

**USE OF ABANDONED MINE DRAINAGE SOLIDS FOR THE CONTROL OF
MERCURY EMISSIONS FROM COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS**

By

Wei Sun

B.S., Wuhan University of Technology, 2002

M.S., Shanghai Jiaotong University, 2006

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Swanson School of Engineering in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

University of Pittsburgh

2009

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
SWANSON SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

This thesis was presented

by

Wei Sun

It was defended on

April 2nd, 2009

and approved by

Radisav D. Vidic, Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

Leonard W. Casson, Associate Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental
Engineering

Jason D. Monnell, Research Assistant Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental
Engineering

Thesis Advisor: Radisav D. Vidic, Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental
Engineering

USE OF ABANDONED MINE DRAINAGE SOLIDS FOR THE CONTROL OF MERCURY EMISSIONS FROM COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS

Wei Sun, M.S.

University of Pittsburgh, 2009

Abandoned mine drainage (AMD) solids were evaluated for their ability to capture mercury from the flue gas of coal fired power plants. A fixed bed system was used to test Hg adsorption and oxidation by this material in a typical simulated flue gas. Fixed-bed tests showed that abandoned mine drainage from three mines displayed considerable capability for absorbing and oxidizing Hg⁰. Among all the flue gas components, HCl showed the greatest impact on Hg capture in the fixed-bed test, while O₂ was shown to be not as important. A decrease in mercury capture and oxidation was observed when SO₂ and NO₂ were added to the flue gas. The addition of SO₂ and NO prohibited mercury uptake but showed no impact on Hg oxidation.

An entrained flow system was utilized to test mercury removal efficiency when abandoned mine drainage solids were injected into the flue gas. Four different AMD solids were tested using both eastern coal and PRB coal flue gas. Results showed that one AMD sample achieved about 80% Hg removal at the solids injection rate of 0.39 g/m³ injection rate. Mercury removal efficiency with other AMD samples under the identical conditions ranged from 25%~50%. Thus, this material shows great potential as a novel sorbent on Hg emission control technology. Moreover, Hg removal efficiency was found to be positively related to the iron content of AMD solids. Therefore, AMD solids with high iron content would be more desirable as mercury removal sorbent.

The foam index test was also performed using this material to study the possible effect of AMD solids on the application of fly ash in concrete making, which is the main disadvantage of activated carbon injection technology. The test results indicated that all AMD samples used in this study would not have any adverse effect on the fly ash with regards to its application for concrete making.

Keyword: Abandoned mine drainage, Flue gas, Mercury adsorption, Mercury oxidation, Mercury removal, Injection.

Copyright © by Wei Sun

2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
LIST OF TABLES	IX
LIST OF FIGURES	IX
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	XIII
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1 MERCURY EMISSION FROM COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS	3
2.2 ACTIVATED CARBON INJECTION (ACI) TECHNOLOGY	10
2.3 ABANDONED MINE DRAINAGE SLUDGE.....	13
2.4 SUMMARY AND RESEARCH NEEDS	16
3.0 MATERIAL AND METHODS	18
3.1 ABANDONED MINE DRAINAGE MATERIAL SAMPLES	18
3.2 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND PROCEDURE	20
3.2.1 Fixed bed system setup	20
3.2.2 Entrained flow system setup	24
3.3 AMD SLUDGE MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION	26
3.3.1 Particle Size Distribution Analysis	26
3.3.2 Surface Area Analysis.....	26
3.3.3 Elemental analysis.....	26

3.3.4	Foam Index Test.....	27
4.0	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	28
4.1	AMD SLUDGE MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION	28
4.1.1	Particle Size Distribution Analysis	28
4.1.2	Surface Area Analysis.....	29
4.1.3	Elemental analysis of AMD sludge samples	30
4.2	MERCURY UPTAKE TEST IN A FIXED BED SYSTEM	30
4.2.1	Hg uptake by Site A sample in Eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas at 140°C	30
4.2.2	Hg uptake by Site B sample in Eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas at 140°C	32
4.2.3	Hg uptake test on Site C sample in Eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	34
4.2.4	Impact of temperature on Hg uptake by Site A sample in Eastern coal flue gas at 140°C.....	36
4.2.5	Impact of flue gas composition on Hg uptake by Site A sample at 140°C	37
4.2.5.1	Impact of CO ₂ and O ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C	38
4.2.5.2	Impact of SO ₂ with O ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C	39
4.2.5.3	Impact of HCl with O ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C.....	40
4.2.5.4	Impact of NO ₂ with O ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C	42
4.2.5.5	Impact of NO with O ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C	43
4.2.5.6	Impact of SO ₂ with HCl on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C....	43
4.2.5.7	Impact of NO ₂ with HCl on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C... ..	45
4.2.5.8	Impact of NO with HCl on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C	46
4.2.5.9	Impact of NO ₂ and NO on Hg uptake and oxidation with flue gas comprised of N ₂ +CO ₂ +O ₂ +HCl+SO ₂	47
4.3	MERCURY UPTAKE BY AMD SOLIDS IN ENTRAINED FLOW SYSTEM ...	51

4.3.1	Impact of quartz wool filter on mercury measurement in the entrained flow reactor.....	51
4.3.2	“Reactor effect” on mercury measurement in the entrained flow reactor	52
4.3.3	Impact of flue gas composition on mercury removal by AMD Site A sample in the entrained flow reactor.....	55
4.3.4	Impact of temperature on mercury removal by Site A sample in the entrained flow reactor	56
4.3.5	Impact of injection rate on mercury removal by Site A sample in the entrained flow reactor	57
4.3.6	Comparison of Site A sample to commercial FGD activated carbon in Eastern coal flue gas at 140 °C	58
4.3.7	Entrained flow tests with other AMD samples in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	60
4.3.8	Entrained flow tests with Fe ₂ O ₃ chemical in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C	62
4.4	FOAM INDEX TEST RESULTS.....	65
5.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	67
6.0	FUTURE WORK.....	68
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Control technology categories and estimated mercury removal ranked by tons of mercury entering plants.....	5
Table 3.1 Compositions of eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas.....	22
Table 4.1 Mean particle size of AMD solid samples.....	29
Table 4.2 Surface area of AMD solid samples.....	29
Table 4.3 Elemental analysis result of AMD solid samples.....	30
Table 4.4 Hg uptake capacity of Site A, B and C samples in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	35
Table 4.5 % oxidized Hg with Site A, B and C samples in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	35
Table 4.6 Combinations of flue gas compositions in flue gas.....	38
Table 4.7 Hg removal efficiency and outlet [Hg ²⁺]/inlet [Hg] after 2 hrs reaction with different flue gas compositions.....	50
Table 4.8 Fe%, Injection rate and [Hg] removal efficiency results in the entrained flow tests....	64
Table 4.9 Foam Index test results of Portland cement and AMD samples.....	65

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Source contributions to 1995 Total US Anthropogenic mercury emission.....	5
Figure 2.2 Percentage of mercury as (A) gas phase elemental and (B) particulate bound at the inlet to particulate control devices (PCDs) based on ICR data.....	6
Figure 2.3 Removal of gaseous mercury across PCD as a function of coal chlorine content based on ICR data.....	7
Figure 2.4 Removal of gaseous mercury across FGD as a function of coal chlorine content based on ICR data.....	8
Figure 2.5 Schematic of Activated carbon injection for mercury control.....	10
Figure 3.1 Schematic of fixed -bed set up.....	21
Figure 3.2 Schematic of Entrained flow set up.....	24
Figure 4.1 Size distribution of Site A sample.....	28
Figure 4.2 Hg uptake on Site A sample in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	32
Figure 4.3 Hg uptake on Site B sample in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	33
Figure 4.4 Hg uptake on Site C sample in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	34
Figure 4.5 Impact of temperature on Hg uptake with Site A sample in Eastern coal flue gas	37
Figure 4.6 Impact of 13.5% CO ₂ and 6% O ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ at 140°C.....	39

Figure 4.7 Impact of 6% O ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ , 13.5% CO ₂ , and 0.15% SO ₂ at 140°C.....	40
Figure 4.8 Impact of 6% O ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ , 13.5% CO ₂ , and 50 ppm HCl at 140°C.....	41
Figure 4.9 Impact of 20 ppm NO ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ , 13.5% CO ₂ , and 6% O ₂ at 140°C.....	42
Figure 4.10 Impact of 300 ppm NO on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ , 13.5% CO ₂ and 6% O ₂ at 140°C.....	43
Figure 4.11 Impact of 0.15% SO ₂ with on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ , 13.5% CO ₂ , 6% O ₂ and 50 ppm HCl at 140°C.....	44
Figure 4.12 Impact of 20 ppm NO ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ , 13.5% CO ₂ , 6% O ₂ and 50 ppm HCl at 140°C.....	45
Figure 4.13 Impact of 300 NO on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ , 13.5% CO ₂ , 6% O ₂ and 50 ppm HCl at 140°C.....	46
Figure 4.14 Impact of 20 ppm NO ₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ , 13.5% CO ₂ , 6% O ₂ , 0.15% SO ₂ , 300 ppm NO and 50 ppm HCl at 140°C.....	47
Figure 4.15 Impact of 300 ppm NO on Hg uptake and oxidation with N ₂ , 13.5% CO ₂ , 6% O ₂ , 0.15% SO ₂ , 20ppm NO ₂ and 50 ppm HCl at 140°C.....	48
Figure 4.16 Suggested heterogeneous model for mercury capture for potential effect of NO ₂ and SO ₂	49
Figure 4.17 Impact of quartz wool filter on mercury measurement in entrained flow reactor.....	52
Figure 4.18 “reactor effect” on mercury measurement in entrained flow reactor.....	54
Figure 4.19 Hg removal in entrained flow test with Site A sample at 140°C in Eastern Coal and PRB flue gas.....	56

Figure 4.20 Hg removal in entrained flow test with Site A sample at 140°C and 370°C in Eastern Coal flue gas.....	57
Figure 4.21 Hg removal in entrained flow test with Site A sample at injection rate of 0.76g/m ³ and 0.39g/m ³ in Eastern Coal flue gas.....	58
Figure 4.22 Hg removal in entrained flow test with Site A sample and FGD activated carbon at 140 °C in Eastern Coal flue gas.....	59
Figure 4.23 Entrain flow test results with site 1 in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	60
Figure 4.24 Site 2 entrained flow test results in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	61
Figure 4.25 Site 3 entrained flow test results in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C.....	62
Figure 4.26 Fe ₂ O ₃ chemical entrained flow test results compared with Site A, 1, 2 and 3 sample in Eastern coal flue gas at 140°C.....	63
Figure 4.27 Fe injection rate and Hg removal results Site A, 1,2,3 and Fe ₂ O ₃ injection.....	65

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my academic advisor, Dr. Radisav D. Vidic. I am highly grateful for his advice, not only on my research work but also more importantly, on my way of thinking. His superior professional standards on research have always driven me to strive for perfection. His insight into different research areas and enthusiastic research attitude also impressed me so much.

I will give my great thanks to Dr. Jason D. Monnell for his unreserved help for me to achieve my research and academic goals. This invaluable help undoubtedly makes my life and research work here much easier.

A great thank also goes to Dr. Leonard W. Casson. What he taught to me is not only the priceless knowledge in courses but also to always keep the invaluable engineering concepts in mind.

I am thankful to Dr. Robert S. Hedin for providing the AMD sludge samples and the elemental analysis.

This study was supported by the National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), USDOE. I would like to thank all my colleagues and friends, Xihua Chen, Ravi Bhardwaj, Huixing Li, Sean Shih, Heng Li, Kent Pu and Hui Liu for their support and help with daily work and study.

Finally, I would send my greatest appreciation to my wife, sister and parents in China,

who never hesitate to show their love and support to me.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Coal fired utility boilers are the largest mercury emission sources caused by human activities. In US, they are responsible for one-third of the Hg emission from the combustion point sources.¹ The mercury species in flue gas vary based on the type of coal combustion conditions used in the plants and mercury removed by existing air pollution control device (APCD) in power plants is highly influenced by mercury speciation.¹

Among different mercury emission control technologies, activated carbon injection (ACI) technology has shown the most promise as a near-term technology. It has been widely studied and applied as an effective means of mercury capture from flue gas and. This technology involves injection of powdered activated carbon (PAC) upstream of a particulate control device (e.g., electrostatic precipitator or fabric filter). Mercury in the combustion flue gas is then adsorbed on PAC and PAC is subsequently captured along with the fly ash in the particulate control device. One of the key disadvantages of ACI technology comes from the fact that activated carbon usage could increase the carbon content in fly ash, which has negative impact on fly ash sale for concrete application.

Abandoned mine drainage (AMD) refers to outflow of contaminated water from abandoned coal mines or metal mines. AMD can have severe adverse impacts on the aquatic environment and should be treated prior to discharge. The solids created by AMD treatment commonly contain significant fraction of iron oxide/hydroxide and are collected and disposed in

secured landfills or injected back into the abandoned mine. AMD solids do not have many known beneficial reuse applications except as pigments in dye manufacturing.²

Previous studies revealed that iron oxide is be capable of adsorbing and oxidizing Hg in simulated flue gas.³ Literature review also shows that iron oxide present in fly ash has the capability to oxidize/capture elemental mercury in flue gas.⁴ Accordingly, it may be possible to utilize iron oxide recovered from sludge in AMD treatment as a novel sorbent to remove Hg from flue gas. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to evaluate the capability of AMD solids for Hg removal in simulated flue gas and investigate the feasibility of using this novel sorbent material for air pollution control in thermoelectric power plants. This overall objective can be divided into following specific objectives:

- 1) Evaluate the Hg adsorption and oxidation capability of AMD solids in a fixed bed system using both eastern coal and PRB coal flue gas.

- 2) Study the impact of flue gas compositions on mercury uptake and oxidation with AMD solids.

- 3) Evaluate the performance of selected AMD solids under more realistic process condition (i.e., in the entrained flow system) for mercury removal in both eastern coal and PRB coal flue gas.

- 4) Investigate the impact of AMD solids as mercury removal sorbent on fly ash for concrete preparation.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 MERCURY EMISSION FROM COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS

Mercury exists in trace amounts in coal, waste and other material. When these materials burn, mercury is released into the air. As shown in Figure 1, coal-fired power plants contributed about 33% of the total US anthropogenic mercury emissions in 1995. When mercury is deposited in water or land, it can be changed by bacteria from metal form into methyl mercury (MeHg), which can bioaccumulate in the food chain. Since mercury has great toxic effects on environment and human health, it is considered as one of the most important trace elements emitted from coal-fired power plants. In the US, the consumption of contaminated fish is the primary source of mercury exposure. Forty one states have issued advisories to limit consumptions of predatory fish species.⁵ New research studies have shown that Hg in atmosphere exists as either elemental (Hg^0), oxidized mercury (Hg^{2+}), or particulate-bound mercury (Hg_p). Elemental mercury has an atmospheric life time of between 12 and 18 months, which causes its transport around the globe before deposition. The atmospheric life time of oxidized mercury is between 5-14 days and it tends to be deposited on land locally to the source. Particulate-bound Hg also shows similar behavior.^{6,7}




Figure 2.1. Source contributions to 1995 Total US Anthropogenic mercury emission ⁸

In 1999, EPA issued a three-part Information Collection Request (ICR) to obtain the data on the amount of mercury in US coals and mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants.⁹ From the mercury emissions estimates reported by EPRI and EPA based on ICR data, approximately 75 tons of mercury entered coal-fired utility boilers during 1999 and about 45 tons were discharged into the atmosphere. On average, about 40% of the mercury was retained in the residues of combustion such as bottom ash, fly ash and scrubber sludge and this percentage number varied from under 10% to 90% depending on coal type and plant design.^{10, 11}

Particulate-bound Hg in flue gas from coal-fired power plants is easily removed using control equipment such as ESP or fabric filter. Wet flue gas desulfurization scrubber can remove high levels of Hg²⁺ since it is highly soluble in water. However, Hg⁰ is difficult to remove because it is relatively insoluble in water and highly volatile. Table 2.1 presents the mercury removals from flue gas for various control technologies.

Table 2.1 Control technology categories and estimated mercury removal ranked by tons of mercury entering plants¹¹

Control category	Tons of mercury entering	Number of U.S. power plants	Number of part III test sites	Estimated mercury removals, %			Mercury emission calculation, EPRI ICR, tons
				ICR EPRI 2000	ICR	EPA, 1996	
ESP cold	39.4	674	18	27	39	32	28.8
ESP cold+ FGD wet	16.8	117	11	49	64	66	8.6
ESP hot	5.5	120	9	4	29		5.3
Fabric filter	2.9	58	9	58	56	44	1.2
Venturi Particulate scrubber	2.2	32	9	18			1.8
Spray dryer+ fabric filter	1.6	47	10	38		30	1
ESP hot + FGD wet	1.6	20	6	26	54		1.2
Fabric filter +FGD wet	1.5	14	2	88	81	78	0.2
Spray dryer + ESP cold	0.3	5	3	18			0.2
FBC+ fabric filter	3.4	39	5	86			0.5
IGCC	0.07	2	2	4			0.1
FBC +ESP cold	0.02	1	1				
Totals	75.3	1128	84				48.8

The ICR data provides the available information to study the effectiveness of existing technologies and their capability to reduce mercury emission. In the ICR tests, close to 100% of mercury burning in coal was emitted ahead of a particulate control device.¹² Mercury speciation was predominantly affected by coal chlorine content and the temperature in Figure 2.2.¹²




Figure 2. 2. Percentage of mercury as (A) gas phase elemental and (B) particulate bound at the inlet to particulate control devices (PCDs) based on ICR data¹²

The percentage of Hg leaving the boiler in elemental form decreased sharply from over 85% to about 10% for coal chlorine contents greater than 150~200pm.

Particulate control devices (PCD) can also influence mercury emission. 75% of coal-fired power plants have only particulate controls, and 80% of these facilities are cold-side or hot-side ESP or a fabric filter (FF). As shown in Table 2, average Hg removal efficiency for these categories are 27%, 4% and 58%, respectively.¹³ Fig 2.3 shows the removal of gaseous mercury across the PCD as a function of coal chlorine content based on ICR data.




Figure 2.3. Removal of gaseous mercury across PCD as a function of coal chlorine content based on ICR data¹²

151 power plants in U.S. have installed wet flue gas desulfurization (WFGD) systems to control the SO₂ emission, which represents about 25% of all coal-fired utility generating capacity. ICR tests on WFGD units followed a cold side-ESP, a hot side-ESP or a FF. The result showed that typically about 90% of the oxidized gaseous mercury entering flue gas system was removed. However, elemental Hg was not eliminated and appeared to increase slightly in some tests. The possible reason for this was that ionic mercury was chemically reduced by sulfite in the scrubber

solution and then remitted as elemental Hg.¹² The influence of the coal chlorine content on mercury removal across scrubbers and particulate controls devices is shown in Figure 2.4.




Figure 2.4. Removal of gaseous mercury across FGD as a function of coal chlorine content based on ICR data¹²

As Figure 4 shows, removal of mercury across FGD alone was approximately doubled from 30% to 60% following a CS-ESP with an increase of chlorine content in coal from 50 to 1000 ppm chlorine. And it also increased from about 20% to 50% when following a hot side-ESP with an increase of chlorine content in coal from 200 and 1000 ppm chlorine in coal.¹³

FGD following a FF achieved the highest combined removal of about 88%, where 77% removal of the mercury entering the scrubber contributed by FF was in an oxidized form. FGD following a hot side- ESP achieved only 26% mercury removal on average.¹⁴

Spray dryer absorber uses alkaline (typically lime) slurry to absorb SO₂. The dry sorbent and fly ash particulates are captured in FF or ESP. Spray dryer absorber can also remove about 90% of the oxidized gaseous mercury. The systems equipped with FF can eliminate a significant fraction of elemental mercury when more than 200ppm chlorine content existed in the coal.¹² Total mercury removal in combined spray dryer and FF varied from 0% to 99% at 10 ICR test Sites with an average removal of 38% removal. The total average mercury removal across spray dryer following an ESP of three ICR test Sites was 18%.

Investigators in Europe have reported that Hg⁰ was completely oxidized to HgCl₂ on the surface of SCR catalyst in the presence of HCl in laboratory tests. In full-scale power plants elemental mercury decreased slightly from 40%-60% to 2%-12%.¹ The effect of the SCR catalyst was considered to be affected by reducing gases and fly ash. Energy and Environmental Research Center (EERC) reported that the fraction of particulate-bound mercury across the SCR increased substantially when burning two high-chlorine eastern bituminous coals in pilot-scale tests. However, there is no effect of SCR on Hg species change when burning a low-chlorine Powder River Basin (PRB) subbituminous coal. Changes in Hg species are affected by coal burned, operating temperature and ammonia concentrations in the flue gas.¹⁵

2.2 ACTIVATED CARBON INJECTION (ACI) TECHNOLOGY

In ACI technology, powdered activated carbon (PAC) sorbent is injected into the flue gas at the location in the duct upstream of the particulate matter (PM) control devices (usually an electrostatic precipitator or a fabric filter). The PAC sorbents adsorb mercury in the flue gas in the duct and is removed in the PM control device. Since gas-particle contact is enhanced in the filter cakes on the surface of the bags in a FF, higher mercury removal is observed with a fabric filter compared to an ESP.




Figure 2.5. Schematic of Activated carbon injection for mercury control ¹⁶

The physical and chemical characteristics of activated carbon determine its performance for mercury removal. Generally, the physical properties of interest are surface area, pore size distribution and particle size distribution. In general the capacity for Hg capture increases with increasing surface area and pore volume. The ability of Hg to enter the interior of a particle is related to the pore size distribution and the pores of the activated carbon sorbent should be large enough for Hg^0 and Hg^{2+} to access to the internal surface. When PAC particle

size decreases, the distance to the adsorption site on the internal surface area of the particle decreases and the adsorption rates increases.¹⁶

Many full scale tests have been performed to evaluate activated carbon injection for mercury control in coal-fired power plants. From 2001 to 2006 ADA-ES was working under a DOE NETL cooperative agreement to assess the costs of controlling mercury from coal-fired plants using PAC injection based on various levels of mercury control.¹⁷ The test results showed that activated carbon was effective on both elemental and oxidized mercury species. In contrast to wet scrubbers, these tests showed that PAC was capable of treating flue gas from both bituminous and subbituminous coals. The type of particulate control equipment is the most important parameter influencing the performance of ACI. Only 2-4 lb/Macf of carbon injection rate could obtain 90% of Hg removal with a fabric filter, while in an ESP at least 10 lb/Macf was required to achieve about 70% removal. Tests with a PRB ash indicated that the presence of even small amounts of activated carbon in the ash would cause the material to be unacceptable for use in concrete production. In addition the COHPAC baghouse configuration was used to collect the ash upstream of the carbon injection so the ash still could be acceptable for sale.¹⁷

Energy & Environmental Research Center (EERC) reported the results of field testing result of activated carbon injection at TXU's Big Brown Station.¹⁸ This test investigated the long-term feasibility of cost-effective mercury removal from Texas lignite-subbituminous blends at TXU's Big Brown Station using activated carbon injection with and without additives or enhancements. The results showed that activated carbon injection of about 4 lb/Macf can attain 80% of Hg removal.

Recent test results indicate that brominated activated carbons achieve higher mercury removal from flue gas at lower injection rate than original activated carbon. Sorbent

Technologies Corporation tested injection of brominated powdered activated carbon (B-PACTM) at seven different power plants. These plants have burning bituminous, subbituminous or lignite coals and equipped with cold-side ESP, hot-side ESP, spray dryers or fabric filters. Mercury removal in these tests varied between 70% and 98% for brominated activated carbon injection rate of 1 lb/MMacf to 2.5 lb/MMacf. With the same injection rate Norit Darco FGD PAC can only attain about 30% ~ 80% of Hg removal efficiency. ¹⁹

PAC injection can have two types of negative impact on the potential use of fly ash in concrete. Fly ash samples with even low concentrations of carbon would be discolored. The darker color would make this material less marketable compared with other ash material without PAC injection. The second impact, which is more important, is that the fly ash with PAC could fail the foam index test. Foam index test is used to determine the amount of Air Entrainment Additives needed to meet freeze thaw requirements for concrete. This means that PAC injection would reduce revenues from ash sales for plant and increase the additional expenses to landfill this material. ^{1,20,21} Therefore, several studies were focused cost-effective non-carbon sorbent to control mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants. ^{22, 4,23,24}


Iron and its oxides were found to be able to catalyze Hg⁰ oxidation.¹ Ferric oxide was tested for its ability to oxidize elemental mercury in eastern coal flue gas at 140°C using the fixed bed reactor.³ The test result showed that ferric oxide was able to adsorb and oxidize Hg⁰ under these conditions. This test revealed that about 40% of mercury exiting the reactor after 300 minutes of continuous feed existed as oxidized mercury. Moreover, the capacity of ferric oxide on mercury uptake was 42.5 µg Hg/g. Dunham et.al.²⁵ observed that the extent of mercury oxidation in the presence of fly ash increased at 120 and 180°C when the magnetite (Fe₃O₄) content of the fly ash increased. Ghorishi et al. ²⁶ exposed simulated flue gas comprised of HCl

to model fly ashes in a fixed bed system and found that 90% of Hg oxidation was achieved by the Fe₂O₃ containing ash at 150°C. When Fe₂O₃ was removed from the model fly ash, only 10% of Hg⁰ was converted to Hg²⁺. This result suggested that Fe₂O₃ in the ash catalyzed oxidation of Hg⁰ to Hg²⁺. Galbreath et al.²⁷ injected α- Fe₂O₃ and γ- Fe₂O₃ into the flue gas with fly ash. It was found that Hg speciation in the flue gas was not changed by injection of α- Fe₂O₃. γ- Fe₂O₃ injection increased the extent of Hg oxidation when being coated onto baghouse filters. Wu. et al.²⁸ developed a process for the Hg⁰ removal using H₂S over iron oxides sorbents. In this study the sulfidation behavior and activity for COS formation were investigated during Hg⁰ removal from coal derived fuel gas over iron oxides prepared by conventional impregnation.²⁸ Qiu et al.²⁹ studied the element mercury oxidation by α- Fe₂O₃ and γ- Fe₂O₃ nanoparticles. In this study α- Fe₂O₃ and γ- Fe₂O₃ nanoparticles were investigated for the heterogeneous interactions with elemental mercury in simulated flue gas. It was found that α- Fe₂O₃ and γ- Fe₂O₃ powders with ordinary size of around 150 μ m could not catalyze and oxidize elemental Hg, which conflicts with the finding ins other studies.^{25, 26, 27} On the other hand, α- Fe₂O₃ and γ- Fe₂O₃ nanoparticles showed ability to oxidize Hg⁰ with about 40% of oxidation efficiency. The increase of temperature will cause an obvious increase in mercury oxidation efficiency for both types of Fe₂O₃ nanoparticles,


2.3 ABANDONED MINE DRAINAGE SLUDGE

Abandoned mine drainage, or AMD, is water that is discharged from abandoned mine once they are filled with water.. Abandoned mine drainage contamination results when the


mineral pyrite (FeS₂) is exposed to air and water, resulting in the formation of sulfuric acid and iron hydroxide. The production process of abandoned mine drainage occurs deep underground or in spoils piles with the oxidation of the mineral pyrite, which is associated with coal and some shales. The chemistry of abandoned mine drainage can be described as following:



Fe²⁺ does not precipitate from solution unless pH is very high. If sufficient oxygen exists in the water, ferrous iron is oxidized to make ferric iron shown below. This reaction causes pH to increase.



If pH value is above approximately 3.5, the ferric iron will react with water to form a solid iron hydroxide precipitate according to:



Abandoned mine drainage can have severe impact on the environment, such as contaminating groundwater, raising water treatment costs and affecting the ordinary growth of terrestrial plants.¹³ Many studies have evaluated to chemical reactions that create the acidity and

the precipitation of dissolved metals. Although improvements have been made in prediction and prevention, the problems of abandoned mine drainage still exist.

Abandoned mine drainage treatment generally includes two broad categories: active and passive treatment. Active treatment involves adding a neutralizing chemicals physically to the source of the abandoned mine drainage or directly to the stream which has been impacted.³⁰ The widely used chemicals are limestone, hydrated lime, soda ash, caustic soda and ammonia. In general, the active treatment systems consist of reaction tank, flash/flocc mixing tank, plate clarifier, a filter press and a settling pond. This technology can be very successful. However, it requires a long-term and continuous commitment to treatment. Weather, equipment failure and budget reductions can result in the failure in the treatment.³⁰

Since the early 1990s, passive treatment system has been developed to treat AMD. Passive treatment of abandoned mine drainage consists of raising the pH to reduce metal loading through a constructed treatment or containment project, such as constructed wetlands, open limestone channels /Anoxic Limestone Drains and diversion wells. Compared with the active treatment, the initial costs of passive treatment technology is higher, but it is more uniform and utilizes processes which require no intensive labor and maintenance.³⁰

A major challenge in AMD treatment is the management of large volumes of loose sludge generated through neutralization.^{2,31} Since AMD is produced in large amounts worldwide, it is difficult to assess the scale of the sludge volume generated from AMD treatment.³² Generally AMD sludge is composed of a mixture of various metal hydroxides and/or oxides. The ultimate chemical composition depends on the AMD characteristics and treatment method.³³ For example, AMD sludge from lime treatment is typically high in Ca due to the presence of gypsum or unreacted lime (up to 40%).³⁴

Commonly active AMD treatment involves with chemical addition (lime and coagulants) followed by aeration and retention in sedimentation ponds. The resulting sludge containing iron oxide/hydroxide is collected and disposed by landfilling or injection into the abandoned mine after the treatment.³⁵ A few studies have been conducted on the beneficial application of abandoned mine drainage sludge. Active treatment facilities have lower Fe concentration in AMD sludge since sludge is diluted by the chemicals addition. The color of the AMD sludge from active treatment facility exhibits considerable variations.³³ Abandoned mine drainage sludge was studied as an adsorbent for a cost-effective treatment approach to phosphorus removal from municipal secondary effluents.³⁶ Adsorption of orthophosphate onto AMD sludge particles followed the Freundlich isotherm model with an adsorption capacity ranging from 9.89 mg/g to 31.97 mg/g and more than 98% of phosphorus removal efficiency was achieved in treating municipal secondary effluent. Moreover, AMD sludge has been used as a raw material to produce pigment or coagulants.³² The wetland facilities used to treat AMD concentrate Fe in the similar way in which nature concentrates Fe from weathered rock. It was found that the Fe concentration in sediments from wetland mine drainage treatment facility exists in the range of natural pigments. The AMD sludge from passive treatment wetlands was considered as a resources for pigment or other uses of ferric oxides.³⁷

2.4 SUMMARY AND RESEARCH NEEDS

Literature review indicates that activated carbon injection technology can have adverse impacts on beneficial reuse of fly ash application due to fly ash discoloration by carbon and due to the fact that the fly ash containing PAC can fail the Foam Index Test. Previously studies found

that iron oxide was capable of absorbing and oxidizing Hg in flue gas. AMD sludge contains high concentration of iron oxide and can possibly serve as a new sorbent for Hg removal in Hg emission control technology. This novel material was evaluated for Hg removal in fixed-bed system and entrained flow reactor with simulated flue gas. In addition, the impact of this material on fly ash performance in concrete manufacturing was also investigated in this study.

3.0 MATERIAL AND METHODS

3.1 ABANDONED MINE DRAINAGE MATERIAL SAMPLES

Five samples of AMD solids named Site A, Site B, Site C, Site 1, Site 2 and Site 3 were used in this research; these samples were collected from four different abandoned mine drainage treatment sites as described below.

Site A sample is recovered from a site of a large system of ponds and wetlands that passively treats a large AMD discharge. The system precipitates most of the iron contamination in ponds designed for sludge removal, while residual iron is removed in a constructed wetland and then recovered to produce pigment-quality iron oxide. All the design follows the patent, “Recovery of Iron Oxides from Polluted Coal Mine Drainage” (USPTO Patent No. 5,954,969).³⁵ The chemical composition of Site A sample is presented in Section 4.

Site B samples were obtained from a treatment plant in McMurray PA (Washington County). The plant pumps 3500 gpm of mine water (pH 6.5, Fe 40 mg/L) that is treated with aeration followed by lime addition and settling. The water is pumped into a basin where it is aggressively aerated to remove CO₂, which raises the pH to 7 and makes subsequent lime treatment more efficient. The basin collects iron sludge. The Site B sample was collected from the end of the aeration basin, before the addition of lime.

Site C samples were collected from an AMD seepage zone in Farmington Township, PA (Clarion County). The iron oxide was produced by a 55 gpm natural spring (pH 5.8, Fe 110 mg/L) that had polluted Little Coon Creek over the last 50 years. Iron oxide sludge is accumulated in a flat area between the spring and the stream. During the construction of a passive treatment system in 2007, the iron sludge was removed and processed (passive drying and screening). The samples were collected from this processed material.

Site 1 sample is produced from an AMD treating water from a mined-out, flooded, Pittsburgh seam mine. The raw water was rich in bicarbonate content and relatively low ferrous iron content. Unit operations at the treatment plant include: 1) preaeration using high speed mechanical aerators, 2) Addition of hydrated lime with more mechanical aeration and 3) gravity sedimentation in an open pond. After drying, Site 1 AMD solids will be composed primarily of calcium carbonate (a reaction product of the lime and the native bicarbonate present in the raw water) and iron oxyhydroxides. Site 1 sample and Site B sample were from the same site, but Site B sample was collected before lime addition.

Site 2 utilizes the High Density Sludge process in which the sludge is settled in a clarifier rather than an open pond. The majority of the settled sludge from the underflow of the clarifier is recycled through a high pH zone and returned to the process at the aeration basin. Recirculation of high pH sludge is supposed to impart a negative surface charge to the particles that will attract the dissolved ferrous iron to the particle surface. The objective is for iron oxidation to occur at the surface of an existing particle so that particle growth is achieved and new particle formation is avoided.

Site 3 treats water that is a combination of water from a mined-out, flooded Freeport seam mine water from overlying Pittsburgh seam deep mines and runoff/leachate from a refuse

disposal area (largely Freeport refuse). The raw water is highly mineralized (ferrous iron, acidity due to dissolved metals and sulfate are all high) and has a higher manganese content than the other waters. The unit operations for the treatment plant are the same as for Site B, but the water was treated to a higher pH (~9.0) to remove the manganese effectively. The sludge is highly expected to contain ferric oxyhydroxide, calcium sulfate and calcium carbonate as major components with a somewhat higher manganese and aluminum content than the other sites.

Site A, Site B, Site C, Site 1 and 2 are ground and sieved to the particle size below 37 μ m for the fixed bed and entrained flow experiments. Site 3 sample is used without sieving since particle size analysis of Site 3 sample after grinding shows that it is not necessary to sieve it.

3.2 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND PROCEDURE

3.2.1 Fixed bed system setup

The fixed bed system in this research consists of the following parts: 1) mercury generator, 2) simulated flue gas system, 3) fixed bed reactor, 4) mercury analyzer system. Figure 3.1 shows the schematic of the fixed bed system.




Figure 3.1. Schematic of fixed -bed set up

A simulated flue gas comprised of N₂, CO₂, O₂, HCl, NO, NO₂ and SO₂ was generated in this study. The compositions of flue gas from the power plants burning Eastern coal and Powder River Basin (PRB) coal were selected for this study. The compositions of those two flue gases were listed in Table 3.1.^{20, 38}

Table 3. 1. Compositions of eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas

Gas Compositions	Conc. In Eastern coal flue gas	Conc. In PRB flue gas
CO ₂	13.5%	13.5%
O ₂	6%	6%
HCl	50 ppm	10ppm
NO	300 ppm	300 ppm
NO ₂	20 ppm	20 ppm
SO ₂	0.15%	300 ppm
N ₂	Balance	Balance

The source of elemental mercury is a mercury permeation tube (VICI Metronics, Santa Clara, CA). This permeation tube was designed to produce elemental Hg vapor as function of temperature only. It was placed in a U-tube glass, which was heated by a temperature controlled oil bath. When carrier gas was introduced into the U-tube glass, the elemental Hg vapor produced by the permeation tube would be picked up and mix with other gases to produce the simulated flue gas. The temperature of oil bath can be adjusted to attain the desired Hg concentration in the study.³⁹

In a fixed bed test, simulated flue gas with 1L/min flow rate was introduced into a quartz reactor (29cm long with 20 mm ID). This reactor was heated to a desired temperature by a tubular furnace (Lindberg Heavi-Duty, Watertown, WI) with a temperature controller. The effluent stream was sent to PSA Sir Galahad II System to analyze total and elemental mercury concentration.

Mercury analysis system in this research involved a wet condition system. This system was utilized not only to remove the acid gas and moisture but also to produce the appropriate sampling gas from the effluent flue gas for the Hg analyzer. In the gas conditioning system the effluent gas passes through a heating box, which prevents oxidized mercury from being absorbed on the tubing. The gas is then spilt into two streams in the heating box. One stream is directed to

the total side through 2% SnCl₂ + 20% NaOH solution that is used to reduce oxidized mercury to elemental form and remove acid gases. This stream is used to measure total mercury in the effluent from the reactor. The other stream is directed through 10% KCl +20% NaOH solution that is used to remove oxidized mercury and acid gases. This stream is used to measure elemental mercury in the effluent from the reactor. Both streams would pass through a chiller in order to condense the moisture in the gas before it entered the Hg analyzer.³⁹

After the wet conditioning system the effluent gas is introduced into PSA 10.525 Sir Galahad II (P S Analytical Ltd, Orpington, Kent, England) to perform the Hg analysis. This Hg analyzer is based on the mechanism of atomic fluorescence measurement. A gold sand trap is used to adsorb any mercury directed into this trap during the sampling phase. After the sampling phase, argon was introduced to flush any residual gases from the sand trap to eliminate their possible interference with mercury analysis. The trap is then heated to about 500°C and the desorbed mercury is carried into a fluorescence detector by argon gas. A solenoid valve controlled by a timer was used to switch the gas flows to Sir Galahad from the elemental side or from the total side one after another. The flow rate of the sample gas was maintained as 200ml/min during a 60s sampling phase for all the tests in this study. The rest of effluent stream passed through an activated carbon trap and vented to the hood.

At the beginning of a single fixed bed test, 1 g of sand washed in aqua regia was placed on the glass frit in the clean quartz reactor. The reactor was then placed vertically in the furnace and 1 L/min desired simulated flue gas was introduced to the reactor to acquire a baseline measurement. When a stable baseline was established, simulated flue gas was directed to vent and 50 mg of AMD solids mixed with 1 g sand treated with aqua regia was then placed on the glass frit in the quartz reactor. After that, the simulated flue gas was directed back to the reactor

with material tested and effluent mercury concentration was measured until a complete breakthrough is achieved.

3.2.2 Entrained flow system setup

Entrained flow system used in this study was comprised of the following parts: 1) sorbent feeding system, 2) simulated flue gas system, 3) entrained flow reactor, 4) mercury analyzer system. Figure 3.2 shows the schematic experimental system.




Figure 3.2. Schematic of entrained flow reactor system

A modified powder feeder (CH-1031, Sylvester and Co. Engineers, Cleveland, Ohio) was used in this study to provide the desired sorbent feeding rate. A new stainless steel screw, which has less carrying capacity of powder than the original one, was used to transport the AMD sludge material out of the sealed chamber with a N₂ carrier gas that carried the sorbent into the reactor. The rotating speed of the screw and the vibration setting of this feeder can be adjusted so that the sorbent feeding rate can be varied to accomplish a desired value. The simulated flue gas generating system and the mercury analyzer system used in entrain flow tests were the same as the ones used in the fixed bed tests.

As shown in Figure 3.2, the 2 cm ID entrained flow reactor with a total length of 65 cm was made of quartz. It was equipped with one sampling port. The reactor is designed to have a total simulated flue gas residence time of 1 second at a desired temperature. The simulated flue gas is introduced through the right port on top of the reactor and is mixed with the sorbent carried by N₂ from the top port. A flow rate of 200 ml/min of the effluent was non-isokinetically sampled from the sampling port in the reactor. The reactor was wrapped with a heating tape (Samox[®] insulated heating tape, Cole-Parmer Instrument Company) to be heated up to a desired temperature. The effluent sample was directed to PSA Sir Galahad system to measure total and elemental mercury concentration. In addition, a quartz wool filter wrapped with a heating tape (Fisher Scientific, Pittsburgh, PA) was added to the sample line to capture the solids that could be possibly coming out of the reactor with the sampling gas from the reactor. The rest of the simulated flue gas was vented to the hood.

An entrained flow test starts with establishing a stable baseline with a desired simulated flue gas flowing through the entrained flow reactor at a desired temperature. When a baseline is

attained, the feeder is turned on to start sorbent injection. After certain period of feeding, the feeder is turned off while mercury monitoring continued for a given period of time after that.

3.3 AMD SLUDGE MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION

3.3.1 Particle Size Distribution Analysis

A Microtrac S3500 Tri-Laser particle analyzer (Microtrac Inc., Montgomeryville, PA) was used to analyze the particle size distribution of AMD solids. A method built in the software was used for AMD samples analysis.

3.3.2 Surface Area Analysis

The surface area of tested material was measured in the Micromeritics ASAP 2000 apparatus (Micromeritics Instrument Corporation, Norcross, GA). Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) calculation was used to analyze adsorption results and calculate surface area.

3.3.3 Elemental analysis

Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS) was used to analyze the elemental composition in the Site A sample. Fusion Inductively-Coupled Plasma (FUS-ICP) was used for the elemental analysis of Site B, Site C, Site 1, 2 and 3 samples. All the samples were sent to a commercial laboratory (Activation Laboratories Ltd, 1336 Sand Hill Drive, Ontario, USA) for analysis.

3.3.4 Foam Index Test

The air entraining admixture (AEA) is surfactant added to concrete to create fine air bubbles (< 1 mm diameter) during the mixing of the concrete. These bubbles impart freeze-thaw resistance to the concrete by providing void volume to accommodate expansion of residual water during freezing. When a fly ash contains a large amount of carbon, the carbon will adsorb AEA surfactant, which destroys the ability of the concrete to hold the required air.⁴⁰ Foam index test is a rapid method to determine the interference of a given material with the air entraining admixture requirement for concrete preparation. The Foam Index Test Procedure is conducted as following:
21, 40, 41

1. Place 20 g of cement in a 125 mL glass jar.
2. Add 50 mL of water to the jar, then cap and shake the jar and its contents for 1 minute.
3. Add diluted AEA solution (Darex II, Grace diluted to 1:20 with DI water) in small increments of 2 to 5 drops at a time. After each addition, cap and shake the jar vigorously for 15 seconds. Observe the stability of the foam.
4. The minimum amount of diluted AEA needed to produce a foam that is stable (bubbles exist over the entire surface) for 45 seconds is the FOAM INDEX of the cement mixture.
5. Repeat steps 1 through 4 using 16 g of cement and 4 g of material tested to develop the foam index of the cement and fly ash mixture.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 AMD SLUDGE MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION

4.1.1 Particle Size Distribution Analysis

A typical size distribution analysis result is shown in the figure below. The mean particle sizes of the samples in this study are listed in Table 4.1. Since all the AMD solid samples were ground and sieved with the same method, the particle size of these samples shown in Table 4.1 are similar.




Figure 4.1. Particle size distribution of Site A sample

Table 4. 1. Mean Particle Sizes of AMD solids samples

Sample	D (μm)
Site A	18.38
Site B	9.98
Site C	21.09
Site 1	21.47
Site 2	20.27
Site 3	18.80

4.1.2 Surface Area Analysis

Six AMD sludge material samples were analyzed for surface area and the results are listed in Table 4.2. Site B shows the highest surface area among all the samples while Site 1 sample shows the lowest surface area among all the samples. Both samples are from the same site but Site B sample was acquired before lime addition. The reason resulting in such a significant difference in surface area for these samples is not clear.

Table 4. 2 Surface area of AMD sludge samples

Sample	Surface area (m^2/g)
Site A	127.7
Site B	214.6
Site C	119.1
Site 1	21.9
Site 2	102.9
Site 3	144.3

4.1.3 Elemental analysis of AMD samples

Elemental analysis of AMD samples is shown in Table 4.3. For Site A, B and C samples, Fe is the main metal existing in these AMD sludge. In general, Site A, B and C samples were produced by passive treatment technology and no lime addition process was involved. Thus, these results are in agreement with the sources description of these three samples. In Site 1, 2, 3 samples, both Ca and Fe are the dominant metals. The site description for Site 1 and 3 samples indicates the treatment method includes lime addition process, so the sludge should have certain amount of Ca, which also agrees with the elemental analysis result in Table 4.3. All the sludge samples tested in this study were dried at 110°C to remove the water content in the wet sludge.

Table 4.3. Elemental analysis results of AMD sludge samples

Sample	Fe%	Mg%	Al%	Ca%	K%	Na%	Mn%	P%
Site A	42.7	0.04	0.69	0.08	0.05	0.005	0.30	0.019
Site B	56.58	0.08	0	0.94	0.06	0.12	0.13	0.01
Site C	52.74	0.01	0.11	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.12
Site 1	2.59	0.42	0.22	34.6	0.008	0.007	0.08	0.009
Site 2	19.01	1.55	0.22	19.73	0.158	0.46	0.50	<0.04
Site 3	27.30	0.97	0.20	19.16	0.050	0.245	0.30	<0.04

4.2 MERCURY UPTAKE TEST IN A FIXED BED SYSTEM

4.2.1 Hg uptake by Site A sample in Eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas at 140°C

In Figure 4.2, baseline with reactor means that this baseline was established with empty reactor and simulated flue gas. Then 1 g of treated sand was placed into the reactor and the

baseline with reactor and 1 g sand was established again. As Figure 4.1 shows that the two baselines are almost identical, which indicates that the treated sand has no capacity for Hg and it does not cause any effect on Hg speciation in the reactor. Therefore, the sand used in this study can be considered as an inert material to Hg uptake and oxidation. In all of the following tests, baseline in the figure will indicate the baseline attained with reactor and 1 g treated sand inside.

Figure 4.2 shows that it took around 400 minutes to reach full mercury breakthrough at 140°C in eastern coal flue gas, while in PRB flue gas the time for breakthrough is about 1000 minutes. Percentage of oxidized Hg in the effluent is shown on the right hand axis. This percentage number was calculated as follows:

$$\text{Oxidized Hg \%} = (C_{\text{Total}} - C_{\text{Elemental}}) / C_{\text{Total}} \times 100\%$$

where, C_{Total} is the total Hg in the effluent and $C_{\text{Elemental}}$ is the elemental Hg concentration.

At the breakthrough point for both tests, about 30% of mercury in the outlet gas existed as oxidized mercury. The mercury uptake capacity for this Site A material was calculated to be 92.2 $\mu\text{g Hg/g}$ in eastern coal flue gas and 174.6 $\mu\text{g Hg / g}$ in PRB flue gas. The possible reason for the higher Hg uptake capacity in PRB coal flue gas will be discussed in the subsequent section.




Figure 4.2. Hg uptake on Site A sample in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C

4.2.2 Hg uptake by Site B sample in Eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas at 140°C

The Hg uptake test result with Site B sample in eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas is shown in Figure 4.3. The result shows that it took around 460 minutes to reach full mercury breakthrough at 140°C in both flue gas condition. The mercury uptake capacity for this Site B material was calculated to be 64.6 $\mu\text{g Hg} / \text{g}$ in eastern coal flue gas and 58.3 $\mu\text{g Hg/g}$ in PRB flue gas. At the breakthrough point for both tests about 30% of mercury exited the reactor as oxidized mercury.




Figure 4.3. Hg uptake on Site B sample in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C

In the test with eastern coal flue gas, the percent of oxidized Hg in effluent stream was observed to be as high as about 80% in the early test and then decreased gradually with time. In the test with PRB flue gas, about 50% of mercury existed as Hg²⁺ when leaving the reactor in the early period of the reaction, which is lower than the result in the Eastern coal flue gas. The possible reason for such behavior is not yet clear.

4.2.3 Hg uptake test on Site C sample in Eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas at 140°C




Figure 4.4. Hg uptake on Site C sample in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C

As shown in Figure 4.4, Site C sample shows no significant difference in Hg uptake behavior in the tests with eastern coal flue gas and PRB coal flue gas. The Hg uptake capacity of Site C sample in Eastern coal flue gas and PRB flue gas is calculated to be 221.3 $\mu\text{g Hg/g}$ and 232.6 $\mu\text{g Hg/g}$, respectively. When 100% breakthrough was achieved in the experiment with PRB flue gas, about 36% of Hg exited the reactor as oxidized Hg. In the test with Eastern coal flue gas, about 28% of Hg existed in the effluent as oxidized mercury after 100% breakthrough.

Table 4.4 compares Hg uptake capacity of Site A, B and C samples in the tests with Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C. Among three samples, Sample C shows the highest

capacity in Hg uptake both in Eastern coal flue gas and in PRB flue gas. Hg uptake capacity of Sample A varies from 92.2 $\mu\text{g Hg/g}$ in Eastern coal flue gas to 174.6 $\mu\text{g Hg/g}$ in PRB flue gas. Section 4.2.5 will focus on the impact of flue gas composition on Hg uptake by Site A sample at 140 °C. The possible mechanism for this will be discussed in section 4.2.5. Compared with Sample A, Sample B and Sample C did not show significantly difference in Hg uptake in the tests with these two different flue gases. With the highest 56.58% of Fe in the solids as shown in Table 4.3, Site B displays poorest capability of Hg uptake in these tests.

Table 4.4. Hg uptake capacity of Site A, Site B and C samples in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C

Sample	Hg uptake Capacity in Eastern coal flue gas, $\mu\text{g Hg/g}$	Hg Capacity in PRB flue gas, $\mu\text{g Hg/g}$
Site A	92.2	174.6
Site B	64.6	58.3
Site C	221.3	232.6

Table 4.5 shows percent of oxidized Hg in the effluent for the tests using Site A, B and C samples with Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C after these tests achieve 100% breakthrough. As shown in Table 4.5, all three AMD solids samples show similar capability for oxidizing Hg in either Eastern coal flue gas or PRB flue gas.

Table 4.5. % Oxidized Hg with Site A, Site B and C samples in Eastern coal and PRB flue gas at 140°C

Sample	% Oxidized Hg in the test with Eastern coal flue gas	% Oxidized Hg in the test with PRB flue gas
Site A	30%	26%
Site B	37%	30%
Site C	28%	36%

4.2.4 Impact of temperature on Hg uptake by Site A sample in Eastern coal flue gas at 140°C

Due to the abundance of Site A sample for various tests, this sample was selected for the following set of experiments. Impact of temperature on Hg uptake by Site A sample is shown in Figure 4.5, where the results obtained at 140°C are compared with those obtained at 370°C. This figure clearly shows that higher temperature results in lower Hg capture, which is in agreement with the common adsorption principles. The mercury uptake capacity for Site A sample in eastern coal flue gas is calculated to be 20.5 $\mu\text{g Hg / g}$ at 370°C. As shown in Figure 4.5, oxidation percentage increased from 25% to 40% when reaction temperature increased from 140°C to 370°C. Qiu et al.²⁹ reported that at higher temperature Fe_2O_3 nanoparticles showed increased Hg oxidation efficiency, which agrees with the findings shown in Figure 4.5. The mechanism could be that high temperature causes high activity of Site A sample as a catalyst, which could lead to high catalytic efficiency.




Figure 4.5. Impact of temperature on Hg uptake with Site A sample in Eastern coal flue gas at 140°C

4.2.5 Impact of flue gas composition on Hg uptake by Site A sample at 140°C

Since AMD material has never before been studied for Hg removal from coal-fired power plant flue gas, it is necessary to understand the transformation of mercury species and propose the possible mechanism of the reaction with this novel material. In this section the impact of flue gas compositions on Hg uptake and oxidation with Site A sample will be investigated. Table 4.6 shows the possible combinations of flue gas compositions in simulated flue gas.

Table 4.6. Combinations of flue gas compositions in flue gas

Number	Combinations of flue gas compositions
1	N_2+CO_2
2	$N_2+CO_2+O_2$
3	$N_2+CO_2+ HCl$
4	$N_2+CO_2+ O_2+ HCl$
5	$N_2+CO_2+SO_2$
6	$N_2+CO_2+O_2+SO_2$
7	$N_2 +CO_2+NO_2$
8	$N_2 +CO_2+NO_2+O_2$
9	$N_2 +CO_2+NO$
10	$N_2 +CO_2+O_2+NO$
11	$N_2+CO_2+O_2+HCl+SO_2$
12	$N_2+CO_2+O_2+HCl+NO$
13	$N_2+CO_2+O_2+HCl+NO_2$
14	$N_2+CO_2+O_2+HCl+ SO_2+NO$
15	$N_2+CO_2+O_2+HCl+ SO_2+NO_2$
16	$N_2+CO_2+O_2+HCl+SO_2+NO_2+NO$

4.2.5.1 Impact of CO₂ and O₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C

In the baseline test with 13.5% CO₂ and balance N₂, no Hg uptake or oxidation was observed during the first 60 minutes of contact with Site A sample (Figure.4.6). After that, 6% O₂ was added into the inlet gas but there was still no Hg uptake or oxidation observed for another 60 minutes of the test. Therefore, it could be concluded that N₂, CO₂, O₂ and their combination facilitated no uptake or transformation of Hg. Such behavior indicates that physisorption of mercury in AMD solids is negligible.




Figure 4.6. Impact of 13.5% CO₂ and 6% O₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N₂ at 140°C

4.2.5.2 Impact of SO₂ with O₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C

Figure 4.7 shows the results of two tests elucidating the impact of SO₂ and O₂ on Hg uptake by Site A sample. In the test with N₂, CO₂ and SO₂, no Hg uptake or oxidation occurred. However, when 6% O₂ was added into the baseline in another test with 0.15% SO₂, a moderate Hg uptake was observed. It took about 60 minutes to reach 100% breakthrough and no Hg oxidation was observed under these conditions. It has already been shown that SO₂ by itself has little effects on mercury capture and oxidation on carbon-based sorbent and fly ash.^{4,20,42} In the case of Site A sample, addition of O₂ with SO₂ results in moderate adsorption of Hg. Cao et al.⁴³ found that SO₂ could be oxidized in SCR reactor to SO₃ by O₂ with the SCR catalyst at about 300°C and SO₃ is responsible for Hg⁰ oxidation. The proposed product of oxidized Hg is HgSO₄.⁴⁴ The possible mechanism responsible for the behavior in this study is that AMD Site A sample

acts as catalyst for O_2 to oxidize SO_2 to SO_3 , and then Hg^0 is oxidized by SO_3 . Moreover, oxidized Hg could be adsorbed on the surface of sample since there is no oxidized Hg existing in the effluent as shown in Figure 4.7. When O_2 was not involved, SO_3 could not be produced by SO_2 , and then Hg^0 could not be oxidized, which is in agreement with the behavior shown in Figure 4.7.




Figure 4.7. Impact of 6% O_2 on Hg uptake and oxidation with N_2 , 13.5% CO_2 , and 0.15% SO_2 at $140^\circ C$

4.2.5.3 Impact of HCl with O_2 on Hg uptake and oxidation at $140^\circ C$

Chen et al.³ found that O_2 is important for the adsorption of Hg by carbon black in the presence of HCl. Figure 4.8 shows that the impact of HCl and O_2 on Hg uptake and oxidation by Site A sample. In both tests shown below (with or without O_2), addition of 50 ppm HCl led to more than 80% of Hg oxidation in effluent gas. Hg capacity was also improved compared to

experiments in the absence of HCl. The results in Figure 4.8 suggest that O₂ may not play a significant role in Hg adsorption by Site A sample in the presence of HCl as it did for carbon black. As can be seen in Figure 4.8, the presence of HCl greatly enhanced mercury oxidation. Recent study suggests that at higher temperatures (e.g. 400-700°C), the HCl is not in itself the critical chlorine-containing species that promotes mercury oxidation. Instead, it has been proposed that atomic chlorine is the primary chlorine-containing species responsible for Hg oxidation.⁴⁵ The reaction pathways leading to the formation of atomic chlorine from HCl are not well understood, although a number of possible mechanisms have been proposed.⁴⁶ Norton et al.⁴ also found that the presence of HCl results in great levels of Hg oxidation for the fly ash sample with 26% of iron content, which is in agreement with the findings in this experiment.




Figure 4.8. Impact of 6% O₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N₂, 13.5%CO₂, and 50ppm HCl at 140°C

4.2.5.4 Impact of NO₂ with O₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C

As shown in Figure 4.9, O₂ had no effect on Hg uptake and oxidation with 20 ppm NO₂. Addition of 20 ppm NO₂ improved the Hg capacity for Site A sample as can be seen by comparing Figure 4.9 with Figure 4.6. Although no oxidized mercury was detected in the outlet stream, it can not be proved that NO₂ does not catalyze Hg⁰ oxidation since the oxidized Hg could be adsorbed on the Site A sample after oxidation. NO₂ was reported to oxidize Hg⁰ in the presence of fly ash and even in the absence of O₂ and HCl⁴ as shown by Reactions 4 and 5 proposed by Galbreath et al.⁴⁷ and Olson et al.⁴⁸





Figure 4.9. Impact of 20 ppm NO₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N₂, 13.5% CO₂, and 6% O₂ at 140°C

4.2.5.5 Impact of NO with O₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C

In this experiment, 300 ppm NO was added into the gas stream with N₂ and CO₂. In the absence of O₂, NO showed no ability to promote Hg capture or oxidation by Site A solids (Figure 4.10). However, the addition of O₂ lead to Hg adsorption to a certain extent but no oxidized Hg was observed in the effluent. NO has been reported to adsorb as NO₂ onto carbon surface in the presence of O₂.⁴⁹ A possible reason for this behavior could be that certain amount of NO was transformed to NO₂ on the surface of AMD sample, which helped to adsorb Hg as discussed in Figure 4.9.




Figure 4.10. Impact of 300 ppm NO on Hg uptake and oxidation with N₂, 13.5% CO₂ and 6% O₂ at 140°C

4.2.5.6 Impact of SO₂ with HCl on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C

SO₂ greatly decreased adsorption capacity of activated carbon for both elemental and oxidized mercury in the presence of HCl.⁵⁰ In this section two tests were carried out to

investigate the impact of SO₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation by Site A sample in the presence of HCl. The concentration of SO₂ and HCl was 0.15% and 50ppm, respectively. And the baseline gas composition included 6% O₂. Results in the Figure 4.11 show that SO₂ did not prohibit Hg adsorption and oxidation with HCl as it did in the case of activated carbon. After introduction of 1500 ppm SO₂ into simulated flue gas with 50 ppm HCl, Site A sample could still achieve 80% of mercury oxidation in the outlet gas. In addition, Hg capacity was not significantly affected. From this point of view, Site A sample was able to achieve higher level of performance than activated carbon in the presence of SO₂.




Figure 4.11. Impact of 0.15% SO₂ with on Hg uptake and oxidation with N₂, 13.5% CO₂, 6% O₂ and 50 ppm HCl at 140°C

4.2.5.7 Impact of NO₂ with HCl on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C

In this experiment, 50 ppm HCl and 20 ppm NO₂ was combined in the simulated flue gas and the result of this test was compared with the one conducted in the absence of NO₂ from simulated flue gas. As the figure below shows, in both tests notable Hg adsorption and 10 % oxidation were observed. NO₂ does not have distinct effect on both Hg adsorption and oxidation. It indicated that NO₂ alone did not cause negative influence on Hg uptake and oxidation caused by HCl in flue gas.




Figure 4.12. Impact of 20 ppm NO₂ on Hg uptake and oxidation with N₂, 13.5% CO₂, 6% O₂ and 50 ppm HCl at 140°C

4.2.5.8 Impact of NO with HCl on Hg uptake and oxidation at 140°C

NO was added into the baseline flue gas at a concentration of 300 ppm in the presence of 50 ppm HCl and the impact on Hg adsorption and oxidation was observed by a comparison with the tests conducted in the absence of NO. The comparison shown in Figure 4.13 reveals that the addition of NO reduced Hg adsorption capacity of this AMD material. After two hours of contact, about 41% Hg removal efficiency was observed in the presence of NO, while the test in the absence of NO yielded 62% Hg removal. Hg oxidation in both tests was remarkable as evidenced by the presence of about 80% of Hg²⁺ in the outlet stream. NO seems to help oxidize Hg from the beginning of the experiment, but this cannot be verified due to the possibility that the enhancement could be caused by desorption of Hg²⁺ absorbed on the surface of material in the presence of NO. These results reveal that NO could moderately reduce Hg adsorption capacity of AMD material in the presence of HCl. However, Hg oxidation was not significantly affected.




Figure 4.13. Impact of 300ppm NO on Hg uptake and oxidation with N₂, 13.5% CO₂, 6% O₂ and 50 ppm HCl at 140°C

