

# Emission of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) from the liquid injection incineration of petrochemical industrial wastewater

Lin-Chi Wang<sup>a,\*</sup>, I.-Ching Wang<sup>b</sup>, Juu-En Chang<sup>b,c</sup>,  
Soon-Onn Lai<sup>d</sup>, Guo-Ping Chang-Chien<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering, Cheng Shiu University, 840, Chengching Rd., Kaohsiung 833, Taiwan, ROC

<sup>b</sup> Department of Environmental Engineering, National Cheng Kung University, 1, University Rd., Tainan 70101, Taiwan, ROC

<sup>c</sup> Sustainable Environment Research Center, National Cheng Kung University, 1, University Rd., Tainan 70101, Taiwan, ROC

<sup>d</sup> Faculty of Engineering and Science, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Jalan Genting Kelang, Setapak 53300, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Received 4 October 2006; received in revised form 11 February 2007; accepted 12 February 2007

Available online 15 February 2007

## Abstract

This study investigated the emission of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) from stack flue gas and air pollution control device (APCD) effluent of the liquid injection incinerator (LII) disposing the petrochemical industrial wastewater, and PAH removal efficiencies of wet electrostatic precipitator (WESP) and wet scrubber (WSB). The PAH carcinogenic potency were investigated with the benzo(a)pyrene equivalent concentration (BaP<sub>eq</sub>). The remarkably high total-BaP<sub>eq</sub> concentration (220  $\mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) in the stack flue gas was much higher than those of several published emission sources, and indicated the possible influence on its surrounding environment. The total-PAH emission factors of the WESP, WSB and stack flue gas were 78.9, 95.7 and 30,900  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater, respectively. The removal efficiencies of total-PAHs were 0.254, 0.309 and 0.563% for WESP, WSB and overall, respectively, suggesting that the use of both WESP and WSB shows insignificant PAH removal efficiencies, and 99.4% of total-PAHs was directly emitted to the ambient air through the stack flue gas. This finding suggested that the better incineration efficiencies, and APCD removal efficiencies for disposing the petrochemical industrial wastewater are necessary in future.

© 2007 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH); Liquid injection incinerator; Benzo(a)pyrene equivalent concentration (BaP<sub>eq</sub>); Emission factor

## 1. Introduction

Incineration is considered as one of the best available techniques to dispose various kinds of wastes [1], and to reduce the volume and quantity of the toxic compounds [2]. However, incineration always results in the risk of unwanted pollution. Among the contaminants resulted from incomplete combustion of organic materials are polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) which consists of two to seven fused benzene rings. Several PAHs are known to be mutagenic and/or carcinogenic [3], and hence understanding the PAH emission is necessary.

The quantitative and qualitative characteristics of PAHs emitted from industrial stacks are associated with the input type, the manufacturing process, and air pollution control devices

(APCDs) [4]. A number of studies examined the PAH emission from combusting various types of waste and fuels [5–17]. The PAH emission from the medical waste incinerators with higher plastic content were much greater than that from municipal waste incinerators [11,15]. Suitable quantity of oxygen would diminish the yield of PAHs and enhance the combustion efficiency [16]. The incineration temperature and residence time exerted marked effects on the PAH emission [18]. While our previous study [19] found that the use of waste terephthalic acid (TPA) as a co-fuel could save the consumption of heavy oil and reduce the PAH emissions during the combustion process in the fluidized-bed incinerator, the traditional APCDs have relatively low PAH removal efficiencies [20].

Petrochemical industry plays an important role in Taiwan economy, but it also produces a variety of wastes (e.g., wastewater containing toxic organic compounds) through the manufacturing processes. A method of incineration of liquid hazardous waste by high-rate injection into a combustion chamber has been

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +886 7 7310606x3921; fax: +886 7 7332204.  
E-mail address: [lcwang@csu.edu.tw](mailto:lcwang@csu.edu.tw) (L.-C. Wang).

used. This liquid injection incineration (LII) has the advantages of low capital and maintenance cost, and exclusive application for pumpable liquid waste, including some low-viscosity sludges and slurries [21]. Emission factors of 19 PAHs emitted from the LII equipped with baghouse and wet scrubber for mixed liquid industrial waste have been reported [22]; however, the waste type was not clearly characterized. It appears that no assessment has been made on the PAH emission from the LII for incinerating manufacturing wastewater in the petrochemical industry.

This study investigated the PAH emission from stack flue gas and APCD effluent of the LII disposing the petrochemical industrial wastewater, and PAH removal efficiencies of two types of APCDs. The carcinogenic potency of PAHs was also included in accordance with the benzo(a)pyrene equivalent concentrations (BaP<sub>eq</sub>) [23], and hence this study was expanded into the perspective of human health.

## 2. Experimental

### 2.1. Brief description of the LII

In this study, a continuous-type (feeding rate = 4500 kg h<sup>-1</sup>, incineration temperature = 850–900 °C) LII used for incinerating manufacturing wastewater operated at a petrochemical industry in southern Taiwan was selected. Heavy oil (feeding rate = 140 kg h<sup>-1</sup>) was adopted as auxiliary fuel. This LII was equipped with a wet electrostatic precipitator (WESP) and a wet scrubber (WSB) which was installed in series. Other background information of the incinerator is summarized in Table 1.

### 2.2. Sample collection

The stack flue gas was collected isokinetically with a PAH Sampling System (PSS), which has been proved comparable with the US EPA Modified Method 5 (MM5; 40CFR60) for sampling semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs). This PSS has been successfully used for sampling PAHs in different industrial stacks [7,9,24]. The PSS was equipped with a sampling probe, a set of cooling devices, a set of XAD-2/PUF glass

cartridges, and a pump, a flow meter, and a controlled computer. The gas phase PAHs were collected with two stages of glass cartridges which were packed with XAD-2 resin and supported by two polyurethane foams (PUFs) on the top and bottom. The particulate phase PAHs contained in the flue gas were collected with a tube-type glass fiber filter (Whatman Glass Filter Thimble, 25 mm × 90 mm). The total-PAH mass (not reported here) in the cooling water and sampling pipe residual (rinsed with *n*-hexane) were included in this study, although their average total-PAH mass fractions (0.843 and 0.651%, respectively) were much smaller than those in the gaseous (93.9%) and particulate (4.60%) phase. The WSB and WESP effluents were collected every 2 min (totally 10 times) concurrently with the stack sampling to obtain good representative samples with glass bottles (pre-treated with 10% HNO<sub>3</sub>, rinsed with distilled water, and wrapped with aluminium foil to avoid PAH decay).

Breakthrough tests were investigated with three stages of XAD-2/PUF cartridge, each of which was individually analyzed and compared in terms of the PAH mass collected. The results showed that the average total-PAH mass distributions for the first (70.2%), second (25.3%) and third (4.50%) stages of the cartridge sequentially decreased, suggesting that no significant PAH mass was detected in the third stage of the cartridge. Totally nine PAH samples were collected, and each was sampled with a duration of 20 min.

### 2.3. Sample analysis

The PAHs contained in the cartridges and filters were Soxhlet extracted with the mixture of *n*-hexane and dichloromethane (v:v=1:1) for 24 h, while those contained in the cooling water and pipe residual were extracted using the liquid/liquid phase separation technique with the mixture of water and dichloromethane (v:v=1:1). The extract was then concentrated, cleaned-up and re-concentrated to exactly 1.0 mL. The detailed analytical procedures have been described elsewhere [25]. PAH contents were detected with a gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) (HP 5890A/5972) equipped with a capillary column (HP Ultra 2–50 m 0.32 mm × 0.17 μm) and a HP 7673 A automatic sampler. The operating conditions of GC/MS and determination of PAHs can be found elsewhere [11].

The concentrations of 21 PAHs species were determined. They were categorized into three different molecular weight ranges: low molecular weight (LMW) PAHs are two- and three-ringed PAHs including naphthalene (Nap), acenaphthylene (AcPy), acenaphthene (Acp), fluorene (Flu), phenanthrene (PA), anthracene (Ant); middle molecular weight (MMW) PAHs are four-ringed PAHs including fluoranthene (FL), pyrene (Pyr), cyclopenta(c,d)pyrene (CYC), benzo(a)anthracene (BaA), chrysene (CHR); high molecular weight (HMW) PAHs are five-, six- and seven-ringed PAHs including benzo(b)fluoranthene (BbF), benzo(k)fluoranthene (BkF), benzo(e)pyrene (BeP), benzo(a)pyrene (BaP), perylene (PER), indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (IND), dibenzo(a,h)anthracene (DBA), benzo(b)chrycene (BbC), benzo(ghi)perylene (BghiP),

Table 1  
The background information of the liquid injection incinerator (LII)

Background information	LII
Feedstock	Manufacturing wastewater
Feeding way	Continuous
Feeding rate (kg h <sup>-1</sup> )	4500
Auxiliary fuel	Heavy oil
Feeding rate (kg h <sup>-1</sup> )	140
Temperature (°C)	
Incineration	850–900
Stack flue gas	105
Emission rate	
Stack flue gas (Nm <sup>3</sup> min <sup>-1</sup> )	1800
WESP effluent (m <sup>3</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )	30.1
WSB effluent (m <sup>3</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )	28.9

and coronene (COR). Of the 21 individual PAHs, BaA, CHR, BbF, BkF, BaP, IND, DBA and BghiP were listed as potential human carcinogens [26]. The PAH carcinogenicity is positively associated with corresponding molecular weight or aromatic rings [3].

Five internal standards (Nap-d8, Acp-d10, PA-d10, CHR-d12 and PER-d12) were added in the recovery tests to determine the final concentrated volumes and injected quantities before injection. The recovery efficiencies of these five internal standards and 21 individual PAH compounds were determined with a solution containing known PAH concentrations following the same experimental procedures. The recovery efficiencies (ranging from 80.6 to 92.1%) of these five internal standards were used to correct the original recovery efficiencies of the 21 individual PAH compounds (their corrected recovery efficiencies ranged from 75.9 to 107%). The blank tests for PAHs were accomplished following the same procedure as the recovery-efficiency tests without adding the known standard solution before extraction. Analyses of field blanks, including the glass bottle, glass fiber filter and XAD-2/PUF cartridge showed no significant contamination.

#### 2.4. Carcinogenic potency

The carcinogenic potency of a given PAH compound can be expressed by the  $BaP_{eq}$  which is the product of its toxic equivalent factor (TEF) and its concentration. The TEF list proposed by Nisbet and LaGoy [23] reflects well the actual state of knowledge on the toxic potency of each individual PAH compound, and thus was adopted in this study. The carcinogenic potency of the total-PAHs (i.e., total- $BaP_{eq}$ ) was the sum of individual of the 21 PAH compounds.

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. Stack flue gas

Table 2 shows the concentrations of 21 individual PAHs and total-PAHs (i.e., the sum of the concentrations of 21 PAH species) in the stack flue gas. The average total-PAH concentration was  $971 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$  and the range was between 362 and  $1790 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$  (R.S.D. = 46.3%). This average was much higher than that of the fixed grate waste incinerator (FG-MWI) mainly used the special medical waste ( $587 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) [11] and waste ion-exchange resin incineration ( $648 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) [6], but lower than that of the mechanical grate waste incinerator (MG-MWI) used for general medical waste ( $1290 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) [11]. The intrinsic divergence of the feedstock composition (e.g., high molecular compounds and phenyl compounds) could lead to these differences.

Contrary to previous finding that the PAH emission from the combustion process was consistently dominated by LM-PAHs [10,11], LM-PAHs ( $436 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) and HM-PAHs ( $444 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) showed similar average concentration in this study (Table 2). Among the HM-PAH compounds, IND ( $130 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) and DBA ( $178 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) showed especially high concentrations. This finding is notably significant in terms

Table 2

The range, mean, and R.S.D. of the concentrations for 21 individual PAHs, LM-PAHs, MM-PAHs, HM-PAHs and  $BaP_{eq}$  in the stack flue gas ( $n=9$ )

Compound	Range ( $\mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ )	Mean ( $\mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ )	R.S.D. (%)
Nap	181–633	373	41.5
AcPy	5.52–27.1	14	48.7
Acp	3.54–23.8	13.9	46.8
Flu	2.89–11.9	8.64	32.2
PA	9.32–26.4	20	25.3
Ant	2.81–14.4	5.3	71.2
FL	6.44–22.1	11.8	44.2
Pyr	12.0–211	63.5	107
CYC	1.38–8.24	4.09	57.6
BaA	1.69–13.6	6.46	78.6
CHR	2.12–21.9	10.8	57.2
BbF	1.27–14.8	7.99	66.5
BkF	1.78–12.2	6.94	51.0
BaP	12.2–29.5	19.9	32.0
BeP	14.4–46.4	26.7	45.7
PER	4.68–23.7	12.4	59.3
IND	2.94–348	130	109
DBA	7.44–447	178	85.3
BbC	1.97–116	31.7	115
BghiP	1.46–72.7	25.7	92.4
COR	0.381–6.64	1.42	142
Total-PAHs	362–1790	971	46.3
LM-PAHs	205–737	435	40.8
MM-PAHs	22.2–268	92.5	90.5
HM-PAHs	135–788	444	43.8
Total- $BaP_{eq}$	22.8–534	220	81.3

of human health. HM-PAHs are known to be more carcinogenic [3], and six of them (i.e., BbF, BkF, BaP, IND, DBA and BghiP) have been listed as potential human carcinogens [26]. This resulted in higher carcinogenic potency in the application of the LII. Petrochemical wastewater could contain high levels of oil and grease ( $30\text{--}600 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ ), phenol ( $200 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ ) and benzene ( $100 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ ) [27]. The formation of LM-PAHs and MM-PAHs with benzene, phenyl and biphenyl as growth species, and the contribution of LM- and MM-PAHs to formation of HM-PAHs have been confirmed ([28] and references therein). These phenyl and high molecular compounds might provide higher possibility for PAHs to be synthesized during the incomplete combustion process and it also explained the high HM-PAHs emission in this study. Of the 21 individual PAHs, Nap (38.4% of total-PAHs) dominated the PAH emission from the LII since it has high volatility.

Total- $BaP_{eq}$  concentrations ranged between 22.8 and  $534 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$  with an average of  $220 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$  (Table 2). Similar to the result found by Mi et al. [9], total- $BaP_{eq}$  was contributed mainly by the three carcinogenic compounds—BaP ( $24.1 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ), IND ( $11.8 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) and DBA ( $160 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) (not reported here). It is noted that PAHs with higher molecular weights are known with higher carcinogenic potencies. Based on this fact and measured PAH concentrations, this average value was much higher than those for the batch mixer ( $0.629 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ), preheating boiler ( $0.112 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) and discharging chute ( $0.950 \mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) from batch hot mix asphalt

Table 3

The range, mean, and R.S.D. of the concentrations for 21 individual PAHs, LM-PAHs, MM-PAHs, HM-PAHs and BaP<sub>eq</sub> and the ratio distributed in the liquid and solid phases in the WESP effluent ( $n = 9$ )

Compound	Liquid phase				Solid phase			
	Range (ng L <sup>-1</sup> )	Mean (ng L <sup>-1</sup> )	R.S.D. (%)	Ratio (%)	Range (ng L <sup>-1</sup> )	Mean (ng L <sup>-1</sup> )	R.S.D. (%)	Ratio (%)
Nap	1620–2230	1,880	17.0	71.7	652–853	740	13.9	28.3
AcPy	691–1250	973	28.7	73.5	237–445	350	30.0	26.5
Acp	997–1420	1,210	17.4	79.8	194–374	306	32.0	20.2
Flu	980–1190	1,080	10.1	86.4	151–199	169	15.8	13.6
PA	11.1–518	306	86.0	92.1	ND–77.0	26.2	168	7.93
Ant	ND–565	188	173	65.2	27.6–167	101	69.3	34.8
FL	0.842–72.0	44.5	85.9	54.7	18.9–60.6	36.8	58.5	45.3
Pyr	94.5–134	108	20.4	70.8	20.2–78.8	44.6	68.3	29.2
CYC	103–240	161	44.1	58.4	ND–288	115	133	41.6
BaA	151–760	359	96.5	69.3	ND–478	159	173	30.7
CHR	172–399	285	39.8	52.0	187–353	263	31.8	48.0
BbF	289–496	367	30.6	87.6	ND–88.8	51.9	89.1	12.4
BkF	ND–58.9	28.9	50.1	44.8	ND–74.5	35.6	105	55.2
BaP	429–729	540	30.6	79.6	76.3–238	138	63.2	20.4
BeP	778–1020	895	13.4	72.8	204–540	334	54.1	27.2
PER	446–866	652	32.3	79.7	137–210	166	23.6	20.3
IND	672–4530	2,130	98.2	48.3	1610–3030	2,280	31.3	51.7
DBA	201–2690	1,400	89.2	29.8	2460–4090	3,300	24.7	70.2
BbC	96.9–500	328	63.4	26.9	ND–2570	889	163	73.1
BghiP	72.4–544	259	96.9	12.9	ND–3000	1,740	89.4	87.1
COR	115–223	171	31.7	86.8	ND–53.6	26.0	103	13.2
Total-PAHs	10,900–16,900	13,300	23.6	54.2	8300–14,500	11,300	27.5	45.8
LM-PAHs	4970–6190	5,630	11.0	76.9	1410–2040	1,690	19.0	23.1
MM-PAHs	478–619	797	54.7	61.3	288–731	503	44.1	38.7
HM-PAHs	4610–10,500	6,900	46.1	43.2	6170–12,600	9,080	35.8	56.8
Total-BaP <sub>eq</sub>	1340–3950	2,600	49.9	37.4	3030–4480	3,910	18.8	62.6

Note: ND: Non-detectable.

plants [10]. The remarkably high total-BaP<sub>eq</sub> concentration emitted from the LII indicated the possible influence on its surrounding environment.

### 3.2. Effluent from the wet electrostatic precipitator

The PAH concentrations of the WESP effluent were measured in both liquid and solid phases (Table 3). The liquid-phase and solid-phase total-PAH concentrations ranged between 10,900 and 16,900 ng L<sup>-1</sup> (average = 13,300 ng L<sup>-1</sup>), and between 8300 and 14,500 ng L<sup>-1</sup> (averaged = 11,300 ng L<sup>-1</sup>), respectively. LM-PAHs and MM-PAHs were mostly dissolved in the liquid phase (76.9 and 61.3%, respectively), whereas HM-PAHs were slightly prone to be adsorbed onto suspended solids (56.8%) (Table 3). Likewise, the total-BaP<sub>eq</sub> concentration was higher in the solid phase (3910 ng L<sup>-1</sup>) than that in the liquid phase (2600 ng L<sup>-1</sup>). Therefore, the carcinogenic potency of the solid phase was 1.67 times higher than that of the liquid phase.

The PAH homologue distributions of the WESP effluent in the liquid phase (LM-PAHs:MM-PAHs:HM-PAHs = 42.3:6.0:51.7%) were significantly different from those in the solid phase (LM-PAHs:MM-PAHs:HM-PAHs = 15.0:4.5:80.5%) (Table 3). Both distributions were significantly different from that in the stack flue gas (LM-PAHs:MM-PAHs:HM-PAHs = 44.8:9.52:45.7%), but all distributions demonstrated

high fraction of HM-PAHs, resulting in high carcinogenic potency in the WESP effluent emitted from the LII.

### 3.3. Effluent from the wet scrubber

In this study, the solid-phase samples of the WSB (equipped after the WESP) effluent were not collected since most particles were already removed by the WESP. As shown in Table 4, the total-PAH concentration of the WSB (liquid-phase) effluent averaged 29,800 ng L<sup>-1</sup> and ranged between 17,200 and 44,600 ng L<sup>-1</sup>. Most PAHs collected in the WSB effluent were HM-PAHs, which averaged 18,600 ng L<sup>-1</sup>, while the mean concentrations of LM-PAHs and MM-PAHs were 9500 and 1710 ng L<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. Similar to the WESP effluent in the liquid phase, the PAH homologue distribution of the WSB effluent show the concentration trend as HM-PAHs > LM-PAHs > MM-PAHs (LM-PAHs:MM-PAHs:HM-PAHs = 31.9:5.7:62.4%). Although most particles were already removed by the WESP, the distribution of HM-PAHs for the WSB effluents in the liquid phase (62.4%) was higher than that for WESP effluents in the liquid phase (51.7%) probably because of the HM-PAH contribution of the dissolved solid. The WSB effluent was more carcinogenic compared with the WESP based on their mean BaP<sub>eq</sub> concentrations (Tables 3 and 4). This result indicated that the WSB effluent needs more efforts to be detoxified before it is discharged.

Table 4

The range, mean, and R.S.D. of the concentrations for 21 individual PAHs, LM-PAHs, MM-PAHs, HM-PAHs and BaP<sub>eq</sub> in the WSB effluent ( $n=9$ )

Compound	Range (ng L <sup>-1</sup> )	Mean (ng L <sup>-1</sup> )	R.S.D. (%)
Nap	3030–3900	3600	14.0
AcPy	968–2150	1650	37.0
Acp	1220–2380	1860	31.7
Flu	1310–1750	1570	14.4
PA	13.0–785	513	84.5
Ant	ND–686	312	111
FL	90.6–111	97.7	11.7
Pyr	116–164	143	17.4
CYC	114–614	381	66.1
BaA	456–559	512	10.2
CHR	121–2270	953	121
BbF	ND	ND	NA
BkF	814–2130	1330	52.5
BeP	901–2320	1460	52.0
BaP	1180–3800	2170	65.6
PER	669–1700	1230	42.3
IND	2470–8980	5280	63.4
DBA	817–11,300	5200	105
BbC	ND–1830	807	116
BghiP	162–1650	670	126
COR	70.6–171	113	45.8
Total-PAHs	17,200–44,600	29,800	46.4
LM-PAHs	3640–11,700	9500	28.0
MM-PAHs	783–3100	1710	72.2
HM-PAHs	9860–29,900	18,600	54.8
Total-BaP <sub>eq</sub>	2390–16,400	8120	90.2

Note: ND: Non-detectable.

### 3.4. Emission factors

Emission factor is a useful tool for estimating the emission of air pollutants, and of great importance in the setting of the national environmental protection regulations. Table 5 shows the PAH emission factors (microgram of PAHs per liter of wastewater) of the WESP, WSB and stack flue gas. The results showed that the total-PAH emission factors of the WESP, WSB and stack flue gas were 78.9, 95.7 and 30,900  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater, respectively, and the overall total-PAH emission factor of the LII was 31,000  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater. On average, the PAH emission factors found in this study were two to five orders of magnitude higher than those reported by Johnson et al. [22] for the LII equipped with baghouse and wet scrubber for incinerating mixed liquid industrial waste (not clearly characterized) (Table 5).

Approximately 35,640 t year<sup>-1</sup> of the wastewater was discharged from the petrochemical industry in this study, and thus approximately 1100 kg of total-PAHs was emitted from the stack in a year. Owing to small fractions of total-PAHs distributed into the effluents of the WESP and WSB, the total-PAH mass emitted from the LII was similar to that emitted from the stack. Applying the same amount of wastewater discharge, a total of 30.2 kg of BaP was emitted from the stack in a year.

The emission factors of the WESP and WSB shared the same trend (HM-PAHs > LM-PAHs > MM-PAHs), while the stack flue gas showed the similar emission factors for HM-PAHs and LM-PAHs, and followed by MM-PAHs. Since the emission

Table 5

The PAH emission factors ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater) of the WESP, WSB and stack flue gas, and overall PAH emission factors of the LII found in this study ( $n=9$ ) and in the literature

Compound	WESP	WSB	Stack flue gas	Overall	Johnson et al. [22]
Nap	8.4	11.6	11,900	11,900	–
AcPy	4.24	5.27	445	455	2.70
Acp	4.86	5.96	442	453	3.60
Flu	3.99	5.02	275	284	6.70
PA	1.07	1.64	635	637	50.2
Ant	0.926	1.00	138	140	5.80
FL	0.26	0.313	376	377	24.8
Pyr	0.49	0.459	2,020	2,020	14.0
CYC	0.885	1.22	122	124	–
BaA	1.66	1.64	205	208	3.00
CHR	1.76	3.05	341	346	5.50
BbF	1.34	ND	254	255	2.50
BkF	0.114	4.28	220	225	–
BeP	2.17	4.67	632	638	1.00
BaP	3.94	6.96	847	858	1.00
PER	2.62	3.96	394	400	0.300
IND	14.2	16.9	4,150	4,180	1.90
DBA	15	16.7	5,640	5,680	0.600
BbC	3.9	2.59	1,010	1,013	–
BghiP	6.42	2.15	817	825	2.10
COR	0.633	0.363	43.6	44.6	1.30
Total-PAHs	78.9	95.7	30,900	31,000	NA
LM-PAHs	23.0	30.0	13,800	13,900	NA
MM-PAHs	4.17	5.46	2,940	2,950	NA
HM-PAHs	51.2	59.7	14,100	14,200	NA
Total-BaP <sub>eq</sub>	20.9	26.0	7,000	7,050	NA

Note: (–), Not available; NA, non-applicable.

factors of the stack flue gas were remarkably large, it was not surprising that the emission factors of the LII followed the same trend as that found for the stack flue gas.

Likewise, the total-BaP<sub>eq</sub> emission factor of the stack flue gas was also much larger (7000  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater) than those of the WESP (20.9  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater) and WSB (26.0  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater), while that of the LII was approximately 7050  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater.

### 3.5. PAH removal efficiencies

In this study, the PAH removal efficiencies of the WESP and WSB were calculated as follows:

$$\eta_{\text{WESP}} = \left[ \frac{\text{ER}_{\text{WESP}}}{\text{ER}_{\text{WESP}} + \text{ER}_{\text{WSB}} + \text{ER}_{\text{ST}}} \right] \times 100\%$$

$$\eta_{\text{WSB}} = \left[ \frac{\text{ER}_{\text{WSB}}}{\text{ER}_{\text{WSB}} + \text{ER}_{\text{ST}}} \right] \times 100\%$$

$$\eta_{\text{O}} = 1 - [(1 - \eta_{\text{WESP}})(1 - \eta_{\text{WSB}})]$$

where  $\eta_{\text{WESP}}$ ,  $\eta_{\text{WSB}}$  and  $\eta_{\text{O}}$  are the PAH removal efficiencies (%) of the WESP, WSB, and overall APCDs, respectively, and  $\text{ER}_{\text{WESP}}$ ,  $\text{ER}_{\text{WSB}}$  and  $\text{ER}_{\text{ST}}$  are the PAH emission rates ( $\text{mg min}^{-1}$ ) from the WESP, WSB and stack flue gas, respectively.

Table 6  
PAH removal efficiencies of the WESP, WSB and overall on 21 individual PAHs, LM-PAHs, MM-PAHs and HM-PAHs

Compound	WESP (%)	WSB (%)	Overall (%)
Nap	0.071	0.097	0.168
AcPy	0.932	1.17	2.091
Acp	1.07	1.33	2.388
Flu	1.41	1.79	3.176
PA	0.167	0.258	0.425
Ant	0.663	0.721	1.379
FL	0.069	0.083	0.152
Pyr	0.024	0.023	0.047
CYC	0.713	0.991	1.697
BaA	0.798	0.794	1.585
CHR	0.507	0.887	1.390
BbF	0.527	0.00	0.527
BkF	0.051	1.90	1.954
BeP	0.341	0.734	1.072
BaP	0.459	0.815	1.270
PER	0.655	0.995	1.643
IND	0.339	0.406	0.743
DBA	0.265	0.295	0.559
BbC	0.385	0.256	0.640
BghiP	0.778	0.262	1.038
COR	1.42	0.825	2.232
Total-PAHs	0.254	0.309	0.563
LM-PAHs	0.170	0.220	0.390
MM-PAHs	0.141	0.185	0.326
HM-PAHs	0.360	0.420	0.778

The removal efficiencies of total-PAHs, LM-PAHs, MM-PAHs and HM-PAHs for the WSB were consistently larger than those for the WESP with the exception of few PAH compounds (i.e., Pyr, BaA, BbF, BbC, BghiP and COR) (Table 6). Lee et al. [11] also found that the WSB had better PAH removal efficiencies over the ESP. It should be highlighted that their PAH removal efficiencies were significantly higher than those in this study, probably owing to the different feedstock type in two studies. Theoretically, the incineration of wastewater generated much smaller particle mass than those of medical wastes [11]. It is therefore expected that the WESP and WSB designed exclusively for particle collection had less possibility to collect high amount of particulate PAHs in this study.

The removal efficiencies of the 21 individual PAHs ranged between 0.024 and 1.42% (0.254% for total-PAHs), between 0 and 1.90% (0.309% for total-PAHs), and between 0.047 and 3.18% (0.563% for total-PAHs) for the WESP, WSB and overall, respectively, suggesting that the use of both WESP and WSB shows insignificant PAH removal efficiencies for the LII, and 99.4% of total-PAHs was directly emitted to the ambient air through the stack flue gas.

#### 4. Conclusions

The use of the LII for incinerating the petrochemical industrial wastewater was found to produce high HM-PAH concentrations and carcinogenic potency. The average total-BaP<sub>eq</sub> concentrations (220  $\mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) was much higher than those for the batch mixer (0.629  $\mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ), preheating boiler

(0.112  $\mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) and discharging chute (0.950  $\mu\text{g Nm}^{-3}$ ) from batch hot mix asphalt plants. The removal efficiencies of total-PAHs were 0.254, 0.309 and 0.563% for the WESP, WSB and overall, respectively. This resulted in the total-BaP<sub>eq</sub> emission factor of the stack flue gas was also much larger (7000  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater) than those of the WESP (20.9  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater) and WSB (26.0  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater), while that of the LII was approximately 7050  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  wastewater. This finding suggested that the better incineration efficiencies (e.g., the destruction of benzene rings), and APCD removal efficiencies for disposing the petrochemical industrial wastewater are necessary in future.

#### References

- [1] C.R. Dempsey, E.T. Oppelt, Incineration of hazardous wastes: a critical review update, *J. Air Waste Manage. Assoc.* 43 (1993) 25–73.
- [2] C.-C. Lee, G.-L. Huffman, Medical waste management/incineration, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 35 (1996) 3495–3501.
- [3] Internal Agency for Research on Cancer, IARC monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, Overall Evaluation of Carcinogenicity: An Updating of Monographs, IARC Monogr. Eval. Carcinog. Risk Chem. Hum., 1987.
- [4] W.H. Griest, B.A. Tomkins, Influence of carbonaceous particles on the interaction of coal combustion stack ash with organic matter, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 20 (1986) 291–295.
- [5] I.W. Davies, R.M. Harrison, R. Perry, D. Ratnayaka, R.A. Wellings, Municipal incinerator as source of polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons in environment, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 10 (1976) 451–453.
- [6] C.-T. Li, W.-J. Lee, H.-H. Mi, C.-C. Su, PAH emission from the incineration of waste oily sludge and PE plastic mixtures, *Sci. Total Environ.* 170 (1995) 171–183.
- [7] H.-H. Yang, W.-J. Lee, S.-J. Chen, S.-O. Lai, PAH emission from various industrial stacks, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 60 (1998) 159–174.
- [8] H.-H. Yang, S.-O. Lai, L.-T. Hsieh, H.-J. Hsueh, T.-W. Chi, Profiles of PAH emission from steel and iron industries, *Chemosphere* 48 (2002) 1061–1074.
- [9] H.-H. Mi, C.-F. Chiang, C.-C. Lai, L.-C. Wang, H.-H. Yang, Comparison of PAH emission from a municipal waste incinerator and mobile sources, *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.* 1 (2001) 83–90.
- [10] W.-J. Lee, W.-H. Chao, M. Shih, C.-H. Tsai, J.-H. Chen, P.-J. Tsai, Emissions of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from batch hot mix asphalt plants, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 38 (2004) 5274–5280.
- [11] W.-J. Lee, M.-C. Liow, P.-J. Tsai, L.-T. Hsieh, Emission of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from medical waste incinerators, *Atmos. Environ.* 36 (2002) 781–790.
- [12] S.-J. Chen, L.-T. Hsieh, S.-C. Chiu, Characteristics of the PAH emissions from the incineration of livestock wastes with/without APCD, *Environ. Int.* 28 (2003) 659–668.
- [13] S.-J. Chen, L.-T. Hsieh, S.-C. Chiu, Emission of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from animal carcass incinerators, *Sci. Total Environ.* 313 (2003) 61–76.
- [14] D.R. Nammari, W. Hogland, M. Marques, S. Nimmermark, V. Moutavchi, Emissions from a controlled fire in municipal solid waste bales, *Waste Manage.* 24 (2004) 9–18.
- [15] A.D. Wheatley, S. Sathra, Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in solid residues from waste incineration, *Chemosphere* 55 (2004) 743–749.
- [16] J. Jauhainen, I. Martin-Gullon, J.A. Conesa, R. Font, Emissions from pyrolysis and combustion of oil solid waste, *Anal. Appl. Pyrol.* 74 (2005) 512–517.
- [17] V. Kakareka, T.I. Kukharchyk, V.S. Khomich, Study of PAH emission from the solid fuels combustion in residential furnaces, *Environ. Pollut.* 133 (2005) 383–387.
- [18] L. Wheatley, Y.A. Leventis, P. Vouros, Exploratory study on the combustion and PAH emissions of selected municipal waste plastics, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 27 (1993) 2885–2895.

- [19] L.-C. Wang, W.-J. Lee, P.-J. Tsai, S.-J. Chen, Potential method for reducing emissions of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from the incineration of biological sludge for the terephthalic acid manufacturing industry, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 36 (2002) 3420–3425.
- [20] C.K. Huynh, T.V. Duc, In-stack dilution technique for the sampling of polycyclic compounds application to effluents of a domestic waste incineration plant, *Atmos. Environ.* 18 (1984) 255–259.
- [21] US EPA, Locating and Estimating Air Emission from Sources of Polycyclic Organic Matter (POM), EPA-454/R-98-014, 1998.
- [22] N.D. Johnson, M.T. Scholtz, V. Cassaday, K. Davidson, MOE Toxic Chemical Emission Inventory for Ontario and Eastern North America, Prepared for the Air Resources Branch, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Rexdale, Ontario, 1990. Draft Report No. P.89-50-5429/OG, p. 151.
- [23] I.C. Nisbet, P.K. LaGoy, Toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), *Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 16 (1992) 290–300.
- [24] P.-J. Tsai, H.-Y. Shieh, L.-T. Hsieh, W.-J. Lee, The fate of PAHs in the carbon black manufacturing process, *Atmos. Environ.* 35 (2001) 3495–3501.
- [25] C.-T. Li, H.-H. Mi, W.-J. Lee, W.-C. You, Y.-F. Wang, PAH emission from the industrial boilers, *J. Hazard. Mater.* A69 (1999) 1–11.
- [26] US EPA, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Evaluation and Estimation Potential Carcinogenic Risk of Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons; Carcinogen Assessment Group, Office of Health and Environmental Assessment. Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC, 1985.
- [27] IFC, International Finance Corporation, Pollution Prevention Abatement Handbook; World Bank Group, Washington, DC, 1998.
- [28] H. Richter, J.B. Howard, Formation of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and their growth to soot—a review of chemical reaction pathways, *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* 26 (2000) 565–608.