Recovery Potential of Bottom Ash from Municipal Solid Waste Incineration

Kameníková, Petra
2015

ERIN, The 9th International Conference for Young Researchers and PhD Students
May 4-6, 2015, Monínec, Czech Republic

RECOVERY POTENTIAL OF BOTTOM ASH FROM MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE INCINERATION

Petra KAMENÍKOVÁ [1], Michal ŠYC [1], Aneta KRAUSOVÁ [2], Michael POHOŘELÝ [1], Boleslav ZACH [1,2], Karel SVOBODA [1], Miroslav PUNČOCHÁŘ [1]

[1] Institute of Chemical Process Fundamentals of the CAS, v. v. i., Environmental Process Engineering Laboratory, Rozvojová 135, 165 02 Praha 6 – Suchdol, Czech Republic

Email: kamenikova@icpf.cas.cz

[2] University of Chemistry and Technology, Prague, Department of Power Engineering, Technická 5, 166 28 Praha 6 – Dejvice, Czech Republic

Bottom ash from municipal solid waste incineration contains valuable components which can be recycled as secondary materials, such as ferrous and non-ferrous metals, some of rare earth elements, glass, etc. Metal-free mineral fraction is reusable in construction industry. Important benefit of bottom ash recycling for the plant operator is also in reduction of fees for solid residuals landfilling. The composition of bottom ash is highly dependent on the composition of incinerated waste but on average can be around 5–13 % ferrous metals, 2–5 % non-ferrous metals, 15–30 % glass and ceramics, 1–5 % unburnt organics and 50–70 % mineral fraction. Many incineration plants in Europe are equipped with advanced systems for metals recovery, mostly based on magnetic separation of ferrous metals and separation of non-ferrous metals usually by eddy-current separators. Some of these systems can recover metal particles even of sizes below 1 mm with overall recovery efficiency higher than 90 %. However, from three big MSWI plants in the Czech Republic only one is equipped with simple non-ferrous metals recovery while the other two only separate large magnetic pieces.

This paper will present the composition of bottom ash determined in samples obtained from MSWI plant in Prague. The samples were first screened into fractions of grain sizes 0–2 mm, 2–4 mm, 4–6 mm, 6–8 mm, 8–10 mm, 10–15 mm, 15–20 mm and >20 mm. Each fraction, with the exception of fines bellow 2 mm, is manually sorted into glass, ceramics, magnetic particles, non-ferrous metals, unburned organics and the residual mineral fraction. It was found that the bottom ash contains in average 15–20 % of glass, 2–4 % of ceramics, 15–20 % of magnetic metals and around 2 % of non-ferrous metals. These results show that the bottom ash from in the Czech Republic is not significantly different from other European countries and has the potential for material recovery.

Keywords: MSWI, bottom ash, material recovery

---

1 INTRODUCTION

Municipal solid waste incineration has in recent years become a leading technology for waste treatment in Europe. Modern MSWI plants can not only use the energy content of waste to produce heat and electricity but can also contribute to recycling of valuable components from solid incineration residues, especially from bottom ash.

Bottom ash has a high potential for recovery of secondary materials, such as ferrous and non-ferrous metals, some of rare earth elements, glass, etc. Metal-free mineral fraction is reusable in construction industry. Important benefit of bottom ash recycling for the plant operator is also in reduction of fees for solid residuals landfilling. The composition of bottom ash corresponds to the composition of incinerated waste which can be significantly variable depending of the locality and season of the year. The average composition reported in literature is around 5–13 % ferrous metals, 2–5 % non-ferrous metals, 15–30 % glass and ceramics, 1–5 % unburnt organics and 50–70 % mineral fraction [1–3].

Current methods of bottom ash treatment used for material recovery are based mostly on dry-mechanical separation technologies. As a standard, MSWI plants are equipped with magnetic separator to recover ferrous scrap. In the simplest version of treatment, magnetic separation is the only step of bottom ash processing and usually is done just after the bottom ash discharge by means of overhead or drum magnets. The efficiency of such separation is limited to large pieces of scrap.

Separation of non-ferrous metals is performed by eddy currents separators (ECS). To achieve sufficient separation efficiency it is necessary to pre-treat the bottom ash. The pre-treatment can include a period of drying followed by sieving into at least two fractions that are then treated separately. Sometimes the coarse fraction is further crushed to release metals contained in ash agglomerates. The separation efficiency of these technologies is around 80 % for ferrous metals and 20–30 % for non-ferrous metals of their total content in bottom ash [4].

Several technologies were introduced to increase the separation efficiency especially oriented towards non-ferrous metals recovery. These technologies use different methods to solve problems caused by fine particles that in wet bottom ash form sticky aggregates and deposits on sieves and separators. Wet separation [1] uses a combination of dry separation and wet physical techniques in water stream. Advanced dry recovery method [5] is able to remove fine particles with the highest water content and treat rest of the bottom ash by conventional methods. Dry bottom ash discharge was developed to enable dry bottom ash treatment through the whole process [6,7]. Separation efficiency can reach over 90 % for both ferrous and non-ferrous metals.

2 EXPERIMENTAL

Samples of bottom ash for analyses presented in this paper were obtained from MSWI plant in Prague (ZEVO Malešice) during summer 2014. Three samples (BAP1–3) are one-day samples of weight of 15–20 kg. Sample BAP4 is a mixed sample from four days of total weight 115 kg. Bottom ash was sampled from a storage bunker before magnetic separation.

Before the analysis the samples were dried under laboratory conditions for 7 days. Dry samples were sieved into 8 fraction with particle sizes <2 mm, 2–4 mm, 4–6 mm, 6–8 mm, 8–10 mm, 10–15 mm, 15–20 mm a >20 mm. Each fraction was then manually sorted according to the material character into following fractions: glass, porcelain and ceramics, magnetic particles, non-ferrous metals, unburned organics and residue. Magnetic and residual fractions were further processed in order to release metal particles sintered into ash aggregates by crushing in a ball mill and manual separation of particles retained on 0.5 mm sieve. This procedure was repeated until no aggregates were retained on the sieve.

3 RESULTS

3.1 PARTICLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION

Particle size distribution plays a decisive role in the possibilities of further utilization of the bottom ash. Metals are with higher efficiency recovered from fractions of larger particles. State-of-the art techniques can recover metal particles from ca. 2 mm size, in special cases even down to 0.5 mm or smaller but this requires a sophisticated tailor-made technology and high investment costs. The particle size distribution of studied samples is shown in Fig. 1. It can be seen that the fraction bellow 2 mm, which is difficult for treatment, represents about 20–35 % of total weight, while the more easily recoverable fractions above 10 mm form only about 20–30 wt.%. It can be also noted that the particle size distribution is greatly heterogeneous even though the samples were collected only several days apart.



Fig. 1a-d: *Particle size distribution of the bottom ash samples BAP1–4*

3.2 BOTTOM ASH COMPOSITION

Composition of bottom ash in the individual size fractions above 2 mm determined by the manual separation is given in Tab. 1–4. The overall composition the samples is summarized in Tab. 5.

In average the samples contain 18–22 wt.% of glass, 2–3.4 wt.% of ceramics, around 2 wt.% of non-ferrous metals and 15–20 wt.% of magnetic particles. Only a small part of magnetic fraction is can be characterized as apparent ferrous scrap, most of the magnetic particles are different types of alloys that will be further studied on the basis of elemental composition.

The composition of individual particle size fractions shows some trends that are similar for all of the samples, although in general there is a significant variability. Glass prevails in the fractions 6–20 mm with the share mostly between 30 and 40 %. Ceramics is in significant amounts present only in fractions above 15 mm but can form up to 20 % of these fractions. The content of magnetic particles is very variable with a significant amount found in the fraction 2–4 mm where most of the particles are mix of ferrous alloys. Ferrous scrap is in higher amounts present in fractions above 10 mm. Non-ferrous metals are in most cases evenly distributed between the fractions with the share between 2–3 %. Most of these metals are represented by aluminium (70–90 %), followed by copper and different types of alloys.

Tab. 1: *Composition of bottom ash sample BAP1 according to particle size fractions (in wt.%)*

Fraction (mm)	2–4	4–6	6–8	8–10	10–15	15–20	> 20
Glass	16.9	12.1	25.6	35.7	32.6	28.1	9.2
Ceramics	< 0.1	0.3	1.0	1.7	4.7	14.6	15.8
Unburned organics	2.5	2.0	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.0	0.8
Magnetic fraction	45.3	7.0	18.6	12.2	15.2	9.0	15.5
of which Fe scrap	0.3	0.6	0.5	1.3	1.6	0.6	5.4
Non-ferrous metals	2.1	2.7	2.5	2.2	2.7	3.1	1.2
Residue	33.2	76.0	50.7	46.8	43.5	44.3	57.4

Tab. 2: *Composition of bottom ash sample BAP2 according to particle size fractions (in wt.%)*

Fraction (mm)	2–4	4–6	6–8	8–10	10–15	15–20	> 20
Glass	15.3	15.3	31.2	39.6	40.7	40.8	10.4
Ceramics	0.1	0.1	0.5	2.5	3.6	8.6	13.7
Unburned organics	2.6	2.0	1.5	0.9	1.1	0.7	0.7
Magnetic fraction	44.2	22.8	17.8	14.0	13.6	15.6	22.9
of which Fe scrap	0.4	1.7	1.5	2.4	2.1	2.7	4.9
Non-ferrous metals	2.1	3.2	2.7	3.1	3.3	3.1	1.1
Residue	35.8	56.5	46.4	39.9	37.7	31.4	51.2

Tab. 3: *Composition of bottom ash sample BAP3 according to particle size fractions (in wt.%)*

Fraction (mm)	2–4	4–6	6–8	8–10	10–15	15–20	> 20
Glass	14.3	25.4	36.4	41.3	42.5	37.3	9.5
Ceramics	< 0.1	0.3	1.2	1.9	4.1	18.1	16.7
Unburned organics	2.8	1.4	1.0	0.7	1.3	0.8	0.9
Magnetic fraction	52.0	22.0	14.5	14.0	18.8	18.2	39.8
of which Fe scrap	1.0	1.6	2.1	1.2	4.6	6.8	24.0
Non-ferrous metals	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.6	2.5	1.5	2.6
Residue	28.1	47.8	43.8	38.5	30.8	24.1	30.5

Tab. 4: *Composition of bottom ash sample BAP4 according to particle size fractions (in wt.%)*

Fraction (mm)	2–4	4–6	6–8	8–10	10–15	15–20	> 20
Glass	16.7	21.6	32.5	33.9	33.7	28.1	3.7
Ceramics	0.2	0.1	0.6	1.5	3.6	10.0	10.7
Unburned organics	2.6	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.0
Magnetic fraction	45.2	25.5	23.0	19.3	22.7	24.2	24.1
of which Fe scrap	0.8	1.3	2.3	2.8	6.2	4.4	1.0
Non-ferrous metals	2.2	2.9	2.9	3.2	3.2	1.6	3.4
Residue	33.1	48.3	39.5	40.6	35.5	34.7	57.1

Tab. 5: *Total composition of bottom ash samples (in wt.%)*

	BAP1	BAP2	BAP3	BAP4
Glass	18	22	20	15
Ceramics	2.7	3.3	3.4	2.0
Unburned organics	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.1
Magnetic fraction	15	18	19	19
of which Fe scrap	0.8	1.8	3.9	1.5
Non-ferrous metals	1.9	2.1	1.9	1.8
Fraction < 2 mm	22	20	30	34
Residue	39	35	24	27

4 CONCLUSION

Pilot analysis of four bottom ash samples from MSWI plant in Prague showed that the average composition of bottom ash is 18–22 wt.% of glass, 2–3.4 wt.% of ceramics, around 2 wt.% of non-ferrous metals, 15–20 wt.% of magnetic particles and 30–50 wt.% of the residual fraction formed by ash and minerals. This composition is within the range reported from various MSWI plants in Europe; thus, it is believed that the separation technologies used in some European countries to recover valuable components from bottom ash can be applicable and profitable also in the conditions of the Czech Republic. In the next phase of the project more samples will be analysed to study the seasonal variability of the bottom ash composition and also the variability between different MSWI plants in the Czech Republic. Detailed composition of the fractions of ferrous and non-ferrous metals will be further studied with the prospect of possible recovery techniques.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was conducted within Waste to Energy Competence Centre funded by the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic (project TE02000236). Authors would like to thank Ing. Tomáš Baloch from Pražské služby, a.s., for kindly providing the bottom ash samples.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Muchová: Wet Physical Separation of MSWI Bottom Ash, PhD Thesis, TU Delft (2010).

[2] J. Chimenos , M. Segarra, M. Fernández, F. Espiell: Characterization of the bottom ash in municipal solid waste incinerator, Journal of Hazardous Materials 64 (1999), 211-222.

[3] S.P.M. Berkhout, B.P.M. Oudenhoven, P.C. Rem: Optimizing Non-Ferrous Metal Value from MSWI Bottom Ashes, Journal of Environmental Protection 02 (2011), 564-570.

[4] R. Koralewska: Waste-to-Energy as part of urban mining – Recovery of metals from bottom ash. 8th ISWA Beacon Conference on Waste-to-Energy, Malmö, Sweden, 27-28 November 2013.

[5] Inashco Presentation. [Online]. Available: http://www.aebamsterdam.nl/media/1323/04-presentatie-bodemas.pdf. [Accessed 16.12. 2014].

[6] ZAR. [Online]. Available: http://zar-ch.ch/en/home/competencesprojects/dry-discharge. [Accessed 11.4. 2014].

[7] Martin Dry Discharge. [Online]. Available:http://www.martingmbh.de/en/dry-discharge-system.html. [Accessed 11.4. 2014].