ARTICLE IN PRESS

JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES XX (2016) XXX-XXX



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect



www.elsevier.com/locate/jes

www.jesc.ac.cn

Phytotoxicity and groundwater impacts of leaching from thermal treatment residues in roadways

$_{\mathbf{Q2}}$ Khamphe Phoungthong^{1,2}, Li-Ming Shao^{2,3}, Pin-Jing He^{2,3}, Hua Zhang^{1,2,*}

4 1. State Key Laboratory of Pollution Control & Resource Reuse, Tongji University, Shanghai 200092, China. E-mail: khamphe@hotmail.com

- 5 2. Institute of Waste Treatment and Reclamation, Tongji University, Shanghai 200092, China
- 6 3. Centre for the Technology Research and Training on Household Waste in Small Towns & Rural Area, Ministry of Housing and

7 Urban–Rural Development of PR China (MOHURD), Shanghai 200092, China

8

10 A R T I C L E I N F O

- 12 Article history:
- 13 Received 29 April 2016
- 14 Revised 13 November 2016
- 15 Accepted 18 November 2016
- 16 Available online xxxx
- 38 Keywords:
- 39 Thermal treatment residues
- 40 Bottom ash
- 41 Flue gas desulfurization residue
- 42 Heavy metals
- 43 Phytotoxicity
- 44 Groundwater impact
- 45

ABSTRACT

The use of coal fly ash (CFA), municipal solid waste incinerator bottom ash (MSWIBA) and flue 17 gas desulfurization residue (FGDR) in road construction has become very common owing to its 18 economical advantages. However, these residues may contain toxic constituents that pose an 19 environmental risk if they leach out and flow through the soil, surface water and groundwater. 20 Therefore, it is necessary to assess the ecotoxicity and groundwater impact of these residues 21 before decisions can be made regarding their utilization for road construction. In this study, 22 the physico-chemical characteristics, leaching and phytotoxicity of these residues were 23 investigated. Specifically, multivariate analyses were used to evaluate the contributions 24 of the leaching constituents of the CFA, MSWIBA and FGDR leachates to the germination 25 index of wheat seeds. B, Ba, Cr, Cu, Fe and Pb were found to be more toxic to the wheat 26 seeds than the other heavy metals. Furthermore, the leached concentrations of the 27 constituents from the CFA, MSWIBA and FGDR were below the regulatory threshold limits of 28 the Chinese identification standard for hazardous wastes. Analyses conducted using a 29 numerical groundwater model (WiscLEACH) indicated that the predicted field concentrations 30 of metals from the CFA, MSWIBA and FGDR increased with time up to about 30 years at the 31 point of compliance, then decreased with time and distance. Overall, this study demonstrated 32 that the risks resulting from MSWIBA, CFA and FGDR leaching could be assessed before 33 its utilization for road construction, providing crucial information for the adoption of these 34 alternative materials. 35

@ 2016 The Research Center for Eco-Environmental Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences. $_{36}$

Published by Elsevier B.V. 37

51 Introduction

Rapid urbanization has led to demands for construction materials that are exceeding the availability of natural materials. At present, several countries are attempting to replace natural materials with residues produced by thermal treatments (Ore et al., 2007) such as municipal solid waste incinerator bottom ash (MSWIBA), coal fly ash (CFA) and flue gas desulfurization residue (FGDR). More than 58 10 million tonnes of MSWIBA (National Bureau of Statistics of 59 China, 2015), 550 million tonnes of CFA (Yu et al., 2015), and 60 7.1 million tonnes of FGDR (Wang et al., 2013) are produced 61 annually in China, showing great potential for resource 62 reuse (Cheng et al., 2007; Córdoba, 2015). However, the types 63 and quantities of solid residues vary according to the waste 64 composition, thermal treatment process, flue gas cleaning 65

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jes.2016.11.009

1001-0742/© 2016 The Research Center for Eco-Environmental Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences. Published by Elsevier B.V.

Please cite this article as: Phoungthong, K., et al., Phytotoxicity and groundwater impacts of leaching from thermal treatment residues in roadways, J. Environ. Sci. (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jes.2016.11.009

^{*} Corresponding author. E-mail: zhanghua_tj@tongji.edu.cn (Hua Zhang).

2

ARTICLE IN PRESS

technology and residue handling at various facilities (Seshadriet al., 2010).

CFA, MSWIBA and FGDR are usually considered non-68 hazardous wastes that can be utilized as alternative construction 69 materials, especially in roadways. The mineral compositions 70 and engineering characteristics of these residues are similar to 71 those of natural sand or aggregates. In China, sustainable waste 72 management policies are encouraging reutilization of these 73 residues (Geng et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2010). The environmental 74 benefits include lowering the amounts of waste being sent 75to landfills and replacing natural materials. Thus, reuse of the 76 residues could save landfill capacity and reduce the environ-77 mental impacts arising from exploitation of natural materials as 78 well as transport of these residues to landfill sites and of virgin 79aggregates to points of use. 80

However, when CFA, MSWIBA and FGDR are used in 81 construction, hazardous constituents contained in the resi-82 dues may be leached out by runoff, surface water or ground-83 water that may come in contact with the materials. Such 84 leaching represents a potential threat to the environment 85 (Cheng et al., 2008; Liyanage et al., 2013; Yu et al., 2013). The 86 compositions of CFA, MSWIBA and FGDR have been described 87 for many different incineration plants and countries (Shim 88 et al., 2005; Rendek et al., 2007; Hua et al., 2010; Rocca et al., 89 2012; Chen et al., 2014; Córdoba, 2015; Phoungthong et al., 90 91 2016a). To assess the environmental impacts arising from use 92of these materials, information is needed not only on the total 93 contents of constituents in the residue materials, but also on the amounts of these constituents that might reach the 94 95 surrounding environment. Therefore, the leaching behavior of 96 alternative materials under field site conditions and during 97 standardized laboratory tests has been discussed by several researchers. It was reported that the impacts of leaching from 98 MSWIBA and CFA used in road construction on the soil and 99 groundwater were low (Schreurs et al., 2000; Bruder-Hubscher 100

et al., 2001). Badreddine and François (2009) assessed the fate of 101 PCDD/Fs from municipal solid waste incineration residues that Q3 were used in four road construction sites (>10 years) as surface, 103 base, and sub-base courses, and found that the materials posed 104 little harm to the quality of road soils. In another study (Lidelöw 105 and Lagerkvist, 2007), however, higher concentrations of Cr and 106 Cu were observed in MSWIBA than in crushed rock used in a 107 construction site. 108

Most studies conducted to date have focused on the physico- 109 chemical properties and constituents of residue leachates. 110 Chemical analysis is used to quantify pollutant concentrations 111 and cannot account for the interaction among the pollutants in 112 complex mixtures (Fan et al., 2006), thus providing insufficient 113 comprehensive risk information. On the contrary, ecotoxicity 114 is the result of the combination of several factors, such as 115 heavy metals, ammonia, salts and volatile fatty acids. There- 116 fore, to reveal the feasibility of utilizing MSWIBA, CFA or FGDR 117 as a construction material, an ecotoxicity risk assessment of 118 leachates derived from these residues needs to be conducted in 119 addition to traditional chemical analyses. A few studies have 120 included ecotoxicological analysis of MSWIBA and CFA leachate 121 using methods such as the Microtox® toxicity test, Daphnia 122 magna immobility test, Ceriodaphnia dubia death test, worm 123 mortality (Quilici et al., 2004; Tsiridis et al., 2006; Ribé et al., 2014; 124 Phoungthong et al., 2016a), and plant assays (Radetski et al., 125 2004; Phoungthong et al., 2016b). Different levels of toxicity 126 have been recorded from the various tests, and the toxicity was 127 greatly influenced by the pH status of the solid samples, the 128 types of the leachants, as well as the concentrations of heavy 129 metals and carboxylic acids in the residues' leachates. There- 130 fore, the residues need to be formally tested with ecotoxic and 131 genotoxic sensitive tests before recycling. Little is currently 132 known about the phytotoxicity of CFA and FGDR. 133

The ecotoxicity of the residues is highly dependent on the 134 leachability of the constituents and the leaching environment 135

Properties	CFA1	MSWIBA1	MSWIBA2	FGDR1	FGDR2	FGDR3	FGDR4	
LOI (%wt, at 600°C)	3.13	3.31	1.14	2.25	9.56	3.64	6.73	
Density (g/cm³)	1.66	2.12	1.83	1.82	1.66	1.54	1.53	
d _{so}	30 µm	3.10 mm	3.80 mm	-	-	-	-	
Elemental content (mg/kg)								
As	44.2	57.1	85.4	34.7	31.5	41.3	63.0	
В	ND	ND	ND	1407	574	1086	3090	
Ва	359	1240	2090	2183	2799	3073	3013	
Ве	6.42	1.78	2.68	ND	0.13	0.17	ND	
Bi	ND	ND	ND	52.6	48.9	51.3	52.3	
Cd	1.01	4.91	7.52	ND	ND	ND	ND	
Co	ND	ND	12.4	ND	ND	ND	ND	
Cr	65.8	330	676	ND	4.73	ND	ND	
Cu	56.0	1670	1710	ND	0.29	1.38	0.76	
Mn	213	705	1080	8.01	342	370	136	
Ni	26.8	131	2107	2.58	22.9	22.9	9.93	
Pb	86.9	482	609	1.49	7.29	3.13	1.29	
Se	16.8	1.60	3.13	ND	ND	ND	ND	
Sr	544	219	366	256	1501	1706	886	
V	140	44.7	54.0	0.47	27.4	28.7	19.1	
Zn	81.9	2100	2370	354	335	390	458	

Please cite this article as: Phoungthong, K., et al., Phytotoxicity and groundwater impacts of leaching from thermal treatment residues in roadways, J. Environ. Sci. (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jes.2016.11.009

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8865729

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8865729

Daneshyari.com