Heterogeneous Oxidation of Elemental Mercury Vapor over RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ Catalyst for Mercury Emissions Control

Zhouyang Liu^a, Vishnu Sriram^a, Joo-Youp Lee^{a,}*

^a Chemical Engineering Program, Department of Biomedical, Chemical, and Environmental Engineering, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0012, United States

* Corresponding author. Tel: 01-513-556-0018; Fax: 01-413-556-0018.
E-mail addresses: joo.lee@uc.edu (J.-Y. Lee); liuzy@mail.uc.edu (Z. Liu); sriramvu@mail.uc.edu (V. Sriram)

Abstract

The catalytic oxidation of elemental mercury (Hg(0)) vapor is an effective way to enhance mercury removal from coal-fired power plants. RuO₂ catalyst was found to be an excellent Hg(0) oxidation catalyst. When rutile TiO₂ was used as the catalyst support, RuO₂ formed well dispersed nano-layers due to the very similar crystal structures of RuO₂ and rutile TiO₂, giving higher Hg(0) oxidation activity over anatase TiO₂ support. The RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst can be used at the tail end section of the selective catalytic reduction (SCR) unit for Hg(0) oxidation. It showed good Hg(0) oxidation performance under sub-bituminous and lignite coal simulated flue gas conditions with low concentration of HCl or HBr gas. The RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst also showed excellent resistance to SO₂ under bituminous coal simulated flue gas, maintaining higher than 90% Hg(0) oxidation with up to 2,000 ppmv SO₂ present. The oxidized mercury in a form of HgCl₂ has a high solubility in water and can be easily captured by other air pollution control systems such as wet scrubbers in coal-fired power plants.

Keywords:

Mercury oxidation, ruthenium oxide, rutile titanium dioxide, coal-fired power plants, flue gas

1. Introduction

Coal naturally contains small amounts of mercury (around 0.1~0.2 ppm by weight) and they will be released into the flue gas after the combustion.[1, 2] It is estimated that around 53 tons of mercury are emitted from coal-fired power plants each year in the United States, accounting for around 50% of emissions from all anthropogenic mercury sources.[3] Mercury has long been recognized as a highly toxic and persistent pollutant. The 1990 Amendments to the Clean Air Act listed mercury as one of the most toxic pollutants among 188 hazardous air pollutants. In 2012, the U.S. EPA finalized the air toxics standards for coal- and oil-fired electric generating units also known as the Mercury Air Toxics Standards (MATS).[4] Prior to the MATS rule in 2011, EPA finalized the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR), replacing the EPA's earlier Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) from 2005.[5] CSAPR further reduces NO_x and SO₂ emissions from power plants in 28 states, and as a result, additional installations of flue gas desulfurization (FGD) and NO_x control systems such as a selective catalytic reduction (SCR) unit are expected.

After combustion, mercury is released and exists in three forms in coal-fired power plants flue gas: oxidized mercury (Hg(2+)), particulate mercury (Hg(p)), and elementary mercury (Hg(0)). The first two forms are readily removed with existing air pollution control systems such as fabric filter (FF), electrostatic precipitators (ESP), and wet FGD.[6-8] Hg(0) is most difficult to remove due to its high volatility, low reactivity and low solubility. Currently, sorbent injection (raw or modified activated carbon), halogen salt (e.g. CaBr₂) addition to the boiler and SCR optimization are commercially available mercury emissions control technologies.[9] Because of the vastly different coal properties and power plant configurations, there is no universal mercury control solution that fits all scenarios, and combinations of control methods

are often needed. Activated carbon injection is the most well-studied and mature technology, but the cost is high. The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that the costs for sorbent injection to achieve 90 percent removal are estimated to be between \$25,000 and \$70,000 per pound of mercury removed.[10] Also, activated carbon sorption capacity is significantly reduced under high sulfur coal conditions.[11] Due to the increasing number of FGD units resulted from recent EPA rules, oxidizing elemental mercury using SCR or other catalysts, followed by oxidized mercury capture in wet FGD is a viable option. Noble metal-based catalysts such as gold, platinum and palladium have been studied as Hg(0) oxidation catalysts.[12, 13] Various metal oxide-based Hg(0) oxidation catalysts, SCR and modified SCR catalysts have also been studied for Hg(0) oxidation.[14-22] Due to the oxygen storing and releasing property of CeO₂, its application in Hg(0) oxidation and adsorption in flue gas has been studied in recent years. Nanostructured CeO₂-MnO_x catalyst and CeO₂-based solid solutions showed good Hg(0) removal performance from increased oxygen vacancies and catalytic activity.[23, 24] CeO₂-TiO₂ and CeO₂ modified MnO_x-TiO₂ were reported to have Hg(0) adsorption capability.[25, 26] CeO₂ was also reported to have a promotional effect for Hg(0) oxidation in a modified SCR catalyst.[27] But, most of them only showed limited Hg(0) oxidation performances at low HCl concentrations of typical flue gases from lignite and sub-bituminous coals. Also, these catalysts are susceptible to SO₂ and NH₃ inhibition and showed degraded performances under high sulfur bituminous coal flue gas conditions (e.g., 2,000 ppmv SO₂). For low rank sub-bituminous and lignite coals with low chlorine (typically with HCl <10 ppmv in the flue gas), additional halogen is usually needed to achieve satisfactory Hg(0) oxidation. Currently, halogen salts such as CaCl₂ or CaBr₂ injection to the boiler to enhance Hg(0) oxidation is one of the most widely used methods.[28] In the absence of any catalyst (either SCR or Hg(0) oxidation catalyst), high

injection rate of the halogen salts is required, and it was reported to cause corrosion problems especially in the air-preheater.[29, 30] A combination of halogen salts addition and Hg(0) oxidation catalysts could be an economical and feasible solution.[31]

Recently, RuO₂-based catalysts were developed for the Deacon reaction for the oxidation of HCl by O₂ to produce Cl₂. [32, 33] It was also found that many Deacon reaction catalysts can also catalyze the Hg(0) oxidation reaction by utilizing HCl gas.[17] In our previous study, oxidized mercury species obtained from the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst were analyzed using X-ray Absorption Near-Edge Structure (XANES) spectroscopy.[34] A major focus of the study was to identify and quantify the oxidized mercury species generated as a result of the reaction of Hg(0) vapor over the catalyst under different simulated flue gas conditions. In the presence of HCl or HBr gas with O₂ gas, HgCl₂ or HgBr₂ was found to be a major oxidized mercury species. HgCl₂ and HgBr₂ have high solubility in water, and can be easily scrubbed by wet FGD scrubbers in coal-fired power plants. In this study, the performances of the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst were investigated in terms of different TiO₂ phases, synthesis methods and gas and temperature conditions.

2. Experimental

2.1 Catalyst synthesis

RuO₂/TiO₂ catalysts were synthesized using RuCl₃ (Sigma-Aldrich) as the precursor. Commercial anatase- and rutile-phase TiO₂ were obtained from Cristal Co. and Sakai Chemical, respectively. Three synthesis methods were used for RuO₂/TiO₂ catalysts, and the procedures are summarized below.

Wetness incipient (WI) method: RuCl_3 was dissolved in a small amount of water (around 0.9 mL per gram of TiO_2) and the solution was added to dry TiO_2 powder. After thorough mixing, the catalyst was dried at room temperature for 12 hours and calcined at 400 °C in air for 3 hours.

Deposition-precipitation (DP) method: TiO_2 powder was added to water (25 mL water per gram of TiO_2 powder) under vigorous stirring. Then RuCl_3 was added and the slurry was heated to 45 °C. A 1 M Na_2CO_3 solution was added dropwise until $\text{pH} > 10$ to precipitate all RuCl_3 . [35, 36] The catalyst was then filtered, washed thoroughly, dried at room temperature for 12 hours and calcined at 400 °C in air for 3 hours.

Strong electrostatic adsorption (SEA) method: TiO_2 powder was added to water (25 mL water per gram of TiO_2 powder) under vigorous stirring and an ammonium hydroxide solution was added until pH reached 11.5. RuCl_3 was then added and stirred for 3 hours. [37] This method utilizes electrostatic charges for adsorption of active metals onto substrate. The point of zero charge (PZC) for TiO_2 in the aqueous phase is around 6. When the pH of a solution is greater than that the PZC (i.e. ~ 6), TiO_2 surface is negatively charged. $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$ formed from RuCl_3 and ammonium hydroxide is positively charged and adsorbs onto the TiO_2 surface. The catalyst was then filtered, washed thoroughly, dried at room temperature for 12 hours and calcined at 400 °C in air for 3 hours.

SCR catalyst with 1 wt.% V_2O_5 loading was synthesized by following a procedure below: 12 g of anatase TiO_2 powder (DT-58, Cristal, containing 9.1 wt.% tungsten and 10.5 wt.% silica), 0.3 g of methylcellulose (Sigma-Aldrich) and 0.24 g of glass fiber (Fibre Glast) were dry mixed for 10 minutes. 0.138 g of NH_4VO_3 (Sigma-Aldrich) dissolved in 11 mL of 1 M oxalic acid (Sigma-Aldrich) was added to the above powders and the dough was kneaded for 10 minutes for

uniform mixing. All the catalysts were extruded into 1 mm (diameter) $\times$ 5 mm (length) cylindrical pellets, and were dried in air at room temperature, followed by calcination at 500 °C in air for 3 hours.

2.2 Characterization

The BET surface area, pore volume and pore diameter were measured by an accelerated surface area and porosimetry system (ASAP 2020, Micromeritics). The high-resolution transmission electron microscopy (HR-TEM) experiments were conducted using JEOL 2010F equipped with a field emission gun operating at 200 keV with a point-to-point resolution of 0.19 nm. Energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy was conducted using the same instrument with an Oxford INCA EDX detector. The X-ray diffraction (XRD) measurement was carried out with an X'Pert Pro MPD X-ray diffractometer under Cu K α radiation (wavelength=1.5406 Å). The powdered samples were loaded in an aluminum holder with a depth of 1 mm. The scanning range was from 10 to 60° (2 θ) with a step size of 0.02° and a time step of 0.5 s. Ruthenium K edge (22,117 eV) X-ray absorption fine structure (XAFS) spectra were collected using the 9-BM-B beamline (Sector 9) at the Advanced Photon Source (APS) at Argonne National Laboratory (ANL, Chicago, IL). A Si (111) monochromator was used, with energy resolution ($\Delta E/E$) of approximately 1.4×10^{-4} . Energy calibration was monitored by measuring the absorption through a reference ruthenium foil simultaneously with the absorption through the samples. Samples were loaded onto Teflon holder between two layers of Kapton tapes and measured in transmission mode. A RuO₂ standard was obtained from Sigma-Aldrich. A spent RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst sample treated after 48 hours of Hg(0) oxidation under a simulated flue gas (containing 15 ppbv Hg(0), 10 ppmv HCl, 5 ppmv NH₃, 5 ppmv NO, 200 ppmv SO₂, 3%(v) O₂, 10%(v) H₂O, 12%(v) CO₂ balanced with N₂) at 350 °C was also examined for XRD and

XAFS analyses. At least five scans were collected for each sample in order to improve the signal-to-noise ratio. XAFS data collected were analyzed using the Athena software package.[38]

2.3 Performance tests

The performances of RuO₂/TiO₂ catalysts were tested using a fixed-bed reactor system. A schematic of the apparatus is shown in Figure 1. Elemental mercury (Hg(0)) vapor was generated using a permeation oven (Dynacalibrator, VICI Metronics) using N₂ as a carrier gas and the inlet Hg(0) vapor concentration was 10-15 ppbv. Water vapor was generated using a bubbler. All the other simulated flue gas components were prepared from compressed gas cylinders (Wright Brothers, Inc.) and the concentrations were controlled by mass flow controllers. The catalysts with ruthenium metal loading of 0.2-1 wt.% (in terms of Ru) were used for the performance tests. The catalysts in the form of extruded pellets (1 mm × 5 mm (D × L)) were placed inside a vertically mounted quartz reactor with a diameter of 16 mm and the temperature was maintained at 350 °C in a tubular furnace. For performance tests under simulated flue gas conditions, 1.7 grams of catalysts were used and the catalyst bed height was around 15 mm. The temperature was chosen to approximate the temperature at the tail end of the SCR unit at coal-fired power plants. The total flow rate of the simulated flue gas was 1 L/min with a gas hourly space velocity 40,000 h⁻¹ (about 10 times higher than typical commercial SCR units). It was confirmed that Hg(0) oxidation under the simulated flue gas conditions was negligible in the absence of the catalysts. Each performance test was conducted for 6 to 24 hours after making sure that the system was stabilized. The Hg(0) oxidation efficiency and oxidation rate were calculated by measuring the concentrations across the reactor bed using the following equations (1) and (2):

$$Hg(0) \text{ oxidation efficiency} = \frac{Hg(0)_{in} - Hg(0)_{out}}{Hg(0)_{in}} \times 100\% \quad (1)$$

$$Hg(0) \text{ oxidation rate} = \frac{Hg(0)_{in} - Hg(0)_{out}}{time} \quad (2)$$

SO₃ generated from the catalyst under a simulated flue gas containing high SO₂ concentration was measured using U.S. EPA Method 8.[39] Two impinger solutions containing 80%(v) isopropanol in water and 3%(v) H₂O₂ in water in series were used to capture SO₃ and SO₂, respectively. Then both fractions were measured separately by the barium-thorin titration method.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Catalysts characterization

3.1.1 TEM

In this study, two types of TiO₂ support (anatase and rutile) and three synthesis methods (WI, DP, SEA) were used. The TEM images of these RuO₂/TiO₂ catalysts with 1%(wt) Ru loading were taken to obtain the information on the morphology of the metal oxides. When anatase TiO₂ was used, RuO₂ formed large aggregates ranging from 50 to 100 nm for all three synthesis methods as shown in Figure 2-b, 2-c and 2-d. RuO₂ particles were much bigger than anatase TiO₂ particles and the metal dispersion was poor. EDX indicated that RuO₂ mainly existed as large aggregates and there was only a very small amount present on the anatase TiO₂ surface. The morphology of RuO₂ changed significantly when rutile TiO₂ was used as a support. Under low resolution TEM, no RuO₂ particle could be found from all the three different synthesis methods. However, EDX proved that RuO₂ was present on the surface. Figure 2-e and 2-f are rutile TiO₂ and RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ (prepared by WI) samples, respectively. The lighter spots on the TiO₂ surface are holes and pores. In order to confirm the morphology of RuO₂, the catalysts were also examined by high resolution TEM. Rutile TiO₂ itself had clean surfaces

(Figure 2-g). After doping with ruthenium, it was found that RuO_2 formed a thin uniform coating on rutile TiO_2 surface with a thickness of 1~2 nm as shown in Figure 2-h. No noticeable difference on RuO_2 morphology was observed among the three different synthesis methods.

For RuO_2 as a Deacon catalyst, Seki also reported the formation of a nano-sized layer of RuO_2 crystals on rutile TiO_2 . [32] Xiang et al. observed the transformation from RuO_2 particles to epitaxial layer during Deacon reaction. [40] Both RuO_2 and rutile TiO_2 have the same body-centered tetragonal structure with very similar lattice constants: RuO_2 with $a=b=0.46$ nm, $c=0.30$ nm and rutile TiO_2 with $a=b=0.45$ nm, $c=0.31$ nm. This similarity makes it easier for RuO_2 to deposit onto rutile TiO_2 surface and to form highly dispersed nano-layers. [40, 41] These results suggest that lattice matching between RuO_2 and rutile TiO_2 be a stronger driving force for the dispersion of RuO_2 than the effects of different catalyst synthesis methods.

3.1.2 BET

The BET surface area, pore volume and average pore diameter of $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2\text{-WI}$ catalysts with different metal loadings and synthesized SCR catalyst were measured and listed in Table 1. The BET surface area, pore volume and average pore diameter decreased from 72 to 64 m^2/g , 0.38 to 0.28 cm^3/g and 202 to 186 Å, respectively, as the ruthenium loading increased to 1 wt.%. The impregnation of ruthenium onto rutile TiO_2 did not significantly decrease surface area or block the pores. For the synthesized SCR catalyst, the anatase TiO_2 support had a higher BET surface area than rutile TiO_2 , and the values measured were within a range of typical commercial SCR catalysts. [42-45]

3.1.3 XRD

Both $\text{RuO}_2/\text{anatase TiO}_2\text{-WI}$ and $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2\text{-WI}$ catalysts were examined by XRD and the patterns are shown in Figure 3. Other synthesis methods (DP and SEA) showed the same

results as the WI method. The RuO₂/anatase TiO₂ catalyst showed two additional RuO₂ peaks at $2\theta=28.0^\circ$ and 35.1° compared to pristine anatase TiO₂. However, when rutile TiO₂ was used as a support, no RuO₂ could be detected. This result was consistent with the information obtained from the TEM results. On anatase TiO₂, the RuO₂ crystal formation could be easily detected by XRD, while the nano-layers of RuO₂ were formed on rutile TiO₂. For nano-structures, the local atom arrangements lack long-range 3-D periodicity that typical crystals have, making XRD nonideal for analyzing nanomaterials.[46] Therefore, an alternative characterization technique was needed to identify the ruthenium species on rutile TiO₂.

3.1.4 XAFS

XAFS can give structural information of materials not affected by the state or morphology of the sample. Since XRD was unable to detect the RuO₂ nano-layers formed on rutile TiO₂, XAFS was used to confirm the speciation of ruthenium. RuO₂ catalysts supported on rutile TiO₂ were used for the analysis. Ruthenium K edge (22,117 eV) XAFS spectra for the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst were collected. Since XAFS is an element-specific characterization technique, TiO₂ in the catalyst does not interfere with the ruthenium measurement. The Fourier transformed spectra $\chi(R)$ are shown in Figure 4. RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalysts with different synthesis methods showed the same result and only the result obtained from WI is shown here. Compared with a RuO₂ standard, a fresh RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst showed the same structure. The first major peak at around 1.5 Å is from a ruthenium atom and the neighboring oxygen atoms, and the second major peak at around 3.1 Å is from a center ruthenium atom and the neighboring ruthenium atoms. The spectra are similar to those reported in other studies.[47, 48] The spectrum of the spent catalyst did not show any change, indicating that RuO₂ was structurally stable under the simulated flue gas conditions.

3.2 Hg(0) oxidation performances

3.2.1 Effects of TiO₂ support and metal loading

The above catalyst characterization results showed major differences in morphology and dispersion of RuO₂ on anatase and rutile TiO₂ supports. Therefore, Hg(0) oxidation performances of 1 wt.% RuO₂ catalysts with different TiO₂ supports and synthesis methods were evaluated and the results are shown in Figure 5. Although the surface area of rutile TiO₂ is slightly lower than anatase TiO₂ under the same conditions, the Hg(0) oxidation performances of RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalysts were around 70% higher than those of RuO₂/anatase TiO₂ catalysts on average. When RuO₂ was used as a Deacon catalyst for HCl oxidation, higher catalytic activity of RuO₂ was reported over rutile TiO₂.^[32] However, it is important to note that the different synthesis methods did not result in significant performance differences. These results are consistent with TEM images. The higher dispersion of RuO₂ over rutile TiO₂ due to lattice matching of these two very similar structures very likely leads to higher catalytic activity. Therefore, rutile TiO₂ was chosen as a preferred substrate in this study, and WI was also selected as a preferred synthesis method because of its simplicity.

As a precious metal, a ruthenium loading on catalyst support should be optimized for the maximum utilization of the active metal. Therefore, the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst with different ruthenium loadings (0.2, 0.5 and 1 wt.%) were compared (Figure 6). In terms of the reaction rate of Hg(0) oxidized per mole of ruthenium used (i.e. turnover frequency), 0.5 wt.% Ru loading gave the highest ruthenium utilization efficiency. The determination of RuO₂ on TiO₂ support using a chemisorption method has an inherent difficulty. It is well reported in the literature that the reduced form of RuO₂ (i.e. Ru) becomes mobile and agglomerates on the TiO₂ surface during the reduction step in chemisorption. This phenomena was reported by Komaya *et al.*, and the

attempts to eliminate the agglomeration by using different reduction conditions were not successful.[49] In this study, the determination of RuO₂ dispersion over rutile the TiO₂ phase was also attempted, but was not successful. Therefore, mass was used as a basis for the Ru loading instead of dispersion.

3.2.2 Effects of temperature

When RuO₂ was used as a Deacon catalyst, the activity was reported to be highest at around 400 °C.[41] This RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ Hg(0) oxidation catalyst can be located between the economizer and air preheater at coal-fired power plants. For power plants with a SCR unit, the catalyst can be located inside the SCR unit, or it can be a stand-alone unit before or after the SCR unit. 300~400 °C is an optimal temperature window for typical SCR catalysts when the boilers are at a full load.[50] The RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ Hg(0) oxidation catalyst can also utilize the same temperature window. The Hg(0) oxidation performances of RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst at temperatures between 300 and 400 °C were evaluated as shown in Figure 7. The results indicated that RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst prefers higher temperature within the temperature window for Hg(0) oxidation.

3.2.3 Hg(0) oxidation under simulated flue gases

For coal-fired power plants with SCR units for NO_x removal, NH₃ as a reductant is injected into the front end of the SCR units. As the de-NO_x reaction proceeds, NH₃ concentration decreases along the SCR unit, and an NH₃ slip at the tail end is usually controlled at < 2 ppmv for commercial SCR catalysts.[51] The effect of NH₃ gas on Hg(0) oxidation is shown in Figure 8. NH₃ has a strong inhibition effect on Hg(0) oxidation over RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst. The catalyst lost almost all its Hg(0) oxidation capability when NH₃ concentration was increased to 50 ppmv. When the 50 ppmv NH₃ was lowered back to 5 ppmv, Hg(0) oxidation

was fully recovered. This corroborates that the adverse effect of NH_3 is most likely derived from competitive adsorption with HCl onto active catalytic sites and not catalyst poisoning. Due to this limitation, the $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2$ catalyst is not suitable for being located at the front end of a SCR unit. Installing at the tail end of a SCR unit, after the SCR unit, or for power plants without the SCR unit are possible options.

A SO_2 concentration in a coal combustion flue gas greatly varies in terms of different types of coals with different sulfur contents. Generally, lignite and sub-bituminous coals have low SO_2 (a few hundred ppmv in the flue gases) while bituminous coal has high SO_2 (up to ~2,000 ppmv in the flue gas). The $\text{Hg}(0)$ oxidation performances under different SO_2 concentrations are shown in Figure 9. It should be noted that these tests were carried out with only 10 ppmv HCl just to demonstrate the effect of SO_2 under extreme conditions. For bituminous coal flue gas with high SO_2 concentration, the HCl concentration is also much higher (e.g., ~50-200 ppmv). Under such high HCl concentrations, the resistance of $\text{Hg}(0)$ oxidation to SO_2 is much lower as reported in our previous study.[34] In general, the $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2$ catalyst has higher resistance to SO_2 compared with other metal oxides-based catalysts such as MnO_2 and CeO_2 . [52, 53] The $\text{Hg}(0)$ oxidation performance was recovered when SO_2 was lowered back to 200 ppmv, also indicating the competitive adsorption of SO_2 with HCl . XRD analysis for the spent catalyst can be used to identify possible sulfates formation.[54] As shown in Figure 10, the XRD diffraction pattern was consistent with that for the fresh $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2$ catalyst (Figure 3), and the peaks for sulfate species were not observed. The XAFS analysis for the spent $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2$ catalyst (Figure 4) did not detect a formation of any potential bonding between ruthenium and sulfur. These results indicated that the catalyst was not poisoned by SO_2

during the reaction. Other flue gas components such as CO₂, water vapor, and NO did not show any noticeable effect on Hg(0) oxidation over RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst.

The Hg(0) oxidation performances of RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst under simulated flue gas of sub-bituminous or lignite coal at the tail end of a SCR unit can be found in our previous paper.[34] The RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst showed better Hg(0) oxidation performances than the SCR catalyst under all HCl concentrations. With only 10 ppmv HCl, the oxidation was > 85%, and > 90% could be achieved at 25 ppmv HCl under a typical simulated flue gas condition of low rank coal. For the scenario of bromine addition, HBr is at least 10 times more effective than HCl and > 90% Hg(0) oxidation performance could be achieved with < 1 ppmv HBr. Again, the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst performed better than the SCR catalyst under all HBr concentrations.

Bituminous coal usually has high sulfur and chlorine contents with typical concentrations of ~1,000-2,000 ppmv SO₂ and ~50-200 ppmv HCl. Such high SO₂ concentrations usually significantly decrease the Hg(0) oxidation performances of most metal oxide-based catalysts.[53, 55, 56] The performance of the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst with a simulated flue gas containing 2,000 ppmv SO₂ is shown in Figure 11. Although the Hg(0) oxidation performance at low HCl concentrations (e.g. < 10 ppmv) decreased, > 90% Hg(0) oxidation performances were obtained at a typical HCl concentration range (e.g. > 50 ppmv) of bituminous coal. Overall, the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst has excellent Hg(0) oxidation performance and superior resistance to high SO₂. One drawback of typical vanadium-based SCR catalysts is that V₂O₅ can also oxidize SO₂ to SO₃. The SO₃/H₂SO₄ emissions can cause corrosion problems and plume opacity especially when high sulfur coals are used. Therefore, the vanadium loading on SCR catalysts is limited by SO₃ generation and typical commercial SCR catalysts try to keep the SO₂ conversion below 1%.[50] The conversion was measured for the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst under the above

simulated flue gas containing 2,000 ppmv SO₂. It was found that only 0.17% of the SO₂ was oxidized to SO₃, demonstrating another advantage of the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst under high sulfur conditions.

In our previous study, oxidized mercury species obtained from the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst were analyzed using XAFS.[34] In the presence of HCl or HBr gas, HgCl₂ or HgBr₂ was found to be the major oxidized mercury species. HgCl₂ and HgBr₂ have high solubility in water, and can be easily scrubbed by wet FGD scrubbers in coal-fired power plants.

4. Conclusions

In this study, the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst for Hg(0) vapor oxidation was systematically studied in terms of different TiO₂ phases and synthesis methods for the first time. A combination of the two structurally similar components of RuO₂ as the active component and rutile TiO₂ as the support resulted in excellent RuO₂ dispersion over the rutile TiO₂ phase as opposed to anatase TiO₂ and thus high catalytic activity. The RuO₂ catalyst supported on rutile TiO₂ showed much higher Hg(0) oxidation activity than that on anatase TiO₂. Among 0.2, 0.5, and 1 wt.% Ru loadings, 0.5 wt.% Ru loading onto rutile TiO₂ gave the highest turnover frequency for Hg(0) oxidation. Different synthesis methods (WI, DP and SEA) did not show noticeable differences in the morphology or the activity of the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst. The RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst performed well in a typical SCR temperature window of 350-400 °C and preferred higher temperature. NH₃ and SO₂ gases had negative effects on Hg(0) oxidation performances due to competitive adsorption with HCl. Between the two gases, the RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ catalyst was more prone to NH₃. However, the catalyst showed very good Hg(0) oxidation performances under typical simulated flue gas conditions of sub-bituminous and lignite coals

with low concentrations of HCl or HBr. It also showed excellent resistance to SO₂ in comparison with a SCR catalyst under typical simulated flue gas conditions of high sulfur bituminous coal with up to 2,000 ppmv SO₂. It has potential for Hg(0) oxidation at the tail end section of the SCR unit in coal-fired power plants especially for high sulfur conditions where the catalytic activities of most metal oxide- or noble metal-based catalysts are significantly inhibited.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the National Science Foundation, NSF CAREER Grant # 1151017, and Ohio Development Service Agency, Grant Agreement # OER-CDO-D-14-21. The authors greatly appreciate their financial support. Sector 9 facilities at the Advanced Photon Source of the Argonne National Laboratory, and research at these facilities, are supported by the U.S. Department of Energy - Basic Energy Sciences, the Canadian Light Source and its funding partners, and the Advanced Photon Source.

References

- [1] L.J. Bragg, Oman, J.K., Tewalt, S.J., Oman, C.J., Rega, N.H., Washington, P.M., Finkelman, R.B., Analytical data, sample locations, and descriptive information, analytical methods and sampling techniques, database perspective, and bibliographic references for selected U.S. coal samples: U.S. Geological Survey Open-file Report 97-134, CD-ROM., 1997.
- [2] B. Toole-O'Neil, S.J. Tewalt, R.B. Finkelman, D.J. Akers, Mercury concentration in coal—unraveling the puzzle, *Fuel*, 78 (1999) 47-54.
- [3] US EPA. <https://www.epa.gov/mats/cleaner-power-plants#controls> (accessed Sep 7th, 2016).

- [4] National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units. 40 CFR Parts 60 and 63. Federal Register 77:32 (Feb 16, 2012) p. 24976.
- [5] Federal Implementation Plans To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone. 40 CFR Parts 51, 52, 72, 78, and 97. Federal Register 76 FR 48208, August 8, 2011.
- [6] C.L. Senior, S.A. Johnson, Impact of Carbon-in-Ash on Mercury Removal across Particulate Control Devices in Coal-Fired Power Plants, *Energy & Fuels*, 19 (2005) 859-863.
- [7] R. Meij, The fate of mercury in coal-fired power plants and the influence of wet flue-gas desulphurization, *Water Air & Soil Pollution*, 56 (1991) 21-33.
- [8] R. Meij, L.H.J. Vredenburg, H.t. Winkel, The Fate and Behavior of Mercury in Coal-Fired Power Plants, *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association*, 52 (2002) 912-917.
- [9] J.H. Pavlish, E.A. Sondreal, M.D. Mann, E.S. Olson, K.C. Galbreath, D.L. Laudal, S.A. Benson, Status review of mercury control options for coal-fired power plants, *Fuel Processing Technology*, 82 (2003) 89-165.
- [10] A.P. Jones, J.W. Hoffmann, D.N. Smith, T.J. Feeley, J.T. Murphy, DOE/NETL's Phase II Mercury Control Technology Field Testing Program: Preliminary Economic Analysis of Activated Carbon Injection, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 41 (2007) 1365-1371.
- [11] S. Sjostrom, M. Durham, C.J. Bustard, C. Martin, Activated carbon injection for mercury control: Overview, *Fuel*, 89 (2010) 1320-1322.

- [12] Y. Zhao, M.D. Mann, J.H. Pavlish, B.A.F. Mibeck, G.E. Dunham, E.S. Olson, Application of Gold Catalyst for Mercury Oxidation by Chlorine, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 40 (2006) 1603-1608.
- [13] A.A. Presto, E.J. Granite, Noble Metal Catalysts for Mercury Oxidation in Utility Flue Gas, *Platinum Metals Review*, 52 (2008) 144-154.
- [14] P. Wang, S. Su, J. Xiang, F. Cao, L. Sun, S. Hu, S. Lei, Catalytic oxidation of Hg⁰ by CuO–MnO₂–Fe₂O₃/γ-Al₂O₃ catalyst, *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 225 (2013) 68-75.
- [15] W. Xu, H. Wang, X. Zhou, T. Zhu, CuO/TiO₂ catalysts for gas-phase Hg⁰ catalytic oxidation, *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 243 (2014) 380-385.
- [16] H. Kamata, S.-i. Ueno, N. Sato, T. Naito, Mercury oxidation by hydrochloric acid over TiO₂ supported metal oxide catalysts in coal combustion flue gas, *Fuel Processing Technology*, 90 (2009) 947-951.
- [17] N. Yan, W. Chen, J. Chen, Z. Qu, Y. Guo, S. Yang, J. Jia, Significance of RuO₂ Modified SCR Catalyst for Elemental Mercury Oxidation in Coal-fired Flue Gas, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 45 (2011) 5725-5730.
- [18] Y. Zhuang, J. Laumb, R. Liggett, M. Holmes, J. Pavlish, Impacts of acid gases on mercury oxidation across SCR catalyst, *Fuel Processing Technology*, 88 (2007) 929-934.
- [19] L. Zhao, C. Li, S. Li, Y. Wang, J. Zhang, T. Wang, G. Zeng, Simultaneous removal of Elemental Mercury and NO in Simulated Flue Gas over V₂O₅/ZrO₂-CeO₂ catalyst, *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, (2016).
- [20] B.-A. Dranga, H. Koeser, Increased co-oxidation activity for mercury under hot and cold site coal power plant conditions–Preparation and evaluation of Au/TiO₂-coated SCR-DeNO_x catalysts, *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, 166 (2015) 302-312.

- [21] H. Xu, Z. Qu, C. Zong, F. Quan, J. Mei, N. Yan, Catalytic oxidation and adsorption of Hg 0 over low-temperature NH₃-SCR LaMnO₃ perovskite oxide from flue gas, *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, 186 (2016) 30-40.
- [22] H. Li, C.-Y. Wu, Y. Li, J. Zhang, Superior activity of MnO_x-CeO₂/TiO₂ catalyst for catalytic oxidation of elemental mercury at low flue gas temperatures, *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, 111–112 (2012) 381-388.
- [23] D. Jampaiah, K.M. Tur, P. Venkataswamy, S.J. Ippolito, Y.M. Sabri, J. Tardio, S.K. Bhargava, B.M. Reddy, Catalytic oxidation and adsorption of elemental mercury over nanostructured CeO₂-MnO_x catalyst, *RSC Advances*, 5 (2015) 30331-30341.
- [24] D. Jampaiah, S.J. Ippolito, Y.M. Sabri, B.M. Reddy, S.K. Bhargava, Highly efficient nanosized Mn and Fe codoped ceria-based solid solutions for elemental mercury removal at low flue gas temperatures, *Catalysis Science & Technology*, 5 (2015) 2913-2924.
- [25] J. Zhou, W. Hou, P. Qi, X. Gao, Z. Luo, K. Cen, CeO₂-TiO₂ Sorbents for the Removal of Elemental Mercury from Syngas, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 47 (2013) 10056-10062.
- [26] J. He, G.K. Reddy, S.W. Thiel, P.G. Smirniotis, N.G. Pinto, Simultaneous Removal of Elemental Mercury and NO from Flue Gas Using CeO₂ Modified MnO_x/TiO₂ Materials, *Energy & Fuels*, 27 (2013) 4832-4839.
- [27] L. Zhao, C. Li, J. Zhang, X. Zhang, F. Zhan, J. Ma, Y.e. Xie, G. Zeng, Promotional effect of CeO₂ modified support on V₂O₅-WO₃/TiO₂ catalyst for elemental mercury oxidation in simulated coal-fired flue gas, *Fuel*, 153 (2015) 361-369.
- [28] M.S. Berry, Full scale calcium bromide injection with subsequent mercury oxidation and removal within wet flue gas desulphurization system: Experience at a 700 MW coal-fired power facility, The University of Alabama at Birmingham, 2012.

- [29] K. Dombrowski, S. McDowell, M. Berry, A.F. Sibley, R. Chang, B. Vosteen, The balance-of-plant impacts of calcium bromide injection as a mercury oxidation technology in power plants, Power Plant Air Pollutant Control Mega Symposium, Baltimore, MD, 2008.
- [30] Y. Zhuang, C. Chen, R. Timpe, J. Pavlish, Investigations on bromine corrosion associated with mercury control technologies in coal flue gas, *Fuel*, 88 (2009) 1692-1697.
- [31] C.E. DiFrancesco, C.J. Bertole, J.T. Freeman, K. Nochi., Achieving and Maintaining Hg Oxidation Performance through SCR Catalyst Selection and Management, Mega Symposium Baltimore, MD, 2012.
- [32] K. Seki, Development of RuO₂/rutile-TiO₂ catalyst for industrial HCl oxidation process, *Catalysis surveys from Asia*, 14 (2010) 168-175.
- [33] K. Iwanaga, K. Seki, T. Hibi, K. Issoh, T. Suzuta, M. Nakada, Y. Mori, T. Abe, The development of improved hydrogen chloride oxidation process, *Sumitomo Kagaku*, 1 (2004).
- [34] Z. Liu, C. Li, V. Sriram, J.-Y. Lee, D. Brewe, XANES study of elemental mercury oxidation over RuO₂/TiO₂ and selective catalytic reduction catalysts for mercury emissions control, *Fuel Processing Technology*, 153 (2016) 156-162.
- [35] V.P. Kumar, Y. Harikrishna, N. Nagaraju, K.V. Chary, Characterization and reactivity of TiO₂ supported nano ruthenium catalysts for vapour phase hydrogenolysis of glycerol, *Indian J Chem A*, 53 (2014) 516-523.
- [36] F. Pinna, Supported metal catalysts preparation, *Catalysis Today*, 41 (1998) 129-137.
- [37] L. Jiao, J.R. Regalbuto, The synthesis of highly dispersed noble and base metals on silica via strong electrostatic adsorption: I. Amorphous silica, *Journal of Catalysis*, 260 (2008) 329-341.
- [38] B. Ravel, M. Newville, ATHENA, ARTEMIS, HEPHAESTUS: data analysis for X-ray absorption spectroscopy using IFEFFIT, *Journal of Synchrotron Radiation*, 12 (2005) 537-541.

- [39] U.S. EPA Emission Measurement Center (EMC) of the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS). "Method 8: Determination of Sulfuric Acid and Sulfur Dioxide Emissions from Stationary Sources."
- [40] G. Xiang, X. Shi, Y. Wu, J. Zhuang, X. Wang, Size effects in atomic-level epitaxial redistribution process of RuO₂ over TiO₂, Scientific reports, 2 (2012).
- [41] M.A. Hevia, A.P. Amrute, T. Schmidt, J. Pérez-Ramírez, Transient mechanistic study of the gas-phase HCl oxidation to Cl₂ on bulk and supported RuO₂ catalysts, Journal of Catalysis, 276 (2010) 141-151.
- [42] Y. Eom, S.H. Jeon, T.A. Ngo, J. Kim, T.G. Lee, Heterogeneous mercury reaction on a selective catalytic reduction (SCR) catalyst, Catalysis Letters, 121 (2008) 219-225.
- [43] H. Kamata, S.-i. Ueno, T. Naito, A. Yukimura, Mercury Oxidation over the V₂O₅(WO₃)/TiO₂ Commercial SCR Catalyst, Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 47 (2008) 8136-8141.
- [44] H. Kamata, K. Takahashi, C.U.I. Odenbrand, The role of K₂O in the selective reduction of NO with NH₃ over a V₂O₅(WO₃)/TiO₂ commercial selective catalytic reduction catalyst, Journal of Molecular Catalysis A: Chemical, 139 (1999) 189-198.
- [45] Y. Zheng, A.D. Jensen, J.E. Johnsson, Laboratory Investigation of Selective Catalytic Reduction Catalysts: Deactivation by Potassium Compounds and Catalyst Regeneration, Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 43 (2004) 941-947.
- [46] B.S. Clausen, H. Topsøe, Application of Combined X-Ray Diffraction and Absorption Techniques, Advances in Catalysis, 42 (1998) 315.
- [47] Y.-Y. Hu, Z. Liu, K.-W. Nam, O.J. Borkiewicz, J. Cheng, X. Hua, M.T. Dunstan, X. Yu, K.M. Wiaderek, L.-S. Du, K.W. Chapman, P.J. Chupas, X.-Q. Yang, C.P. Grey, Origin of

additional capacities in metal oxide lithium-ion battery electrodes, *Nat Mater*, 12 (2013) 1130-1136.

[48] D.A. McKeown, P.L. Hagans, L.P. Carette, A.E. Russell, K.E. Swider, D.R. Rolison, Structure of hydrous ruthenium oxides: implications for charge storage, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 103 (1999) 4825-4832.

[49] T. Komaya, A.T. Bell, Z. Wengsieh, R. Gronsby, F. Engelke, T.S. King, M. Pruski, Effects of dispersion and metal-metal oxide interactions on Fischer-Tropsch synthesis over Ru/TiO₂ and TiO₂-promoted Ru/SiO₂, *Journal of Catalysis*, 150 (1994) 400-406.

[50] P. Forzatti, Present status and perspectives in de-NO_x SCR catalysis, *Applied Catalysis A: General*, 222 (2001) 221-236.

[51] Institute of Clean Air Companies (ICAC). Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) Control of NO_x Emissions From Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Power Plants., 2009.

[52] H. Li, C.-Y. Wu, Y. Li, L. Li, Y. Zhao, J. Zhang, Role of flue gas components in mercury oxidation over TiO₂ supported MnO_x-CeO₂ mixed-oxide at low temperature, *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 243 (2012) 117-123.

[53] S. Qiao, J. Chen, J. Li, Z. Qu, P. Liu, N. Yan, J. Jia, Adsorption and catalytic oxidation of gaseous elemental mercury in flue gas over MnO_x/alumina, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 48 (2009) 3317-3322.

[54] Z. Zhou, X. Liu, Z. Liao, H. Shao, C. Lv, Y. Hu, M. Xu, Manganese doped CeO₂-ZrO₂ catalyst for elemental mercury oxidation at low temperature, *Fuel Processing Technology*, 152 (2016) 285-293.

[55] S. Eswaran, H.G. Stenger, Understanding Mercury Conversion in Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) Catalysts, *Energy & Fuels*, 19 (2005) 2328-2334.

[56] L. Ji, P.M. Sreekanth, P.G. Smirniotis, S.W. Thiel, N.G. Pinto, Manganese oxide/titania materials for removal of NO_x and elemental mercury from flue gas, *Energy & Fuels*, 22 (2008) 2299-2306.

Figure Captions:

Figure 1. A schematic of the experimental set-up for the catalysts performance test.

Figure 2. TEM images of the RuO₂/TiO₂ catalysts with different supports and synthesis methods. a: anatase TiO₂; b: RuO₂/anatase TiO₂_WI; c: RuO₂/anatase TiO₂_DP; d: RuO₂/anatase TiO₂_SEA; e: rutile TiO₂; f: RuO₂/rutile TiO₂_WI; g: HR-TEM of rutile TiO₂; h: HR-TEM of RuO₂/rutile TiO₂_WI.
Scale bars: a~d=50 nm; e~f=20 nm; g~h=2 nm

Figure 3. XRD patterns of different TiO₂ and RuO₂/TiO₂_WI catalysts.

Figure 4. Fourier transformed Ru XAFS spectra ($|\chi(R)|$) for fresh RuO₂/rutile TiO₂_WI, spent RuO₂/rutile TiO₂_WI and RuO₂ standard.

Figure 5. Hg(0) oxidation activities of 1 wt.% RuO₂/TiO₂ catalysts with different TiO₂ supports and synthesis methods. Conditions: 10 ppbv Hg(0), 10 ppmv HCl, 3%(v) O₂, and balance N₂ at T=350 °C.

Figure 6. Effect of metal loadings on the utilization efficiency of ruthenium on rutile TiO₂ (WI method). Conditions: 10 ppbv Hg(0), 10 ppmv HCl, 3%(v) O₂, and balance N₂ at T=350 °C.

Figure 7. Effect of temperature on the 1 wt.% RuO₂/rutile TiO₂_WI catalyst activity. Conditions: 10 ppbv Hg(0), 5 ppmv HCl, 3%(v) O₂, and balance N₂.

Figure 8. Effect NH_3 concentrations on $\text{Hg}(0)$ oxidation performances of 1 wt.% $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2$ catalyst under simulated flue gas. Conditions: 15 ppbv $\text{Hg}(0)$, 10 ppmv HCl , 5 ppmv NO , 200 ppmv SO_2 , 3%(v) O_2 , 10%(v) H_2O , 12%(v) CO_2 balanced with N_2 at 350 °C.

Figure 9. Effect of SO_2 concentrations on $\text{Hg}(0)$ oxidation performances of 1 wt.% $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2$ catalyst under simulated flue gas. Conditions: 15 ppbv $\text{Hg}(0)$, 10 ppmv HCl , 5 ppmv NH_3 , 5 ppmv NO , 3%(v) O_2 , 10%(v) H_2O , 12%(v) CO_2 balanced with N_2 at 350 °C.

Figure 10. XRD pattern of the spent $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2$ catalyst. Conditions: 15 ppbv $\text{Hg}(0)$, 10 ppmv HCl , 5 ppmv NH_3 , 5 ppmv NO , 200 ppmv SO_2 , 3%(v) O_2 , 10%(v) H_2O , 12%(v) CO_2 balanced with N_2 at 350 °C for 48 hours.

Figure 11. $\text{Hg}(0)$ oxidation performances of 1 wt.% $\text{RuO}_2/\text{rutile TiO}_2$ catalyst with respect to different HCl concentration under a simulated flue gas condition of high sulfur bituminous coal. Conditions: 15 ppbv $\text{Hg}(0)$, 5 ppmv NH_3 , 5 ppmv NO , 2,000 ppmv SO_2 , 3%(v) O_2 , 10%(v) H_2O , 12%(v) CO_2 balanced with N_2 at 350 °C.

Table 1. BET surface area, pore volume and average pore diameter measurements for synthesized RuO₂/rutile TiO₂ and SCR catalysts.

Catalyst	BET surface area (m ² /g)	Por e volume (cm ³ /g)	Average pore diameter (Å)
Rutile TiO ₂	72	0.38	202
0.2% Ru loading	69	0.31	194
0.5% Ru loading	66	0.28	184
1% Ru loading	64	0.28	186
Synthesized SCR	95	0.29	126
Commercial SCR		0.17	
[36-39]	61-120	-0.29	103-151

Graphical abstract