**United States Environmental Protection** Agency

Air and Energy Engineering Research Laboratory Research Triangle Park, NC 27711

Research and Development

EPA/600/SR-93/188

December 1993



## **Project Summary**

## **Evaluation of Simultaneous** SO,/NO, Control Technology

Kevin R. Bruce and Walter F. Hansen

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) have led to accelerated research into novel sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) control technologies for coal-fired industrial boilers. One of these technologies combines sorbent injection and selective non-catalytic reduction for simultaneous SO,/NO removal. The work presented herein concentrated on characterizing three process operational parameters of this technology: injection temperature, sorbent type, and reductant/pollutant stoichiometric ratio. A slurry composed of a urea-based solution (NO OUT A or NO OUT A+) and various calcium-(Ca-) based sorbents was injected at a range of temperatures and reactant/pollutant stoichiometries in a natural-gas-fired, pilot-scale reactor with doped pollutants. Up to 80% reduction of SO, and NO, at reactant/pollutant stoichíometric râtios of 2 and 1.5, respectively, was achieved. SO, emission reductions from slurry injection were enhanced moderately when compared with dry sorbent injection methods, possibly caused by sorbent fracturing to smaller, more reactive particles. Emissions from ammonia (NH3) slip (unreacted nitrogen-based reducing agent) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) formation were reduced in comparison with other published results, while similar NO reductions were obtained. Increased carbon monoxide (CO) emissions, caused by the decomposition of urea, were moderate. Emissions of CO, NH<sub>3</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O for the enhanced urea solution (NO OUT A+) were substantially less than the levels observed dur-

ing urea (NO OUT A) injection. The injection of the urea-based solution enhanced SO, removal, probably because of the formation of (NH<sub>2</sub>), CA(SO<sub>2</sub>), H<sub>2</sub>O. The results of this pilot-scale study have shown high reduction of both SO. and NO

This Project Summary was developed by EPA's Air and Energy Engineering Research Laboratory, Research Triangle Park, NC, to announce key findings of the research project that is fully documented in a separate report of the same title (see Project Report ordering information at back).

## Introduction

The project work reported here was initiated through a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) between EPA and Nalco Fuel Tech, a commercial licensor of a urea-based reducing agent injection technology for NO reduction.

Experimental testing of Nalco Fuel Tech's urea-based NO OUT A and NO\_OUT A+ reducing agents for NO\_control, in combination with Ca-based sorbent injection for SO<sub>2</sub> control, was conducted from June to November 1991. Testing was performed at EPA's Environmental Research Center in Research Triangle Park, NC, in a pollutant-doped, natural-gas-fired 50,000 Btu/h (15 kW) furnace.

The project scope of work included testing furnace sorbent injection of several Ca-based sorbents to remove SO from flue gas. The tested sorbents came from a single source of commercially prepared slaked lime [Ca(OH)2], limestone (CaCO3), and quicklime (CaO). A comparison of  ${\rm SO}_{\rm 2}$  removal efficiency was made between dry and slurry injection. The effect of  ${\rm CaCO}_{\rm 3}$  sorbent particle size was also studied

Slurry sorbent injection was found to be superior to dry injection for SO<sub>2</sub> removal. Dry injection of Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub> achieved a maximum of 60% SO<sub>2</sub> removal (at a Ca/S ratio = 2), while the Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub> slurry removed 72%. Removal efficiency with Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub> was superior to that with CaCO<sub>3</sub> in both dry (43%) and slurry (58%) testing. CaO was tested in slurry form by slaking to form Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub> slurry, and compared to the commercially prepared Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub>. The slaked CaO proved identical in its SO<sub>2</sub> removal performance to the commercially prepared Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub>.

Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub>.

Both NO OUT A and NO OUT A+ achieved maximum NO<sub>x</sub> removal when injected at a temperature of about 1,100 °C. Almost no difference in the two reducing agents existed at the optimum temperature; approximately 80% NO<sub>x</sub> removal was observed for both reducing agents. At temperatures higher than the optimum, NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency dropped quickly. At about 1,170 °C, the reducing agents be-

gan producing NO<sub>x</sub>, caused probably by high temperature oxidation of the NH<sub>3</sub> produced by urea decomposition. At temperatures lower than the optimum, NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency gradually decreased.

Varying the molar ratio of reducing agent (urea) to baseline NO<sub>x</sub>, or N/NO<sub>xi</sub>, showed that increasing N/NO<sub>xi</sub> to a value of near 2 produced significant improvement in NO<sub>x</sub> removal. Further N/NO<sub>xi</sub> increases had little or no effect on removal efficiency.

The work mentioned above also entailed characterizing NH3, N2O, and CO emissions produced by injecting the reducing agent over a range of temperatures and N/NO, Each reducing agent produced maximum NH3 slip (unreacted nitrogen-based reducing agent) at the lower injection temperatures; around 821 °C, the amount of slip was about 140 ppm for both NO OUT A and NO OUT A+. As injection temperature increased, NH slip for the NO OUT A decreased quickly, while slip from NO OUT A+ dropped off almost completely at around 875 °C. At 900-1,000 °C, slip generated by NO OUT A gradually decreased to a level of about 60 ppm. Throughout this temperature regime, NO<sub>x</sub>OUT A+ produced negligible NH<sub>3</sub> slip (<10 ppm).

CO emissions produced by NO OUT A rose gradually from about 20 ppm at 800 °C to a maximum of 25 ppm at 1,100 °C. NO OUT A+ produced low CO at 800-1,000 °C (<10 ppm), with a maximum of 50 ppm around 1,100 °C.

N<sub>2</sub>O production by NO<sub>2</sub>OUT A was negligible at lower injection temperatures (approximately 25 ppm), but increased with injection temperature to a maximum of 200 ppm at approximately 1,150 °C, about 42% of the NO<sub>2</sub> reduced. NO<sub>2</sub>OUT Approduced only moderate levels of N<sub>2</sub>O (typically <40 ppm, less than 20% of the NO<sub>2</sub> reduced) over the entire temperature range. A maximum of about 30 ppm was observed at around 1,150 °C.

Aqueous ammonia solution was injected to ensure that these results would be reproducible on other facilities. Available data for NO<sub>x</sub> removal using aqueous ammonia injection showed comparable results to others' work. These data validated improvements shown by this work with both NO<sub>x</sub>OUT solutions and suggested the applicability of these results to other facilities.

\*U.S. Government Printing Office: 1994 -- 550-067/80136

K. Bruce and W. Hansen are with Acurex Environmental Corp., Research Triangle Park, NC 27709.

Brian K. Gullett is the EPA Project Officer (see below).

The complete report, entitled "Évaluation of Simultaneous SO, /NO, Control Technology," (Order No. PB94-114741/AS; Cost: \$27.00; subject to change) will be available only from:

National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, VA 22161

Telephone: 703-487-4650
The EPA Project Officer can be contacted at:

Air and Energy Engineering Research Laboratory U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Environmental Protection Agenc Research Triangle Park, NC 27711

United States
Environmental Protection Agency
Center for Environmental Research Information
Cincinnati, OH 45268

Official Business Penalty for Private Use \$300 BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
EPA
PERMIT No. G-35