

EPA-650/2-73-029

September 1973

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY SERIES

INTERACTIONS OF STACK GAS SULFUR AND NITROGEN OXIDES ON DRY SORBENTS



Office of Research and Development
National Environmental Research Center
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27711

P

INTERACTIONS OF STACK GAS SULFUR AND NITROGEN OXIDES ON DRY SORBENTS

by

J.W. Brown, D.W. Pershing, J.H. Wasser, and E.E. Berkau

Control Systems Laboratory
National Environmental Research Center
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27711

Project No. 21ADG42
Program Element No. 1A2014

Prepared for

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NORTH CAROLINA 27711

September 1973

This report has been reviewed by the Environmental Protection Agency and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

ABSTRACT

It was noted that the standard analytical system used for the measurement of NO emissions gave incorrect NO concentrations in the presence of SO₂. The problem was traced to the dry sorbents used to remove water vapor prior to the NO analysis. A brief test series demonstrated that both Drierite and molecular sieve sorbents can cause incorrect NO results if SO₂ is present. Further testing revealed that the materials are capable of simultaneous removal of both NO and SO₂ even in low concentrations. More work is needed to define the actual fate of these species; however, it appears that this might offer a possible NO_x/SO_x control technique since the data indicate that the sorbent effect is thermally regenerable.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	iii
List of Figures	v
List of Tables	v
Introduction	1
Isothermal Testing with Known Gas Concentrations	3
Hot-Flow Testing -- Propane Combustion Doped with SO ₂	7
Hot-Flow Testing -- Residual-Oil-Fired Package Boiler	13
Conclusions/Recommendations	17
Bibliography	18

FIGURES

<u>No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Isothermal Test Facility	4
2	Hot-Flow Test Facility	8
3	Recorded Traces for Tests B-1, B-5, B-7, and B-8	11
4	Package Boiler Hot-Flow Test Facility	12
5	Emission Reduction Across a 65-Gram Molecular Sieve Bed	16

TABLES

<u>No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Series 1 Results	5
2	Series 2 Results	9
3	Series 3 Results -- Emissions After 5 Minutes of Sampling	14

INTRODUCTION

During recent experimental testing, the Combustion Research Section (CRS) of EPA's Control Systems Laboratory observed that sampling and analytical procedures previously utilized for measuring NO_x emissions from natural gas and light oil combustion¹ were not satisfactory for measuring nitrogen oxides (NO_x) in sulfur oxide (SO_x) laden gases. For example, sulfur dioxide (SO_2) levels of 1600 ppm (equivalent of 2.5 percent sulfur fuel) resulted in measured NO_x concentrations of less than half the actual level. The problem was finally isolated to the dry sorbent system used to remove water from the gas sample prior to the analytical instrumentation.

It is well known (e.g., Sundaresan et al.)² that certain drying materials such as commercial zeolites and silica gel have the ability to selectively adsorb NO_x from nitric acid tail gases where the NO_x concentration is in excess of 2000 ppm. Previous CRS work had shown that NO adsorption and/or reaction did not occur with the molecular sieve and Drierite drying agents utilized in the standard CRS analytical train;¹ however, all prior work had been done with essentially sulfur free flue gases. The purpose of the work reported herein was to briefly investigate the observed SO_x/NO_x /drying agent interactions and to define what further work, if any, should be done in the area.

A three part approach was utilized. First, controlled mixtures of ambient air, nitric oxide (NO), and SO_2 were prepared, passed through various types of drying systems, and then sampled to determine exactly what interferences and/or interactions should be expected. Next, the tests were repeated using actual flue gas from a propane flame with and without SO_2 present. Finally, the work was extended to full scale testing on a package boiler burning residual oil with 0.9 percent sulfur.

ISOTHERMAL TESTING WITH KNOWN GAS CONCENTRATIONS

Under combustion conditions it is not possible to measure the amount of NO in a given flue gas stream without first removing the water of combustion. (Failure to do so will result in water vapor condensation in the sample cell and/or instrument interference.) Therefore, in the first test series ambient air (with appropriate NO and SO₂ added) was utilized instead of actual flue gas so that the sample could be run directly to the appropriate analyzer. The purpose of this series was to define which elements if any of the standard drying system needed further investigation.

The experimental facility used for this test series is shown in Figure 1. Basically, it was designed to allow sampling a gas flow of ambient air with and without NO and/or SO₂. Both the NO and SO₂ came from laboratory cylinders through precalibrated rotameters into the sampling duct ahead of the mixing section. Sampling was accomplished via a standard quartz combustion probe. From the probe the sample went either directly to the analyzer (baseline tests) or to the system component being checked (e.g., the ice bath) then to the analyzer. All NO analysis in this series was done with a chemiluminescent analyzer.

The results of these tests are shown in Table 1. In Tests A-1 through A-5 the stream being sampled contained only ambient air and approximately 200 ppm NO. As the data indicate, none of the common drying schemes had any significant effect on the measurement. In Tests A-6 through A-10 sufficient SO₂ was added to the air stream to give about 1600 ppm in the mixture. As the data indicate both the Drierite and the molecular sieve led to radical reductions in the measured NO level initially; however, with time both appeared to "saturate" and the NO asymptotically approached the correct value. These data suggest that some type of NO_x/SO_x




Figure 1. Isothermal test facility.

Table 1. SERIES 1 RESULTS

Test No.	Test gas composition	Sample conditions ^a	Chemiluminescent measured NO, ppm
A-1	Ambient air + ~200 ppm NO	Direct to analyzer	194
A-2	"	Drierite, ^b 15 g ^c	204
A-3	"	Molecular sieve, ^d "	189
A-4	"	CaCl ₂ ·2H ₂ O, ^e "	195
A-5	"	Ice bath	193
A-6	Ambient air + ~200 ppm NO + ~1600 ppm SO ₂	Direct to analyzer	184
A-7	"	Drierite, 15 g	(2 min.) 141, (10 min.) 176
A-8	"	Molecular sieve, "	(2 min.) 67, (10 min.) 159
A-9	"	CaCl ₂ ·2H ₂ O, "	185
A-10	"	Ice bath	183
A-11	Ambient air + ~1600 ppm SO ₂	Direct to analyzer	0.98
A-12	"	Drierite, 15 g	0.60
A-13	"	Molecular sieve, "	0.25
A-14	"	CaCl ₂ ·2H ₂ O, "	0.78
A-15	"	Ice bath	0.95

^aTotal sample flow was 71 liters/hr (2.5 scfh). The flue gas sample flowed through a particulate filter to prevent clogging instrument sampling lines. (There was no evidence that this filter adversely affected measured NO_x readings.) A dry layer air filter pack #99/97 Microsorban made by Delbag Co. was used to remove particulates.

^bNew "Drierite" - anhydrous CaSO₄, W. A. Hammond Drierite Co.

^cFresh drying agent materials were weighed on a triple-beam balance for each sample requiring an agent.

^dNew molecular sieve - #022-006-3A, #1 pellet, Guild Corp. (clay base).

^eCaCl₂·2H₂O - Calcium chloride, reagent grade, Matheson, Coleman & Bell.

interaction was occurring; however, unfortunately during this series it was not possible to measure SO_2 to determine its fate. It was also noted, that if the bulk of the flow (the ambient air) was replaced by pure nitrogen no NO/SO_2 interaction was observed. This suggests that O_2 and/or water vapor was also involved.

In Tests A-11 through A-15 the NO was turned off to investigate possible negative interference effects by SO_2 on the analyzer and the system components. As the data show SO_2 had essentially no positive or negative effect on the chemiluminescent NO analyzer since all readings were less than 1 ppm. The data do show, however, that even at the ambient level of about 1 ppm NO, molecular sieve and Drierite reduced the NO in the presence of SO_2 .

HOT-FLOW TESTING -- PROPANE COMBUSTION DOPED WITH SO₂

In the second test series flue gas from propane combustion was artificially doped with SO₂ on a controlled basis. The purpose of this series was to investigate the NO_x/SO_x interaction on as nearly a practical system as possible and still be able to control the SO₂ concentration in the flue gas stream being sampled. Figure 2 shows the test facility used for this portion of the work. Basically, it was an upright multi-fuel combustor, with a 40.6 cm (16-in.) ID refractory combustion chamber, and hot-air heat exchanger. Combustion air was supplied by several air blowers in a variety of combinations so that ambient air, preheated air, or flue gas can be supplied to the primary, axial, or swirl streams. The combustor, burner, and support facilities were identical to those used in previous studies.³ In this series a six-hole radial propane injector was utilized and the combustor was fired at 75 million cal/hr (300,000 Btu/hr) and 5 percent excess air.

The NO in this test series was the result of the normal propane combustion (as compared to the first test series where with no flame the NO level was simulated by injection of concentrated NO). The SO₂ was injected after the combustion zone to prevent flame zone reactions and at a flow to give a concentration of 1600 ppm inside the combustor. As before NO was measured with a chemiluminescent analyzer. Instrumentation was not available for SO₂.

The results of this test series are presented in Table 2. In tests B-1 through B-4 the only major pollutant in the flue gas being sampled was NO (since propane contains no sulfur and this




Figure 2. Hot-flow test facility.

Table 2. SERIES 2 RESULTS

Test No.	Test gas composition	Sample conditions ^a			Chemiluminescent measured NO, ppm
B-1	Combustion gas	Ice bath			94
B-2	"	Drierite, ^b	15 g ^c	+ ice bath	96.5
B-3	"	Molecular sieve, ^d	"	"	98.5
B-4	"	CaCl ₂ ·2H ₂ O, ^e	"	"	94
B-5	Combustion gas + ~1600 ppm SO ₂	Ice bath			94
B-6	"	Drierite,	15 g ^c	+ ice bath	(2 min.) 41, (30 min.) 89
B-7	"	Molecular sieve	"	"	(2 min.) 33, (30 min.) 92
B-8	"	CaCl ₂ ·2H ₂ O,	"	"	94

^aThe total sample flow was 71 liters/hr (2.5 scfh). In all cases the flue gas sample flowed through a particulate filter to prevent clogging the instrument sampling lines. (There was no evidence that this filter had any adverse effect on measured NO_x readings.) A dry layer air filter pack #99/97 Microsorb made by Delbag Co. was used to remove particulates.

^bNew "Drierite" - anhydrous CaSO₄, W. A. Hammond Drierite Co.

^cFresh drying agent materials were weighed out on a triple beam balance for each sample where an agent was required.

^dNew molecular sieve - #022-006-3A, #1 pellet, Guild Corp. (clay base).

^eCaCl₂·2H₂O - Calcium chloride, reagent grade, Matheson, Coleman & Bell.

combustor does not produce significant carbon monoxide, unburned hydrocarbons, or NO_2). As in the first test series all of the drying methods gave essentially the same NO concentration level; there was no evidence of any unusual interactions. (The sample could not be run directly to the analyzer without the ice bath due to water condensation in the analyzer cell.)

During Tests B-5 through B-8, SO_2 was added to the flue gas stream and as before the use of both Drierite and molecular sieve gave incorrect NO readings. Figure 3 shows the recorder traces for the CaCl_2 and molecular sieve tests. As these data indicate 15 grams of molecular sieve material required almost 30 minutes before equilibration occurred, while the $\text{CaCl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ gave the correct reading almost immediately.




Figure 3. Recorded traces for tests B-1, B-5, B-7, and B-8.




Figure 4. Package boiler hot-flow test facility.

HOT-FLOW TESTING -- RESIDUAL- OIL-FIRED PACKAGE BOILER

The final test series was conducted in a 60-hp residual-oil-fired package boiler. The purpose of this series was to confirm the previous results with flue gas from a typical commercial system and to quantify the actual effects. Figure 4 shows the experimental setup used for this series. Basically, it consisted of a 64-liter/hr (17-gph) Scotch-Marine boiler operating at 25 percent excess air. NO was measured by both chemiluminescent and NDIR analyzers. SO₂ was determined by wet chemical analysis (Shell method⁴). During each experiment the flue gas sample from the boiler stack was passed through a cooler and the test bed before going to the appropriate analyzer.

The results of Tests C-1 through C-5 are shown in Table 3. In Test C-1 no drying agent (other than the refrigeration cooler) was used to remove water vapor prior to the emission analysis. The 232 ppm NO is considered to be the baseline emission for this unit. In the next four tests new and regenerated molecular sieve and Drierite samples were used for final sample drying. (New implies the material had just been received from the manufacturer; regenerated implies the material had been used on several prior occasions for water removal and then "regenerated" by heating to drive off absorbed water.) The data indicate that:

1. With both molecular sieve and Drierite some reduction in NO does occur across the drying material, confirming the Series A and B results.
2. The process involves simultaneous reaction of both NO and SO₂.
3. Regenerated molecular sieve gave the largest reductions in both NO and SO₂.

Table 3. SERIES 3 RESULTS -- EMISSIONS AFTER
5 MINUTES OF SAMPLING^a

Test No.	Drying agent ^b	NO by chemiluminescent, ppm ^c	NO by NDIR, ppm	SO ₂ by wet chemistry, ^d ppm
C-1	None	232	ND ^e	421
C-2	New molecular sieve	138	143	
C-3	Regenerated molecular sieve	99	105	25
C-4	New Drierite	122	185	
C-5	Regenerated Drierite	183	174	

^a 60-hp residual-oil-fired package boiler at 25 percent excess air.

^b In all cases refrigeration cooling was used to remove the initial portion of the water.

^c As measured, dry.

^d Shell method (for details see Reference 1).

^e Since water vapor strongly interferes with NDIR analyzers it was not possible to use these analyzers without moisture removal.

It should be noted, however, that eventually the measured emissions approached the baseline level as the drying material "saturated". To quantify this phenomenon three tests were run where flue gas was drawn through 65 grams of regenerated molecular sieve and the emissions were monitored in turn for NO by chemiluminescent analysis, SO₂ by NDIR, and NO by NDIR, all as a function of time. The reduced results are shown in Figure 5. C_t/C_o is the ratio of the concentration of pollutant after a given number of liters of gas had passed through the sieve bed to the correct (baseline) emission level. (Thus a C_t/C_o of 1.0 means no reduction in pollutant concentration is occurring across the bed and a C_t/C_o of 0.0 indicates complete reduction: zero pollutant concentration after the bed.) The data show that for the test case of 65 grams of molecular sieve a 75 percent reduction in SO₂ and a 55 percent reduction in NO occurred for the first 25 to 30 liters of gas. From these data an SO₂ removal of 0.59 mg/g of sieve was estimated; the NO removal was 0.077 mg/g of sieve. The relative volumes also appear to be 3 parts of SO₂ for 1 part of NO.

To investigate the possible use of dry sorption as a possible simultaneous NO_x/SO_x control technique the data were used to estimate a system for a 1000 mw power plant burning 1 percent sulfur fuel. (It should be clearly noted that this type calculation is crude at best because no attempt was made to experimentally optimize conditions, sorbent, bed configuration etc., and all work was done on a very small scale system, 65 grams of material.) The calculations indicated that 5.9×10^6 Kg/hr (13×10^6 lb/hr) of molecular sieve would be required to reduce SO₂ concentration from 421 ppm to <25 ppm and simultaneously reduce NO concentration from 232 ppm to 99 ppm.




Figure 5. Emission reduction across a 65-gram molecular sieve bed.

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Use of a solid sorbent drying material prior to NO analysis can lead to erroneously measured NO concentrations in SO₂ laden flue gases. Drierite and molecular sieve have both been shown to be susceptible to this problem in varying degrees; calcium chloride dehydrate appears to be a possible alternative but needs a more complete analysis. The results are rudimentary at best but even so they suggest the serious need for a detailed chemical-analytical study to provide definitive guidelines for NO_x sampling.

2. Both Drierite and molecular sieve have been shown capable of simultaneous NO and SO₂ "removal" when both are present even in low concentrations. Experimental work should be undertaken to define the fate of the specie; i.e., is the NO being retained on the surface of the sorbent in some form or is it coming through the bed in a form not detected by the analyzer (e.g., NO₂)?

3. Since this concept potentially offers simultaneous NO_x and SO_x removal work should be undertaken to assess the feasibility of using it for flue gas treatment. Future work should develop data on the effect of sorbent composition and structure, NO_x and SO_x concentrations, and regeneration times so that a reasonable economic analysis can be conducted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Martin, G. B., D. W. Pershing, and E. E. Berkau. Effects of Fuel Additives on Air Pollutant Emissions from Distillate Oil-Fired Furnaces. EPA. Research Triangle Park, N. C. Office of Air Programs Publication No. AP-87. June 1971. 91.
2. Sundaresan, B. B., C. I. Harding, F. P. May, and E. R. Hendrickson. Adsorption of Nitrogen Oxides from Waste Gas. Environ. Sci. Technol. 1:151-156, February 1967.
3. Pershing, D. W., J. W. Brown, and E. E. Berkau. Relationship of Burner Design to the Control of NO_x Emissions Through Combustion Modification. EPA. (Presented at Coal Combustion Seminar. Research Triangle Park, N. C. June 19-20, 1973.) 53.
4. Shell Development Company, Analytical Department. Determination of Sulfur Dioxide and Sulfur Trioxide in Stack Gases. Emeryville, Calif. 1959.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING FORM NTIS-35 (10-70) (Bibliographic Data Sheet based on COSATI Guidelines to Format Standards for Scientific and Technical Reports Prepared by or for the Federal Government, PB-180 600).

1. **Report Number.** Each individually bound report shall carry a unique alphanumeric designation selected by the performing organization or provided by the sponsoring organization. Use uppercase letters and Arabic numerals only. Examples FASEB-NS-87 and FAA-RD-68-09.
2. **Leave blank.**
3. **Recipient's Accession Number.** Reserved for use by each report recipient.
4. **Title and Subtitle.** Title should indicate clearly and briefly the subject coverage of the report, and be displayed prominently. Set subtitle, if used, in smaller type or otherwise subordinate it to main title. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number and include subtitle for the specific volume.
5. **Report Date.** Each report shall carry a date indicating at least month and year. Indicate the basis on which it was selected (e.g., date of issue, date of approval, date of preparation).
6. **Performing Organization Code.** Leave blank.
7. **Author(s).** Give name(s) in conventional order (e.g., John R. Doe, or J. Robert Doe). List author's affiliation if it differs from the performing organization.
8. **Performing Organization Report Number.** Insert if performing organization wishes to assign this number.
9. **Performing Organization Name and Address.** Give name, street, city, state, and zip code. List no more than two levels of an organizational hierarchy. Display the name of the organization exactly as it should appear in Government indexes such as USGRDR-I.
10. **Project/Task/Work Unit Number.** Use the project, task and work unit numbers under which the report was prepared.
11. **Contract/Grant Number.** Insert contract or grant number under which report was prepared.
12. **Sponsoring Agency Name and Address.** Include zip code.
13. **Type of Report and Period Covered.** Indicate interim, final, etc., and, if applicable, dates covered.
14. **Sponsoring Agency Code.** Leave blank.
15. **Supplementary Notes.** Enter information not included elsewhere but useful, such as Prepared in cooperation with . . . Translation of . . . Presented at conference of . . . To be published in . . . Supersedes . . . Supplements . . .
16. **Abstract.** Include a brief (200 words or less) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report. If the report contains a significant bibliography or literature survey, mention it here.
17. **Key Words and Document Analysis.** (a). **Descriptors.** Select from the Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms the proper authorized terms that identify the major concept of the research and are sufficiently specific and precise to be used as index entries for cataloging.
(b). **Identifiers and Open-Ended Terms.** Use identifiers for project names, code names, equipment designators, etc. Use open-ended terms written in descriptor form for those subjects for which no descriptor exists.
(c). **COSATI Field/Group.** Field and Group assignments are to be taken from the 1965 COSATI Subject Category List. Since the majority of documents are multidisciplinary in nature, the primary Field/Group assignment(s) will be the specific discipline, area of human endeavor, or type of physical object. The application(s) will be cross-referenced with secondary Field/Group assignments that will follow the primary posting(s).
18. **Distribution Statement.** Denote releasability to the public or limitation for reasons other than security for example "Release unlimited". Cite any availability to the public, with address and price.
- 19 & 20. **Security Classification.** Do not submit classified reports to the National Technical
21. **Number of Pages.** Insert the total number of pages, including this one and unnumbered pages, but excluding distribution list, if any.
22. **Price.** Insert the price set by the National Technical Information Service or the Government Printing Office, if known.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. EPA-650/2-73-029	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle Interactions of Stack Gas Sulfur and Nitrogen Oxides on Dry Sorbents		5. Report Date September 1973	
7. Author(s) J. W. Brown, D. W. Pershing, J. H. Wasser, and E. E. Berkau		8. Performing Organization Rept. No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address EPA, Office of Research and Development NERC-RTP, Control Systems Laboratory Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 21ADG42	
		11. Contract/Grant No. In-House Report	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address		13. Type of Report & Period Covered Final	
		14.	
15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Abstracts The report describes a brief test series that demonstrates that both Drierite and molecular sieve sorbents can cause incorrect NO results if SO2 is present. It was noted that the standard analytical system used for measuring NO emissions gave incorrect NO emissions in the presence of SO2. The problem was traced to the dry sorbents used to remove water vapor prior to the NO analysis. Further testing revealed that the materials can simultaneously remove both NO and SO2, even in low concentrations. Although more work is needed to define the actual fate of these species, it appears that this might offer a possible NOx/SOx control technique since the data indicate that the sorbent effect is thermally regenerable.			
17. Key Words and Document Analysis 17a Descriptors Air Pollution Flue Gases Sulfur Oxides Nitrogen Oxides Sorbents Desiccants			
17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms Air Pollution Control Stationary Sources Dry Sorbents Molecular Sieves			
17c. COSATI Field/Group 13B, 07B			
18. Availability Statement Unlimited		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 24
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price