# THE INFLUENCE OF SULFUR ON THE FORMATION OF PCDD/F BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER POOR COMBUSTION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE

Aurell J, Fick J, Marklund S

Department of Chemistry, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

#### Abstract

In a laboratory-scale fluidized-bed reactor combusting artificial municipal solid waste the formation of PCDD/F was studied during good combustion, poor combustion and the following memory effects; with and without addition of SO<sub>2</sub>. The SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl ratio in the flue gas for the different experiments, were 0, 0.1, 0.4 and 1.6. Parallel sampling at the temperatures 400 and 200°C were performed. The results show that sulfur reduces the PCDF formation during and after poor combustion, while PCDD formation increases. The PCDD/PCDF ratio increased with increased SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl ratio at 200°C. However, the PCDD/PCDF ratio decreased during poor combustion with no sulfur added. The results imply that there are different pathways involved for the PCDF and PCDD formation.

## Introduction

Poor combustion of municipal solid waste is known to increase the PCDD/F formation<sup>1</sup>. This could lead to an I-TEQ concentration above regulation limits,  $0.1 \text{ ng/Nm}^3$  and  $15\mu\text{g/kg}$ , both in the flue gas and the residues<sup>2</sup>. A reduced dioxin concentration in the residues makes it possible to use them in construction works instead of deposit on landfills. This can be accomplished by either treatment of the residues or optimization of combustion plants such as temperatures, process parameters and the composition of the flue gas and fuel. Sulfur in the fuel has been seen by other authors to reduce the formation of PCDD/F<sup>3,4</sup>. Recent research found that sulfur can even reduce the PCDD/F during poor combustion periods<sup>5</sup>. The aim of this study was to examine if sulfur reduces the PCDD/F emissions during poor combustion, also to study the formation of PCDD and PCDF before, during and after such condition.

## **Material and Methods**

A laboratory-scale fluidized-bed reactor, 5 kW, combusting an artificial municipal solid waste was used, Figure 1, described in detailed by Wikström et al.<sup>6</sup> and Aurell et al.<sup>7</sup>. A total of seven combustion experiments where performed; three with no addition of  $SO_2$ , one with 30 ppm  $SO_2$  in the flue gas, two with 100 ppm SO<sub>2</sub> in the flue gas and one with 500 ppm SO<sub>2</sub> in the flue gas. For each of the combustion experiments the reactor was preheated with propane for two hours, thereafter the solid fuel feed started. The reactor reaches steady state after approximately three hours of solid fuel combustion<sup>7</sup>. The  $SO_2$  gas was injected in I1 (Figure 1), located at the secondary air supply, and preheated with an oven to approximately 240°C. For each combustion experiment four sampling periods were performed:

Freeboard HI The lob condexy air Propane 1 The lob condexy air Propane 1 The lob condexy air

**Figure 1.** The laboratory-scale fluidized-bed reactor, not in scale. The air pollution control system consist of cyclone, textile filter, wet scrubber and active carbon denoted A, B, C and D, respectively. The sampling was performed in P3 and P7, in the convector section, and  $SO_2$  added in I1, in the bed section.

1. Good combustion, after four hours of solid

- fuel combustion, this sampling occurred for 45 min.
- 2. Poor combustion (PC), an increased CO level were made by adding more fuel and reducing the air supply, an increased CO concentration (>3000 ppm) every third minute for one hour, this sampling occurred for 20 min.
- 3. Memory effects 1, sampling started directly after the poor combustion period and was performed for 30 min.
- 4. Memory effects 2, sampling started 60 minutes after the poor combustion period and was performed for 30 min.

For one of the three combustion experiments, with no addition of SO<sub>2</sub> and also for one of the 100 ppm SO<sub>2</sub> in the flue gas, only sampling period number 1 (good combustion) was performed. For each of the seven combustion experiments, parallel sampling at 400 and 200°C was performed, ending up in a total of 40 samples. To reduce the memory effects between combustion experiments, the fuel feed continued for 30-60 minutes after the last sampling occasion, and the reactor was thoroughly cleaned after each experiment. Measures of H<sub>2</sub>O, CO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO, HCl, NH<sub>3</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and CH<sub>4</sub> (30 seconds average) and O<sub>2</sub> (every second) were continuously made. The cooled probe sampling technique was used and performed according to the standard method EN:1948:1-3<sup>8</sup>. The extraction and clean-up procedures are explained elsewhere<sup>9</sup>. The samples were analyzed for PCDD/F 4-8 and PAH (acenaphtylene, acenaphtene, fluorene, phenanthrene, anthracene, flouranthene, pyrene, chrysene, benzo [*b* and *k*] fluoranthene, benzo [*a*] pyrene, indeno [1,2,3-*cd*] pyrene, dibenzo [*a*,*h*] anthracene and benzo [*ghi*] perylene), with high and low resolution GC/MS respectively.

## **Results and Discussion**

The SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl ratio (by mass) in the flue gas for the different experiments, during good combustion, were 0, 0.1, 0.4 and 1.6 respectively. With this small experimental set-up it was rather difficult to reach the same increased CO concentration throughout each experiment and between the different combustion experiments. Since a cumulative sampling method was used, and one interest of this study was to study the formation of PCDD/F before, during and after poor combustion the number and level of CO is exaggerated compared to a malfunction in a full scale plant. Noted is that increased CO level were easier to reach when no SO<sub>2</sub> were added, and the increased CO level returned to the start value faster when SO<sub>2</sub> was added, Figure 2. Addition of SO<sub>2</sub> reduces the NO<sub>2</sub> and NO and increases the HCl and N<sub>2</sub>O, at SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl 1.6 the CH<sub>4</sub> even increase (this at good combustion). NO, HCl, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO<sub>2</sub> reduces and NH<sub>3</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> increases with increased CO concentration.



**Figure 2.** The variation of CO, SO<sub>2</sub> and HCl concentration during poor combustion. The left hand side SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl 0 (no sulfur added) and the right hand side SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl 1.6. Sampling occurred during the first 20 minutes of the one hour of poor combustion.

It has been suggested that CO concentration do not correlate to PCDD/ $F^{10,11}$ . The CO has been reported in the literature to be a good indicator for the Sum PAH<sup>12</sup>. In this study the average CO concentration with the Sum PAH are used to confirm that a certain level of poor combustion has been reached, in each of the experiments. A higher soot formation could have occurred in the added SO<sub>2</sub> experiments, since more fuel needed to be added to reach an increased CO level. However, the total amount fuel used during the poor combustion was the same as during the good combustion periods. Figure 3 show an increase of the Sum PAH with increased CO



**Figure 3.** Concentration of the Sum PAH in relation to the average CO concentration during poor combustion.

concentration, for the replicate experiments, without any addition of  $SO_2$ . The experiments with addition of  $SO_2$  show no less level of poor combustion.

During good combustion a reduction on the formation of Sum PCDF can be seen for, SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl 0.4 and 1.6 at both 400 and 200°C, Figure 4. However, for the Sum PCDD a reduction in the formation can only be seen at 400°C, with SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl 0.4 and 1.6. The PCDD formation at 200°C, SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl 1.6, can be due to the change in combustion conditions (increased CH<sub>4</sub>). The triplicate runs, without addition of SO<sub>2</sub>, show an excellent reproducibility for this combustion system. An increase of the PCDD/PCDF ratio occurred with increased SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl ratio at 200°C, Table 1.



**Figure 4.** Concentration of Sum PCDF (left hand side) and Sum PCDD (right hand side) during good combustion, with and without addition of SO<sub>2</sub>. Error bars represent  $\pm 1$  standard deviation.

The poor combustion periods show a reduced formation of the Sum PCDF at both 400 and 200°C with addition of sulfur, while for the Sum PCDD it actually show an increased formation, Figure 5. The Sum PCDF formation during the memory effects shows the same trends as during poor combustion. The Sum PCDD formation increase at the second memory effects at 200°C with addition of sulfur, at 400°C it tend to reduce with increased SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl ratio. Experiment 1 (only poor combustion) SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl 0, 200°C, was sampled for 30 min instead of 20 min, this can be the reason why the memory effects 1 are higher than during the poor combustion for the other experiments. The reduction in formation seen in the experiment SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl 0.1 can be due to the enhanced SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl ratio, which occur due to the increased CO concentration. These results indicate that sulfur reduces the PCDF formation during and after poor combustion, while PCDD formation increases.

Sampling period	S:Cl 0, EXP 1	S:Cl 0, EXP 2		S:Cl 0.1		S:Cl 0.4		S:Cl 1.6	
	200°C	400°C	200°C	400°C	200°C	400°C	200°C	400°C	200°C
Good combustion	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.18	0.17	0.33
Poor combustion	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.16	0.20	0.29	0.41	0.52	0.77
Memory effects 1	0.15	0.09	0.12	0.28	0.51	0.32	0.87	0.42	0.98
Memory effects 2	0.13	0.11	0.14	0.14	0.72	0.14	1.12	0.21	1.18

Table 1. PCDD/PCDF ratios, during good combustion, poor combustion and memory effects.

The increased PCDD concentration at 200°C for the added sulfur experiments can be due to a higher soot formation, looking at the CO- and Sum PAH concentrations, Figure 3. If so, it again imply that sulfur have a larger impact on the PCDF formation then PCDD and there most probably are different pathways involved for the PCDF and PCDD formation.

Whether or not the CO and PAH are good indicators for PCDD/F formation, the PCDD/PCDF ratio tend to change with increased SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl ratio even during and after the poor combustion periods. During poor combustion with no sulfur addition, the PCDD/PCDF ratio decrease compared with good combustion. However, with sulfur addition the ratio increased, compared to good combustion, with increased SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl ratio and decreased temperature, Table 1. In full scale plants an increased PCDD/PCDF ratio has been observed during transient conditions<sup>10,13,14</sup>, however the SO<sub>2</sub>:HCl ratio was not discussed. The result from this study also show that average CO and Sum PAH concentration do not correlate to the PCDD/F concentration, the fuel composition and memory effects is important.



**Figure 5.** The concentration of Sum PCDF (upper diagrams) and Sum PCDD (lower diagrams) during and after poor combustion, at 400 (left hand side) and 200°C (right hand side). EXP 1 poor combustion with no addition of SO<sub>2</sub>, was sampled for 30 minutes instead of 20 minutes as for the other poor combustions sampling occasions.

## Acknowledgements

This work was partly sponsored by the PSO, Energinet.dk, Denmark. Special thanks to Marie Calla for the help during the combustion experiments and laboratory work and Per Liljelind for the help with the GC/MS analyses.

#### References

- 1. De Fre R, Rymen T. Chemosphere 1989;19:331-336
- 2. European Union, Council Directive 2000/76/EG
- 3. Griffin RD. Chemosphere 1986;15:1987-1990
- 4. Gullett BK, Bruce KR, Beach LO. Environ Sci Technol 1992;26:1938-1943
- 5. Ryan SP, Li XD, Gullett BK, Lee CW, Clayton M, Touati A. Environ Sci Technol 2006;40:7040-7047
- 6. Wikström E, Andersson P, Marklund S. Review of Scientific Instruments 1998;69:1850-1859
- 7. Aurell J, Jansson S, Marklund S. Organohalogen Compounds 2006;68
- 8. European Committee for Standardization. 1997;EN:1948:1-3
- Liljelind P, Söderström G, Hedman B, Karlsson S, Lundin L, Marklund S. Environ Sci Technol 2003;37:3680-3686
- 10. Gullett B, Touati A, Oudejans L, Ryan S, Tabor D. Organohalogen Compounds 2006;68
- 11. Weber R, Sakurai T, Ueno S, Nishino J. Chemosphere 2002;49:127-134
- 12. Blumenstock M, Zimmermann R, Schramm KW, Kettrup A. Chemosphere 2000;40:987-993
- 13. Gass HC, Wilken M, Lüder K. Organohalogen Compounds 2003; 60-65
- 14. Grosso M, Cernuschi S, Palini E, Lodi M, Mariani G. Organohalogen Compounds 2004;66