



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

**Fluoride Emissions
from Aluminium Electrolysis Cells**

by
Edwin Campbell Patterson

A thesis submitted to the University of Auckland
in fulfilment of the requirements of
Doctor of Philosophy in Chemical Engineering.

Auckland

March 2001

Abstract.

Modern aluminium electrolysis cells generate between 15 to 40 kg fluoride per tonne of aluminium fluoride produced. This represents a large material recycle load, of which over 99% of this fluoride content is returned to the cell via a dry scrubbing system. Most past research has concentrated on increasing the efficiency of this end scrubbing system, neglecting the actual cause of the fluoride emissions. Lower emissions would reduce this loading, resulting in smaller scrubbing systems, and ultimately lower capital costs. Fluoride emissions also contribute to the changes in heat balance in the cell. The fluoride evolved represents a material loss that requires to be replaced with AlF_3 . The addition of this species is a major variable in cell heat balance instability [1]. Overall a better understanding of the contributors to fluoride generation in an aluminium cell would benefit the operation and economics of an aluminium smelter.

Past studies [2-6] have identified most of the important emission contributors to hydrogen fluoride (HF) generation. Two sources were shown to be significant. The most studied source was primary HF generation. This is HF generation from electrolytic reactions between constituents of the fluoride based electrolyte and water from the feed alumina and hydrogen in the anode. Overlooked in some studies were generation reactions outside the electrolyte - defined in this study as secondary HF generation. This source was found to occur mainly from hydrolysis reactions with the generated particulate fluorides. However the results and the relative contributions from these studies are not strictly applicable to the current generation scenario. The present smelting practices and technology, dry scrubbing technology and raw material specifications differ substantially from those used during the period of each past investigation. The present study was designed to identify and quantify emission sources for the current smelter technology and practices. This used controlled laboratory based studies of the individual generation sources complemented by in plant studies analysing the HF emission from production aluminium electrolysis cells.

It was shown that the main contributor to primary HF generation is the addition of water to the electrolyte from the feed alumina. This results in the cyclic short term variations in HF emission, which correlate to the rate of alumina addition to the cell. Laboratory and industrial studies show that only a fraction of the added water reacts. The water reacted is likely the structural water of the alumina. The adsorbed water is thought to be flashed off before addition to the bath. Depending on feeding technology and crust integrity, between 10 to 50% of this water can react. This produces 7 to 14

kgF/tonneAl. This makes it the most significant emission component. The remainder of this structural water is either entrained in the anode gases or forms part of the electrolyte dissolved water content.

Dissolved water generation is the second most significant primary generation contributor, and third most significant emission component. Dissolved water is in equilibrium with the alumina content of the bath. It represents a constant emission source. Depending on feeding technology and cell design, the emission can vary between 3 to 10 kgF/tonneAl.

The final primary HF emission contributor results from electrolytic generation of the hydrogen content of the anode. Laboratory studies found the emission to have a reaction efficiency of approximately 10%. This results in a small emission, of 2 – 5 kg/tonneAl. The remainder of the hydrogen content is expected to be entrained in the anode gases, as the generation of this CO/CO₂ mixture is an order of magnitude greater than the HF generation reaction.

Secondary generation of hydrogen fluoride is also a significant HF emission source. In an industrial cell this results from mainly thermal hydrolysis of the particulate fluoride emissions at the crust–air interface. Laboratory studies have shown that other identified secondary emission sources are unlikely due to the ambient conditions and feeding practices in a modern prebake aluminium electrolysis cell. Hence previously proposed generation from hydrolysis of the particulates in the ducts and desorption of the surface fluoride from the fed secondary alumina, have been found to be insignificant compared to the main HF generation sources.

The thermal hydrolysis emission contributor is the only significant secondary generation emission component. Industrial measurements show that it varies with ambient humidity and crust integrity, two parameters which vary constantly in a modern prebake anode cell. Measurements show that the emission from this source is responsible for 2 to 8 kgF/tonneAl. This makes it the second highest HF emission component. Control of the crust condition and feeder hole states reduces this component significantly.

Hence in a modern prebake aluminium cell, the most significant operational factors affecting emission are related mainly to secondary generation. Industrial measurements show that the long term variations in an emission result from changes in the ambient humidity and the cells crust cover. Control of the crust integrity is thus paramount in

reducing such variations. This relates both to normal operation and batch operations. Reduction of all other sources of emission are a material composition problem. Simply reducing the water content (LOI(300) and LOI(1000)) and reducing the hydrogen content of the anodes will reduce the emission. However material considerations affect other aspects of cell operation and hence these factors are not as simple to adjust.

Acknowledgements.

We all know that three and a bit years brings so many people into ones work and life. Of the countless I have missed in this little note - I thank you whole heartedly.

I can't think a better place to start than with those who have guided me the whole way. Margaret and Barry I'm indebted for you help through all patches, even the rather rough one at the end. Its been fun – and what else is life about. Never fear, I'm glad I've done this and it's finished now 😊.

Those feisty technicians at C&M. Great beer at the end, pity we ran out at the last BBQ. May be a good thing. Still Tom, Keith, Bruce, Alan, Dragan, Bill, Andy and all those past and present – thanks. I love to build stuff, you guys just do it better!!!!

To those at Hydro Aluminium. Victoria thanks for you help, friendship and guidance. Halvor, your advise and help has been invaluable. Bjorn – thanks for the help at the end. To all the rest at ATA in Ardal. Thank you, it was a fun time with a great team. I'll be back some time for a visit.

What is a degree with out friends. All the postgrads past and present – Torsten, Ursula, Derek, Susie, Hoani, Steve (both types), Parin, Dolly, and so many more good friends – thanks. I'll miss those squash nights. And those infamous morning coffees – or morning jolts!

To my Family. Mum, Dad, T and Darrell (and those attention grabbing cats). Thanks for the love and support, where would I be without that sort of foundation.

What else – well I'll end on this – we all need self commentary!!

Its had its ups and downs and side tracks a many
But who could ask for more than this....
Three years of fun, friends, rewards and heartbreak.
But its time to move on now way from all that,
Up and on and flying into the future
With a sprinkling that special nova dust,
Mixed in with sweat and tears.

Contents.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION. | 17 |
| 2. ALUMINIUM SMELTING. | 19 |
| 2.1. The Aluminium Cell. | 19 |
| 2.2. Dry Scrubbing. | 20 |
| 3. ALUMINA. | 21 |
| 3.1. Introduction. | 21 |
| 3.2. Alumina Properties. | 21 |
| 3.3. Alumina hydration. | 23 |
| 3.3.1. Hydration Mechanisms. | 23 |
| 3.3.2. Adsorption studies. | 25 |
| 3.4. Alumina Dissolution in an Aluminium Cell. | 27 |
| 3.5. Variables Affecting Alumina Dissolution. | 28 |
| 3.5.1. Operating Conditions. | 29 |
| 3.5.2. Alumina Properties. | 31 |
| 4. FLUORIDE EMISSION FROM ALUMINIUM CELLS. | 33 |
| 4.1. Introduction. | 33 |
| 4.2. The composition of the fume gases. | 33 |
| 4.3. Composition of Fluoride Emissions. | 34 |
| 4.4. Mechanisms of Formation of Fluoride Emissions. | 35 |
| 4.5. Primary Generation of Hydrogen Fluoride. | 36 |
| 4.5.1. Alumina Hydrogen Fluoride Generation. | 37 |
| 4.5.2. Hydrogen Fluoride from Dissolved Water. | 38 |
| 4.5.3. Hydrogen fluoride from Hydrogen in the Anodes. | 39 |
| 4.6. Secondary Generation of Hydrogen Fluoride. | 41 |
| 4.6.1. Total Particulates. | 41 |
| 4.6.2. Particulate Generation - Vaporisation from the electrolyte. | 43 |
| 4.6.3. Particulate Generation - Entrained Bath. | 44 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| 4.6.4. | Secondary HF Generation - Particulate Hydrolysis. | 44 |
| 4.6.5. | Secondary HF Generation - Desorbed Fluoride. | 48 |
| 4.7. | Combined Contribution Effects. | 54 |
| 4.7.1. | Electrolyte Compositional Effects. | 54 |
| 4.7.2. | Modelling Combined Contribution Effects. | 57 |
| 4.7.3. | Correlations for Fluoride Emissions. | 58 |
| 5. | PRIMARY GENERATION OF HYDROGEN FLUORIDE. | 60 |
| 5.1. | Hydrogen in the Anode. | 61 |
| 5.1.1. | Experimental Methodology. | 61 |
| 5.1.2. | FTIR Calibration. | 62 |
| 5.1.3. | Results. | 63 |
| 5.1.4. | Conclusions. | 65 |
| 5.2. | Dissolved Water. | 66 |
| 5.2.1. | Experimental Methodology. | 66 |
| 5.2.2. | Experimental Results. | 67 |
| 5.2.3. | Industrial Methodology. | 69 |
| 5.2.4. | Industrial Results. | 69 |
| 5.2.5. | Conclusions. | 71 |
| 5.3. | Alumina Water Generation. | 72 |
| 5.3.1. | Experimental Methodology. | 72 |
| 5.3.2. | Experimental Results. | 73 |
| 5.3.3. | Industrial Methodology. | 74 |
| 5.3.4. | Industrial Results. | 75 |
| 5.3.5. | Alumina Water balance. | 80 |
| 5.3.6. | Conclusions. | 82 |
| 6. | SECONDARY GENERATION OF HYDROGEN FLUORIDE. | 83 |
| 6.1. | Particulate Hydrolysis. | 83 |
| 6.1.1. | Thermodynamic Analysis. | 83 |
| 6.1.2. | Experimental Methodology. | 91 |
| 6.1.3. | Experimental Results. | 92 |
| 6.1.4. | Industrial implications. | 93 |
| 6.1.5. | Conclusions. | 95 |
| 6.2. | Desorbed Fluoride. | 95 |
| 6.2.1. | Laboratory Methodology. | 96 |
| 6.2.2. | Alumina Properties. | 98 |
| 6.2.3. | Laboratory Desorption Results. | 98 |
| 6.2.4. | Surface Analysis. | 100 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|------------|
| 6.2.5. | SEM Investigation | 100 |
| 6.2.6. | Adsorption Ageing. | 102 |
| 6.2.7. | Surface Comparison. | 103 |
| 6.2.8. | XPS Surface Analysis. | 105 |
| 6.2.9. | Emissions Stages. | 106 |
| 6.2.10. | Modelling Alumina Hydrolysis. | 108 |
| 6.2.11. | Industrial Methodology. | 110 |
| 6.2.12. | Primary vs Secondary Results. | 111 |
| 6.2.13. | Conclusions. | 113 |
| 7. | INDUSTRIAL EMISSION DATA. | 115 |
| 7.1. | Definitions. | 115 |
| 7.2. | The Δ Correlation. | 116 |
| 7.2.1. | Derivation. | 116 |
| 7.2.2. | The Validity of the Δ Correlation. | 117 |
| 7.3. | Experimental Procedure. | 118 |
| 7.4. | Base line emission characteristics. | 119 |
| 7.5. | Humidity Effects. | 122 |
| 7.5.1. | The Overall Emission. | 122 |
| 7.5.2. | Humidity Effects on Anode Change. | 123 |
| 7.5.3. | Humidity effects from varying the Duct Flow. | 126 |
| 7.5.4. | Conclusions. | 128 |
| 7.6. | Heat balance effects. | 128 |
| 7.6.1. | Tapping. | 129 |
| 7.6.2. | Anode Effect. | 131 |
| 7.6.3. | Crust Addition. | 132 |
| 7.6.4. | Conclusions. | 133 |
| 7.7. | Crust Integrity Effects. | 133 |
| 7.7.1. | Experimental Methodology. | 135 |
| 7.7.2. | Experimental Results. | 135 |
| 7.7.3. | Conclusion. | 139 |
| 7.8. | Feeder hole states. | 140 |
| 7.8.1. | Introduction. | 140 |
| 7.8.2. | Feeder hole state and the Alumina Emission. | 140 |
| 7.8.3. | Feeder Hole Mechanisms. | 143 |
| 7.8.4. | Conclusion. | 146 |
| 7.9. | Duct Temperature Effects. | 147 |

| | | |
|--------------|---|------------|
| 7.9.1. | Cell Technology I. | 147 |
| 7.9.2. | Cell Technology II. | 148 |
| 7.9.3. | Conclusion. | 150 |
| 7.10. | Bath Temperature. | 151 |
| 7.11. | Overall Conclusions. | 152 |
| 8. | MODELLING HYDROGEN FLUORIDE EMISSIONS. | 154 |
| 8.1. | Dynamic Modelling. | 154 |
| 8.1.1. | Step Response Analysis. | 154 |
| 8.1.2. | The Rate Model. | 159 |
| 8.2. | Predictive Model. | 168 |
| 8.2.1. | Haupin and Kvande Model. | 168 |
| 8.2.2. | Primary Generation Contributions. | 169 |
| 8.2.3. | Secondary Generation Contributions. | 171 |
| 8.2.4. | Modified Haupin-Kvande Model. | 173 |
| 8.2.5. | Model Predictions. | 174 |
| 8.2.6. | Conclusions. | 177 |
| 9. | CONCLUSIONS. | 178 |
| 9.1. | Primary Generation. | 178 |
| 9.2. | Secondary Generation. | 179 |
| 9.3. | Cell emission Factors. | 180 |
| 10. | REFERENCES. | 182 |
| | APPENDIX 1 – THE FLUORINATION RIG. | 187 |
| A1.1 | Experimental Procedure. | 187 |
| A1.2 | Experimental Results. | 189 |
| | APPENDIX 2 – MODEL EXAMPLES. | 191 |
| A2.1 | – Haupin – Kvande. | 191 |
| A2.2 | – Cell Technology I. | 192 |
| A2.3 | – Cell Technology II. | 193 |

List of Figures.

| No. | Caption | Page |
|------|--|------|
| 2.1 | The basic features of an industrial aluminium cell. | 17 |
| 2.2 | The dry scrubbing process. | 18 |
| 3.1 | Representation of the chemisorption of water molecules on an activated alumina site. | 22 |
| 3.2 | Water adsorption on smelter grade alumina at 40°C. Values in parenthesis are the water vapour pressure at equilibrium. | 23 |
| 3.3 | Water adsorption isotherms at 21°C (circles), 40°C (squares) and 50°C (triangles). Insert is the 21°C adsorption and desorption curves. | 24 |
| 3.4 | Typical dissolution curve for batchwise feeding of alumina to a cryolite melt. | 26 |
| 4.1 | The major fluoride emission sources from a prebake aluminium cell. | 33 |
| 4.2 | Gaseous and particulate fluoride emissions as influenced by moisture content of the alumina. | 35 |
| 4.3 | Typical particle distribution of dust evolved from primary aluminium cells. | 40 |
| 4.4 | Total Vapour pressure of the System $\text{Na}_3\text{AlF}_6\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{-CaF}_2$ versus temperature (compositions in Mass%). | 41 |
| 4.5 | Emission of HF from mixed dust (filter cake) and fines at $T=110^\circ\text{C}$, $X=20\text{g/kg}$. | 43 |
| 4.6 | HF emission from filter bags. Effect of temperature at different humidities levels. | 44 |
| 4.7 | The adsorption capacity of smelter grade alumina versus relative humidity in the range 0 to 70%. | 47 |
| 4.8 | Fluoride loss vs temperature for shock (triangles) and static (squares) heating of RH_{low} alumina. | 49 |
| 4.9 | XPS wide scans of dry scrubber alumina (a) Unheated. (b)Heated to 700°C . | 51 |
| 4.10 | Aluminium Fluoride usage by feed type. | 51 |
| 4.11 | Thermographs for Al_2O_3 recovery products and possible recovery compounds. | 52 |
| 4.12 | The temperature dependence of the fluoride emission. | 52 |
| 4.13 | The relationships found by Henry [2] for (1)Bath Ratio. (2)Alumina Content. (3)Temperature. | 53 |
| 4.14 | Fluoride evolution predictions vs bath ratio for a 15°C superheat. | 54 |
| 4.15 | Lid et al[7] total fluoride evolution results. (A)Variations in F with cell temperature and AlF_3 concentration. (B). Variation in F evolution with Al_2O_3 and AlF_3 concentration. | 55 |
| 4.16 | The relations found by <i>Haupin and Kvande</i> . (1)Total Fluoride vs bath ratio. (2)Particulate and gaseous emissions vs bath ratio. (3)Gaseous and particulate <i>emissions vs alumina content</i> . | 57 |
| 5.1 | The experimental laboratory apparatus. | 58 |
| 5.2 | The calibration curve for the FTIR fluoride signal intensity peaks. | 60 |
| 5.3 | Emissions from different anode materials used during laboratory electrolysis. | 61 |
| 5.4 | The emission content from the dissolved water run. | 65 |
| 5.5 | The in-plant study equipment for cell technology I. | 67 |
| 5.6 | HF emission response to zero alumina feeding conditions. (A)Cell Technology I. (B)Cell Technology II. | 68 |
| 5.7 | Fitted decay lines for the zero feed emission responses. (A)Cell Technology I. (B)Cell Technology II. | 68 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 5.8 | The measured alumina concentrations in the bath during zero feed period for cell technology II. | 68 |
| 5.9 | Continuous emission data from cell technology I. | 72 |
| 5.10 | Dusting resulting from adding wetted alumina to cell technology I. (A)Before. (B)After. | 73 |
| 5.11 | A volcano resulting from adding wetted alumina to cell technology I. (A)Before. (B)After. | 74 |
| 5.12 | Continuous HF concentrations for adding hydrated secondary alumina to cell technology I. | 75 |
| 5.13 | Continuous HF concentrations for adding hydrated primary alumina to cell technology I. | 75 |
| 6.1 | Heating NaAlF ₄ (100 mol NaAlF ₄). | 80 |
| 6.2 | The hydrolysis of NaAlF ₄ (100 mol NaAlF ₄ , 20 mol H ₂ O). | 80 |
| 6.3 | Heating Na ₃ AlF ₆ (100 mol Na ₃ AlF ₆). | 82 |
| 6.4 | The Hydrolysis of Na ₃ AlF ₆ (100 mol Na ₃ AlF ₆ , 20 mol H ₂ O). | 82 |
| 6.5 | AlF ₃ Hydrolysis (100 Mol AlF ₃ , 20 mol H ₂ O). | 83 |
| 6.6 | The hydrolysis of Na ₅ Al ₃ F ₁₄ (100 mol Na ₅ Al ₃ F ₁₄ , 20 mol H ₂ O). | 84 |
| 6.7 | Thermal decomposition of particulates (100 mol NaAlF ₄ , 20 mol Na ₃ AlF ₆ , 20 mol AlF ₃ , 20 mol Al ₂ O ₃) | 84 |
| 6.8 | Thermal hydrolysis of particulates (100 mol of H ₂ O, 100 mol NaAlF ₄ , 20 mol Na ₃ AlF ₆ , 20 mol AlF ₃ , 20 mol Al ₂ O ₃). | 85 |
| 6.9 | Heating particulate simulation with changing water content at 400°C. | 86 |
| 6.10 | The Humidity Trials Set Up. | 87 |
| 6.11 | Percentage retained of bath materials hydrolysed under different humidities. | 88 |
| 6.12 | Comparing simple heating with hydrolysis heating of the simulated particulate material. (A)Volatilisation (RH=0% @25°C, 4h). (B)Hydrolysis (RH=50% @25°C, 4h). | 89 |
| 6.13 | The Emissions Reduction Rig Set Up. | 92 |
| 6.14 | The emissions control set up. | 93 |
| 6.15 | Heating fluorinated alumina. (A)Insitu heating. (B)Comparing surface fluoride retention | 94 |
| 6.16 | Comparison of alumina particles at 2500x. (A)Unfluorinated. (B) Complete Fluorination. | 97 |
| 6.17 | Comparison of 600°C alumina surface heating runs. (A)Emission Heated Sample. (B)Control Heated Sample. | 97 |
| 6.18 | Aged Adsorption Run (AD13) – 6.5wt% fluoride on surface . | 99 |
| 6.19 | Adsorption Ageing. (A)Adsorption Alumina. (B)Fresh Adsorption Sample 21. (C)Adsorption Run 21 aged three months. | 99 |
| 6.20 | Surface Analysis results for Sample Ad32. (A)SEM Image at 1050x. (B)SEM Image at 8400x. (C)XRD Scan. (D)Fluoride XPS Peak. | 100 |
| 6.21 | Surface Analysis results for Sample EmissA2. (A)SEM Image at 1050x. (B)SEM Image at 8400x. (C)XRD Scan. (D)Fluoride XPS Peak. | 101 |
| 6.22 | Comparing the Aluminium XPS detailed Scans. (A)Adsorption Run 32. (B)Emission Run Air 2. | 102 |
| 6.23 | The stages in an emission Trial. (A)Adsorption Alumina. (B)Adsorption Run 35 (Fresh). (C)Stagnant Emission Run 4 – Control. (D)Stagnant Emission Run 4 – Emission. | 103 |
| 6.24 | Possible species upon heating alumina in an HF environment (10 mol HF, 200 mol Al ₂ O ₃). | 105 |
| 6.25 | Possible species upon heating alumina in an HF environment (10 mol HF, 200 mol Al ₂ O ₃ , 30 mol H ₂ O). | 105 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 6.26 | Comparison of the F% and Na% of s-alumina analysis. | 106 |
| 6.27 | The logged base emissions and temperatures followed by the transition from secondary to primary alumina fed for cell technology III. | 107 |
| 6.28 | The transition from primary to secondary alumina from cell technology I. | 108 |
| 7.1 | The separated emission components. | 111 |
| 7.2 | HF response during an a zero feeding period for cell technology I. | 114 |
| 7.3 | Equipment set up for cell technology II and III. | 114 |
| 7.4 | HF monitor duct set up on overhead cells for cells technology II and III. | 115 |
| 7.5 | The base measurements for (A)Cell Technology I. (B)Cell Technology II. | 116 |
| 7.6 | Changes in the emission with changes in humidity for cell technology III. (A). Total Emission. (B). Calculated non alumina feeding emission. | 118 |
| 7.7 | The non alumina feeding emission vs. ambient humidity (pH ₂ O). (A)First set of base measurements. (B)Second set of base measurements. | 119 |
| 7.8 | A typical anode change emission profile (A)Cell Technology II (B)Cell Technology III. | 120 |
| 7.9 | Cell Technology II Emission profile differences from: (A)Shorter anode change. (B)Longer anode change. | 121 |
| 7.10 | The hydrolysis correlation for anode changes for cell technology II. | 122 |
| 7.11 | Comparing the approximate emissions from the duct flow trial. | 123 |
| 7.12 | The HF response curve upon tapping for cell technology I. | 125 |
| 7.13 | Bath Temperature effects upon tapping. | 126 |
| 7.14 | A typical tapping emission profile. | 126 |
| 7.15 | A typical anode effect emission profile for cell technology II. | 127 |
| 7.16 | A typical crust addition emission profile for cell technology II. (A)Emissions Profile. (B)Signal Intensity profile. | 128 |
| 7.17 | A typical crust addition emission profile for cell technology I. A)Emissions Profile. (B)Signal Intensity profile. | 129 |
| 7.18 | Two crust types. (A)Poor crust integrity. (B)Good Crust integrity. | 130 |
| 7.19 | Comparing the emission before and after crust addition for cell technology II. (A)Before crust addition. (B)After primary crust addition. | 132 |
| 7.20 | Comparing HF emission between 6.43am and 12.30pm after crust addition, 1 day after crust addition, and 2 days after crust addition. | 133 |
| 7.21 | Feeder hole state changes for extreme changes in crust for cell technology I. | 137 |
| 7.22 | The journey for s-alumina feeding to a open feeder hole. | 140 |
| 7.23 | The journey for s-alumina feeding to a closed feeder hole. | 141 |
| 7.24 | The journey for s-alumina feeding to a partially filled feeder hole. | 142 |
| 7.25 | HF conc/feeding vs duct temperature for cell technology I. | 143 |
| 7.26 | Duct temperature vs bath temperature correlations for cell technology I. | 144 |
| 7.27 | Ambient and duct temperature trends for cell technology II. | 145 |
| 7.28 | The relationship between duct temperature and HF emissions for cell technology II. | 145 |
| 7.29 | The relationship between ambient humidity and HF emissions for cell technology II. | 146 |
| 7.30 | The correlation between bath temperature and HF emissions for cell technology I. | 147 |
| 7.31 | The poor correlation between excess AlF ₃ composition and bath liquidus temperature for cell technology I. | 147 |
| 7.32 | The non-relationship between cell temperature and HF emissions for cell technology II. | 148 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 8.1 | Step response of HF emission to alumina feed for (A)Cell technology I. (B)Cell technology II. | 150 |
| 8.2 | The alumina concentration decay curve for track for cell technology II. | 151 |
| 8.3 | The response theory for a step forcing function. | 152 |
| 8.4 | The modified response curve containing a constant emission value. | 152 |
| 8.5 | The average results for the step response analysis for cell technology I. (A)Step rise average values. (B)Step decay average values. | 153 |
| 8.6 | A normal alumina response curve for cell technology II track. | 154 |
| 8.7 | Slower alumina response curves for cell technology II. (A)Medium Response. (B)Slow Response. | 154 |
| 8.8 | Pseudo rate law fits for cell technology I: (A)Second Order. (B)1.5 Order. (C)First Order. | 157 |
| 8.9 | Pseudo rate law fits for cell technology II: (A)First Order. (B)Second Order. | 158 |
| 8.10 | Fitting the pseudo rate equation for cell technology I: (A)High k example. (B)Low k example. | 159 |
| 8.11 | Fitting the pseudo rate equation for cell technology II. (A)High k example. (B)Low k example. | 160 |
| 8.12 | The rate model for HF evolution rates for cell technology I. Model plotted has a $k=5 \times 10^{-3}$. | 161 |
| 8.13 | The rate model for HF evolution rates for cell technology II. Model plotted has a $k=3 \times 10^{-2}$. | 162 |
| 8.14 | The structural water reaction figures for (A)Cell Technology I. (B)Cell technology II. | 166 |
| 8.15 | The effect of excess AlF_3 on the emission (A)Bath Temperature. (B)Fluoride Emission. | 170 |
| 8.16 | The effects of Humidity on the Emission contributors for cell technology II. | 171 |
| 8.17 | The effects of crust state and feeder hole state on the hydrolysis emission for cell technology II. | 172 |
| 8.18 | The effects of crust state and feeder hole state on the overall HF emission for cell technology II. | 173 |
| A1.1 | The fluoride adsorption rig. | 183 |
| A1.2 | Representative fluoride adsorption breakthrough curve. | 184 |
| A2.1 | The spreadsheet calculations for the Haupin Kvande Model. | 186 |
| A2.2 | The spreadsheet calculations for the model predicting cell technology I emissions. | 187 |
| A2.3 | The spreadsheet calculations for the model predicting cell technology II emissions. | 188 |

List of Tables.

| Table | Caption | Page |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| 3.1 | The factors affecting alumina dissolution. | 26 |
| 4.1 | The proportions of fluoride emissions from cells. | 31 |
| 4.2 | Potential reactions for primary HF generation. | 33 |
| 4.3 | Sources of Hydrogen converted to HF. | 35 |
| 4.4 | Henry's anode hydrogen HF evolution results. | 37 |
| 4.5 | Average raw material requirements for P155A cell studied. | 44 |
| 4.6 | Sources of HF. | 44 |
| 4.7 | XPS surface atomic compositions. | 49 |
| 5.1 | Comparing the three studied cell technologies. | 56 |
| 5.2 | Anode hydrogen contents. | 58 |
| 5.3 | Measured non alumina HF emissions levels. | 59 |
| 5.4 | Calculated and measured HF emissions. | 60 |
| 5.5 | The dissolved water emission rates for cell technology I and II for 3wt% alumina. | 66 |
| 5.6 | The LOI(300) and LOI(1000) analysis for the fed alumina (wt%). | 68 |
| 5.7 | The HF peak heights for the different LOI alumina. | 69 |
| 5.8 | The average properties of the alumina for the hydrated alumina trials. | 69 |
| 5.9 | Comparing wet alumina runs with normal condition results | 71 |
| 5.10 | D_{feeding} and calculated non alumina feeding emission B for hydrated secondary trial. | 74 |
| 5.11 | Water mass balance for 24h period for cell technology I. | 75 |
| 5.12 | Water mass balance for 24h period for cell technology II. | 76 |
| 6.1 | The bath vapour hydrolysis trials conditions. | 88 |
| 6.2 | Comparison of the XRF results for the relevant emissions runs. | 95 |
| 6.3 | Comparing Surface Compositions of Ad 32 and EmissA2. | 102 |
| 6.4 | Comparing the properties of the cell technology 3 primary and secondary alumina. | 107 |
| 6.5 | Comparing batch measured fluoride generation contents for cell technology 1. | 108 |
| 7.1 | Comparing the base emission characteristics of the three cell technologies. | 117 |
| 7.2 | The Results of the Duct Flow Investigation. | 123 |
| 7.3 | D_{feeding} and calculated Non Alumina Feeding Emission B for cell technology I tapping. | 125 |
| 7.4 | Laboratory results of the primary alumina cover over the 4 days of the crust trial. | 133 |
| 7.5 | The calculated non alumina feeding emission (B) and D values for the crust trial. | 134 |
| 7.6 | The calculated non alumina feeding generation for cell technology II. | 135 |
| 7.7 | Calculated Δ correlation data for extreme crust changes in cell technology I. | 138 |
| 8.1 | Resistance changes and Reaction efficiencies. | 163 |
| 8.2 | The dissolved water contribution for the three cell technologies. | 165 |
| 8.3 | Comparing the Model and measured results for cell technology I. | 169 |
| 8.4 | Comparing the Model and measured results for cell technology II. | 169 |
| 9.1 | Summary of HF emission contributors. | 176 |

List of Symbols.

| | | |
|------------------|--|---------------|
| T | = Temperature | (K) |
| T _b | = Bath Temperature | (°C) |
| P | = Absolute Pressure | (kPa) |
| p _{H2O} | = Partial pressure of water in the air at a fixed T and P | (kPa) |
| ΔG | = Gibbs Free Energy | (J) |
| K | = Equilibrium Constant | (---) |
| CR | = Cryolite Ratio | (---) |
| r | = Reaction rate | |
| k | = Rate constant | |
| k' | = Pseudo rate constant | |
| U | = Underfeed HF emission | (kg/h). |
| O | = Overfeed HF Emission | (kg/h). |
| A | = OF alumina feed rate | (kg/min). |
| a | = UF alumina feed rate | (kg/min). |
| B | = Non alumina emission | (kg/h). |
| D | = U – O = D _{feeding} | (kg/h). |
| d | = A - α | (kg/min). |
| α | = Difference between alumina feed normalised overfeeding and underfeeding emission rates | (---). |
| τ | = Time constant for structural water dissolution | (s). |
| t | = Time | (s). |
| A, B, C | = Derived constants for step response analysis. | |
| a, b, c | = Derived constants for step response analysis. | |
| F | = Total primary fluoride evolution | (kg/tonne Al) |
| W | = Bath weight ratio. | |
| AW | = Alumina water content | (%) |
| BA | = Bath Alumina content | (%) |
| CF | = Bath calcium fluoride content | (%) |
| AE | = Anode effect. | |
| TR | = Track. | |
| AF | = Hand fluoride addition. | |
| HC | = Average hydrogen content of the anodes | (%) |
| ftc | = Feeding technology coefficient | |
| OFH | = Open Feeder hole percentage | (%) |
| P _B | = Ambient Pressure | (kPa) |
| %CE | = Current Efficiency | (%) |
| P _{NaF} | = Vapour Pressure of NaF above Bath | (kPa) |
| R _b | = Weight Ratio NaF/AlF ₃ in bath | (---) |
| HBA | = Hydrolysis by air factor. | |

