### **SRI International**





#### Project Review (DE-FE0031552) DEVELOPMENT OF A HIGHLY-EFFICIENT MEMBRANE-BASED WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR THERMAL POWER PLANTS



Department of Energy (DOE): \$639,949; Cost share: \$160,000; DOE Project Manger: Anthony Zinn

2020 WATER TECHNOLOGIES PROJECT REVIEW MEETING

September 17,2020

### Disclaimer

This presentation includes an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

> "MODELED WATER SAVINGS IN YEAR 2043: COMBINED TECHNOLOGIES COULD REDUCE THERMOELECTRIC WATER WITHDRAWALS BY 603 BGY"

Source: NETL Water Management Program Update, Annual Project Review meeting- 3 September 2020

# Flue Gas Desulfurization Wastewater (FGD WW):

Treatment for water recovery and reuse



Schematic for pulverized coal (PC) power plant with cooling and wet FGD Source: NETL Report, Dipietro, 2009

Waste Heat Concentrate Makeup water disposal Hydrocyclone High Pressure FGD RO Unit Blowdown  $32^{\circ}C \rightarrow 70^{\circ}C$ Salt precipitates Low Pressure FGD RO Unit Recycle Clean water Recovery Current Project

Block diagram showing advanced mode of operation for recovering make-up water and quality water

- To maintain optimum operating conditions in a wet scrubber, a purge stream is discharged from the system (primarily for efficient SO<sub>2</sub> removal and chloride and corrosion control). This aqueous purge stream (FGD blowdown) is acidic (pH ~ 4-6), supersaturated with gypsum, and contains high levels of total dissolved solids (TDS) and total suspended solids (TSS). The TDS is composed of heavy metals, chlorides, sulfates, calcium, magnesium, and dissolved organic compounds.
- Our approach is to use a membrane separation technology for (1) recovering FGD makeup water and clean water (2) removing selenium from FGD WW until it is below the effluent discharge limits.

## Membrane Material for Hollow Fiber Production

We use polybenzimidazole (PBI) hollow-fiber membrane (HFM) based separation technology for removing salts from FGD wastewater. The PBI membranes are resistant to fouling and can be operated under substantially harsher environments than conditions tolerated by commercially available membranes.

- Superb thermal stability: Tg = 450°C, degradation at 450°C in air, continuous operating temperature to 250°C.
- Excellent resistance to chemicals, acid, and base hydrolysis.
- Commercially available from the US entity, PBI Performance Products. The polymer is available in powder form or various formulations solubilized in *N*,*N*-dimethyl acetamide (DMAc).



PBI HFM spinning line (SRI has two spinning lines with 10 m/min capacity)

Polybenzimidazole



PBI HFM cross-section (*left*) and a bundle (*right*)



PBI hollow-fiber membrane asymmetric structure

# **Project Tasks Timeline and Milestones**

			Q	0	G	1		Q2		Q3	\$	0	ຊ4		Q5		Q6	;	Q	7		Q8		Q	)	Q	10	6	211	Q	12
Task	Start Date	End Date		Dec	Jan Feh	March	April	May	VIII.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov. Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	April	May	June	auiy Aua.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Feb.	March	April	June	July	Aug. Sep.	Oct. ►I,	Dec.
PBI HFM BP1 and BP2	12/1/17	5/31/20																													
Task 1.0 - Project Management and Planning	12/1/17	5/31/20																													
Task 2-0: Membrane Development and Testing	2/1/18	7/31/19																													
Subtask 2.1 - Development of a Test Plan	12/1/18	1/31/19																													
Subtask 2.2 - Membrane Selection and Testing	2/1/18	7/31/19																													
Subtask 2.3 - Development of Small Diameter Fibers	10/1/18	3/31/19																													
Subtask 2.4 - Preliminary Membrane Modeling		2/28/19																											<u>.</u>		
Task 3.0 - Testing With Filed Samples	4/1/19	12/31/20																													
Subtask 3.1 - Performance Evaluation	4/1/19	6/30/19																											<u> </u>		
Subtask 3.2 - Long Term Testing and Fouling Testing	7/1/19	4/30/20																													
Subtask 3.3 - Fabrication and Testing of Small Diameter Fibers	10/1/19	3/31/20																											1		
Task 4.0 - Modeling	4/1/19	5/31/20																													
Subtask 4.1 - Modeling of Module Arrangement	4/1/19	8/31/19																											1		
Subtask 4.2-Modeling of System Integration		4/30/20																													
																													1		
Final Report																															

Task/Sub task No.	Milestone Description	Status			
1	Updated PMP				
1	Kickoff Meeting				
	Completion of small-diameter RO membrane fabrication protocol 2.3 development				
2.3					
2.4	2.4 Completion of preliminary membrane system modeling				
2.2	Completion of membrane testing with synthestic water and data analysis	20			
	Completion of PBI membrane performance testing with real field wastewater	0			
3.1	samples				
3.2	Completion of longer-term membrane fouling testing				
	Completion of fabrication and pressure testing of small-diameter RO	00% Complete			
3.3	membranes	90% Complete			
4.1	Completion of membrane module assembly array				
	Completion of identification of system components for effluent management	Completed			
4.2	system				
1	Final report	Net Yet Started			

## **PBI HFM Selection for Testing**

HFM Screening

- Use N<sub>2</sub> permeation (GPU) measurement for fiber screening
- Evaluate the performance using 2000 ppm NaCl, MgSO<sub>4</sub> or NaSO<sub>4</sub>



Water flux or salt rejection as a function of  $N_2$  permeance though the membrane in PBI HFMs with dense layer thickness < 0.3-micron.



Water flux or salt rejection as a function of  $N_2$  permeance though the membrane in PBI HFMs with dense layer thickness > 0.3-micron.



High magnification photographs of PBI HFM.



PBI HFM ID: 53A



PBI HFM ID: 51A

Type 2 membranes with two different wall thicknesses were used in the current project; cross sections are shown. Majority of the testes were conducted using 51A.

## Test Solutions and the Test System

<b>Parameters Varied</b>	Value
pН	4 to 10
Temperature	RT and 50 °C
Duration	Short and long
	2000 to 22,000
Concentration	ppm
Se doping	250 ppb
Pressure	200 to 500 psi

Typical Synthetic FGD Test Solution Composition									
Salt	Concentration (ppm)	lons	Concentration (ppm)						
CaSO <sub>4</sub>	2511	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	3272						
CaCl <sub>2</sub>	7029	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	1908						
MgCl <sub>2</sub>	7553	Na+	681						
NaCl	1731	Cl-	11191						
Total	18824	SO4 <sup>2-</sup>	1773						



---: Computer interface

Bench-scale desalination system: Simplified schematic (*left*) and photograph (*right*) of the system.

## Results:

#### For synthetic solutions and long-term testing of FGD WW



Observed water flux for synthetic solutions at varying Temperatures and pressures. Observed long term stability at varying concentrations and pH.

Synthetic Solutions: Water flux increased linearly with pressure and temperature. This is expected behavior for RO membranes. The order of water flux by salt solution was  $CaSO_4 > CaCl_2 > MgCl_2 > NaCl$ . Salt rejection was >99% in all cases. FGD WW: Observed a stable water flux and >98% salt rejection.

# Results (continued):

For raw and diluted FGD WW (6,900 to 14,000 ppm range)







## Observed salt rejection for FGD water as a function of pressure.



varying temperatures and pressures.

Observed salt rejection 8100 ppm FGD water at varying temperatures and pressures.

As expected, water flux increased linearly with pressure and temperature >98% salt rejection observed

### Results (continued): For 14,400 ppm FGD WW



Effects of temperature and pressure on water flux and % rejection for FGD WW.



Effects of pressure and pH on water flux and %rejection for FGD WW.

Flux increases with increasing temperature and pressure; >98% salt rejection. Maximum salt rejection observed at pH rage 5.3 to 7.8 at about 40°C and 400 psi.

### Results Summary

- The testing of PBI HFM synthetic solutions (single & mixed salts) with real FGD WW were successful.
  - Synthetic solutions consisting of CaSO<sub>4</sub>, CaCl<sub>2</sub>, MgCl<sub>2</sub>, and NaCl (up to 22,000 showed >99% rejection.
  - Synthetic solutions doped with 250 ppb Se showed <1 ppb Se can be achieved using a twostage membrane system.
  - FGD WW solutions showed >98% rejection during 100 hr. testing. No flux reduction observed with PBI HFM with fiber OD/ID ratio <1.7. pH and temperature effects as expected. The water flux increased by a factor of 2 at 50 °C compared to RT.
  - Enerfex modeled a membrane system for treating 200GPM FGD WW stream based on the measured PBI HFM performance at 500 psi. Validated performance for reusing 50% of the FGD WW as make-up.
  - Manuscript has been prepared for peer-review publication.
- Industry involvement at early development phase.
  - Generon successfully fabricated PBI HFM cartridges for 2.5 and 4-in standard commercial modules.





4-in element (*left*) currently being fabricated at Generon facility to fit into commercial standard 1000 psi 4-in vessel (*right*).

Generon made 2.5-in modules-SRI fibers inside (500 psi).

### **Future Developments**

- Longer term testing (500 hr) with preconditioning (*e.g.*, UF) of FGD WW.
- Design, build, and test a 2-stage prototype system.

# Acknowledgements

- Anthony Zinn and others at NETL
- Eminet Gebremichael, Michael Wales, Xiao Wang, Palitha Jayaweera, Elisabeth Perea, and Bill Olson (SRI)
- Richard Callahan (Enerfex, Inc.)
- Greg Copeland and Michael Gruender (PBI Performance Products)
- John Jensvold and his team (Generon IGS)
- Nandakishore Rajagopalan and Sriraam Chandrasekaran, (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

Contact:

Dr. Indira Jayaweera Sr. Staff Scientist and Sr. Program Manager indira.jayaweera@sri.com 1-650-859-4042



Headquarters 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94025 +1.650.859.2000

Additional U.S. and international locations

www.sri.com

**Thank You**