

Coal-fired Power Plants and their impact on Ecosystems Health

ABSTRACT

Coal-fired power plants emit greenhouse gases (GHG) that cause global warming. Coal, being one of the most important fossil fuel, emits three times as much GHG as natural gas. The combustion of coal (fossil fuels at large) discharge different kinds of chemical substances that affect ecosystems and human health. Some of the most important by-products include Nitrous oxides, Sulfur oxides, Carbon dioxide, Fly ash and Mercury. Various studies have confirmed that fly ash contains high levels of carcinogens causing more incidences of cancer, albeit data on ecosystems health is scanty and little is understood. The Author designed a greenhouse study to investigate the effects of coal by-products on the health of immediate ecosystems by growing tomatoes in potted soils collected from two coal-fired power plants. The first site (Chalk Point generating station), is located in Prince George's County (MD) while the second one (Brandon Shore generating Station) is located in Anne Arundel County near Curtis Bay (MD). Three replicate samples were taken within 1 mile and 4 miles radius of these coal-fired power plants. Measurements were made on the soils physico-chemical (pH, soil texture) and plant morphological (leaf-area-index, color, stalk diameter and height) characteristics. Results of the analysis show that plants growing in close proximity to the coal-fired power plants exhibit a very low leaf-area-index, stunted growth and overall low performance. The study concluded that coal-fired power plants do exert undesirable ecological impacts and in the long-run can have a detrimental effect on the health of ecosystems.

Keywords: Coal-fired power plants, Ecosystems health, Greenhouse gases, By-products

1. INTRODUCTION (ARIAL, BOLD, 11 FONT, LEFT ALIGNED, CAPS)

Coal-fired power plants emit more than 60 different hazardous air pollutants. Yet, despite billions of dollars of investment, scientists are unable to completely remove harmful emissions from plants. Pollution from coal-fired power stations is released in four main ways; (i) fly ash from the smoke stack, (ii) bottom ash which stays at the bottom after the coal is burned, (iii) waste gases from the scrubber units (which are chemical processes used to remove some pollutants) and (iv) gas released into the air (Geoffrey and Simate 2014).

27 Studies by Easterling and Wehner (2009) have shown that the large scale burning of coal
28 contributes to global climate change and regional air pollution. There are a number of by-
29 products that are released by coal burning; among these the most important are sulfur
30 dioxide, nitrogen oxides, carbon dioxide and mercury. Sulfur dioxide has been associated
31 with acid rain and the increased occurrence of respiratory disease. Another chemical that
32 has been associated with acid rain is nitrogen oxide, which is also linked to photochemical
33 smog and to the depletion of the Earth's ozone layer. Mercury is another by-product that is
34 associated with both neurological and developmental damage in human beings and animals
35 (Dentener et al., 2005).

36 In the United States alone, air pollution from power plants contributes to an estimated 30,000
37 premature deaths, hundreds of thousands of asthma attacks, and tens of thousands of
38 hospitalizations for respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses each year. Studies show that
39 people living in coal mining with no direct contact with the mines themselves were at higher
40 risk for kidney disease and chronic lung and heart diseases. They were found to be 70 times
41 as likely to develop kidney disease, 64 times as likely to develop chronic lung diseases such
42 as emphysema, and 30 percent more likely to develop high blood pressure (Jacobson,
43 2009). Death rates in coal mining communities are higher than in other parts of the country,
44 even among non-mine workers. Fine matter pollution from U.S. power plants leads to more
45 than 24,000 deaths each year. Power plant pollution is responsible for 38,200 non-fatal heart
46 attacks per year (McConnell et al., 2007).

47 Ecosystems are also strongly impacted by coal-fired power plants. Mining operations rip
48 apart ecosystems and reform the landscape. As forests are replaced with non-native
49 grasslands, soils become compressed and streams polluted. Study by Hansen (2008) has
50 shown that in the United States there are over 156 coal-fired power plants that store ash in
51 surface ponds similar to the one that collapsed in the coal incident in Tennessee. Records
52 specify that Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Georgia and Alabama store the most ash in their
53 ponds. The impacts of these ponds on water resources and the surrounding fauna and flora
54 are not fully studied (McConnell et al., 2007). Constance and Johnson (2005) stated that the
55 negative health effects of these coal-fired power plants on the nearby human population,
56 plant life, and wildlife have been hard to quantify precisely and thoroughly.

57 This study attempted to examine the local ecosystems impacts of power generating plants in
58 an experiment that was carried out in a greenhouse using tomatoes as an indicator plant on
59 soils collected from two coal-fired coal plants in Maryland. The objectives of the study were
60 to examine the impacts of the by-products on select soil properties and morphological
61 characteristics of the indicator crop.

62

63

64


65

66 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

67

68 **Study Sites**

69 In 2016, approximately 37.1% of all energy produced in Maryland came from coal. Out of the
70 nine major coal-fired power plants, we selected two for this study. Figure 1 shows Brandon
71 shore and Chalk point power generating stations. Chalk point power generating station is
72 located in Prince George's County (MD) whereas Brandon **shores** power generating station
73 is located in Anne Arundel County (MD).



Source: www.sierraclub.org

Figure 1. Map showing the study sites (Black arrows indicating Brandon shore and Chalk point power generating stations)

Soil samples were collected within 1 mile and 4 miles radius of the study sites. Three replicate samples were collected from each radius to ensure complete representation of the study sites. As control, we used garden soil (with no chemical by-products) to investigate the impacts of the by-products on soil properties and plant morphological characteristics.

Experimental Design

Each site had three treatments (1 mile, 4 miles and control) and the pots were filled with equal mass of soil. All pots were watered at the same frequency and depth using a sprinkler system. Tomato seeds were germinated on a seedling bed before transplanted into the pots. The seeds took over 14 days to have the minimum number of leaves (4) required for transplanting.

Soil Analysis

Once soil samples were brought to the lab, analysis was made on select physico-chemical characteristics following standard procedures. The analysis included soil pH and particle size distribution.

95

96 **Monitoring Plant Morphological Characteristics**

97 Periodic measurements were made on important morphological characteristics of the
98 indicator crop (tomato), including plant height, leaf area index, stalk diameter, leaf color, and
99 flowering and overall growth rate.

100

101 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

102

103 **Soil characterization**

104 **Soil texture**

105

106 Particle size analysis of the experimental soils (Table 1) shows that Brandon shore has a silt
107 loam texture whereas Chalk point has a sandy clay loam. The control (garden soil) was
108 classified as clay loam texture.

109

110 ***Table 1. Soil texture analysis of the study sites***

111

| Particle size | Value | Soil type | Methods |
|----------------------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Brandon Shore | | | |
| Sand (%) | 32.7 | Silty loam | Pipette Method |
| Silt (%) | 52.2 | | |
| Clay (%) | 15.1 | | |
| Chalk Point | | | |
| Sand (%) | 46.1 | Sandy clay loam | Pipette Method |
| Silt (%) | 26.3 | | |
| Clay (%) | 27.6 | | |
| Control | | | |
| Sand (%) | 33.7 | Clay loam | Pipette Method |
| Silt (%) | 34.2 | | |
| Clay (%) | 32.1 | | |

112

113

114 **Soil pH**

115

116 Soil pH was measured for all treatments and their replications and the result is presented in
117 Table 2.

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129
130
131
132

Table 2. Measurement of Soil pH for the study sites and control sample

| Soil pH | Value | Soil pH | Value |
|-----------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|-------|
| Brandon Shore (1 mi) | | Brandon Shore (4 mi) | |
| REP 1 | 5.27 | REP 1 | 7.10 |
| REP 2 | 5.53 | REP 2 | 7.46 |
| REP 3 | 6.02 | REP 3 | 7.39 |
| Chalk Point (1 mi) | | Chalk Point (4 mi) | |
| REP 1 | 7.23 | REP 1 | 7.99 |
| REP 2 | 7.08 | REP 2 | 7.56 |
| REP 3 | 7.01 | REP 3 | 8.00 |
| Control | | | |
| REP 1 | 7.20 | | |
| REP 2 | 7.14 | | |
| REP 3 | 7.00 | | |

133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161

As can be seen from the table, Brandon shore is more acidic (average pH 5.6) closer to the power plant (1 mile radius) than further away (4 miles radius) from it (average pH 7.32). On the other hand, Chalk point gets more alkaline as **one goes** further away from the power plant (4 miles). **The Author believes** the acidity of Brandon shore soil is the result of by-products from the power plant. The pH is an important indicator of soil's productivity and plants performance (Hussain *et al.*, 2005).

Plant Morphological characteristics

The study used plant height, leaf diameter, color and stalk diameter to compare the difference treatments. Figure 2 (a, b and C) is an example to show the difference in the rates of growth (after 8 weeks of planting) at 1 mile, 4 mile and control samples for Brandon shore power generating plant. Leaves of the control sample had deeper green color while leaves within 1 mile radius revealed lighter green colors showing some level of stress.



Figure 2 (a) Brandon shore (4 mi)




Figure 2 (b) Brandon shore (1 mi)



Figure 2 (c) Control sample

The Author observed the same pattern for Chalk point where tomatoes planted on samples collected from 4 miles showed a better morphological performance compared to 1 mile radius (Figure 3). This difference could be explained from the fact concentration of the byproducts decrease as we go away from the power plants hence impact on soil and plant health will decrease.

175



176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

Figure 3. Morphological measurements (in cm) after 8 weeks of planting. For Chalk Point, 1- 3 indicate samples within 4 miles and 4-6 show samples within 1 mile radius. For Brandon Shore 1-3 indicate within 1 mile and 4-6 indicate within 4 miles radius

Similar studies on the impacts of coal-fired power plants on water quality have shown that Acid Mine Drainage (AMD) refers to distinctive types of waste bodies that originate from the weathering and leaching of sulphide minerals present contamination of drinking water and disrupted growth and reproduction of aquatic plants and animals (Geoffrey and Simate, 2014). Effects of AMD related to water pollution include the killing of fish and loss of aquatic life and corrosion of mining equipment and structures such as bridges and concrete materials.

4. CONCLUSION

The trace elements contained in coal are a large group of diverse pollutants with a number of health and environmental effects. These elements are a public health concern because at sufficient exposure levels they adversely affect human health. Some are known to cause cancer, others impair reproduction and the normal development of children, and still others damage the nervous and immune systems. Many are also respiratory irritants that can worsen respiratory conditions such as asthma. They are also an environmental concern because they damage ecosystems. Power plants also emit large quantities of carbon dioxide (CO₂), the “greenhouse gas” largely responsible for climate change. The health and environmental effects caused by power plant emissions may vary over time and space, from short-term episodes of coal dust blown from a passing train to the long-term global dispersion of mercury, to climate change. Because of different factors like geology, demographics and climate, impacts will also vary from place to place.

In order to better understand the local ecological impacts of coal-fired plants, a green-house experiment was conducted on soils sampled from two plantations, using tomatoes as an indicator crop. Soils collected close to the power plants have higher acidity (as evidenced by pH measurements). Tomatoes that were grown on soil sample taken within 1 mi radius of the power plants showed poor performance in all morphological characteristics. Future study should consider more treatments (closer proximity to the power generating stations) and add more replications to have a comprehensive understanding on the impacts of Coal-fired power plants.

In summary, there is nothing clean about coal and the health of our ecosystem is constantly being threatened by it. Coal-fired power plants cause a host of environmental harms; promoting increased reliance on coal without additional environmental safeguards is certain to increase those harms. One of those safeguard measures would be to locate these coal-fired power plants far from urban ecosystems so that their impacts on animal and plant habitats could be minimized.

COMPETING INTEREST

I DECLARE THAT THERE IS NO COMPETING INTERESTS.

REFERENCES

Constance L. S. and Johnson S. A. (2006). Impact of Carbon-in-Ash on Mercury Removal across Particulate Control Devices in Coal-Fired Power Plants. *Energy & Fuels* 2005, 19, 859-863

Dentener, F., Stevenson, D., Cofala, J., Mechler, R., Amann, M., Bergamaschi, P., Raes, F., and Derwent, R.(2005). The impact of air pollutant and methane emission controls on tropospheric ozone and radiative forcing: CTM calculations for the period 1990–2030, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 1731–1755.

235 Easterling, D. R. and Wehner, M. F. (2009) Is the climate warming or cooling? *Geophysics*.
 236 *Research.*, 36, L08706, doi:10.1029/2009GL037810.

237 Geoffrey S. and Simate S. (2014) Acid mine drainage: Challenges and opportunities *Journal*
 238 *of Environmental Chemical Engineering*. Volume 2, Issue 3, September 2014, Pages 1785-
 239 1803

240 Hansen, J., Ruedy, R., Sato, M., Imhoff, M., Lawrence, W., Easterling, D., Peterson, T., and
 241 Karl, T. (2008). A closer look at United States and global surface temperature change,
 242 *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106, 23947–23963.

243 Hussain, I., K.R. Olson and S.A. Ebelhar (2005). Long-Term Tillage Effects on Soil Chemical
 244 Properties and Organic Matter Fractions. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 63:1335-
 245 1341.

246 Jacobson, M. (2009). 5 Review of solutions to global warming, air pollution, and energy
 247 security, *Energy. Environ. Sciences.*, 2, 148–173, doi:10.1039/b809990.

248 McConnell, J., Edwards, R., Kok, G., Flanner, M., Zender, C., Saltzman, E., Banta, J.,
 249 Pasteris, D., Carter, M., and Kahl, J. (2007). 20th-century industrial black carbon emissions
 250 altered arctic climate forcing. *Science*, 317, 1381–1384.

251 Mitchell, J. F. B., Davis, R. A., Ingram, W. J., and Senior, C. (2005). On surface temperature,
 252 greenhouse gases, and aerosols: Models and observations, *J. Climate*, 8, 2364–2386.

253 Schulz, M., Textor, C., Kinne, S., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Bernsten, T., Berglen, T.,
 254 Boucher, O., Dentener, F., Guibert, S., Isaksen, I. S. A., Iversen, T., Koch, D., Kirkevåg, A.,
 255 Liu, X., Montanaro, V., Myhre, G., Penner, J. E., Pitari, G., Reddy, S., Seland, Ø., Stier, P.,
 256 and Takemura, T. (2006). Radiative forcing by aerosols as derived from the AeroCom
 257 present-day and pre-industrial simulations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 5225–5246.

258 Shindell, D., Lamarque, J.-F., Unger, N., Koch, D., Faluvegi, G., Bauer, S., Ammann, M.,
 259 Cofala, J., and Teich, H. (2008). Climate forcing and air quality change due to regional
 260 emissions reductions by economic sector, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8, 7101–7113,

261 Shindell, D. and Faluvegi, G. (2009). Climate response to regional radiative forcing during
 262 the 20th century, *Nature Geosci.*, 2, 294–300.

263 Shindell, D. T., Faluvegi, G., Bell, N., and Schmidt, G. A. (2005). An emissions-based view
 264 of climate forcing by methane and tropospheric ozone, *Geophys. Res. Letter*, 32, L04803,
 265 doi:10.1029/2004GL021900

266 Williams, Walt. New Study Says Health Risks Greater in Coal-Mining Communities. *The*
 267 *State Journal*, Web. 10/10/2017