A History of Values

“Let us strive to finish the work we are in…”

Abraham Lincoln,
Second Inaugural Address
March 4, 1865

At Boral Material Technologies Inc., we are committed to delivering performance, exceeding expectations through leadership, focus, persistence and respect.

Based on these values, Boral has led the Coal Combustion Products industry for 40 years in developing improved products, services, and processes.

To learn more about Boral values and how these values will assist you to meet your goals contact us at 800-964-0981 or www.boralmti.com.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Remarks by ACAA Chairman Tom Jansen ............................................. 2
Message from ACAA Executive Director Dave Goss .......................... 4
Calendar of Events ........................................................................ 6

FEATURES

C2P2 Awards Ceremony Follow-Up .................................................... 8
Environmental Release of Mercury from Coal Utilization By-Products: 
Will New Mercury Controls at Power Plants Make a Difference?

A New Beneficial Use For “Unusable” Fly Ash
By Javed I. Bhatty and John Gajda .................................................. 18

Computer Modeling and CCPs
By Defne Apul, Kevin Gardner, and Taylor Eighty .......................... 23

The Future of FGD Gypsum
By E. Cheri Miller ......................................................................... 29

ACAA Membership Listings ............................................................. 32
World of Coal Ash a Success! .......................................................... 39

Index to Advertisers ..................................................................... 40

Cover features (clockwise from top left): the logo from the World of Coal Ash; the Lexington History Museum, where the C2P2 awards were held; the Lexington Center, where the World of Coal Ash was held.
WHERE THERE IS DEMAND, THERE IS OPPORTUNITY

ACAA creates market demand and creates opportunities for the CCP industry.

By Thomas Jansen

The CCP industry is unique in the world of business – it generates large quantities of product regardless of market demand. I’ve been told that marketing a byproduct is much different than marketing conventionally manufactured products. On the other hand, some experts tell me that many marketing strategies still apply to the CCP industry, and one stands out – create demand and profit from its opportunities.

Demand-driven strategies may be taking the lead as the maturing CCP industry enters a new phase. The supply of CCP often motivates the decisions of producers but there are many recent examples of utilities responding to market demands for supplementary cementitious materials (SCM) and other construction materials. In the last five years there have been increasing numbers of utilities and marketers that benefit from their fly ash to produce a higher quality SCM. Large, elaborate storage and loading facilities can be seen at many generating stations that now serve construction markets during periods of highest demand. Good quality fly ash is shipped more frequently to serve distant markets that are hungry for SCM for a variety of reasons, including cement shortages, and because more engineers specify fly ash as a way to make better concrete. Bottom ash is being processed and sold as lightweight aggregate. Utilities are investing in equipment and resources to produce high quality gypsum in a synergistic response to manufacturers’ investments in modern wallboard plants. And I am sure there will be upcoming announcements of investments to produce other products made from or with large volumes of CCP.

We still have plenty of CCP that is not marketed, and certainly there are limits to current market demand. There are regions of the U.S. where there is an abundance of CCP that does not meet specifications for some end uses or the source is not economically accessible. The oversupply of CCP will be more acute due to increased reliance on new power generation from coal. The U.S. Department of Energy (www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/aeo/coal.html) projects that coal consumption for electricity generation will increase at an average rate of 1.6% through the year 2025 (that is 1.5 billion tons of coal in 2005 compared to 1.1 billion tons consumed in 2003). Compared to the growth of ash production, the materials from dry scrubbers and wet scrubbers will be our fastest growing and most immediate challenge.

Where will the demand come from for the approximately 75 million tons of CCP that are now disposed of each year, as well as the additionally produced byproducts? Our industry has demonstrated that we can respond to demand by researching and developing new technologies, making the necessary investments, and selling CCP to the pockets of existing demand. To keep moving the markets forward, ACAA is the CCP industry’s best vehicle to create demand through the cooperative efforts of its members and stakeholders. Here are some ways that ACAA and its members can create additional demand:

- Create or revise specifications, guidelines and standards.
- Produce high-quality products. This can be done by equipment upgrades, improved QC/QA programs, and training plant operators.
- Remove encumbrances to the use of CCP such as excessive regulation and lack of favorable specifications. Customers demand products that are easy to use and available when they need it.
- Sell and use CCP with the goal of long-term growth. All products have limitations. Make sure CCP is used properly and successfully. Referrals and testimonials from satisfied customers are the best means for future sales and long-term growth.
- Price the product to reflect its true value (discounts do not encourage long term demand for a product because it stifles quality improvements, inhibits efficient distribution, and eliminates the added expense of service and technical support). Yes, even ACAA can help with this one by promoting the benefits of CCP, and by helping members and their customers understand the expense of competing materials and systems.
- Use ACAA resources for customer referrals and value-added services.
- Leverage your resources with other industries and organizations. For example, promote greener buildings; greener highways; more durable roads; lighter weight building components; safer fire-rated walls; flowable and self-consolidating backfill and concrete.

Together we can create demand and profit from the opportunities.
Since 1976, The SEFA Group has been a partner in some of the country's most successful coal ash utilization and management programs.

Today, we are developing innovative technologies that will change the face of the Fly Ash industry. Our newest processes in Thermal Beneficiation™ are efficient, economical, and designed to meet the needs of our utility partners.

We believe that successful business is based on superior customer service and quality products, and we are excited about the future we're developing for our industry.
PARTNERSHIPS AND A NEW RESOURCE

By Dave Goss

Joining with other trade associations and government agencies, ACAA continues in its leadership role of increasing national awareness of industrial material recycling. A key part in this role is our participation in two upcoming national conferences. As has been the case since 2002 with the advent of the first Industrial Byproducts Summit, which was held in Chicago, ACAA is active in the planning of this year’s Summit to be held in Philadelphia on November 29-30, 2005. The Summits bring together the public and private sectors to discuss opportunities and barriers to the use of industrial residues, including coal ash, steel and iron slag, foundry sands and other recycled materials.

Another event in which we will be participating later this year is the Green Highway Forum, to be held in College Park, Maryland. Originally intended to address only wetlands, watershed and other land issues related to highway construction, additional sessions on construction and materials, as well as maintenance, have been added. Involvement in this event is integral to ACAA’s Green Highway concept, laid out in our recently implemented Strategic Plan.

ACAA is also working closely with the EPA, FHWA, FIRST (Foundry Industry Recycling Starts Today) and other groups to support one of the EPA’s solid waste focus areas for 2005, that being the beneficial use of “selected” industrial byproducts, specifically coal ash, foundry sand and recycled concrete aggregate. These partnerships, joint outreach and collaborative activities are assisting federal, state and local government agencies to realize the benefits of reusing coal ash and other materials instead of depleting natural resources. Our efforts also dovetail into the Green Highways event outlined above. We will keep you well informed as these activities progress.

Serving as a resource for the ash industry is both interesting and challenging. The ACAA staff receive 10 to 20 inquiries a week seeking a variety of information. Questions cover wide-ranging topics, such as the physical properties of coal ash, transportation methods and cost, usage projections and technical applications. For this reason, ACAA is continually looking for good reference publications.

I recently had the opportunity to review a new book published by Elsevier Academic Press, titled “Coal Energy Systems” and written by Bruce G. Miller of Penn State’s Energy Institute. For an industry novice or a journeyman veteran who might be looking for a basic reference, the book has much to offer. It is well organized, easy to use, contains many well-designed technical diagrams, charts and tables and is a substantive source of industry information. Starting with a fundamental discussion of coal, its roles in society and its impact on the environment, Mr. Miller moves on to cover major U.S. emission and air quality legislative actions influencing the use of coal. Also included are chapters on coal combustion processes, clean coal technologies and various emission control systems. If you are searching for a single reference volume for your library that will enrich and support your understanding of coal, CCPs and the coal-fueled utility industry, you should seriously consider purchasing “Coal Energy Systems”.

ACAA Mission Statement
The mission of the American Coal Ash Association is to advance the management and use of coal combustion products (CCP) in ways that are environmentally responsible, technically sound and commercially competitive.

ACAA Vision
ACAA will continue to be a world leader in advancing beneficial use of coal combustion products (CCP) and resource conservation through utilization.

ACAA Goals
1. Increase annual utilization of fly ash and bottom ash as a supplementary cementitious material and cement clinker raw feed to 18 million tons by 2010.
2. Increase the annual total beneficial use of CCP to 58 million tons by 2008, and to 64 million tons by 2010 (this is 45 percent and 50 percent respectfully, compared to 2002 survey results).
3. Proactively anticipate, assess and respond to issues that impact the CCP industry.
4. Develop stronger relationships with stakeholders and influencers of CCP utilization and resource conservation.
5. Increase ACAA membership to 100 by 2008, including at least 40 Class U (utility) members.
GATX owns or manages over 165,000 railcars of all types, as well as over 800 locomotives, and can supply the equipment you need in North America or Europe.

GATX provides railcars, locomotives, management and maintenance services to meet the industry’s increasingly demanding fleet requirements. GATX Rail’s operational capabilities are complemented by financial expertise and resources to help you achieve your financing objectives and meet your equipment needs. And as a partner in the Responsible Care® program, we are committed to the protection and safety of our employees, the environment and our customers.

For more information: 312-621-6200 or visit www.gatxrail.com

© 2005 GATX Corporation
Calendar of Events

2005 ACAAI Fall Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia: September 26-28 Embassy Suites Hotel-Atlanta Buckhead

2006 ACAAI Annual Meeting New Orleans, LA: January 30-February 1, Chateau Sonesta Hotel

2006 ACAAI Summer Meeting, Milwaukee, WI: June 5-7 Wyndham Milwaukee Center Hotel

Visit Calendar of Events to Locate Upcoming Meetings www.acaa-usa.org
Mineral Resource Technologies
Providers of quality fly ash, bottom ash and pozzolanic products for the construction industry

- The industry’s most extensive network of distribution and terminal assets
- Engineering, design, and construction services
- Total CCP Program Management
- Full spectrum of on-site ash handling operations
- State of the Art R&D Technology Center
- History of successful fly ash products development with in excess of 10 patents
- Quality Control/Quality Assurance
- Technical and customer service
- A leader in promoting the CCP industry

Businessdevelopment@mrtus.com
1-800-615-1100
The first ever Coal Combustion Products Partnership (C2P2) awards ceremony was held on April 13, 2005 in Lexington, Kentucky in conjunction with the World of Coal Ash. At this event, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and other co-sponsors recognized thirteen organizations for their environmental and commercial initiatives to increase the use of coal ash. C2P2 is a cooperative effort of government agencies and the coal combustion products (CCPs) industry to help promote the beneficial use of CCPs and the environmental benefits which can result from that beneficial use. Award winners were:

**GREAT RIVER ENERGY**

**FIRST PLACE – ENVIRONMENTAL ACHIEVEMENT**

Great River Energy spent over $27 million to develop an infrastructure for on-site reclamation of coal ash at its Coal Creek and Stanton Stations in North Dakota. It also developed a highly energy-efficient, aerated concrete product called Flex Crete that will be used in the construction of the National Energy Technology Training and Education Center at Bismarck State College. Since 2003, the company’s efforts have resulted in a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 525,000 tons.

**CHARAH ENVIRONMENTAL INC.**

**FIRST PLACE – INNOVATION AWARD**

Charah Environmental Inc. is finding new ways to bring recycled bottom ash back to the consumer. Instead of using dusty paper concrete bags, the company sells its lightweight, bottom ash concrete in two-handed plastic bags. This innovation helped the company win an agreement with Home Depot, which will purchase 41 million bags of Charah's concrete over the next three years – reusing 1.3 million tons of bottom ash and 160,000 tons of fly ash.

**PITTSBURGH MINERAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY INC. (PMET)**

**HONORABLE MENTION – INNOVATION AWARD**

PMET has developed a technology to build brick pavers that use high loss-of-ignition coal ash that would otherwise not be an acceptable substitute for portland cement. As a result, more coal ash can now be reused, preventing the pollution-causing process of making new cement. PMET is currently building a new plant that will make 13.6 million pavers per year and use 67 to 90% less energy than modern high-efficiency brick kilns.

**LOWER COLORADO RIVER AUTHORITY: FAYETTE POWER PROJECT**

**FIRST PLACE – ENHANCED UTILIZATION**

The Fayette Power Project has maintained an astounding recycling rate of over 100% for all of its coal combustion products. The project's marketing has been so successful, in fact, that the Lower Colorado River Authority has had to dig up its old stockpiles of combustion products just to meet the needs of customers who want to purchase the ash.

**XCEL ENERGY AND LAFARGE NORTH AMERICA**

**HONORABLE MENTION – ENHANCED UTILIZATION**

Lafarge N.A. and Xcel were recognized for their enhanced CCP utilization efforts at Tolk and Harrington power stations in the Texas Panhandle area. Their work with the Texas Department of Transportation and other professionals in the area has led to a major increase in the use of coal combustion products the region. Both power stations now recycle 100% of their CCPs, a combined total of more than 500,000 tons per year.
GAI Consultants, Inc.
Pittsburgh Office
385 East Waterfront Drive
Homestead, PA 15120-5005
412.476.2000
www.gaiconsultants.com

Salt River Materials Group is an industry leader when it comes to supplying the highest quality beneficiated fly ash, CCP products, aggregates and cement products throughout the southwest.

Effective strategies for successful management of CCP’s include minimizing CCP production through improved fuel burning efficiencies, extensive logistical investment and expertise, and state of the art CCP market development and promotion. This integrated approach results in significant reduction of CCP disposal to landfills. Our 45 years experience as a cement manufacturer has required a detailed understanding and knowledge of user requirements, material properties and fuels. Salt River Materials Group and its utility partners such as Arizona Public Service, Public Service Company of New Mexico, and Tri-State G&T Co-op are constantly pursuing a better understanding of CCP production and building a knowledge base that ultimately maximizes CCP utilization.

Salt River Materials Group
(480) 850-5757
www.srmaterials.com
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www.flyashdirect.com
FlyAshDirect provides utilities Exposure to CCP utilization opportunities...

We offer:
> CCP Marketing Services...
> CCP Consulting Services...
> Bid Procurement Services...
> Automated correspondence with potential users...

FlyAshDirect creates value for By-Product Resources...

To learn more about these services, contact us at:
E-mail: info@flyashdirect.com
Toll Free: 866-871-9733

got fly ash?

Salt River Materials Group is an industry leader when it comes to supplying the highest quality beneficiated fly ash, CCP products, aggregates and cement products throughout the southwest.

Effective strategies for successful management of CCP’s include minimizing CCP production through improved fuel burning efficiencies, extensive logistical investment and expertise, and state of the art CCP market development and promotion. This integrated approach results in significant reduction of CCP disposal to landfills. Our 45 years experience as a cement manufacturer has required a detailed understanding and knowledge of user requirements, material properties and fuels. Salt River Materials Group and its utility partners such as Arizona Public Service, Public Service Company of New Mexico, and Tri-State G&T Co-op are constantly pursuing a better understanding of CCP production and building a knowledge base that ultimately maximizes CCP utilization.

Salt River Materials Group
(480) 850-5757
www.srmaterials.com
LEWIS AND CLARK
FORT MANDAN FOUNDATION

FIRST PLACE – COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH
Attracting thousands of visitors each year, the Lewis and Clark
Fort Mandan Foundation is America’s premier demonstration
project for coal combustion products. The Foundation edu-
cates the public about the environmental and economic ben-
efits of coal ash reuse. The structure of the Foundation’s Visitors
Center is a demonstration of the flexibility of coal combustion
products – they are incorporated into nearly all of its major
building components.

ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN INDUS-
TRIES RECYCLING COAL ASH (CIRCA)

HONORABLE MENTION – COMMUNICATIONS
AND OUTREACH
CIRCA is working hard to expand the public’s knowledge
of coal ash reuse. It has developed educational materials
describing the environmental benefits of coal ash in a variety
of applications, including use in concrete. CIRCA’s efforts
have spanned continents – its outreach materials are being
used extensively throughout Canada, Europe, Australia, and
the United States.

KANSAS CITY POWER AND LIGHT;
JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI;
LAFARGE N.A.; AND THE UNIVERSITY
OF MISSOURI – KANSAS CITY

FIRST PLACE – PARTNERSHIP
These four organizations partnered to coordinate a project
demonstrating the viability of full-depth, in-place, cold
recycling of asphalt. Nearly 22 miles of existing asphalt
pavement and base materials were ground up, mixed with
700 tons of Class C coal ash, and re-laid in place. This
technique reduced the cost of road repairs by 33%, saving on
the cost of hauling away the old pavement and eliminating
the need for virgin materials.

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL
RESEARCH CENTER (EERC)

FIRST PLACE – RESEARCH
EERC began studying the potential impact of mercury
capture technologies on CCPs in 1998 with an investigation
of the possible release of mercury and other toxic elements
into the atmosphere and groundwater. Since then, EERC has
continued to further our scientific knowledge of coal ash,
also studying regulatory and code impediments. In 2001,
it launched the Coal Ash Resource Center website, providing information about coal ash to the public. The site also includes the FIRST SEARCH technical document database and the Buyer’s Guide to Coal Ash Containing Products.

**WE INDUSTRIES (WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY)**

**OVERALL ACHIEVEMENT**

WE Industries received the Overall Achievement Award for its outstanding CCP management efforts over the last twenty years. In 1980, WE Industries land-disposed 95% of its coal ash. Thanks to the new methods it developed – at the cost of millions of dollars – WE Industries now recycles 98% of its coal ash! The technologies the company utilizes to reuse coal ash have been so successful that it is now digging up its old coal ash to be used again. In 2004, WE Industries also won the 2004 Edison Award for its innovation and leadership in expanding the markets for coal combustion products.

Providing opening comments and hosting the ceremony was Mr. Tom Dunne, Deputy Assistant EPA Administrator of the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. He was assisted by Mr. Tom Feeley, Technology Manager for Innovations for Existing Plants. The program featured the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory; Mr. Jose Sepulveda, FHWA Division Administrator; Mr. Jim Roewer, Executive Director of Utility Solid Waste Activities Group; and David Goss, Executive Director of ACAA. Mr. Goss was given special recognition for his leadership and support of C²P². More details about the Award Winners can be found at www.epa.gov/epaoswer/osw/conserve/2005news/03-c2p2.htm.

Mr. Tom Dunne, Deputy Assistant Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, stands with the recipients of the 2005 C²P² “Partnership Award”. (l to r) Jack Carson, Lafarge-NA; Catherine Shields, Jackson County, Missouri; Tom Dunne, USEPA; Fred Gustin, Kansas City Power & Light; and Anil Misra, University of Kansas City – Missouri.

**C²P² Awards**

C²P² is a cooperative effort of government agencies and the coal combustion products (CCPs) industry to help promote the beneficial use of CCPs and the environmental benefits which can result from that beneficial use.
INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Energy’s National Energy Technology Laboratory (DOE/NETL) uses the term coal utilization by-products (CUBs) to describe the solid materials produced by the combustion or gasification of coal, such as fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag, gasifier ash and slag, and flue gas desulfurization (FGD) solids. While the materials are identical to the ones referred to by ACAA as “coal combustion products” (CCPs), DOE/NETL prefers to use the broader term “utilization” rather than “combustion” because coal gasification creates distinctly different types of solid materials than coal combustion.

CUBs are composed primarily of benign mineral components, but also contain trace elements of aluminum, arsenic, boron, cadmium, lead, mercury, and selenium. CUBs from coal-fired power plants are currently categorized as non-hazardous wastes by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The continued regulatory categorization of CUBs as a non-hazardous solid waste is obviously an important factor in minimizing the cost of disposal and is critical to CUB marketability for beneficial use applications.

According to EPA estimates in 1999, U.S. power plants burned 786 million tons of coal containing approximately 75 tons of mercury. It is estimated that approximately 48 tons of mercury were emitted to the atmosphere, while the remaining 27 tons, along with 107 million tons of CUBs, were captured by air pollution control devices, such as electrostatic precipitators (ESPs) and FGD systems. Although it is generally assumed that most of the mercury captured in today’s pollution control systems resides in the solid by-product materials, recently-issued EPA regulations to reduce mercury from U.S. coal-fired power plants will increase the capture of mercury. This will result in higher concentrations of mercury in CUBs, leading to greater concern over their environmental behavior in both disposal and utilization applications.

DOE/NETL’S CUB RESEARCH PROGRAM

DOE/NETL is conducting a comprehensive research and development program to enhance the environmental performance of coal-based power plants. The goal of the CUB research activity is to increase coal by-product utilization in the United States from current levels of about 35% to 50% by 2010. An important aspect of this research is the examination and testing of mechanisms by which mercury in CUBs could be released to the environment, such as leaching, volatilization, and microbiological transformation. A comprehensive review of DOE/NETL research on the fate of mercury in CUBs was recently published. The focus of this article is DOE/NETL’s research on the release of mercury from CUBs produced during full-scale field tests of new technologies that were designed specifically to capture mercury from power plant flue gases and transfer it to the solid CUB materials. Additional information on all DOE/NETL CUB projects can be found online at www.netl.doe.gov/coal/E&WR/cub.
CUB ANALYSIS FROM ACTIVATED CARBON INJECTION MERCURY CONTROL FIELD DEMONSTRATIONS

In 2001 and 2002, under DOE/NETL sponsorship, ADA-ES Inc. and Reaction Engineering International conducted field demonstrations of activated carbon injection (ACI) for mercury control at four coal-fired power plants: Alabama Power’s E.C. Gaston, PG&E’s Brayton Point, WE Energies’ Pleasant Prairie, and PG&E’s Salem Harbor. All the plants burned bituminous coal except for Pleasant Prairie, which burned subbituminous coal. Results of leaching tests of the CUBs produced during these field demonstrations are described below.

E.C. Gaston. The particulate collection configuration at the Gaston power plant (Figure 1) was unique because it included both a hot-side ESP for primary particulate collection and a compact hybrid particulate collector (COHPAC) fabric filter baghouse downstream of the ESP. During mercury control testing, activated carbon was injected downstream of the ESP and upstream of the COHPAC to prevent carbon contamination of the ESP ash. Mercury concentrations in the baseline (pre-ACI injection) ash from the COHPAC measured 0.2-2 microgram per gram (µg/g); whereas, at an ACI feed rate of 1.5 lb per million actual cubic feet (lb/MMacf) of flue gas, mercury concentrations in the combined activated carbon/fly ash by-product ranged from 10 to 50 µg/g. Since most of the fly ash was captured in the hot-side ESP, total mercury concentration in the COHPAC by-product was significantly higher than it would be in applications with ACI located upstream of the primary particulate control device.

Figure 1. ACI configuration at E. C. Gaston plant

Brayton Point. The Brayton Point particulate collection system was also somewhat atypical because two cold-side ESPs were used in series. Most of the fly ash was collected in the upstream ESP. During mercury control testing, activated carbon was injected between the upstream and downstream ESPs. The baseline ash from both the upstream and downstream ESPs contained 0.2-0.53 µg/g of mercury, whereas, at an ACI feed rate of 10-20 lb/MMacf, the downstream ESP ash contained 0.4-1.4 µg/g of mercury. The reason for the low mercury content of the downstream ESP ash at Brayton Point (compared to the Gaston COHPAC ash) is that most of the mercury in the flue gas was not captured by the activated carbon, but instead was captured by the fly ash in the upstream ESP. Apparently, the unburned carbon in the fly ash was sufficient on its own to achieve a high degree of mercury capture across the upstream ESP, leaving only a small amount to be collected by ACI and the downstream ESP. However, because the mercury captured by the upstream ESP was diluted with the bulk of the ash product, total mercury concentrations in the ash were very low.

Figure 2. ACI configuration at Brayton Point

Pleasant Prairie and Salem Harbor. The particulate collection systems at Salem Harbor and Pleasant Prairie were more typical of the current fleet of coal-fired power plants in the United States, with one cold-side ESP unit at each plant. However, the specific collection areas (SCA) – the ESP collection plate area divided by flue gas flow rate – at both plants were comparatively large. The SCAs at Pleasant Prairie and Salem Harbor were 468 and 474, respectively, compared to a median of about 300 for all U.S. coal plants, leading to extremely efficient capture of both fly ash and injected sorbent. Baseline ash from the Pleasant Prairie ESP contained less than 0.5 µg/g of mercury; whereas, at an ACI feed rate of 10 lb/MMacf, the ash by-product contained 0.5-5 µg/g of mercury. At Salem Harbor, mercury concentrations ranged from 0.1 to 0.7 µg/g during both baseline and ACI testing conditions (10 lb/MMacf). Like Brayton Point, much of the mercury in the flue gas at Salem Harbor was collected by the carbon in the baseline fly ash, thereby minimizing the addition of mercury to the ash as the result of ACI.

Figure 3. ACI configuration at Pleasant Prairie and Salem Harbor

Leaching Test Descriptions and Results. Leaching analyses were conducted on the combined activated carbon/fly ash by-products collected during ACI tests. Both the standard toxicity characteristic leaching procedure (TCLP) and a synthetic groundwater leaching procedure (SGLP) developed by the University of North Dakota Energy & Environmental Research Center (UNDEERC) were used. The TCLP method was designed to simulate leaching in an unlined sanitary landfill using an acetic acid as the leaching solution. UNDEERC developed the SGLP method to more realistically simulate CUB leaching in typical disposal environments. For the SGLP analysis, deionized water was used as the leaching solution with a 20:1 liquid:solid ratio.
Table 1 summarizes the leaching test results at the four ACI test plants. For the Gaston and Pleasant Prairie ash samples, the amount of mercury in the leachate was at or below the measurement detection limit of 0.01 microgram per liter (µg/L). For Salem Harbor, only one sample exceeded the detection limit (0.034 µg/L); this sample came from the baseline ash (i.e., no ACI). For Brayton Point, leachate of samples from both the nontreated (upstream) ESP and the ACI-treated (downstream) ESP contained detectable amounts of mercury (0.01-0.07 µg/L). However, no discernable differences in leachate concentrations were found between the upstream and downstream ESPs, or at different levels of ACI injection. This appears to be related to the fact that most of the mercury removal at Brayton Point occurred as the result of high carbon levels in the baseline ash. It should be noted that the leachate mercury concentrations at all four plants were more than an order of magnitude lower than the 0.77 µg/L freshwater criterion continuous concentration and 1.4 µg/L freshwater criterion maximum concentration for mercury under the federal water quality criteria for protection of aquatic life.

Ash by-product samples from Gaston and Pleasant Prairie were also tested using other leaching procedures for comparison. All of the additional test results were below or equal to the 0.01 µg/L detection limit.

CUB ANALYSIS FROM WET FGD REAGENT MERCURY CONTROL FIELD DEMONSTRATIONS

In 2001, Babcock & Wilcox (B&W) and McDermott Technology Inc. (MTI) carried out joint full-scale field testing of a proprietary liquid reagent to enhance mercury capture in coal-fired power plants equipped with wet FGD systems. The field tests were conducted at two power plants: Michigan South Central Power Agency’s 60-MW Endicott Station and Cinergy Corp.’s 1300-MW Zimmer Station. Both plants burn Ohio high-sulfur bituminous coal and use cold-side ESPs for particulate control. Endicott uses a limestone wet FGD system with in-situ forced oxidation, while Zimmer uses a magnesium-enhanced lime wet FGD system with ex-situ forced oxidation. Table 2 presents a summary of the average mercury concentrations for the coal and process by-product stream samples for both Endicott and Zimmer. Although not shown in the data, the majority of liquid stream samples were “nondetects” for mercury (i.e., measuring less than 0.5 µg/L), with a few samples measuring 1-3 µg/L.

B&W and MTI also evaluated the by-product stream samples for their potential to volatilize mercury at elevated temperatures using a thermal dissociation test (TDT) developed by MTI. The TDT method involves the gradual heating of a CUB test sample in an oven while measuring the off-gas mercury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. ADA-ES leaching test results for ACI ash by-products.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Prairie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Prairie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Prairie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brayton Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brayton Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brayton Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brayton Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brayton Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brayton Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem Harbor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BDL = below detection limit of 0.01 µg/L
*N/A = not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Mercury concentration in B&amp;W and MTI process samples.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD slurry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endicott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2001, Babcock & Wilcox (B&W) and McDermott Technology Inc. (MTI) carried out joint full-scale field testing of a proprietary liquid reagent to enhance mercury capture in coal-fired power plants equipped with wet FGD systems. The field tests were conducted at two power plants: Michigan South Central Power Agency’s 60-MW Endicott Station and Cinergy Corp.’s 1300-MW Zimmer Station. Both plants burn Ohio high-sulfur bituminous coal and use cold-side ESPs for particulate control. Endicott uses a limestone wet FGD system with in-situ forced oxidation, while Zimmer uses a magnesium-enhanced lime wet FGD system with ex-situ forced oxidation. Table 2 presents a summary of the average mercury concentrations for the coal and process by-product stream samples for both Endicott and Zimmer. Although not shown in the data, the majority of liquid stream samples were “nondetects” for mercury (i.e., measuring less than 0.5 µg/L), with a few samples measuring 1-3 µg/L.

B&W and MTI also evaluated the by-product stream samples for their potential to volatilize mercury at elevated temperatures using a thermal dissociation test (TDT) developed by MTI. The TDT method involves the gradual heating of a CUB test sample in an oven while measuring the off-gas mercury
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concentration. To represent the temperature-time conditions that FGD by-products are likely to encounter when used as feedstock during the manufacture of wallboard, a temperature of 140°C was held for about 10 minutes in the early portions of the tests. Results of TDTs for Endicott and Zimmer FGD gypsum indicated that only about 3% of the total mercury evolved during the course of the tests occurred at or below 140°C. By contrast, a peak in mercury volatilization occurred at about 250°C (482°F). Since some wallboard manufacturing processes may expose FGD by-products to temperatures between 140°C and 250°C, DOE/NETL is sponsoring additional research to further determine the fate of mercury in wallboard manufacturing facilities. Results from this research are incomplete and are still being evaluated.

One of the significant findings from the B&W and MTI test program was that the mercury in the wet FGD material from both plants was associated primarily with small particle size impurities in the slurry (fines) and was not bound to the larger gypsum particles. Therefore, it may be possible to use particle separation techniques and provide separate landfill disposal of the fines, if necessary, for use in applications where mercury release is a concern.

CUB ANALYSIS FOR MERCURY CONTROL TECHNOLOGY FIELD TESTING IN 2004-2006

As DOE/NETL continues to support the field testing of cost-effective technologies to reduce air emissions of mercury from coal-fired power plants, it will continue to investigate the potential release of mercury from the CUBs produced during these field demonstrations. Toward this end, DOE/NETL issued a competitive solicitation in July 2004 for one or more contractors to conduct independent laboratory analysis of CUBs generated during DOE/NETL’s mercury control technology field tests to be conducted at 22 coal-fired power plant units in 2004-2006. The purpose of the solicitation was to ensure accurate and consistent laboratory procedures are used to determine the environmental fate of mercury in CUBs. DOE/NETL expects to award the contract in late spring 2005.

SUMMARY

The following general observations can be drawn from results of field tests that have been carried out thus far to determine whether new technologies for mercury emission control at coal power plants will affect the release of mercury from CUBs:

- There appears to be only minimal potential mercury release to the environment in typical disposal or utilization applications for CUBs generated using ACI control technologies.
- There appears to be only minimal mercury release to the environment in typical disposal and utilization applications for CUBs generated using wet FGD control technologies. The potential release of mercury from wet FGD gypsum during the manufacture of wallboard is still under evaluation.
- The amount of mercury leached from CUB samples tested by DOE/NETL is significantly lower than the federal drinking water standards and water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life; in many cases, leachate concentrations were below the detection limits of the analytical methods.

DOE/NETL will continue to partner with industry and other key stakeholders in carrying out research to better understand the fate of mercury and other trace elements in the by-products from coal combustion.
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A NEW BENEFICIAL USE FOR "UNUSABLE" FLY ASH

By Javed I. Bhatty and John Gajda

INTRODUCTION

Nearly 70 million tons of fly ash are generated annually in the U.S., more than 60% of which is disposed of as “unusable” in landfills because its carbon content is too high or because it is contaminated from processing measures to limit stack emissions. This paper discusses an economic use for much of this “unusable” fly ash as a raw material in cement manufacturing. Demonstrations have produced cements that met applicable standards, and exhibited engineering properties comparable or superior to that of those normally used to produce cement. Cement plants conducting the demonstrations realized several material, operational, fuel, and environmental benefits. The operations were smooth, stable and glitch-free. The fuel consumption declined, and the rate of cement production increased.

OVERVIEW OF CEMENT MANUFACTURE

Portland cement is produced by firing, at high temperatures, a raw feed composed of carefully proportioned lime, silica, alumina, and iron components. These components are derived from naturally occurring materials such as limestone, clay/shale, sand and iron ore. The materials are finely ground, blended in appropriate amounts, and fired in a rotary kiln to form ½- to 1-in. diameter “clinker.” The clinker is then pulverized by inter-grinding with about 5% gypsum to make the finished product – cement.

Cement manufacturing is an energy-intensive process. Approximately 80% of the total energy is consumed in the thermal conversion of raw feed into clinker. When used as a raw feed component in cement manufacturing, typical Class F fly ashes with a high concentration of unburned carbon can supplement the fuel. The inclusion of Class C fly ash in cement raw feed could also be beneficial. The lime content of Class C ash would replace a portion of limestone in the raw feed and thus reduce CO₂ emissions.

FLY ASH COMPATIBILITY CRITERIA

WHY FLY ASH?

Fly ash is typically rich in the compounds normally used in the cement manufacturing process. Not only does it provide some of the necessary chemical constituents, but its unburned carbon also provides fuel value. However it is critical that, prior to its use at a cement plant, the fly ash in question be characterized and evaluated for its compatibility with the cement raw feed. Based on the chemical and physical make up of the fly ash, the following criteria for their compatibility with cement raw feed have been outlined and discussed.

CHEMICAL COMPOSITION

The high-carbon fly ashes used in the subject demonstrations were chemically comparable to the constituent(s) that they replaced (Table 1). The LOI content ranged from approximately 7% to 21%. Typical shales contained 9.5%.

Table 1. Oxide Composition of Fly Ash, Shale is also shown for comparison, wt. %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>Fly Ash A</th>
<th>Fly Ash B</th>
<th>Fly Ash C</th>
<th>Typical Shale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>42.95</td>
<td>47.87</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>56.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al₂O₃</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>15.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe₂O₃</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₃</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na₂O</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K₂O</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO₂</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.O.I.* at 950°C</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*L.O.I. = Loss on ignition

DRI Y VS. WET FLY ASH

Cement plants prefer dry particulate raw materials that are free flowing, easy to handle, and easily blended. Dry fly ash is advantageous because it is easily transportable and blended with the raw mix without pre-processing and grinding. For wet cement plants, the scenario(s) of fly ash use can vary and would require a separate set of evaluations.

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS

For optimal benefit, fly ash must be fine. The fineness provides a large specific surface, which imparts improved reactivity during clinkering. Demonstration materials were finely divided with an average size less than #325 mesh (45 microns).

MINERALOGICAL COMPOSITION

The combinability of fly ash particles with cement raw feed at high temperature (particularly the lime-rich kiln feed)
depends upon the glassy nature of the fly ash. The glass enhances reactivity with cement raw materials during clinkering.

**THERMAL BEHAVIOR, FUEL VALUE, AND EMISSIONS**

Evaluating fly ashes for fuel value and emissions, especially those containing high levels of carbon, is critical for their potential use at cement plants. Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) is usually employed to check for heat content (Joules/gram degrees centigrade of material), and the presence of any volatiles and other organic compounds. DSC also identifies the behavior of fly ash with temperature, together with the critical thermal points at which any volatile or organic species may release.

**COMMERCIAL DEMONSTRATIONS**

**DEMONSTRATION PARTICIPANTS**

CTLGroup, in conjunction with several Midwest cement plants and coal-fired power plants using Illinois coal, performed several commercial demonstrations to consume large volumes of high-carbon fly ash in the manufacturing of cement. As a proof of concept, dry Class F fly ashes from different Illinois power plants were used, with L.O.I. ranging from 6 to 20%.

**FLY ASH COLLECTION AND TRANSPORTATION**

Using pneumatic transport trucks (Figure 1), nearly 500 tons of high-carbon fly ash were collected from the power plants and transported to the participating cement plants. The blending of the dry fly ash with other raw materials at the cement plant was easy and required no pre-processing.

**RAW FEED MIX DESIGN**

The chemistry of the limestone and remaining shale limited the addition of fly ash to between 3 and 6% of the raw feed. The use of fly ash, however, replaced a majority of the shale in the normal feed.

**CEMENT PLANT OPERATIONS**

The two demonstrating cement plants used, respectively, a multi-stage pre-heater and a long dry process (Figure 2). For the pre-heater process, the raw feed was introduced into the top stage of the pre-heaters. Typically, the raw feed moves from one pre-heater stage to the next countercurrent to the flow of the hot flue gases from the rotary kiln. Because of the heat exchange, much of the calcination of the raw feed can occur by the time the feed leaves the final stage of the pre-heaters. For the long dry kiln, the raw feed was directly introduced in the feed end of the kiln, where the material travels forward countercurrent to the hot flue gases. The material undergoes calcination and gradual clinkering as it travels into the kiln towards the firing zone. In both cases, the fly ash-blended raw feed was introduced normally.

**PARAMETERS OBSERVED DURING DEMONSTRATION (1)**

Several key parameters, noted in Table 2, related particularly to the carbon content of the fly ash were observed to benefit the overall operations.
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mineralogical phases such as C₃S (tricalcium silicate), C₂S (dicalcium silicate), C₃A (tricalcium aluminate), and C₄AF (tetra-aluminoferrite). The analyses also indicated the absence of free lime, which is preferred for durable cement. The absence of free lime is attributed to improved reaction of fly ash with lime in the raw mix rendered by the fine and glassy particles of the fly ash.

The microscopical examination of clinker also confirmed the presence and uniform distribution of major clinker phases. Such distribution reflects normal clinkering reaction and uniform transformation of kiln feed to clinker.

CEMENT TESTING

Cements produced from the clinkers made during the demonstrations were tested for compliance with ASTM C 150 for both the chemical and physical properties. Both the demonstration cement and the cement produced before the demonstration conformed to ASTM specifications. Clinker samples collected prior to grinding were also characterized for chemistry and phase mineralogy.

CONCLUSIONS

The commercial-scale demonstrations showed that cement manufacturing can be employed as a high-volume management of discarded fly ashes, especially, high-carbon fly ash. The high-carbon content of the fly ashes provided an additional benefit as a fuel supplement in the energy intensive process thus providing useful energy conservation. It is critical that the fly ash be evaluated for compatibility based on both chemical as well as physical characteristics. Cement produced during the demonstrations was comparable to normally produced cements in chemical and physical properties.

Depending upon the chemical composition of the fly ash and that of the target cement raw mix, using 6% fly ash in U.S. cement manufacturing, can consume more than 9 million tons of fly ash annually. The demonstrations signal the emergence of a new market for “unusable” high-carbon fly ash with tangible material, operational, product, and environmental benefits to both the power generation and cement industries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The funding for this project was provided in part by grants from the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO) through the Office of Coal Development and the Illinois Clean Coal Institute (ICCI).

NOTES

(1) The data on plant operation, production, and product evaluations given here are from one plant, although similar results were observed at the other cement plant.

(2) Extensive pre-testing was done to ensure compatibility with the cement plant material and processes.
INTRODUCTION

There are nearly six million kilometers of roads in the United States. Construction and maintenance of these roadways require approximately 350 million tons of material every year. Embankments provide suitable settings to utilize large volumes of coal fly ash. This potential is not fully explored though, especially when compared to Europe. The Netherlands for example recycles 100% of its coal fly ash and coal bottom ash whereas approximately only 30% of coal fly and bottom ash is reused in the U.S.

One of the barriers to beneficial reuse in the highway environment is the concern from leaching of metals from coal combustion products. This concern applies not just to coal ash but to any type of secondary material that can be placed in a road or an embankment. A material may have excellent engineering properties but if it has metals or other toxic compounds in it, scientists, engineers, regulators, and the public are justifiably concerned with the potential for these chemicals to leach and contaminate the soil and groundwater in large spatial scales, perhaps more easily visualized as ‘linear landfills’. Many states often agree that their reasons for not using secondary materials in roads include their worry about potential environmental effect. However, this worry is often a perceived risk that is not necessarily grounded in facts.

Computer modeling is one way to address and evaluate these concerns by allowing us to predict into the future and scientifically determine whether the concerns are justified or perception based. Computer modeling allows us to test ‘what if’ scenarios and to identify critical beneficial reuse conditions where a concern may be grounded. Availability of predictive methods including computer modeling will potentially lead to more informed decisions with respect to the use of not just coal combustion byproducts but also other secondary materials in roads and embankments including relatively more established ones such as steel slag and some newer materials such as shingles, foundry sand, and contaminated soils. In this article, we present some of the recent advances we have made with respect to modeling contaminant release and transport in the highway environment.

CONTAMINANT LEACHING IN THE EMBANKMENT

An understanding of the hydrology in the highway environment is essential for predicting contaminant release and transport since water is the primary media that transports contaminants. If there is no water, there will be no contaminant leaching. If there is stagnant water there may be leaching and transport of contaminants through ‘diffusion’, however, this process alone
will be much slower than ‘advection’ of contaminants which happens when the water is moving as in infiltrating rain water. A powerful model that can handle these complexities is HYDRUS2D which was used in this research.

To predict the hydrology in embankments, we used continuously monitored water content field data from Minnesota from an embankment that did not have coal ash in it. Once we were able to model the hydrology in the Minnesota embankment, we expanded our model to ask the question, what would happen if the embankment in Minnesota had a foot of soil replaced with coal fly ash?

The literature is scarce with respect to information on hydrological conditions in embankments and the hydraulic properties of road construction materials which poses a significant challenge.

Figure 1: Water content and precipitation intensity in the embankment (taken from Apul et al., 2005)

Figure 2: Coal fly ash embankment leaching scenario
towards modeling embankment water movement and contaminant transport. This challenge was overcome by probabilistic calibration of the relevant parameters in collaboration with Dr. Ernst Linder, Ms. Tara Frizzel (from University of New Hampshire), and Ms. Ruth Roberson (from MnDOT). Upon application of a Bayesian Monte Carlo method (further details available in a separate article*) the model output closely predicted field water content measurements in the Minnesota embankment. Figure 1 shows the close match between modeled and field measured water content values in the embankment along with precipitation intensity for a period of 16 days.

With confidence in our ability to model the hydrology in embankments, the next step focused on adding coal fly ash to the embankment model and analyzing leaching of Cadmium from coal fly ash in a scenario where the precipitation is similar to that in Minnesota and the groundwater table is 1.2 m below the surface (Figure 2). The model was run probabilistically to explicitly incorporate the uncertainty of parameters in the system. We took a probabilistic approach because a single value of model output with no information on the confidence in the output value may not be as valuable. In the probabilistic approach, we can clearly state how much confidence we have in a given output value.

The results for cumulative Cadmium leached in 10 years is shown in Figure 3 and compared to results from a simple model and field data from the literature. Probabilistic results can be interpreted by defining an acceptable level of certainty (i.e. by picking a value on the y-axis). Figure 3 shows that based on the HYDRUS2D model we used, we are 90% certain that the cumulative Cadmium leached in 10 years will not exceed 0.0027 mg/kg. This result is slightly higher than the field data found in the literature for coal fly ash lysimeters (0.00082 mg/kg).

An alternative, simpler model that does not consider the hydrology and spatial scales explicitly is the single equation model that multiplies solubility of the metal with the liquid to solid ratio observed in the field. The simpler model results show that if a low solubility value is used, the results are similar to those obtained from HYDRUS2D model results.

Figure 3: Cumulative probabilities of amount of Cd that may leach in 10 years (taken from Apul et al., 2005)
However, operating based on the ‘precautionary principle’ many regulators would tend to use a high solubility value which over predicts leaching of cadmium by two orders of magnitude (0.610 mg/kg). With these findings we propose that the use of HYDRUS2D type of detailed hydrology models is a powerful method for realistically predicting contaminant release, especially when coupled with probability.

**CONTAMINANT LEACHING FROM THE BASE LAYER**

If we consider the two dimensional cross-section of the highway environment, the hydraulic regimes are even more complicated due to lateral water flow. For example, even when the pavement is completely impervious, there is potential for water to get under the pavement due to differences in the pressure head. Figure 4 shows lateral water movement in half of a cross section of a road where the water getting into the embankment also moves sideways towards the pavement.

Coal bottom ash can be used in the base layer of a road. In evaluating the potential leaching of contaminants from the base layer the condition of the road has to be considered. Contaminant leaching from the base layer in a completely intact pavement, in a completely damaged pavement, and a pavement with only two cracks (or joints) in it was analyzed (Figure 5). Leaching of both salts and metals were analyzed. The difference between these two types of chemicals is that metals are much less mobile than salts because of their affinity for sorptive sites. While salts are mobilized easily, the public perception for salt contamination is often not so negative, especially considering road salting in cold climates is a standard practice even if...
the salt fluxes from it may be much higher than any potential release from a secondary road construction material.

Figure 5 shows that in a period of 12 months in the intact pavement, the salts in the base layer, in coal bottom ash, or any other secondary material do not mobilize much except at the edge of the pavement. In a period of 20 years, only 4% of the initial salt mass in the base layer reaches the groundwater. In a pavement with two cracks, the centerline crack allows very little water in the pavement whereas a shoulder crack will lead to depletion of salts immediately below it. Finally, if the pavement is completely damaged, salts are significantly mobilized in 12 months and in 2.5 years all of the initial mass of salts in the base layer reaches the groundwater (not shown).

A summary of multiple simulation results for a typical Minnesota climate with high groundwater table (3 ft from the surface) sites is given in Table 1. Simulations for metals were conducted for two different subgrade types; one that retards metals significantly (clayey subgrade), and one that doesn’t. If the pavement is constructed on a sandy subgrade and is left completely damaged for 20 years, 0.1% of the initial metal concentration will reach the groundwater. However, this scenario is not very likely to happen. The three other scenarios for metals suggest that contamination of groundwater is not expected since fractions as low as $10^{-10}$ to $10^{-28}$ are essentially equal to zero.

**SUMMARY**

Computer modeling of the dynamic hydrological and geochemical conditions in the highway environment can be an instructive tool to assess the contaminant release and transport from coal combustion byproducts and other secondary materials used in roads.
Computer modeling of the dynamic hydrological and geochemical conditions in the highway environment can be an instructive tool to assess the contaminant release and transport from coal combustion byproducts and other secondary materials used in roads and embankments.

and embankments. Results from the HYDRUS2D model coupled with an uncertainty analysis suggest that the Cadmium fluxes will be significantly less than the output from simpler models with worst case (high solubility) scenarios. Two dimensional analysis of the leaching from the base layer also suggest that concentrations leaching ground water will not be significant for metals unless the pavement is completely damaged and built on sandy soils. Development and verification of these types of tools may lead the way to more informed decision with respect to beneficial use of coal combustion byproducts and other secondary materials.
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According to ACAA’s most recent Coal Combustion Product Production and Use Survey covering calendar year 2003, FGD gypsum is closing the gap with Boiler Slag on percentage utilization. Slag utilization was at almost 96% and FGD gypsum utilization has risen to 70%, but less than 2 million tons of slag are produced annually compared to almost 12 million tons of FGD gypsum. While almost all of this FGD gypsum was utilized as a raw material in gypsum wallboard manufacturing (7.8 million tons), use in cement and concrete products as well as agriculture are steadily growing.

Utilities and wallboard manufacturers have been fortunate that up until now there has been a synergy between the supply and demand for FGD gypsum east of the Mississippi River. Most of the large power plants that have been retrofitted with wet limestone or lime scrubbers that produce FGD gypsum as a byproduct are located in the east, which matched nicely with the recent growth in demand for wallboard products. Virtually all of the 12 newest wallboard plants built or announced since 1995 (Figure 1) have been specifically designed to take advantage of the availability of this raw material. For the most part, these wallboard plants have been located in close proximity to utility sources or on major river systems to take advantage of low cost barge transportation.

However, despite this synergy, only 27% of total gypsum wallboard production in the U.S. utilizes FGD gypsum. Seemingly there is a great opportunity out there to utilize even more FGD gypsum for wallboard, but in reality there may be significant challenges to our industry in expanding use of FGD gypsum in wallboard.

Based on utility projections for sulfur dioxide reduction in response to new regulatory programs, FGD products (including FGD gypsum) production is expected to approach 40 million tons by 2015 and most of the FGD gypsum production will remain in the East or the Midwest, not in key future market growth areas for gypsum wallboard – i.e. the Northeast and West Coast. While the abundant supply of FGD synthetic materials loads FGD gypsum on barge at the Tennessee Valley Authority’s Cumberland Fossil Plant for transport to Temple Inland’s West Memphis, Arkansas wallboard plant.
gypsum east of the Mississippi River could make it economical to convert a few more of the older gypsum wallboard plants from natural or “rock” gypsum to FGD gypsum, the material will remain out of reach for the majority of natural gypsum wallboard facilities in the West due to handling and transportation costs (Figure 2).

Based on these considerations, continued growth in FGD gypsum sales will need to take advantage of its suitability for other high volume uses including cement, concrete products and agricultural uses. In 2003 less than 1 million tons of FGD gypsum were sold into these markets, but the potential exists for much larger volumes to be used in these applications.

In addition to the challenges presented by the doubling of FGD gypsum production over the next few years, environmental groups and regulatory agencies concerned with the issue of mercury sequestration and re-release from CCPs will require the utility producers as well as end users (wallboard, cement and agriculture) to prove that FGD gypsum does not present a risk to populations exposed to products containing it.

ACAA is responding to these challenges and to growth in membership representing wallboard manufacturers, FGD gypsum marketing companies and major utilities with scrubbers in their future. The Technical Committee of ACAA has formed an FGD Subcommittee that is beginning to develop Resource Bulletins and Fact Sheets on FGD gypsum. With such broad support from the stakeholders, ACAA will be in the forefront of disseminating the technical information needed to promote the continued growth in FGD gypsum use.

Several members of the FGD Subcommittee and Dave Goss provided information on FGD processes and products in an informal meeting with representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Office of Solid Waste and the U.S. Department of Energy’s National Energy Technology Laboratory (DOE NETL) at EPA’s Washington, D.C. office on February 17, 2005. The actual presentations can be viewed on the ACAA website under “Library”. Click on “Library and Meeting/Symposium Presentations”, “ACAA Related Presentations”, then “Presentations to US EPA”. EPA staffers showed a keen interest in the presentations and its potential impact on the industry’s ability to meet CCP utilization goals set for C2P2.

Anyone interested in participating in the activities of the FGD Subcommittee is encouraged to contact either me (ecmiller@tva.gov) or Jenny Hitch (jhitch@headwaters.com) (preferably via e-mail with all your contact information), and we will put you right to work!

I would like to thank Jessica Marshal and John Gaynor of United States Gypsum Company for providing the figures used in this article.

E. Cheri Miller is with the Tennessee Valley Authority and may be reached at ecmiller@tva.gov.
Synthetic Materials (synmat) specializes in the dewatering of synthetic gypsum slurries to produce gypsum cake. Synmat is involved in all aspects of synthetic gypsum production, marketing and transportation. By taking ownership of the gypsum in slurry form and providing the capital for the gypsum dewatering facility, Synmat eliminates gypsum production risk from the utility and meets the needs of our customers in gypsum board, cement and agriculture.

P.O. Box 87, 244 Old Highway 149
Cumberland City, TN 37050
Telephone (931) 827-4075
Fax (931) 827-4125

info@synmat.com
www.synmat.com
Cinergy Corp. is a major energy producer utilizing over 30 million tons of coal annually in electrical generation. The products from coal combustion, including cenospheres, bottom ash, fly ash, gypsum and scrubber solids, are currently being used in many commercial and industrial applications. For additional information on the availability and location of these products, contact one of our Cinergy representatives.

Cinergy Corp.
139 E. Fourth St., EX510, Cincinnati, OH 45201
Ph: (513) 287-5345
Fax: (513) 419-5525
John Hill – Manager, Coal Combustion Products
john.hill@cinergy.com
www.cinergy.com

Combustion Products Management
Sunburst Office Plaza, 1541 Alta Dr., Ste. 205, Whitehall, PA 18052
Ph: (800) 951-5558
Fax: (610) 821-6911
Stephen Benza
sbenza@cpmash.com
www.cpmash.com

Cumberland Elkhorn Coal & Coke
P.O. Box 878, Harlan, KY 40831
Ph: (606) 573-6300
Fax: (606) 573-6315
C.V. Bennett – Vice President
cvbennett@ce-coal.com

A Full Service Ash Management Provider

John A. Hill, PE
Manager,
Coal Combustion Products
139 E. Fourth Street, Ex 510
P.O. Box 960
Cincinnati, OH 45201-0960
john.hill@cinergy.com
Ph: 513/287-5345

Howard S. Lewis
Senior Engineer
1000 E. Main Street
Plainfield, IN 46168
howard.lewis@cinergy.com
Ph: 317/838-1661
Indianapolis Power & Light Co. (IPL)
P.O. Box 436, 6925 N. State Rd. 57, Petersburgh, IN 47567
Ph: (812) 354-7251
Fax: (812) 354-7287
Jeffrey Jenkins – Environmental Coordinator
jeffrey.jenkins@aes.com
www.ipalco.com

Korea Coal Ash Recycling Association
Rm. 1928, Oceantower Bldg., 760-3 U-dong, Haenundae-gu Pusan, Rep. of Korea
Ph: 011-82-51-7405910
Fax: 011-82-51-7405914
Jung Kwon Soo – Chairman
shchoi777@paran.com
www.coalash.or.kr

LaFarge North America
600 SW. Jefferson St., Ste. 302, Lee’s Summit, MO 64063
Ph: (816) 251-2147
Shrief Kabis – Regional Product Manager - Ash
shrief.kabis@lafarge-na.com
www.lafargecorp.com

LB Industrial Systems, LLC
12508 Jones Maltsberger Rd., Ste. 100, San Antonio, TX 78247
Ph: (210) 344-2009
Fax: (210) 344-1121
Robert Lister – President
ralister@swbell.net
www.lbindustrialsystems.com

Lehigh Cement Company
7660 Imperial Way, Allentown, PA 18195-1040
Ph: (610) 366-4761
Fax: (610) 366-4616
Mark Stillwagon – Manager Purchasing/Materials
mstillwagon@lehighcement.com
www.lehighcement.com

LG&E Energy, LLC
220 W. Main St., 4th Fl., Louisville, KY 40202
Ph: (502) 627-3154
Fax: (502) 627-2194
Kenneth Tapp – By-products Coordinator
kenny.tapp@lgeenergy.com
www.lgeenergy.com

LMS Environmental Contracting, Inc.
6515 W. 500 N., Madison, IN 47250
Ph: (812) 273-5740
Fax: (812) 273-1651
Tom Kuhn – Director, Business Development
tomkuhn@lmscontracting.com

Lower Colorado River Authority
6549 Power Plant Rd., LaGrange, TX 78945
Ph: (979) 249-8661
Fax: (979) 249-8724
Ken Koehler – Sr. Environmental Coordinator
kkoehler@lcra.org
www.lcra.org/index.html

McDonald Farms Enterprises, Inc.
7247 E. County Line Rd., Longmont, CO 80501
Ph: (303) 772-4577
Fax: (303) 442-5706
Randall McDonald – General Manager
mcfarms3@aol.com
www.mcdonaldfarmsent.com

Headwaters Resources
5248 County Rd. 302, Nacogdoches, TX 75961
Ph: (936) 564-2423
Fax: (936) 564-0008
Bill Gehrmann – President
bgehrmann@headwaters.com
www.flyash.com

Holcim (US) Inc.
1100 Victors Way, Ann Arbor, MI 48108
Ph: (734) 821-7043
Fax: (734) 821-7117
Barry Descheneaux – Product Support & Development
barry.descheneaux@holcim.com
www.holcim.com

Kansas City Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 418679, Kansas City, MO 64141-9679
Ph: (816) 556-2108
Fax: (816) 556-2047
Fred Gustin – Coal Combustion Products Analyst
fred.gustin@kcpl.com
www.greatplainsenergy.com

Korea Coal Ash Recycling Association
Dedicated to the promotion of coal combustion by-products (CCBs) within the western United States in applications that are technically proven, environmentally and socially beneficial and commercially viable.

Visit us at www.wrashg.org
Whole Rock, Fly Ash, Coal Ash, Portland Cement
Chloride in Coal, Fly Ash and Cements

Accuracy and Quick Turn Around Time

Wyoming Analytical Laboratories, Inc.
Denver Division, 1511 Washington Ave.
Golden, Colorado 80401
Phone (303) 278-2446, Fax (303) 278-2439
Call or Inquire at e: walxray@aol.com

For all of our Laboratories and Capabilities visit www.wal-lab.com
The Combustion Byproducts Recycling Consortium (CBRC) is requesting pre-proposals for research expected to be funded April 15, 2006. The research will be sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy - National Energy Technology Laboratory (DOE-NETL).

Applicants whose pre-proposals are selected will be asked to submit full proposals. It is expected that approximately $1.25 million will be available for new and continuing projects starting in 2006. Funding of selected proposals is dependent upon available funding from DOE-NETL. A cost-share match of 25% is required.

Instructions for submitting a pre-proposal can be found at:
http://www.nrcce.wvu.edu/programs/cbrc

The deadline for submitting pre-proposals is July 31, 2005

Inquiries regarding the RFP2005 can be made to Tamara Vandivort at 304-293-2867 x 5448 or at tvandivo@wvu.edu.

CBRC is a program of the West Virginia Water Research Institute located at the National Research Center for Coal and Energy at West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.
Santee Cooper
1 Riverwood Dr., Moncks Corner, SC  29461
Ph: (843) 761-8000
Fax: (843) 761-4156
Thomas Edens – Administrator, Combustion Product Utilization
tfedens@santeecooper.com
www.santeecooper.com

Don Saylak, Ph.D., P.E., Research Engineer
Texas Transportation Institute &
Director of By-product Utilization and Recycling
Texas A&M University,
College Station, TX  77843
Ph: (979) 845-9962
Fax: (979) 458-0780
d-saylak@tamu.edu
www.tamu.edu

Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.
P.O. Box 272000, Tampa, FL  33688-2000
Ph: (813) 739-1213
Fax: (813) 264-7906
Jim Frazen – Manager Environmental Affairs
jfrazen@seminole-electric.com
www.seminole-electric.com

Separation Technologies LLC
10 Kearney Rd., Needham, MA  02494
Ph: (781) 455-8824
Fax: (781) 455-6518
Tom Cerullo – Northeast Regional Manager
tcerullo@stiash.com
www.stiash.com

S. Carolina Electric and Gas Co., Inc.
111 Research Dr., Columbia, SC  29203
Ph: (803) 217-7461
Fax: (803) 933-8064
Ted Frady – Sr. Engineer,
Ash Utilization & Disposal
tfrady@scana.com
www.scana.com

Southern Company Generation
P.O. Box 2641, Birmingham, AL  35291
Ph: (205) 257-7602
Fax: (205) 257-7246
Mike Wolfe – Combustion Products Manager
mawolfe@southernco.com
www.southernco.com

Southern Illinois Power Cooperative
11543 Lake of Egypt Rd., Marion, IL  62959
Ph: (618) 964-1448
Fax: (618) 964-1867
Richard Myott – Planning & Environmental Department Manager
rmyott@sipower.org

Trans-Ash leads the industry in CCP management and utilization.
- Landfill management
- Econo-Fill® structural fill program
- Active ash pond excavation
- Ash system construction
- CCP Utilization
- Processed boiler slag and bottom ash products

Trans-Ash now offers a broad range of Power Plant Services:
- Coal handling
- Fly ash silo management and operation
- Scrubber materials handling
- Plant labor resources

Contact Trans-Ash for more information on CCP Management or Power Plant Services.

513-733-4770
www.transash.com
The World of Coal Ash (WOCA) held in Lexington, Kentucky April 11-15, 2005 was a resounding success! Based on the feedback from attendees, the American Coal Ash Association and the University of Kentucky Center for Applied Energy Research (CAER) have already started planning for WOCA - 2007. Although the details have not been finalized, it is anticipated that WOCA - 2007 will be held in April, 2007. We plan to maintain the enthusiasm and positive responses we have had from the industry to plan another multi-day event focusing on the CCP industry.

Please visit the WOCA web site for ongoing information.

www.worldofcoalash.org
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www.ashtech2006.org

14-17 May 2006
Birmingham Hippodrome
Birmingham
United Kingdom

AshTech 2006
International Coal Ash Technology Conference

AshTech 2006 is being hosted by the UK Quality Ash Association. It is hoped to attract upwards of 300 international delegates with 80 plus papers being presented over three concurrent sessions covering all aspects of coal fired power station products. A social programme is also being developed around the conference.

Call for Papers
abstract deadline: 1 December 2005
possible submission topics (list not exhaustive):
research & development; process & handling technology; environmental issues; applications for coal ash

contact for submission guidelines:
Dr Lindon Sear
UKQAA, Regent House, Bath Avenue
Wolverhampton, West Midlands, WV1 4EG, UK
Tel: +44 (0) 1902 810087 Fax: +44 (0) 1902 810187
email: conference@ukqaa.org.uk
www.ashtech2006.org
Generating value with building products created from by-products. As a global leader in building materials—and the largest provider of cement and cement-related products in North America—Lafarge is one of the continent’s largest marketers of fly ash and other CCPs. We use them in cement, concrete and drywall products for strength and density. We use them in grouting, mortars, stuccos and other materials. We promote their use in geotechnical applications—to stabilize soils and aggregate bases, create engineered structural fills, recycle bituminous pavement into road bases, and even dry out muddy construction sites.

If you’re looking for a reliable partner to market your CCPs, look to the company that’s creating new value, from a material as old as the hills. For more information, contact Shrief Kabis, Regional Product Manager—Ash, at 1-800-482-5749, or visit us online at www.lafargenorthamerica.com.
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TECHNOLOGIES
for fly ash quality

• Ammonia Removal
• Carbon Fixation

Introducing
PRODUCTS
for increasing ash utilization
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