

DOE/PC/94251--T8

*Advanced Emissions Control Development Program*

*Quarterly Technical Progress Report #4*

*for the period: July 1 to September 30, 1995*

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

**MASTER**

**CLEARED BY  
PATENT COUNSEL**

RECEIVED  
DOE/PETC  
NOV 13 11:19 AM '95  
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

US DOE - PETC Contract: DE-FC22-94PC94251  
OCDO Grant Agreement: CDO/D-922-13  
Babcock & Wilcox Contract: CRD-1310

George A. Farthing  
FAX: 216-823-0693  
Phone: 216-829-7494

## **DISCLAIMER**

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, make any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.**

***Legal Notice/Disclaimer***

This report was prepared by the Babcock & Wilcox Company pursuant to a Cooperative Agreement partially funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, and neither Babcock & Wilcox nor any of its subcontractors nor the U.S. Department of Energy, nor any person acting on behalf of either:

- a) Makes any warranty or representation, express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately-owned rights; or
- b) Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of, any information, apparatus, method or process disclosed in this report.

Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the U.S. Department of Energy. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U.S. Department of Energy.

## **Executive Summary**

Babcock & Wilcox (B&W) is conducting a five-year project aimed at the development of practical, cost-effective strategies for reducing the emissions of hazardous air pollutants (commonly called air toxics) from coal-fired electric utility plants. The need for air toxic emissions controls will likely arise as the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency proceeds with implementation of Title III of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. Data generated during the program will provide utilities with the technical and economic information necessary to reliably evaluate various air toxics emissions compliance options such as fuel switching, coal cleaning, and flue gas treatment. The development work is being carried out using B&W's new Clean Environment Development Facility (CEDF) wherein air toxics emissions control strategies can be developed under controlled conditions, and with proven predictability to commercial systems. Tests conducted in the CEDF will provide high quality, repeatable, comparable data over a wide range of coal properties, operating conditions, and emissions control systems. The specific objectives of the project are to: 1) measure and understand the production and partitioning of air toxics species for a variety of steam coals, 2) optimize the air toxics removal performance of conventional flue gas cleanup systems (ESPs, baghouses, scrubbers), 3) develop advanced air toxics emissions control concepts, 4) develop and validate air toxics emissions measurement and monitoring techniques, and 5) establish a comprehensive, self-consistent air toxics data library. Development work is currently concentrated on the capture of mercury, fine particulate, and a variety of inorganic species such as the acid gases (hydrogen chloride, hydrogen fluoride, etc.).

## **Background**

The ultimate objective of this project is to develop practical, cost-effective strategies for reducing the emissions of hazardous air pollutants (commonly called air toxics) from coal-fired power plants. The need for such controls will likely arise as the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proceeds with implementation of requirements set forth in the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA's) of 1990. Promulgation of air toxics emissions regulations for electric utility plants could dramatically impact utilities burning coal, their industrial and residential customers, and the coal industry. Work during the project will supply the information needed by utilities to respond to potential air toxics regulations in a timely, cost-effective, environmentally-sound manner which supports the continued use of the Nation's abundant reserves of coal, such as those in the State of Ohio.

### *The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990*

Title III of the CAAA's established a list of 189 hazardous air pollutants and charged the EPA with the responsibility for regulating emissions of these substances into the atmosphere as required to protect public health and the environment. The first phase of compliance is to be based on available technology, and will require many industrial plants to install the "maximum achievable control technology". Electric utility plants are exempt from this requirement, however, pending the outcome of several risk assessment and emissions characterization studies. The EPA is scheduled to propose its plan for regulating electric utilities under Title III in a report to Congress in November, 1995.

The EPA is currently working with the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE), the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), and the Utility Air Regulatory Group (UARG) to characterize air toxics emissions from existing power plants. Both DOE and EPRI have put major field testing programs into place to accomplish this purpose. The results of these emissions characterization studies will be reviewed by the EPA in conjunction with the results of several on-going EPA risk assessment studies to determine the need for air toxics emissions regulations aimed at coal-fired utilities. These field testing programs will provide considerable insight into the quantities of air toxics being emitted by power plants. However, B&W believes that they are only a first step toward developing an understanding of the formation, partitioning, and capture of air toxics species, and how to effectively control their emissions.


While the EPA's ultimate approach is uncertain, at least some air toxics species issuing from utility stacks may be regulated — especially some of the high-risk compounds such as arsenic, cadmium, chromium, and mercury, and/or compounds known to be emitted in relatively large quantities such as hydrogen chloride and hydrogen fluoride. Mercury, in particular, is the subject of intensive research due to its known build-up in the atmosphere, subsequent deposition in lakes, and potential human health and environmental impacts. B&W strongly believes that a proactive approach to the development of the technical and economic information utilities will need to assess air toxics control options is needed to keep pace with regulatory actions.

#### *Overview of the Project*

The objective of this project is to develop practical strategies and systems for the simultaneous control of SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, particulate matter, and air toxics emissions from coal-fired boilers in such a way as to keep coal economically and environmentally competitive as a utility boiler fuel. Of particular interest is the control of air toxics emissions through the cost-effective use of conventional flue gas clean-up equipment. This objective will be achieved through extensive development testing in B&W's new \$16.5 million, state-of-the-art Clean Environment Development Facility (CEDF) wherein air toxics emissions control strategies can be developed under controlled conditions and with proven predictability to commercial power plant systems. It is understood that the B&W CEDF is being funded entirely with B&W funds, and, hence, is not part of the scope of work of this project.

The CEDF has been designed for pulverized coal firing, and has a rated capacity of 100 million Btu/hr (thermal input). It is designed to simulate the furnace environment (temperatures, residence times, etc.) of a commercial boiler in order to yield representative results for combustion NO<sub>x</sub> and air toxics emissions studies at the furnace exit. The convective pass simulates a commercial boiler convection bank from the furnace exit to the air heater exit.

The project will extend the capabilities of the CEDF to facilitate air toxics emissions control development work on "backend" flue gas cleanup equipment. Specifically, an ESP, a fabric filter (baghouse), and a wet scrubber for SO<sub>2</sub> (and air toxics) control will be added — all designed to yield air toxics emissions data under controlled conditions, and with proven predictability to commercial systems. A schematic of B&W's CEDF and the project test equipment to be added is shown in the figure.



The specific objectives of the project are to:

Provide a flexible, representative test bed for conducting air toxics emissions control development work.

Measure and understand production and partitioning of air toxics species for a variety of Ohio coals.

Optimize the air toxics removal performance of conventional flue gas cleanup systems.

Quantify the impacts of coal cleaning on air toxics emissions.

Develop advanced air toxics emissions control concepts.

Develop and validate air toxics emissions measurement and monitoring techniques.

Establish an air toxics data library to facilitate studies of the impacts of coal selection, coal cleaning, and emissions control strategies on the air toxics emissions of coal-fired power plants.

*Description of Project Phases*

The project is divided into three phases. Phase I (Facility Modification and Benchmarking) consists of installation, shakedown, validation, and benchmarking of the test equipment to be added (ESP, fabric filter, and wet SO<sub>2</sub> scrubber) to B&W's CEDF. Baseline air toxics emissions and capture efficiency will be established for each of the major flue gas cleanup devices: ESP, baghouse, and wet SO<sub>2</sub> scrubber. All tests will be conducted with a high sulfur Ohio steam coal. The work in this phase will culminate in the development of a data library, or database, for use by project participants.

Phase II (Optimization of Conventional Systems) testing will involve the development of air toxics control strategies based on conventional particulate and SO<sub>2</sub> control equipment. Development testing, engineering and evaluation will be done to optimize the performance of these devices for the capture of air toxic species. Phase II testing will also provide data on the impacts of coal properties on air toxics emissions for several steam coals. The impacts of coal cleaning on air toxics emissions will be investigated through the testing of two cleaned coals and their associated parent (uncleaned) coals. The development of new air toxics measurement techniques and monitoring instrumentation will also be investigated in this phase.

Phase III (Advanced Concepts and Comparison Coals) testing will be directed at the development of new air toxics emissions control strategies and devices, to further reduce the emissions of selected toxics. Testing will also be conducted to extend the air toxics data library to include a broader range of coal types. Finally, the development work on advanced air toxics emissions measurement and monitoring techniques begun in Phase II will continue in Phase III.

**Work Performed During Reporting Period**

The Phase I scope of work is being conducted under five major tasks. Phase I work began on November 1, 1993.

**Task 1 -- Project Planning and Management**

Work during the reporting period primarily consisted of routine planning, tracking, and scheduling activities. Routine air toxics cognizance activities also continued. This work includes a literature survey, discussions with a variety of other air toxics investigators, and participation in various meetings, seminars and workshops. Members of the project team participated in the DOE-sponsored 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Coal Preparation, Utilization, and Environmental Control Contractors Conference, the EPRI/DOE International Conference on Managing Hazardous and Particulate Air Pollutants, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting of The EPA's Center for Toxic Metals. We also visited the Electric Power Research Institute to bring them up to date on the project, discuss their activities, and explore ways in which we might work.



**Task 2 – Test Equipment Modification and Shakedown**


Work under this task was previously completed on schedule and within budget.

*Fabric Filter*

The fabric filter system consists of a pulse-jet baghouse and a fly ash disposal system. The fabric filter and the wet scrubber are designed for a partial flow flue gas slipstream from the CEDF of 5 million Btu/hr.

*Pulse-Jet Baghouse.* Particulate from the flue gas stream is collected on the outside surface of a porous filter bag in the baghouse. The pulse-jet baghouse is named for the manner in which the bags are cleaned. The filter cake is removed from the outer surface of the bag by a pulsed jet of compressed air which causes a sudden bag expansion. The dust is effectively removed by inertial forces as the bag reaches maximum expansion. The dust is effectively removed by inertial forces as the bag reaches maximum expansion.

The baghouse initially contains commercial size conventional fabric filter bags to simulate air toxics capture in commercial baghouses. The control of these substances is determined by the baghouse operating parameters that affect particulate collection. The baghouse design permits baghouse operation over a wide range of air-to-cloth ratio (measure of the gas passing through each square foot of fabric in the baghouse), particulate loading, cleaning cycle frequency and cleaning pressure. The baghouse temperature can be varied to evaluate the effect of operating temperature on air toxics and particulate collection. Particulate collection efficiency can also be affected by the type of fuel combusted, the resulting particulate characteristics, and the particle size distribution in addition to baghouse operation.



The baghouse is designed to process 6,000 lb/hr of flue gas with a particulate loading of 94 lb/hr. The baghouse will reduce particulate emissions to less than the New Source Performance Standard of 0.03 lb/10<sup>6</sup> Btu. The primary design characteristics for the baghouse are summarized below:

*AECDP Baghouse Design Summary*

Compartments	two; 33 ft high x 4 ft square
Bags/Compartment	16
Bag Dimensions	6¼" diameter x 20 ft long
Air-to-Cloth ratio	3.2 to 5.2 ft/sec
Cleaning Method	Pulse-jet; on-line or off-line

*Fly Ash Disposal System.* The fly ash collected on the fabric filter bags will fall into the baghouse hopper and pass through a rotary valve into a vacuum ash handling system for transport to a disposal bin. The baghouse flyash will be mixed with wet scrubber by-product for landfill disposal.

*Wet Scrubber*

The wet scrubber subsystems include the absorber tower, reagent feed system, mist eliminator system, and slurry dewatering and disposal system. The absorber tower is designed as a vertical section of a commercial reactor to simulate the SO<sub>2</sub> and air toxics removal. Emphasis is placed on the duplication of gas/liquid interaction, minimization of wall impingement, and the proper simulation of operating parameters that affect particulate control in a wet scrubber. The wet scrubber is designed to treat the flue gas from the partial flow, pulse-jet baghouse or a flue gas slipstream from the full-flow electrostatic precipitator, and includes the equipment required to handle the associated reagent and waste streams.

*Absorber tower.* The absorber tower consists of the absorber tower and a separate slurry recirculation tank. The particulate loading in the flue gas entering the absorber tower depends upon the operating efficiency of either the upstream ESP or pulse-jet baghouse, and will typically be in compliance with the New Source Performance Standard (NSPS) for coal-fired boilers. The absorber tower operating conditions will be influenced by the type of fuel. The design incorporates a perforated-plate tray to reduce flue gas flow maldistribution. The absorber tower comprises several interchangeable modules to vary the number of perforated trays and the tray height. The modular tower design permits testing with different spray and tray configurations to best simulate the operation of conventional wet scrubbers.

The wet scrubber is designed to process 5,062 lb/hr of flue gas with a SO<sub>2</sub> concentration of up to 6,000 ppm. The primary design characteristics for the wet scrubber system are summarized in the following table:


**AECDP Wet Scrubber Design Summary**

Design limestone stoichiometry	1.1 mole Ca/mole SO <sub>2</sub> absorbed
Nominal SO <sub>2</sub> removal	90%
Design L/G ratio	267 gpm/1000 acfm
Normal L/G ratio	120 gpm/1000 acfm
Tower velocity range	5.0 to 20 ft/sec

**Absorber Recirculation Tank.** The absorber recirculation tank is located below the absorber tower to facilitate the gravimetric flow of reaction products into the tank. The design of the recirculation tank allows the evaluation of the degree of forced oxidation on SO<sub>2</sub> removal and air toxics collection in the wet scrubber. The air sparger system provides clean, humidified air to obtain a wide range of oxidation levels. The absorber recirculation tank is equipped with an agitator to keep the solids from settling.

The pH of the slurry stream from the recirculation tank to the spray nozzles is monitored with an in-line pH sensor. The continuous pH measurement is used to control the slurry feed rate from the fresh slurry storage tank to the recirculation tank.

**Reagent Feed System.** This system comprises a slurry storage/preparation tank, agitator, and pump and will operate in a batch mode. The reagent (typically limestone) preparation system does not include a ball mill for grinding the limestone on-site. Pulverized limestone will be delivered to the facility. The reagent feed system is designed to handle a wide range of slurry feed rates and reagents to achieve specific levels of SO<sub>2</sub> control for the variety of coals.



*Mist Eliminator System.* Mist eliminators minimize carryover of slurry and liquid droplets generated in the absorber tower. To prevent buildup and plugging, the mist eliminators are periodically washed by way of water spray nozzles. The wet scrubber is designed to operate with vertical flow and/or horizontal flow mist eliminators. The system also includes a mist eliminator wash/recycle tank. To evaluate the contribution of the mist eliminators to particulate collection efficiency and air toxics capture, sampling ports are located at the inlet and outlet of the mist eliminator sections. The modular tower design permits simple removal of the mist eliminator sections for testing purposes.


*Slurry Dewatering and Disposal System.* Slurry from the absorber recirculation tank is sent to the dewatering system for solids disposal and return of the clarified water. The waste slurry dewatering system consists of a hydroclone, several slurry settling tanks, a clarified recycle water storage tank, an agitator and a pump. The system is designed to be run on a batch basis. The reaction products from the slurry recirculation tank are sent to the hydroclone for primary dewatering. A density transmitter in the recirculation line is used to activate the pump to the hydroclone. The hydroclone overflow is returned to the slurry recirculation tank to duplicate the slurry chemistry in a commercial scrubber. Secondary dewatering occurs in settling bins prior to mixing with flyash or dry sorbent for landfill disposal. The clarified recycle water storage tank is equipped with a blowdown line to control the concentration of chlorides in the scrubber liquor. The blowdown on the clarified recycle water storage tank is adjustable to determine the effect of chloride level on SO<sub>2</sub> removal performance and the possible influence on air toxics capture.

*Booster Fan.* The booster fan located downstream of the wet scrubber is designed to overcome the pressure losses in the AECDF test equipment. The fan provides the turndown capacity to simulate a wide range of commercial flue gas cleanup equipment operation. A "wet", induced-draft fan was selected instead of a forced-draft fan to avoid wet scrubber operation at a positive pressure, and to prevent employee exposure to flue gas.

#### *Electrostatic Precipitator*

The ESP operates on the full flue gas flow (100 million Btu/hr) from the CEDF. The ESP is being supplied by B&W's commercial Environmental Equipment Division (EED). Design of the ESP follows conventional practice used commercially in power boiler emissions control. The ESP consists of discharge electrodes which impart an electric charge to ash particles in the flue gas as it passes through the ESP. The charged particles are attracted to charged collector plates and are removed from the gas stream. The plates are rapped periodically to remove the collected particles. The ash falls into hoppers below the plates and is removed from the ESP through rotary air locks.

The ESP design is sufficiently flexible to treat flue gas from a range of coals with variable ash and sulfur contents. The ESP is designed to process 102,893 lb/hr of flue gas with a particulate loading of 1883 lb/hr. The ESP is designed reduce particulate emissions to less than the New Source Performance Standard of 0.03 lb/10<sup>6</sup> Btu. The ESP will include wire discharge frames and rigid discharge electrodes. Both discharge systems are used in commercial ESPs. The primary design characteristics for the ESP are summarized in the following table.



*AECDP ESP Design Summary*

Electric fields	four; 6m high x 4m deep
Specific collection area (SCA)	330-370 ft <sup>2</sup> /1000 ACFM
Flue gas velocity	3.6 to 4.0 ft/sec
Migration velocity	7.5 to 9.8 cm/sec
Residence time	13 to 14 sec
Transformer rectifier sets	four; 75 kV, 125 mA

### **Task 3 -- Benchmarking and Verification Tests**

#### *Verification Tests*

Verification testing of the wet scrubber, fabric filter, and ESP subsystems were previously completed. The objectives of these tests were to characterize the performance of the units, and to correlate that performance with commercial systems.

#### *Air Toxics Benchmarking Tests*

The objective of the air toxics benchmarking tests is to characterize the air toxics removal performance of the baghouse, ESP, and wet scrubber under conditions representative of current commercial practice. The benchmarking tests were successfully completed in the previous quarter. Air toxics measurements were simultaneously made at the inlet and outlet of each of the three flue gas treatment devices while firing the CEDF at 100 MBtu/hr with a high sulfur Ohio bituminous coal. Measurements included mercury, trace metal, HCl, HF, and total particulate concentrations. A post-test review -- "lessons learned" -- was conducted with sampling and sample recovery personnel to identify areas where our procedures could be improved.

An AECDP Equipment Operating Manual was prepared and issued.

### **Task 4 -- Data Analysis and Reporting**

Analysis of the verification testing results was completed. Chemical analysis and data reduction work began on the results of the air toxics benchmarking tests. The air toxics benchmarking tests resulted in the need to perform almost 500 laboratory chemical analyses. A computer program was written to calculate predicted emissions based on the analysis of the coal. Literature data was assembled for comparison with AECDP benchmarking test results. The required status reports, etc., were prepared and issued. Work continued on the Phase I Final Report. Several sections were prepared and circulated for internal review.

### **Task 5 -- Technology Transfer**

Work continued on the first project Newsletter. Planning activities began for the second project Advisory Committee meeting now scheduled for mid-December, 1995. Technical papers for several technical conferences are also being prepared.

**Planned Work for Next Reporting Period**

**Task 1 -- Project Planning and Management**

Air toxics cognizance activities will continue.

**Task 2 -- Test Equipment Modification and Shakedown**

All work under this task has been completed.

**Task 3 -- Benchmarking and Verification Tests**

Work under this task has been completed.

**Task 4 -- Data Analysis and Reporting**

Data analysis work will be completed, and the air toxics data library will be constructed. The Phase I final report will be issued. Status reporting activities will continue.

**Task 5 -- Technology Transfer**

The first Newsletter will be issued. The second project Advisory Committee meeting will be held.

## **Phase I Milestones and Schedule**

Progress to date and completed milestones are indicated in the figure.


## **Budget and Schedule Issues**

The milestone schedule presented in the figure reflects a revised completion schedule for the Phase I scope of work. We had previously projected an early completion of Phase I. However, it has not been possible to turn around the extensive laboratory chemical analysis work as quickly as we had hoped. The large number of samples put quite a strain on our analytical laboratory given their recent workload from other projects – especially high priority commercial work. We now anticipate a Phase I completion nearer the original project schedule. We hope to get a draft of the Phase I final report to the OCDO and DOE project managers before the end of November, and hold an Advisory Committee meeting in December.

At their August 31, 1995, meeting the OCDO Technical Advisory Committee approved our request for funding for Phases II&III of the project (\$1.9M). We are optimistic that the new federal budget will also be responsive to the funding requirements of our project.



Advanced Emissions Control Development Program  
Revised Phase I Milestone Plan



Phase I Milestone Plan