (February 2–4, 2004) testing of Caballo coal. Samples were collected at the ESP inlet upstream of the carbon injection location during three different conditions: baseline and SEA1 and SEA2 additions. The objective was to determine the effects of SEA additions on trace metal concentrations and particle–gas partitioning. Oct. 2005 Report at 26:

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates a gas processing system. On the left, a green trapezoidal structure labeled 'P.T.C.' (combustion chamber) receives input from a box labeled 'Coal and Additives' (highlighted with a red border). A horizontal pipe extends from the top of the P.T.C. to the right. A vertical arrow labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 1' points down from this pipe. Further right, a vertical arrow labeled 'Sorbent Injection' points down into the pipe. The pipe continues to a blue cylindrical vessel labeled 'E.S.P.' (electrostatic precipitator). Below the E.S.P., a vertical arrow labeled 'OH and CMM Sampling Site 2' points down. The pipe then leads to a brown trapezoidal structure labeled 'Stack' on the far right. A red vertical line is positioned to the right of the stack. The text 'EEHC CC22781.GDR' is in the top right corner.
1c	collecting mercury in the mercury-containing gas with a sorbent added to	The Feb. 2004 Report describes injecting Darco FGD activated carbon into the mercury-containing gas downstream of the combustion chamber during the September 2003 testing (page 11):

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice																																																																																				
	the mercury-containing gas, the sorbent comprising activated carbon.	<table><tr><th colspan="5">Table 1. Test Matrix for Unscrubbed Systems Equipped with ESPs</th></tr><tr><th rowspan="2">Test No.</th><th colspan="2">Mercury Oxidant Additive</th><th colspan="2">Sorbent</th></tr><tr><th>Category</th><th>Injection Rate, lb/Macf</th><th>Category</th><th>Injection Rate, lb/Macf</th></tr><tr><td>T1-1(Baseline)</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-2</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>2.75–18.4</td></tr><tr><td>T1-3</td><td>NaCl</td><td>3.76–14.7</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-4</td><td>NaCl</td><td>3.76–14.7</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>2.75–4.59</td></tr><tr><td>T1-5</td><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84–7.34</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-6</td><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>2.57</td></tr><tr><td>T1-7</td><td>NaCl</td><td>7.34–11.0</td><td>HCl-Treated FGD</td><td>2.57–4.59</td></tr><tr><td>T1-8</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>EERC-Treated Carbon</td><td>1.84–2.75</td></tr><tr><td>T1-9</td><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84</td><td>EERC-Treated Carbon</td><td>2.75</td></tr><tr><td>T1-10</td><td>Zn</td><td>7.34</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-11</td><td>Zn and NaCl</td><td>7.34–11.0</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>T1-12</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>Na₂S₄ (solution)</td><td>0.89–6.67</td></tr><tr><td>T1-13</td><td>CaCl₂</td><td>11</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>0–4.59</td></tr><tr><td>T1-14</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>ALSTOM Sorbent</td><td>1.1–3.1</td></tr></table> <i>See also</i> Feb. 2004 Report at 15 (describing “DARCO® FGD activated carbon, supplied by NORIT Americas, Inc.; an EERC-treated activated carbon”)	Table 1. Test Matrix for Unscrubbed Systems Equipped with ESPs					Test No.	Mercury Oxidant Additive		Sorbent		Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	T1-1(Baseline)	None	NA	None	NA	T1-2	None	NA	DARCO® FGD	2.75–18.4	T1-3	NaCl	3.76–14.7	None	NA	T1-4	NaCl	3.76–14.7	DARCO® FGD	2.75–4.59	T1-5	SEA 2	1.84–7.34	None	NA	T1-6	SEA 2	1.84	DARCO® FGD	2.57	T1-7	NaCl	7.34–11.0	HCl-Treated FGD	2.57–4.59	T1-8	None	NA	EERC-Treated Carbon	1.84–2.75	T1-9	SEA 2	1.84	EERC-Treated Carbon	2.75	T1-10	Zn	7.34	None	NA	T1-11	Zn and NaCl	7.34–11.0	None	NA	T1-12	None	NA	Na ₂ S ₄ (solution)	0.89–6.67	T1-13	CaCl ₂	11	DARCO® FGD	0–4.59	T1-14	None	NA	ALSTOM Sorbent	1.1–3.1
Table 1. Test Matrix for Unscrubbed Systems Equipped with ESPs																																																																																						
Test No.	Mercury Oxidant Additive		Sorbent																																																																																			
	Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	Category	Injection Rate, lb/Macf																																																																																		
T1-1(Baseline)	None	NA	None	NA																																																																																		
T1-2	None	NA	DARCO® FGD	2.75–18.4																																																																																		
T1-3	NaCl	3.76–14.7	None	NA																																																																																		
T1-4	NaCl	3.76–14.7	DARCO® FGD	2.75–4.59																																																																																		
T1-5	SEA 2	1.84–7.34	None	NA																																																																																		
T1-6	SEA 2	1.84	DARCO® FGD	2.57																																																																																		
T1-7	NaCl	7.34–11.0	HCl-Treated FGD	2.57–4.59																																																																																		
T1-8	None	NA	EERC-Treated Carbon	1.84–2.75																																																																																		
T1-9	SEA 2	1.84	EERC-Treated Carbon	2.75																																																																																		
T1-10	Zn	7.34	None	NA																																																																																		
T1-11	Zn and NaCl	7.34–11.0	None	NA																																																																																		
T1-12	None	NA	Na ₂ S ₄ (solution)	0.89–6.67																																																																																		
T1-13	CaCl ₂	11	DARCO® FGD	0–4.59																																																																																		
T1-14	None	NA	ALSTOM Sorbent	1.1–3.1																																																																																		

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 Figure 4. Injection and sampling schematic of the PTC with an ESP. The Feb. 2004 Report also describes injecting activated carbon sorbent during the December 2003 testing:²⁷

²⁷ This table refers to a “December 2004 run,” which is a typo. It should refer to a December 2003 run as noted in the preceding paragraph. Final Report at 14 (“One week of short-term sorbent (Task 2.2) and furnace additive testing was accomplished in December 2003 to demonstrate mercury removal by sorbent injection combined with

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice																																																				
		<table><tr><th colspan="4">Table 4. Spray Dryer Test Sample Matrix (December 2004 run)</th></tr><tr><th colspan="2">Mercury Oxidation Additive</th><th colspan="2">Sorbent</th></tr><tr><th>Type</th><th>Feed Rate, lb/Macf</th><th>Type</th><th>Injection Rate, lb/Macf</th></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>1.84 – 11.02</td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>EERC-Treated FGD</td><td>1.84 – 7.35</td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>NA</td><td>Amended Silicate™</td><td>7.35</td></tr><tr><td>NaCl</td><td>3.67 – 11.02</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>NaCl</td><td>3.67 – 11.02</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>3.67</td></tr><tr><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84 – 3.67</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>SEA 2</td><td>1.84 – 3.67</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>1.84</td></tr><tr><td>CaCl₂</td><td>3.67 – 11.02</td><td>None</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>CaCl₂</td><td>3.67 – 11.03</td><td>DARCO® FGD</td><td>3.67</td></tr></table> See also Feb. 2005 Report at 25:	Table 4. Spray Dryer Test Sample Matrix (December 2004 run)				Mercury Oxidation Additive		Sorbent		Type	Feed Rate, lb/Macf	Type	Injection Rate, lb/Macf	None	NA	None	NA	None	NA	DARCO® FGD	1.84 – 11.02	None	NA	EERC-Treated FGD	1.84 – 7.35	None	NA	Amended Silicate™	7.35	NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA	NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	DARCO® FGD	3.67	SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	None	NA	SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	DARCO® FGD	1.84	CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA	CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.03	DARCO® FGD	3.67
Table 4. Spray Dryer Test Sample Matrix (December 2004 run)																																																						
Mercury Oxidation Additive		Sorbent																																																				
Type	Feed Rate, lb/Macf	Type	Injection Rate, lb/Macf																																																			
None	NA	None	NA																																																			
None	NA	DARCO® FGD	1.84 – 11.02																																																			
None	NA	EERC-Treated FGD	1.84 – 7.35																																																			
None	NA	Amended Silicate™	7.35																																																			
NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA																																																			
NaCl	3.67 – 11.02	DARCO® FGD	3.67																																																			
SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	None	NA																																																			
SEA 2	1.84 – 3.67	DARCO® FGD	1.84																																																			
CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.02	None	NA																																																			
CaCl ₂	3.67 – 11.03	DARCO® FGD	3.67																																																			

various oxidizing additives to simulate a scrubbed baghouse system.”). This is also evidence based on the fact that the Final Report was prepared in February 2004.


No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 The diagram illustrates a process flow for a sorbent injection system. It begins with 'Coal and Additives' entering a green 'Furnace'. From the furnace, a pipe leads to a blue 'SD' (Sorbent Dispenser) unit, with a side branch for 'GH, HCl, and CMM Sampling'. A red box labeled 'Sorbent Injection' points to the SD unit. The pipe continues from the SD unit to a yellow 'FF Baghouse' (Fabric Filter Baghouse). From the baghouse, the pipe leads to a brown 'Stack' (Exhaust Stack), with a side branch for 'OH and CMM Sampling'. The text 'EERC KG23081.CDR' is located in the upper right corner of the diagram area. The Oct. 2005 Report describes injecting activated carbon sorbent during the February 2004 testing (pages 26-27):

Table 9-2. Week 1 – Test Matrix

Date	Sampling Inlet	Sampling Outlet	Sorbent	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf	Oxidant	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf
2/2/04	OH M-29	OH	Baseline					
			Baseline					
			DARCO	25.0	7.03			
			DARCO	28.0	7.84			
			DARCO	32.0	8.96			
			DARCO	45.0	12.60			
2/3/04	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	69.0	19.20			
			Baseline					
						SEA1	15.2	4.28
						SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	45.5	12.80
2/4/04	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	59.9	16.73
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	15.2	4.28
			Baseline					
						SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	25.0	6.96	SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	9.8	2.73
2/5/2004	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	15.0	4.18			
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	6.9	1.92
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	4.3	1.20
			DARCO	15.0	4.18			
			DARCO	15.0	4.18			
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA1-SEA2	2.6	0.72
2/5/2004	OH	OH	Baseline					
			EERC carbon	25.0	6.97			
			EERC carbon	35.0	9.76			
			Am. Silicate	25.0	6.91			
			Am. Silicate	50.0	13.82			

Notes:


M-29 = EPA Method 29


EERC carbon = EERC-treated DARCO carbon

Am. Silicate = Amended Silicate

SEA1-SEA2 = 50%-50% blend of SEA1 and SEA2. The total rate for both is given.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		Diagram illustrating the mercury removal process. Coal and Additives enter the PTC (Preheated Turbine Compressor). The gas stream then passes through the ESP (Electrostatic Precipitator) where Sorbent Injection occurs. Sampling sites for OH and CMM are located before and after the ESP. The gas stream exits the ESP through a stack. EEHC CC22781.GDR The mercury/sorbent composition was separated, and the mercury was collected using an electrostatic precipitator during the September 2003 testing. Feb. 2004 Report at 10-11 (“Fourteen tests were completed to evaluate various sorbent and mercury oxidant performance on mercury removal across the ESP as functions of feed rate.”):

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		 Figure 4. Injection and sampling schematic of the PTC with an ESP. The mercury/sorbent composition was separated, and the mercury was collected using a scrubbed baghouse system during the December 2003 testing. Feb. 2004 Report at 14 (“One week of short-term sorbent (Task 2.2) and furnace additive testing was accomplished in December 2003 to demonstrate mercury removal by

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		sorbent injection combined with various oxidizing additives to simulate a scrubbed baghouse system.”); <i>see also</i> Feb. 2005 Report at 25:  The diagram illustrates a process for simulating a scrubbed baghouse system. It begins with a green 'Furnace' where 'Coal and Additives' are introduced. Gases exit the furnace and pass through a blue 'SD' (Sorbent Desiccant) unit and a yellow 'FF Baghouse', which are enclosed in a red box. 'Sorbent Injection' is shown entering the gas stream before the SD unit. Sampling points are indicated for 'GH, HCl, and CMM Sampling' before the SD unit, and 'OH and CMM Sampling' after the baghouse. The final gas stream exits through a brown 'Stack'. The reference 'EERC KG23081.CDR' is noted in the top right corner.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		The mercury/sorbent composition was separated, and the mercury was collected using an electrostatic precipitator during the February 2004 testing. Oct. 2005 Report at 26 (“ESP Hg removal testing was performed with the PTC firing Caballo subbituminous coal.”):
2	The method of claim 1, further comprising injecting an alkaline sorbent into the mercury-containing gas stream.	At least one of the sorbents used during the February 2004 testing were alkaline sorbents. <i>See</i> Oct. 2005 Report at 54: The inorganic fraction of DARCO FGD is primarily an Fe₂O₃-, CaO-, and SO₃-rich aluminosilicate material. It lacks alkali metals, Na₂O and K₂O, but contains relatively high alkaline-earth metal, CaO and MgO, content. DARCO FGD carbon is commonly used as a “baseline” sorbent to compare with the Hg removal effectiveness of other Hg control technologies.
3	The method of claim 2, wherein the alkaline sorbent is selected from the group consisting of alkali elements,	<i>See</i> claim 2.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	alkaline earth elements, alkali salts, alkaline earth salts, and combinations thereof.	
5	The method of claim 1, wherein the sorbent has a composition comprising from about 1 to about 30 grams of the element bromine per 100 grams of activated carbon.	The February 2004 testing used bromine injection rates within this range. <i>See</i> Oct. 2005 Report at 27:

Table 9-2. Week 1 – Test Matrix

Date	Sampling Inlet	Sampling Outlet	Sorbent	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf	Oxidant	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf
2/2/04	OH M-29	OH	Baseline					
			Baseline					
			DARCO	25.0	7.03			
			DARCO	28.0	7.84			
			DARCO	32.0	8.96			
			DARCO	45.0	12.60			
2/3/04	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	69.0	19.20			
			Baseline					
						SEA1	15.2	4.28
						SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	29.8	8.38
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	45.5	12.80
2/4/04	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	59.9	16.73
			DARCO	25.0	7.03	SEA1	15.2	4.28
			Baseline					
						SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	25.0	6.96	SEA2	9.8	2.73
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	9.8	2.73
2/5/2004	OH M-29	OH	DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	6.9	1.92
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA2	4.3	1.20
			DARCO	15.0	4.18			
			DARCO	15.0	4.18	SEA1-SEA2	2.6	0.72
			Baseline					
			EERC carbon	25.0	6.97			
2/5/2004	OH M-29	OH	EERC carbon	35.0	9.76			
			Am. Silicate	25.0	6.91			
			Am. Silicate	50.0	13.82			
			Am. Silicate	50.0	13.82			

Notes:

M-29 = EPA Method 29

EERC carbon = EERC-treated DARCO carbon

Am. Silicate = Amended Silicate

SEA1-SEA2 = 50%-50% blend of SEA1 and SEA2. The total rate for both is given.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
		<i>See Ex. 2025, Oct. 2005 Report at 30:</i>

Table 9-4. Week 2 – Test Matrix

Date	Sampling Inlet	Sampling Outlet	Sorbent	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf	Oxidant	Rate, g/hr	Rate, lb/MMacf
SDA-ESP 2/17/04	OH	OH	Baseline DARCO	25 35 45 55	5.82 8.14 10.47 12.8			
		OH	Baseline					
						SEA1	25	5.82
SDA-ESP 2/18/04			Baseline					
	OH	OH	DARCO	25	5.82	SEA1	25	5.82
			DARCO	25	5.82	SEA1	35	8.14
			Baseline					
						SEA2	1	0.23
		OH	DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	2.5	0.58
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	5	1.16
SDA-FF 2/19/04		OH	Baseline					
	OH	OH	DARCO	10	2.33			
			DARCO	25	5.82			
			DARCO	55	12.8			
			Baseline					
		OH	DARCO	10	2.33	SEA1	10	2.33
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA1	15	3.49
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA1	25	5.82
SDA-FF 2/20/2004			Baseline					
						SEA2	1	0.23
		OH	DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	1.5	0.35
			DARCO	10	2.33	SEA2	0.5	0.12
			Baseline					
			Am. Silicate	15	3.49			
			Am. Silicate	30	6.98			

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
6	The method of claim 1, comprising collecting greater than 70 wt % of the mercury in the mercury-containing gas.	This level of mercury capture was achieved during the September 2003, December 2003, and February 2004 testing. <i>See</i> Feb. 2004 Report at 73: – SEA2 and DARCO[®] FGD. The combination of DARCO[®] FGD injection at 1.84 lb/Macf and SEA2 addition provided exceptional SDA–FF Hg(g) capture, >90%, even at the lower addition rate of 1.84 lb/Macf. <i>See</i> Oct. 2005 Report at 49: The effectiveness of SEA2 addition, SEA2 additions combined with DARCO FGD injection, and a 50:50 wt% SEA1 and SEA2 mixture addition combined with ACI to remove Hg_{total} and Hg⁰ from Caballo coal combustion flue gas is shown in Figures 11-15, 11-16, and 11-17. SEA2 addition at 1.9 lb/MMacf reduced the ESP outlet Hg_{total} concentration by 70%. When SEA2 was added during ACI, ESP Hg_{total} capture increased moderately to >80%. The Hg speciation results in Figure 11-16 suggest that in addition to Hg⁰, some Hg²⁺ exited the ESP during the SEA2 and SEA2–SEA1 addition and ACI tests. The addition of the SEA1–SEA2 mixture at 0.5 lb/MMacf combined with ACI at 2.9 lb/MMacf resulted in a slightly lower ESP Hg_{total} removal as compared to the SEA2 addition and ACI tests.
7	The method of claim 1, comprising	<i>See</i> claim 6.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	collecting greater than 70 wt % of the mercury in the mercury-containing gas with the sorbent.	
8a	The method of claim 1, further comprising:	<i>See</i> '114 1g
8b	measuring mercury content of the mercury-containing gas; and	<i>See</i> '114 1g
8c	modifying, in response to the measured mercury content,	<i>See</i> '114 1h

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
8d	an injection rate of injecting the sorbent comprising activated carbon into the mercury-containing gas,	<i>See</i> '114 1h
8e	an amount of the additive comprising the Br ₂ , HBr, bromide compound, or a combination thereof, added to the coal, or	<i>See</i> '114 1h
8f	a combination thereof.	<i>See</i> '114 1h
9	The method of claim 8, wherein the measuring of	<i>See</i> '225 claim 24

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	the mercury content of the mercury-containing gas is performed substantially continuously.	
10a	The method of claim 1, further comprising:	See '114 1h
10b	modifying, in response to a measured mercury content,	See '114 1h
10c	an injection rate of injecting the sorbent comprising activated carbon into the mercury-containing gas,	See '114 1h

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
10d	an amount of the Br ₂ , HBr, bromide compound, or a combination thereof, added to the coal, or	See '114 1h
10e	a combination thereof.	See '114 1h
11	The method of claim 1, wherein the coal comprises a subbituminous coal.	Our testing included tests with subbituminous coal. See Oct. 2005 Report at 28: 9.2 Week 2 Testing: SDA–ESP and SDA–FF Configurations Testing began with the PTC in the SDA–ESP configuration, with CMM and OH sampling performed at the SDA inlet and ESP outlet. After two days of testing, the PTC was reconfigured to the SDA–FF configuration, as shown in Figure 9-2. Caballo subbituminous coal was fired during Week 2 testing.
12	The method of claim 1, wherein	Our testing included tests with lignite coal. See Feb. 2004 Report at 10:

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	the coal comprises lignite coal.	<i>Coal and Combustion Flue Gas Analyses</i> North Dakota Freedom lignite was tested in the PTC at the EERC. The proximate and ultimate analysis data for the Freedom lignite are reported in Table 2, showing a concentration of mercury in the range of 0.0503–0.0515 µg/g (dry basis), with a mean value of 0.0508 µg/g. Based on the proximate and ultimate analysis data, it was calculated that 1 lb of coal would produce 89 scf of dry flue gas normalized to a 3.0% oxygen level. From the mercury content in raw coal, the total mercury concentration in flue gas was expected to be 7.2 µg/m³ of dry flue gas (at a 3% oxygen level).
13	The method of claim 1, wherein the coal comprises the added Br ₂ , HBr, the bromide compound, or a combination thereof, added to the coal before the coal enters the	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	combustion chamber.	
14	The method of claim 1, wherein the combustion chamber comprises the added Br ₂ , HBr, the bromide compound, or a combination thereof.	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
15	The method of claim 1, wherein the coal is combusted in the combustion chamber at a coal-combustion facility, wherein the Br ₂ ,	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	HBr, bromide compound, or combination thereof, is added to the coal before the coal enters the combustion chamber, wherein the addition of the Br₂, HBr, bromide compound, or combination thereof, to the coal is performed at the coal-combustion facility.	
17	The method of claim 1, wherein the combustion chamber is an	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	electric utility coal combustion chamber.	
18a	The method of claim 1, further comprising:	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
18b	measuring mercury content of the mercury-containing gas; and	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
18c	modifying, in response to the measured mercury content, an injection rate of injecting the sorbent comprising activated carbon	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	into the mercury-containing gas.	
19	The method of claim 1, wherein the mercury-containing gas comprises about 1 g to about 30 g of the element bromine per 100 g of the sorbent.	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
21	The method of claim 1, wherein the sorbent in the mercury-containing gas comprises about 1 g to about 30 g of the added Br ₂ , HBr, the	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	bromide compound, or a combination thereof, per 100 g of the sorbent.	
22	The method of claim 1, wherein the Br ₂ , HBr, or the bromide compound is contacted with the sorbent in vapor form, gaseous form, liquid form, or in an organic solvent.	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
24	The method of claim 1, wherein the sorbent injected into the mercury-	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	containing gas is free of contact with a halogen or halide promoter prior to injection of the sorbent into the mercury-containing gas.	
25	The method of claim 1, wherein the injection of the sorbent into the mercury-containing gas occurs upstream of a particulate separator or a scrubber.	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
26	The method of claim 25, wherein the particulate separator comprises an electrostatic precipitator, a baghouse, a fabric filter, or a combination thereof.	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
29a	A method of separating mercury from a mercury-containing gas, the method comprising:	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
29b	combusting coal in a combustion chamber, wherein	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
29c	the coal comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, bromide compound, or a combination thereof, added to the coal before the coal enters the combustion chamber, or	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
29d	the combustion chamber comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, bromide compound, or a combination thereof, or	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
29e	a combination thereof; and	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
29f	collecting mercury in the mercury-containing gas with a sorbent added to the mercury-containing gas, the sorbent comprising activated carbon.	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
30a	A method of separating mercury from a mercury-containing gas, the method comprising:	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
30b	combusting coal in a combustion chamber, to provide the mercury-containing gas, wherein the	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	mercury-containing gas comprises a halogen or halide promoter comprising HBr, Br ⁻ , or a combination thereof, wherein	
30c	the coal comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, bromide compound, or a combination thereof, added to the coal before the coal enters the combustion chamber, or	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
30d	the combustion chamber comprises added Br ₂ , HBr, bromide compound, or a combination thereof, or	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
30e	a combination thereof;	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
30f	collecting mercury in the mercury-containing gas with a sorbent added to the mercury-containing gas, the sorbent comprising activated carbon;	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
30g	separating the sorbent contacted with the mercury from the mercury-containing gas;	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
30h	measuring the mercury content of the mercury-containing gas; and	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
30i	modifying, in response to the measured mercury content of the mercury-containing gas,	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
30j	an injection rate of injecting the sorbent into the	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.

No.	'517 Claim Element	Evidence of Reduction to Practice
	mercury-containing gas,	
30k	an amount of the Br ₂ , HBr, bromide compound, or a combination thereof, added to the coal or the combustion chamber, or	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.
30l	a combination thereof.	These claims are reflected in our testing for the same reasons described above and also with respect to claim 1 of the '114 Patent.