



## ***Getting Mercury Out of Coal Combustion Gases***

**James Gallup, PhD  
U.S. EPA Office of Research & Development  
National Center for Environmental Research (NCER)  
Washington, DC**

**Nick Hutson, PhD  
U.S. EPA Office of Research & Development  
National Risk Management Research Laboratory (NRMRL)  
Research Triangle Park, NC**

**EPA Region 5 Science Forum – October 6, 2004 – Chicago, IL**

# Outline

- Background
  - Mercury (Hg) sources and health impacts
  - Regulatory alternatives
- Mercury in power plants
- Mercury control technologies
- EPA's mercury research program



## ***Background***

- Hg known to bioaccumulate in human and animal tissue in its most toxic form: methyl mercury
- Human exposure associated with serious neurological and developmental effects
- EPA regulated municipal waste combustors (MWCs) and medical waste incinerators in 1990s; controlled more than 40 tons
- Coal-fired power plants now major source; 48 tons (1999)
- On January 30, 2004 EPA proposed regulations for power plant Hg control; March 15, 2004 supplemental proposal; presently in comment under review. Final rule by March 15, 2005



## Coal-Fired Power Plants



U.S. Coal-Fired Power Plants

- There are about 530 power plants with 305 gigawatt of capacity that consist of about 1,300 units, 1,150 of which are >25 megawatt.
- Coal plants generate the vast majority of power sector emissions:
  - 100% of Hg
  - 95% of SO<sub>2</sub>
  - 90% of NO<sub>x</sub>




RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

Coal-fired plants are scattered throughout the U.S.

## **Power Generation Is a Major Source of Mercury Emissions**

### **1999 Mercury Air Emissions**



- |  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| ■ Fuel Combustion-<br>electric utilities | □ Industrial Processing |
| ■ Other stationary<br>combustion*        | □ Transportation        |
|  | ■ Miscellaneous         |

\* Other stationary combustion includes residential and commercial sources.




RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

Utilities are major emitters of several pollutants of concern

# Mercury Contamination in Fish

- Currently 44 states have issued fish consumption advisories for some or all of their waters due to contamination from mercury.\*



Widespread influence of mercury emissions.

## ***Proposed Regulatory Alternatives***

- **3 approaches outlined in the January 30, 2004 proposal**
  - Propose traditional, command-and-control section 112 MACT requirements for utility units
    - Reduces mercury emissions from 48 to 34 tons by January 2008
  - Propose cap-and-trade approach under guidelines outlined in section 112(n)(1)(A)
  - Propose market-based, cap-and trade approach under section 111
    - Revises December 20, 2000 finding that it is “appropriate and necessary” to regulate Utility Units under section 112
    - Caps mercury emissions at 15 tons in 2018; interim cap for 2010 proposed to encourage early reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, generating additional Hg emissions reductions
  
- **Final approach to be determined following completion of public hearings and close of public comment period**
  - Final rule signed on/before March 15, 2005



## ***To Learn More...***

---

### Utility Mercury Reductions Rule

- **Website:** <http://www.epa.gov/mercury>
- **Docket no.** OAR-2002-0056  
(Electronic docket: <http://www.epa.gov/edocket>)




RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*



# Power Plant Equipment and Mercury



**Removal in PM Controls**

Mercury adsorbed in fly ash/sorbent, which is captured in ESP or FF; Hg<sup>2+</sup> compounds are more readily adsorbed than Hg<sup>0</sup>

**Capture in Wet Scrubbers**

Hg<sup>2+</sup> compounds absorbed in scrubbing solution; Hg<sup>0</sup> is insoluble and cannot be captured; capture enhanced by SCR



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT


Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions

## ***Factors That Influence Mercury Control from Coal-Fired Boilers***

- Coal type
- Time/temperature profile
- Flue gas composition (chlorine) and fly ash characteristics (carbon, calcium, iron, porosity)
- Air pollution controls already in place



## ICR Data – Capture in Existing Equipment



- Higher levels of Hg capture for bituminous coal-fired plants compared to low-rank coal-fired plants
- Large ranges of Hg capture observed
- Compared to electrostatic precipitators (ESPs), fabric filters (FF) capture higher levels of Hg
- Limited data suggested that scrubbers could potentially capture oxidized Hg effectively



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions


C-ESP vs. H-ESP: T effect;  $Hg^0$  not so well.

FF: much better than C-ESP; good for both  $Hg^{2+}$  and  $Hg^0$ .

SDA + FF vs. FF: improved capture of  $Hg^{2+}$ , but worse capture of  $Hg^0$ ; acidic  $Hg^{2+}$  compounds captured on lime and flyash, but neutral  $Hg^0$  is captured on flyash only. Moreover alkaline environment due to lime may result in reduced number of lewis acid sites on flyash. This, in turn, may reduce capture of  $Hg^0$  on flyash.

Configurations w/ wet FGD reflect improved  $Hg^{2+}$  removal over corresponding configurations w/o wet FGD.  $Hg^0$  changes relatively small.

## Looking Ahead - Coal Use



**Consumption of low-sulfur coals in the power generation sector is expected to increase in the future.**

Source: Annual Energy Outlook 2003 with Projections to 2025, DOE/EIA-0383(2003)



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT



Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions

## ***Potential Mercury Control Routes***

- Modified (optimized) NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and PM controls
- Emerging add-on Hg controls
  - Activated carbon injection
  - Other sorbents
- Sorbent injection + optimized NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and PM controls



# Looking Ahead – SCR and FGD Projections



Source: 2003 Technical Support Package for Clear Skies




RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT


Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions

# Sorbent Injection

Two approaches:



Or



The extent of capture depends on:

- Sorbent characteristics (particle size distribution, porosity, capacity at different gas temperatures)
- Residence time in the flue gas
- Type of PM control (FF vs. ESP)
- Concentrations of SO<sub>2</sub> and other contaminants




## ***Activated Carbon Injection (ACI)***

ACI system includes a sorbent storage silo and a sorbent injection system. It may also include an added fabric filter to capture the carbon.

*Activated carbon storage and feed system*



*Activated carbon injection system*



*Source: ADA-ES*



**RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT**

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*



## Initial Short-Term, Full-Scale, ACI Projects

Test Site Information			Mercury Capture, %		
Test Site	Coal	Particulate Control	Baseline	ACI Test Results	Test Duration
PG&E Brayton Point, Unit 1	Low-sulfur bituminous, Hg = 0.03 ppm, Cl = 2000-4000 ppm	Two ESPs in series	90.8	94.5	ACI for two 5-day periods; 10 lb/mmacf
PG&E Salem Harbor, Unit 1	Low-sulfur bituminous, Hg = 0.03-0.08 ppm, Cl = 206 ppm	ESP	90.8	90	ACI for one 4-day period; 10 lb/mmacf
Wisconsin Electric Pleasant Prairie, Unit 2	Subbituminous, Hg = 0.11 ppm, Cl = 8 ppm	ESP	5.3	66	ACI for one 5-day period; 11.3 lb/mmacf
Alabama Power Gaston, Unit 3	Low-sulfur bituminous, Hg = 0.14 ppm, Cl = 169 ppm	ESP + small FF	0	90.6 (78)	ACI for one 9-day period; 1.5 lb/mmacf

**Note:** Short-term tests, variability in Hg emissions, impacts on plant operation, unique test conditions, limited capture of Hg for low-rank coal, amount of carbon injected affects the level of capture.



## ***Brominated B-PAC Carbon Sorbent***

- EPA SBIR Phase I and Phase II
  - Manufacture of New Low-Cost High-Temperature Mercury Sorbent for Duct Injection at Electric Utilities
  
- Sorbent Technologies Corporation  
Twinsburg, OH  
Sid Nelson Jr, President  
Snelsonjr@SorbentTechnologies.com  
(330) 425-2354



## ***B-PAC Appears Broadly Applicable***

<u>Coal</u>	<u>PM Unit</u>	<u>Hg Removal</u>	<u>@lb/MMacf</u>	<u>@ Plant</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Data</u>
Bitum. Low-S	FF	94%	0.5	Valley	Slipstream	Apogee
Bitum. High-S	CS-ESP	70%	4.0	Lausche	Full-Scale	SorbTech
Bitum. Low-S	HS ESP	>80%*	6.4	Cliffside	Full-Scale	SorbTech
Subbitum.Blend	CS-ESP	90%***	3.0	St. Clair	Full-Scale	SorbTech
Subbituminous	CS-ESP	90+%	3.0	St. Clair	Full-Scale	SorbTech
Subbituminous	CS-ESP	89%	4.9	Pleasant Prairie	Slipstream	Apogee
Subbituminous	FF	87%	0.5	Pleasant Prairie	Slipstream	Apogee
Subbituminous	SD/FF	82%**	<1.8	Holcomb	Slipstream	ADA-ES
Lignite	SD/FF	95%	1.5	Stanton 10	Full-Scale	EERC
Lignite	CS-ESP+	70%+	1.5	Stanton 10	Full-Scale	EERC

\* when under low-load conditions. STC will return in the fall for improved runs.

\*\* on-fabric removal only, with no in-flight opportunity and the effective "injection rate" could have been significantly lower.

\*\*\* data from only the first two weeks of parametric testing; more extensive data to come.

+ actually the in-flight Hg removal across the spray dryer, with an injection rate of only 1.5 lb/MMacf.




RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

# Initial B-PAC Injection Tests at St. Clair Power Plant

Subbituminous Coal and a Cold-Side ESP



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions

## ***Relative Capital Costs***

	<b><u>\$/kW</u></b>
<b>SO<sub>2</sub> Scrubbers</b>	<b>\$200</b>
<b>NOx SCR</b>	<b>\$120</b>
<b>Toxecon™ Baghouse</b>	<b>\$60</b>
<b>PAC Injection alone</b>	<b>&lt;\$2</b>

With PAC Injection alone:

- Almost no installation time needed
- Little trade labor needed
- Costs are incurred only when operating
- No losses if scrubbers installed later



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

## ***B-PAC is Now Commercially-Available***

- World's first dedicated mercury sorbent production plant
- Can permanently serve a number of power plants
- Estimated price of \$1.00/lb today, \$0.75/lb with E-o-S
- B-PAC™ is now available in quantity for utility trials & permanent commercial use
- 6+ more plant trials in works



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

## ***Amended Silicate Sorbents***

- EPA SBIR Phase I and Phase II
  - Development of New Silicate Sorbents to Capture and Immobilize Vapor-Phase Mercury and Mercury Compounds
  
- ADA Technologies, Inc.  
Littleton, CO  
Jim Butz, Project Director  
[www.adatech.com](http://www.adatech.com)  
(800) 232-0296



## ***Amended Silicates™***

- Amended Silicates™ are inexpensive, non-carbon substrates amended with mercury binding sites
- Silicate-based substrate, chemically similar to the native fly ash - no impact on sale of fly ash
- Sites react with elemental and oxidized mercury species to bind the mercury to the sorbent
- Patented
- Generation 1 materials have been tested at full scale
- Generation 2 materials with higher capacity and lower cost to be tested at a power plant in October 2004





## ***Attributes of Amended Silicates™***

- **High mercury-capture capacity** – equal or exceeding that of activated carbon.
- **Low cost** – provides a cost-competitive alternative to other sorbent materials (e.g., activated carbon)
- **Little impact to ongoing operation** – uses readily available and demonstrated injection equipment
- **Reliable mercury control** – performance not affected by low chlorine coals, moisture, or acid gas constituents
- **Maintains commercial viability of fly ash as a concrete additive** – no effect on fly ash properties for concrete use
- **Mercury tightly bound to sorbent** – leaching tests via TCLP indicate “below-detection” for mercury.



## ***Other Mercury Sorbents***

- Other halogenated PACs (e.g., Norit's E-3)
- Sodium Tetrasulfide
  - Commercially used in Europe on waste incinerators
  - Avoids ash disposal issues
- Mercury Control Absorption Process (MerCAP)
  - Sorbent-coated (gold) metal plates suspended in flue gas
  - Slipstream tests at Great River Power, WEPCO, and Minnesota Power plants
- Sorbents from Waste Tires (AFR)

*Sources: Babcock Power, 2003 Mega Symposium, DOE releases*



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

Anthony Licata  
Roderick Beittel  
Terence Ake

**COAL-FIRED POWER PLANT MERCURY CONTROL BY  
INJECTING SODIUM TETRASULFIDE  
ICAC FORUM 03'  
NASHVILLE, TN, OCT 14-15, 2003**

**<http://www.netl.doe.gov/publications/factsheets/program/Prog054.pdf>**

**Low-Cost Mercury Sorbents Derived from Waste Tires**  
**Advanced Fuel Research, Inc. – EPA SBIR Contract No. 68-D-03-039**


**Objectives:** (1) removal and recovery of mercury from combustion/incineration flue gas; (2) reprocessing of waste tires into value-added products.

**Approach:** mercury adsorption on low-cost, sulfur-rich activated carbons derived from scrap tires. The sulfur added to tire rubber during vulcanization makes tire-derived sorbents particularly effective in mercury control due to the high chemical affinity between mercury and sulfur.



**Applications:** coal-fired power plants; municipal, medical, and hazardous waste incinerators.

**Implementations:** (1) sorbent injection into the flue-gas duct (near-term applications); and (2) a patented regenerative scheme (long-term applications) - U.S. Patents No. 6,103,205 and 6,322,613.

**From Solid Waste to Mercury Sorbents**



**Selected Results**



**Contact Information:**


Dr. Marek A. Wójtowicz  
 Vice-President  
 Advanced Fuel Research, Inc.  
 87 Church Street  
 East Hartford, CT 06108-3728  
 Tel. (860) 528-9806 ext. 142  
 Fax (860) 528-0648  
 E-mail: [marek@AFRinc.com](mailto:marek@AFRinc.com)  
 Web: [www.AFRinc.com](http://www.AFRinc.com)



*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

## Enhancing Hg Removal in Wet Scrubbers

Increase the amount of Hg<sup>2+</sup> in flue gas



SCR – Ongoing full-scale measurements: ~85- 90+% Hg removal for SCR + PM control + wet scrubber with bituminous coals; performance with low-rank coals uncertain. Effects of catalyst volume and aging need investigation. Optimize SCR for Hg capture.

Oxidizing catalysts and chemicals – under development



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

## ***Summary & Conclusions***

- Hg capture with existing controls depends on coal and technology type; more difficult to control Hg from low-rank coal-fired boilers.
- Sorbent injection (including ACI) is an emerging Hg control technology.
- Hg control of 90% using ACI with a fabric filter for all coals is potentially achievable by 2007.
- Sorbents other than ACI are under development via EPA's Small Business Innovative Research program and by others.



## ***EPA's Mercury Research Program***

- Current focus on mercury control
  - Via injection of sorbent (primarily activated carbon)
  - Via currently utilized SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM controls
  
- EPA's mercury research program is examining
  - Key issues related to above approaches for mercury control
  - Mercury emissions measurement-related needs (CEMs)
  - Potential for reemission from coal combustion residues (fly ash and scrubber sludge)
  
- SBIR Program



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

EPA has taken regulatory actions to control emissions of Hg from coal-fired utility plants. The final Hg rule is scheduled to be issued in December of this year (2004).

There is an urgent need to make available cost-effective control technologies in the 2010-2015 timeframe.

Effective mercury control is very coal-type dependent and on the type(s) of air pollution control that are already in place. There are many opportunities for co-benefit Hg control with existing technologies for control of SO<sub>x</sub> (wet scrubbers), NO<sub>x</sub> (selective catalytic reduction, SCR) and particulate matter (PM) control. Many of our current programs are currently exploring those opportunities.


We are continuing to collaborate with DOE, EPRI, and other organizations in this area.

## Mercury Control in SO<sub>2</sub> Scrubbers

Objective: enhance net Hg removal in wet scrubbers by stabilizing dissolved Hg<sup>2+</sup> to prevent reemission of insoluble Hg<sup>0</sup>

### Findings:

- Absorbed Hg<sup>2+</sup> is not stable, a portion of Hg<sup>2+</sup> can be reduced to Hg<sup>0</sup> and reemitted
- Sulfite/bisulfite and heavy metals can cause reemission
- Additives used for waste water treatment may be able to stabilize Hg<sup>2+</sup>



EPA Contact: Dr. John Chang, [chang.john@epa.gov](mailto:chang.john@epa.gov), (919) 541-3747



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT


Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions

## Mercury Oxidation Across SCR Catalyst

**Objective:** understand the science of Hg<sup>0</sup> oxidation across SCR catalysts, and develop approaches to control the extent of this oxidation

**Findings:**

- HCl is a key source of chlorine needed for Hg<sup>0</sup> oxidation
- No apparent effect of catalyst aging
- Effect of residence time on oxidation
- No apparent effect of SO<sub>2</sub> on oxidation



EPA Contact: Dr. C.W. Lee, [lee.chun-wai@epa.gov](mailto:lee.chun-wai@epa.gov), (919) 541-7663



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*


Results are consistent between the in-house pilot tests and field tests



## Development of Multipollutant Sorbents

### Objectives:

- Synthesis, Characterization, Evaluation & Optimization
- Relate structure and chemical nature to adsorption characteristics



### Adsorption capacity at 80 °C, 1-hr

Sorbent	SO <sub>2</sub> (mg/g)	NO <sub>x</sub> (mg/g)	Hg (ug/g)
Activated Carbon	35.9	0.5	58.0
Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub>	64.8	3.2	0.5
EPA-1 (CSH)	130.5	10.6	30.9
EPA-2 (HT)	122.8	16.4	4.8
EPA-3 (RM)	20.9	0.3	50.1
EPA-4 (BX)	33.0	0.8	41.3

**EPA Contact: Dr. Nick Hutson, [hutson.nick@epa.gov](mailto:hutson.nick@epa.gov), (919) 541-2968**



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

### Motivation

Multipollutant sorbents offer an attractive and cost-effective means for removing Hg and other pollutants of interest

### Sorbent Development

- Synthesis, Characterization, Evaluation & Optimization
- Relate structure and chemical nature to adsorption characteristics

### Types of Sorbents Being Studied

- Sorbents synthesized using industrial by-products (fumed waste silica; bauxite residue, *etc.*)
- Modified carbonaceous sorbents
- Surface modified Calcium Silicate Hydrate (C-S-H)
- Hydrotalcite-like compounds (HTLcs) and other layered compounds
- Sorbents with catalytic properties

## Mercury Oxidation and Binding Mechanisms


### Objective:

- isolate individual mechanisms of elemental mercury ( $\text{Hg}^0$ ) oxidation and  $\text{Hg}^0/\text{Hg}^{2+}$  (oxidized mercury) capture,
- compete these mechanisms over a broad temperature range to determine which are dominant in those temperature ranges,
- vary fly ash parameters (carbon and calcium) to promote and/or inhibit these surface mechanisms, and
- vary concentrations of flue gas acid species, including sulfuric acid ( $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$ ), to determine the optimum for driving these reactions.


### Experimental program:

- Bench- and pilot-scale experiments
- Hg chemistry for inclusion in predictive models

EPA Contact: Dr. Nick Hutson,  
[hutson.nick@epa.gov](mailto:hutson.nick@epa.gov), (919) 541-2968



Hg Oxidation at 120 °C



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions

The effective use of fly ash and flue gas cooling/conditioning as a mercury control strategy would greatly reduce the cost of mercury control by potentially reducing or eliminating the need for injection of activated carbon or other external sorbent materials, or, alternatively, reducing the need for scrubber additives, new SCR formulations or adding upstream oxidants for higher FGD mercury removals.

This would also alleviate the potential loss of carbon-contaminated fly ash as a salable byproduct and resultant increased disposal in landfills.

Another benefit is in determining how fly ash and flue gas properties affect sulfuric acid emissions that may lead to concurrent reduction of PM<sub>2.5</sub> condensable emissions and mercury by flue gas cooling and conditioning.

Specific configurations are being explored to address issues such as pozzolanic reactions (cementation), turbulence/mass transfer, and corrosion.

EPRI has expressed an interest in working collaboratively in this area.

## ***Multi-Pollutant Control Research Facility (MPCRF)***

- **State-of-the-art research facility**
  - 4 Million Btu/hr (1.2 MW<sub>e</sub>) Pulverized-Coal-Fired Facility
  - Evaluate Combinations of Technologies
  - Optimize Control of Multipollutants (SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM, and Hg)
- **Incorporates several technology options**
  - Electrostatic Fabric Filter (ESFF): Fine PM and Hg Capture
  - Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR): NO<sub>x</sub> and Hg Oxidation
  - Lime Flue Gas Desulfurization (FGD): SO<sub>2</sub> and Hg Capture
  - Conventional and Advanced Sorbents: Hg, SO<sub>2</sub>, and/or NO<sub>x</sub>
- **Future capability**
  - Circulating Fluidized Bed: SO<sub>2</sub>, Hg, and NO<sub>x</sub>
- **Collaborative research possibilities**

**EPA Contact: Dr. Shannon Serre, [serre.shannon@epa.gov](mailto:serre.shannon@epa.gov), (919) 541-2968**



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

## ***Hg Control Research on MPCRF***

Objective: develop data on activated carbon injection-based mercury capture with ESFF; examine operational concerns, especially impact on bag life

### Experimental program:

- Burn different rank coals in the MPCRF
- Characterize removal of Hg by native flyash
- Inject activated carbon prior to baghouse
- Test effect of air-to-cloth ratio, carbon type, carbon feed rate, and gas temperature on Hg removal; examine carbon impact on bag cleaning frequency
- Ontario-Hydro and CEM Hg measurements

**EPA Contact: Dr. Shannon Serre, [serre.shannon@epa.gov](mailto:serre.shannon@epa.gov), (919) 541-2968**



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

# Mercury Measurements

## Contributions:

- Major support to OAR and OAQPS
- Demonstration of Hg CEM performance through field testing
- Pilot-plant testing to expedite Hg CEM technology development
- Pilot-plant and field testing of Method 324
- Coauthored proposed regulatory methods PS 12A and 324
- Review, research, revision, and approval of ASTM Ontario Hydro Method
- Development of gaseous standards for Hg CEM operation
- Development of speciated measurement techniques for control technology research

## Ongoing activities:

- Continued support to OAR and OAQPS
- Long-term Hg CEM field testing
- Improved QC techniques for proposed Method 324 sampling
- Development of oxidized Hg gas standards
- Improved techniques (e.g., inertial probes) for speciated measurements at PM control inlet locations



EPA Contact: Mr. Jeff Ryan, [ryan.jeff@epa.gov](mailto:ryan.jeff@epa.gov), (919) 541-1437



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

Quality Hg measurements (total and speciated) are the key to Hg formation and control research

## ***Evaluation of Potential for Cross-Media Transfers***

Objective: investigate the potential for leaching and release of Hg from coal combustion residues

Contributions:

- Development and standardization of analysis protocols
- Evaluation of potential for cross-media transfer
  - Class C and Class F fly ash
  - Scrubber sludge (synthetic gypsum)

Ongoing activities:

- Continued evaluation of fly ashes and scrubber sludge for a spectrum of coal/control technology combinations

**EPA Contact: Ms. Susan Thorneloe, [thorneloe.susan@epa.gov](mailto:thorneloe.susan@epa.gov), (919) 541-2968  
and Dr. Nick Hutson, [hutson.nick@epa.gov](mailto:hutson.nick@epa.gov), (919) 541-2968**



RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

*Building a scientific foundation for sound environmental decisions*

## ***Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR)***

- EPA and 11 Federal Agencies
- Priority EPA technology development needs
- Annual solicitations
- Two phases
  - Phase I - \$70,000
  - Phase II - \$225,000 - \$350,000
- Annual budget - \$6M



## ***Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR)***

- Regular Topics
  - Air pollution control; P2; Water; Waste; Monitoring
  
- Special Topics
  - Region 1 (2002); Region 8 (2003); Region 9 (2004)
  - Region 3 and Region 10 (2005)
  - Region 5 (2006)

