

Formation and Sources P20

Use of Mono- to Tri-Chlorinated Dibenzodioxin (CDD) and Dibenzofuran (CDF) Congeners/Homologues as Indicators of Tetra- to Octa-CDD/CDF Emissions from Municipal Waste and Waste/Coal Combustion

Brian K. Gullett and Evalena Wikström*

National Risk Management Research Laboratory,
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (MD-65),
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, USA

*Institute of Environmental Chemistry,
Umeå University,
S-901 82 Umeå, Sweden

Introduction

Knowledge of the congener patterns and homologue profiles of polychlorinated dibenzodioxin and polychlorinated dibenzofuran (PCDD/F) are important because toxicity is linked to the concentration distribution of the 17 congeners that are fully chlorinated in the 2,3,7,8 positions. A mechanistic understanding of how chlorine (Cl) partitions among and within the homologues will enable approaches toward reducing overall formation of PCDD/F and/or reducing the concentration of the 17 congeners that comprise the toxic equivalency (TEQ) value. Efforts have been made to model equilibrium distributions of congeners using computational molecular modelling (1). Modelling of homologue distributions has used binomial reactivity functions (2). The homologue profiles appear much more dynamic than the congener patterns and have been linked through Principal Component Analyses (PCA) to ash characteristics and operating parameters (3,4) and through a combination of Poisson process/structural equations modelling (5) to gas concentrations and operating parameters. Recent efforts (6) have modelled homologue profiles and concentrations using generalized additive models to develop a multivariate model with input of six operating and flue gas parameters.

The effort reported here uses homologue concentrations and a subset of the mono- to tri-chlorinated PCDD/F congeners to predict both PCDD/F TOTAL (sum of mono- to octa- CDD/F concentrations) and TEQ values. The ability to establish correlations between PCDD/F measures (particularly TEQ values) and concentrations of a limited subset of the 74 mono- to tri-CDD and CDF congeners is particularly valuable since current instrumentation development shows promise for measuring these lowly chlorinated congeners in an on-line, real-time mode (7). Sampling results from two facilities and a wide range of operating conditions are used to establish the robustness of the predictions for application to other facilities and fuels. Strong relationships between lowly chlorinated congeners and PCDD/F measures (such as TEQ) coupled with further development of methods to monitor the concentrations of these congeners in flue gas should provide a valuable tool for understanding the mechanism of PCDD/F formation and finding process control methods to reduce or prevent their formation.

Experimental

A municipal waste combustor located near Norfolk, Virginia, burning processed fluff refuse derived fuel (RDF), was the site for 13 pre-spray-dryer sampling tests ("Norfolk"). This facility fired RDF-only or co-fired RDF with two types of coal during this test campaign. One coal was low sulfur (S, 0.7 wt %) and one coal from Illinois was high S (3.5 wt %). Co-firing up to 5 wt % high S coal with RDF reduced the pre-spray-dryer PCDD/F concentration by up to 70% from the initial baseline. Sampling and analytical methods were expanded to quantify mono-, di-, and tri-CDD/CDF congener totals as well as select isomers using the isotope dilution method. Labelled di- and tri-CDF and di- and tri-CDD surrogates were also added to XAD-2 prior to sampling to assess overall-measurement performance.

The pilot scale Umeå reactor is a solid fuel combustor that burns artificial pellets on an underfire/overfire air supplied grate. The nominal burn rate is 18 MJ/h (1 kg/h). A triple looped convection section, 5 m per section, allows for simulating quench rates in field units. Further details can be found in Wikström et al. (8,9).

Two test groups were run in this reactor. "Umeå-1" run parameters varied total air flow from 90 to 150 L/min, flow in the secondary air varied from 20 to 70 %, and the temperature of the secondary air varied from 50 to 350 °C [the test matrix is shown in Wikström and Marklund (10)]. The "Umeå-2" tests were run under non-varied combustion conditions. The purpose of these tests was to simulate full scale combustion with an artificial municipal solid waste to study formation of PCDD/F.

Results, Analyses, and Discussion

Thirteen tests at the Norfolk site and 16 tests at the Umeå pilot plant resulted in a fairly wide range of PCDD/F TOTAL and TEQ values, with the common dominance of PCDF over PCDD. Each group's homologue profiles (not shown) exhibit consistent, intra-group profiles, although the magnitude and peak homologue group vary considerably between the three test groups. The stability of the homologue pattern is not surprising, although Umeå-1, with planned operation at the limits of combustion conditions, might have been expected to exhibit a larger profile variation based on work by Gullett et al. (6). Their work showed shifts or magnitude changes in the homologue profile that were associated with changes in operational parameters of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and hydrogen chloride (HCl) concentration, residence time, and quench rate.

SAS[®] procedure REG (11) was used to obtain the best 1-, 2-, and 3-predictor models (Table IA) of run-specific ln (TEQ) from among the total concentrations [pmol/m³, 7% oxygen (O₂)] of the mono- to tri-CDD/F homologues. Logarithms of the dependent variable were evaluated to ensure a normal distribution of the data. The model selection criterion is based on maximization of R². Use of the mono- to tri-CDD/F homologues as potential predictors of TEQ shows that the Norfolk and Umeå-2 data result in models whose single predictors show good prediction of TEQ (R² = 0.767 and 0.948, respectively). However, none of the three data sets results in selection of a common, single predictor. Prediction of TEQ with the Umeå-1 homologues is poor, even when extended to a 3-predictor model. This is particularly noteworthy in that the Umeå-1 profile (not shown) is a result of combustor operation at extreme conditions of air flow and temperature, unrepresentative of the normal operating mode. The homologues are dominated by mono-CDF (MCDF) and di-CDD (DiCDF) homologues, yet the concentrations of these lower chlorinated compounds do not readily reflect the higher chlorinated compounds that comprise the TEQ measure. Extension to a 3-predictor model results in improvement in R² for both Norfolk and Umeå-2 and selection of the same homologues, albeit some with different signs (+/-). These results suggest that homologue totals may be useful only in predicting TEQ on a facility-specific basis.

Switching now from a regulatory focus (TEQ) to a mechanistic focus (TOTAL), Table IB shows the best 1-, 2-, and 3-predictor models for PCDD/F TOTAL from among the mono- to tri-CDD/F.

Single homologue totals do well at predicting TOTAL, although (as in Table IA), the selected predictors are not consistent between the data sets. Only modest improvements in R^2 are noted with selection of additional predictors. Unlike Table IA, the Umeå-1 R^2 value is high for even the single predictor model, likely reflecting the ability of the homologue to predict itself (the profile is dominated by MCDF and DiCDF). This difference in the ability of the Umeå-1 homologue data to predict TOTAL versus TEQ may be indicative solely of the high concentration of the lowly chlorinated compounds in this sample. For all of the data sets there is surprising frequency of PCDD homologue selection (rather than PCDF homologue) to reflect TOTAL, since TOTAL is dominated by PCDF compounds.

Finally, we evaluated the ability of select mono- to tri-CDD/F congener concentrations (pmol/m^3 , 7% O_2) to predict the logarithm of TEQ either singly or in combination with another congener (Table IC). Twelve potential predictors were evaluated from among the concentrations of 15 congeners (some predictors consisted of the sum of co-eluting peaks) for which we (EPA) had chromatography standards. These same 12 predictors were used as candidates to model the Norfolk, Umeå-1, and Umeå-2 datasets for TEQ. The joint model selection criteria are maximization of R^2 and preference for non-co-eluting congeners. Table IC shows that the concentrations of select TrCDF compounds, particularly 1,2,3-TrCDF and 2,4,6-TrCDF, show reasonable correlations with TEQ. For example, knowledge of the concentration of a single congener, 1,2,3-TrCDF, allows prediction of over 67% of the variation in the TEQ values for the Norfolk data. Significant improvement in R^2 ($> 80\%$ for all three data sets) is obtained with addition of a second predictor. It should be noted that selection of the specific congeners cited in Table IC is not necessarily unique; other selected congeners may be substituted without large loss of R^2 . The actual prediction of $\ln(\text{TEQ})$ can be written as a weighted linear combination of the selected predictors using the regression coefficients (not shown) as weights. These results suggest that the gas phase concentrations of a limited number of mono- to tri-chlorinated congeners can serve as indicators of flue gas CDD/CDF concentrations. Recent instrumental developments (7) in the ability to monitor these congeners in real time and at observed flue gas concentrations suggest a method for monitoring emissions and providing feedback to control combustor performance.

Acknowledgements

B. Gullett's work was partly sponsored by the Illinois Clean Coal Institute (ICCI). Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the view of the ICCI.

References

1. Unsworth, J. F.; and Dorans, H., *Chemosphere* 1993, 27(1-3), 351-358.
2. Funcke, W.; and Hemminghaus, H.-J., *Organohalogen Compounds* 1993, 11, 345-350.
3. Manninen, H.; Perkiö, A.; Vartiainen, T.; and Russkanen, J., *Environmental Science & Pollution Research* 1996, 3(3), 129-134.
4. Pitea, D.; Lasagni, M.; Moro, G.; Todeschini, R.; Clementi, S.; Cruciani, G.; and Chiesa, G., *Chemosphere* 1990, 20(10-12), 1973-1979.
5. Gullett, B. K.; and Dunn, J. E., In: *Proceedings: International Specialty Conference on Solid Waste Management: Thermal Treatment & Waste-to-Energy Technologies*, EPA/AEERL, April 18-21, 1995, Washington, DC.
6. Gullett, B. K.; Dunn, J. E.; Bae, S.-K.; and Raghunathan, K., In: *Proceedings: 1998 International Conference on Incineration & Thermal Treatment Technologies*, UC-Irvine/AWMA, May 11-15, 1998, Salt Lake City, Utah.
7. Oser, H.; Thanner, R.; Grotheer, H.-H.; Gullett, B. K.; Natschke, D.; and Raghunathan, K., Presented at: *Fifth International Congress on Toxic Combustion By-Products*, June 25-27, 1997, Dayton, OH, and accepted for publication in *Combustion Science & Technology*, March 1998.

8. Wikström, E.; Andersson, P.; and Marklund, S., *Review of Scientific Instruments* 1998, 69(4), 1850-1859.
9. Wikström, E.; and Marklund, S., accepted for publication in *Waste Management & Research* 1998, 16.
10. Wikström, E.; and Marklund, S., *Organohalogen Compounds* 1997, 31, 532-537.
11. SAS/STAT User's Guide; Vol. 2, version 6, 4th ed.; SAS Institute, Inc., 1990, Cary, NC.

Table I. Regression Models for TEQ and TOTAL Using Mono- to Tri-CDD/F Homologue Totals and Congeners.[†]

A. TEQ Models Using Mono- to Tri-CDD/F:					
Norfolk (13 runs)		Umeå-1 (10 runs)		Umeå-2 (6 runs)	
Predictor(s)	R ²	Predictor(s)	R ²	Predictor(s)	R ²
TrCDF	0.767	MCDF	0.250	TrCDD	0.948
DiCDF, TrCDF	0.813	MCDF, TrCDF	0.278	TrCDD, DiCDF	0.969
DiCDD, DiCDF, TrCDF	0.868	DiCDD, TrCDD, MCDF	0.390	DiCDD, DiCDF, TrCDF	0.996
B. TOTAL Models Using Mono- to Tri-CDD/F:					
Norfolk		Umeå-1		Umeå-2	
Predictor(s)	R ²	Predictor(s)	R ²	Predictor(s)	R ²
DiCDD	0.761	DiCDF	0.731	TrCDD	0.838
MCDD, DiCDD	0.782	DiCDF, TrCDF	0.852	MCDD, TrCDD	0.897
MCDD, DiCDD, TrCDD	0.787	MCDF, DiCDF, TrCDF	0.855	TrCDD, MCDF, TrCDF	0.917
C. Regression Models for TEQ Using 12 Mono- to Tri-CDD/F Congener* Concentrations:					
Norfolk		Umeå-1		Umeå-2	
Predictor(s)	R ²	Predictor(s)	R ²	Predictor(s)	R ²
1,2,3-TrCDF	0.679	2,4,6-TrCDF	0.438	2,4,6-TrCDF	0.442
1,2,3-TrCDF; 1,6-DiCDD	0.843	1,2,3-TrCDF; 2,4,6-TrCDF	0.832	1,2,3-TrCDF; 2,4,6-TrCDF	0.856

*1-MCDD; 2-MCDD; 1,6-DiCDD; 2,3-, 2,7-, 2,8-DiCDD; 1,2,3-, 1,7,8-TrCDD; 2-MCDF; 4-MCDF; 2,4-DiCDF; 2,8-DiCDF; 1,2,3-TrCDF; 2,4,6-TrCDF; 2,4,8-TrCDF

[†]Italicized values have p values > 0.10. The p values indicate the probability that we have rejected the null hypothesis (no linear relationship between the predictor and the dependent variable) in error.