Chapter

Fossil Fuel Fires: A Forgotten Factor of Air Quality

Łukasz Kruszewski

Abstract

Spontaneous fossil fuel fires, especially coal fires, are known worldwide. They occur in numerous sites, both completely natural (coal seam outcrops) and anthropogenic (burning mining waste heaps, or BMWHs). Coal and waste/barren rock fires produce gaseous emanations, acting within exhalative processes. This factor is rarely being considered as influencing quality of the atmospheric air. The paper shortly discusses most important available methods for field gas analysis, with an emphasis on a portable FTIR spectrometer. It summarizes results of gas analyses from Polish BMWHs, using a multi-tool approach. It also lists a number of additional analyses from 53 vents of these environmentally important objects, with the main purpose of enlarging the knowledge of the span of concentrations of the particular compounds. This is especially true for formaldehyde, pyridine, CO, 1,1,1-trichloroethene, 1,1-dichloroethene, cumene, SO₂, and, to a lesser extent, NO₂, CCl₄, ethane, propane, ethene, and thiophene. The latter, and DMS, are confirmed as gaseous S source more frequent and rich than SO₂.

Keywords: natural spontaneous coal fires, combustion gas emissions, in situ FTIR gas analysis

1. Introduction – fossil fuel fires

Spontaneous fires of fossil fuels – mainly coals but also bituminous shales and oil shales – are known worldwide. They both concern natural environments and their anthropogenic analogues – burning mining waste heaps (BCWH). The CWHs are, more or less, permanent elements of the environment of coal basins. Although sometimes under reclamation, their recultivation procedures may also negatively influence the surroundings. The phenomena taking place in the BCWH are described, e.g., in Nasdala & Pekov [1], Cebulak et al. [2], Sokol et al., [3], Stracher [4], and papers of Ł.K. The later largely characterize complex products of gaseous emissions related to both coal and barren rock – mutually known as mining waste – burning. This chapter characterizes the composition of these emissions, by juxtaposing published concentrations and their related mean values with new data obtained for new BCWH-type object. As such, the chapter extends knowledge about the geochemical charge of the BCWH gaseous emissions and, as such, their potential atmospheric input.

2. Environmental gas emission measurement methods

Numerous methods of gas analysis in the environment exist. One of the most simple one, based on colorimetric chemical reactions, uses indicatory tubes (IT).

This method is based on colorimetric interaction of measured gaseous species with a chemical filler. In particular, Dräger tubes allow to detect and measure amounts of gases like O₂, CO₂, CO, NO₂, SO₂, NH₃, PH₃ (phosphine), acetic acid, acetone, propane, benzene, toluene, styrene, *o*-xylene, butadiene, total mercaptans (thiols), methanol, *i*-propanol, trichloroethene (TCE), vinyl chloride, methyl tert-butyl eter (MTBE), and others. However, the IT method brings large errors due to crosssensitivity and numerous coincident reactions of the emanation-contained gaseous species, and humidity. Positive determinations for the BCWHs gases were thus single, and the following substances were observed (with semi-quantitative due to the above factors): H₂S (up to 1140 ppm), HCN (single determination (s.d.), 16 ppm), acetaldehyde (possibly up to 1150 ppm), diethyl ether (up to 1100 ppm), trimethylamine (and/or other amines; ca. 57 ppm), ethyl formate (s.d., <23 ppm), and I_2 (s.d., 1.7 ppm). Gas Chromatography (GC) is a method of choice for the analysis of environmental organics. A sample is put into specialized columns, where retention time of a particular molecule, related to its mass and charge (m/z) parameter), is measured. However, it is relatively rarely used for gas analysis due to a need of a more sophisticated sample loader. This is overcame by a method of Colman et al. [5], where a sample sucked into a steel can and sent to laboratory (here: overseas) is reheated (to the temperature measured *in situ*), divided into aliquots with various pre-treatments including (1) passing heated aliquots over a glass for low-volatile compounds exerting and (2) water-immersion-driven revolatization, and (3) chromatographic separation. Analyses of such portioned sample using 3 detection methods: Mass Spectrometry (MS), Flame Ionization (FI), and Electron Capture (EC), both shown in Kruszewski et al. [6] and this chapter, proven to be problematic, as explained below.

The GC method is, however, useful in the environmental gas analyses if coupled with tools like Nitrogen-Phosphorus-Detector and cryo-focusing. A good example is a work of Wickenheiser et al. [7], who analyzed gases emitted from Italian wetland bogs. The compounds included PH₃, ethane, ethene, and NO_x. GC coupled with Inductively Coupled Plasma – Mass Spectroscopy (ICP-MS) allowed them to address heavy organo(semi/non)metallic gases like trimethylarsine (TMA), (CH₃)₃As, and trimethylstibine (TMS), (CH₃)₃Sb, and also metallic Hg, emitted from algal mats. The same method allowed to Feldmann et al. to detect (via cryotrapping) trimethylbismuthine, $(CH_3)_3Bi$, as a common gas in municipal solid waste and sewage gas. Traces of tetramethyltin and TMS were also detected this way (vide [8]). Another method mentioned by the latter author is hydride generation. The use of tedlar bags, a gas trapping solution (with HNO_3 and H_2O_2), charcoal sorbent tubes, preconcentrators, and analysis with GC-MS and GC-PID (GC with photoionization detection) is also widely exploited, e.g., to measure TMA and propanethiol [9]. A method to be exploited by the author (Ł.K.) is a GC in conjunction with Atomic Emission Spectroscopy (AES). This two-step method involved very-low-detection-limit analysis, both qualitative and quantitative, of mainly (semi)metals in a gas sample, followed by analysis of their immediate surroundings for proposing types of organic and inorganic (semi)metal forms (R. Stasiuk, pers. comm.).

3. Mining waste heaps and products of their fires

A large number of coal mining waste heaps bear numerous spontaneous fire foci. In these burning coal-mining waste heaps (BCWHs), the fire incidents are due to criss-crossing influence of coal petrography (i.e., maceral composition), sulfide mineral content (especially pyrite), coal rank, and microbial activity. The fires

induce three types of mineral-forming phenomena: a high-temperature solid-solid and gas-solid transformation of the waste, known as pyrometamorphism (up to \sim 1200°C in the coal case; [3]); medium-temperature exhalative processes; and lowtemperature supergene weathering processes ([6, 10–12], and references therein). Of the Air Quality interest is, of course, the second group of processes, involving both gas emission and gas-waste interface reactions. The latter include direct gas desublimation (condensation) and pneumatolysis-like gaseous extraction of various waste-contained metals followed by hydrothermal mineralization. The first process mainly produces minerals like native sulfur (S₈), salammoniac (NH₄Cl), and a number of less frequent species like kremersite, $(NH_4,K)_2$ [FeCl₅(H₂O)] and other chlorides. The second one is responsible for vast, thick sulfate crusts mainly comprising godovikovite-sabieite solid solution, (NH₄)(Al,Fe)(SO₄)₂, millosevichitemikasaite solid solution, (Al,Fe)₂(SO₄)₃, steklite, KAl(SO₄)₂, tschermigite, (NH₄)Al $(SO_4)_2 \cdot 12H_2O$ (natural ammonium aluminum alum), alunite-supergroup minerals, and many others. Pyrometamorphic processes and their product in Polish BCWH within both the Upper and Lower Silesian Coal Basins (USCB and LSCB, respectively) was extensively studied, e.g., by Kruszewski [13, 14] and Kruszewski et al. [15, 16], with process imitation experiments described, e.g. by Kruszewski [10]. Mineralogy of the exhalative processes and gas phase composition of the local fumaroles was largely addressed by Kruszewski [6, 12, 17–19]. Fabiańska et al. [20] and Lewińska-Preis et al. [21] addressed some environmental aspects of the gas emissions in question. Supergene mineralogy was described in Kruszewski [11]. Presentation of the BCWH as models of various natural environments, including extraterrestrial ones, was shown by Kruszewski et al. [22, 23]. Biological aspects of the BCWH environment were brought up by Kruszewski & Matlakowska [24].

The fumaroles bear numerous minerals rich in trace and toxic elements, like zinc, copper, nickel, arsenic, thallium, lead, bismuth, selenium, bromine, iodine, indium, silver, and others. The mineral segregations are, obviously, related to the gas phase composition. Analyzing the latter was somewhat pioneering, as we could not find any literature sources showing the use of a portable FTIR (Fourier-Transformed InfraRed) spectroscopy for *in situ* analyzing of gaseous emissions, at least in the BCWH or the coal-fire environment in general. The IR method is a type of spectroscopy where vibrations of chemical bonds in molecules are being addressed, and depicted by their interaction with IR laser (a similar method is Raman spectroscopy). Various types of vibrations (i.e., stretching, bending, rocking, and other types) are responsible for various peaks in the spectra observed. Most compounds show response to the IR light (i.e., IR laser), by a pattern more or less characteristic for the particular molecule. Some exceptions include H_2S (hydrogen sulfide), which – in the variation of the IR method described here – gives only weak signals, thus making the aforementioned IT method somewhat more useful. The main components were shown (in [6]) to be H_2O and CO_2 , with minor but variable add of CH_4 and CO. However, the composition was shown to be much more complex. The portable FTIR GASMET DX-4000 (OMC ENVAG) system was thoroughly characterized in Kruszewski et al. [6, 12]. It system a tool of choice for analysis of complex, hot, chemically aggressive and char- and ash-rich emanations, including combustion/exhaust gases. It comprises a probe with stainless-steel tip, connected with special wires with gas conditioning system (with a pressure control, pump, and system of 2 µm filters for catching any solid and liquid contaminants) and then the FTIR spectrometer. The interferometer has a ZnSe beam splitter; the sample cell has its path length of 5.0 m, volume is 0.4 L; Viton gaskets, MgF_2 protective coating, and BaF_2 window are present, too. The whole sampling system is internally coated by protective layers of rhodium and, gold and nickel.

FTIR results obtained for total 52 fumaroles in four BCWHs located in Pszów, Rybnik-Rymer, Radlin, and Rydułtowy (USCB), respectively, showed up to [in ppm, unless noticed; whole-range maximums underlined]: H₂O 57.5, 19.3, 12.5, 36.2 vol.%; CO₂ 67.2, 7.63, 6.82, 30.6 vol.%; CO 2690, 694, 21, 347; NO 434, 38, 123, 151; N₂O not observed (n.o.), 0.42, 1.2, 8.7; NO₂ 16430, 116, 24, 191; NH₃ 1715, 646, 14, 98; SO₂ 582, 74, 64, 226; HCl 58, 23, 2.4, 8.9; CCl₄ 22, 1.5, 6.0, 14; HF 4.0, 2.2, n. o., 5.1; SiF₄ 1890, 228, 504, 1980; AsH₃ 8.2, 0.49, 0.18, 0.64; CH₄ 82970, 1050, 838, 888; ethane 511, 306, 42, 316; propane 1446, 100, 16, 284; hexane 921, 123, n.o., 262; ethene 92, 28, 21, 21; dichloromethane (DCM) 5472, 1730, 241, 1980; 1,1-dichloroethane (1,1-DCE) 2110, 580, 175, and 742; 1,2-DCE 573, 28, 7.4, n.o.; 1,1,1trichloroethane (1,1,1-TCE) 7.7, n.o., 40, 23; 1,2-dichloropropane (1,2-DCP) 4900, 12, n.o., 44; 1,1-dichloroethene (1,1-DCEe) 51, 3.3, 34, 140; vinyl chloride 1700, 809, n.o., 1980; chlorobenzene 416, 71, 92, 100; cumene (*i*-propylbenzene) 194, 84, 35, 75; phenol 43, 348, 37, and 103; *o*-cresol (2-methylphenol) 1620, 99, n.o., 99; furan 27, 29, 130, 12; tetrahydrofuran (THF) 598, 372, n.o., 2830; thiophene 781, 578, 773, 550; acetic acid 7000, 12, 12, 650; dimethyl sulfide (DMS) 6650, 2230, n.o., 6780; dimethyl disulfide (DMDS) 518, 36, n.o., 97; formaldehyde 5.7, n.o., n.o., and 3.1. Pyridine was observed only in Radlin, in very constant amounts, 10–11 ppm. Although certified (as in the case of other compounds in the calibration library), the maximum contents of germanium tetrachloride, GeCl₄, i.e., 3130, 209, 333, and 2098 should be treated with care due to possible coincidence as yet unresolvable by the Calcmet software. Geometric means of the concentration values (Pszów, Rybnik-Rymer, Radlin, Rydułtowy, whole series) are: H₂O 31, 12, 3.0, 21, and 19 (*n*_{total} = 46); CO₂ 31, 4.0, 0.22, 11, and 7.0 (*n*_{total} = 50) [vol.%]; CO 84, 186, 9.6, 81, and 81 (*n*_{total} = 41); NO 87, 15, 14, 66, and 42 (*n*_{total} = 24); NO₂ 334, 38, 14, 42, and 41 (*n*_{total} = 26); N₂O -, 0.10, 0.66, 4.3, and 0.83 (*n*_{total} = 17); NH₃ 287, 22, 3.4, 59, and 88 (*n*_{total} = 18); SO₂ 110, 18, 17, 48, and 56 (*n*_{total} = 31); HCl 7.4, 4.2, 0.56, 3.0, and 3.8 (*n*_{total} = 46); CCl₄ 3.2, 0.18, 0.91, 2.5, and 1.6 (*n*_{total} = 51); HF 4.0, 2.2, -, 3.3, and 3.4 ($n_{\text{total}} = 9$); SiF₄ 16, 114, 94, 182, and 65 ($n_{\text{total}} = 29$); AsH₃ 1.1, 0.19, 0.17, 1.0, and 0.58 (*n*_{total} = 26); CH₄ 1945, 500, 23, 537, and 457 (*n*_{total} = 47); ethane 46, 114, 15, 75, and 59 (*n*_{total} = 37); propane 148, 70, 16, 27, and 46 (*n*_{total} = 27); hexane 160, 25, -, 15, and 38 (*n*_{total} = 26); ethene 7.9, 7.3, 11, 8.3, and 8.2 (*n*_{total} = 28); DCM 230, 119, 160, 295, and 214 (*n*_{total} = 45); 1,1-DCE 235, 190, 98, 99, and 139 (*n*_{total} = 32); 1,2-DCE 153, 28, 7.4, -, and 91 (*n*_{total} = 9); 1,1,1-TCE 5.4, -, 40, 9.5, and 7.7 $(n_{\text{total}} = 19)$; 1,2-DCP 1038, 5.7, -, 20, and 166 $(n_{\text{total}} = 9)$; 1,1-DCEe 19, 2.6, 31, 25, and 20 (*n*_{total} = 35); vinyl chloride 329, 38, -, 394, and 289 (*n*_{total} = 32); chlorobenzene 24, 36, 92, 32, and 32 (*n*_{total} = 12); cumene 28, 30, 35, 15, and 22 (*n*_{total} = 38); phenol 14, 36, 3.8, 32, and 19 (*n*_{total} = 32); *o*-cresol 115, 21, -, 99, and 73 (*n*_{total} = 15); furan 11, 9.8, 72, 12, and 31 (*n*_{total} = 18); THF 126, 372, -, 643, and 195 (*n*_{total} = 10); thiophene 251, 200, 90, 156, and 186 (*n*_{total} = 40); formaldehyde 3.5, -, -, 0.54, and 0.82 (*n*_{total} = 8); acetic acid 189, 6.6, 8.1, 83, and 54 (*n*_{total} = 22); DMS 517, 433, -, 921, and 533 (*n*_{total} = 16); DMDS 68, 11, -, 31, and 41 (*n*_{total} = 35); and pyridine -, -, 11, -, and 11 (total 8 records).

GC results were also published in the paper, with confirmed occurrence of carbonyl sulfide, COS, carbon disulfide, CS₂, freons (CCl₃F, CCl₂F₂, CHClF₂), *i*-butane, *n*-butane, *i*-pentane, *n*-pentane, *n*-hexane, *n*-heptane, *n*-octane, *n*-nonane, *n*-decane, propene, 1-butene, *i*-butene, *trans*- and *cis*-2-butene, *trans*- and *cis*-2-pentene, ethyne, 1,3-butadiene, isoprene (2-methyl-1,3,-butadiene), 2,3-dimethylbutane; 2- and 3-methylpentanes; benzene, toluene, *m/p*- and *o*-xylenes, styrene, ethylbenzene, *n*- and *i*-propylbenzene; 2-, 3,- and 4- (or *m*-, *p*- and o-) ethyltoluene; 1,2,3-, 1,2,4-, and 1,3,5-trimethylbenzenes; and α - and β -pinene. As shown in the paper, the GC results may be quite unreliable due to their non-*in situ* character and possible intra-gas and gas-steel interactions, and are thus not resumed

here. In turn, we have later used a second and third mode of the FTIR spectra reading. The first one is an external library search, where the spectra are read and calculated using libraries containing other compound sets, thus reporting semiquantitative results with fit factor $(r^2, in \%)$, as described in Kruszewski et al. [12]. Any misfits are due to recording the standards in different conditions than in the DX-4000 calibration library case. Applying this method allowed to detect additional compounds for the previously listed 4 BCWH sites [in ppm, with results for fit ≥90%, 75–90%, 50–75%, and < 50%, and whole-data maximums underlined]: acetylene, C_2H_2 (up to 0.81; up to 27; up to 38; up to 288), *n*-butane (-; -; 7.1; 1.5), *i*-butane (-; -; 9.7; 0.25), propene (-; -; up to 101; up to 30), *n*-pentane (-; -; 4.0; 1.9), *i*-pentane (-; -; 11; 0.91), heptane (-; -; up to 2.1; -), octane (-; -; up to 2.3; -), nonane (-; -; up to 2.1; -), decane (-; -; up to 2.0; -), undecane (-; -; up to 2.0; -), 1,3-butadiene (3.2; -; up to 144; up to 169), cyclohexane (-; -; up to 2.7; -), α -pinene (-; -; up to 4.0; up to 1.1), limonene (C₁₀H₁₆; -; -; up to 4.9; 2.7), 3-carene (C₁₀H₁₆; 512; up to 2.2), benzene (8.8; up to 5.1; up to 52; up to 5700), toluene (-; -; up to 74; up to 18), styrene (-; 88; 0.76; up to 154), *m*-xylene (-; -; 19; up to 51), *p*-xylene (-; -; 16; up to 23), ethylbenzene (-; -; -; up to 8.4), 1,3,5-TMB (-; -; up to 729; up to 32), 1,2,4-TMB (-; -; up to 1610; up to 27), 1,2,3-TMB (-; -; up to 1360; up to 23), tetrachloroethene (-; up to 4.3; up to 28; up to 27), methanol (11; 5.4; up to 18; up to 75), ethanol (16; 5.4; up to 38; up to 126), *i*propanol (isopropanol; -; -; -; up to 16), *i*-butanol (isobutanol; -; -; -; 5.4), *n*propanol (-; -; 982; -), methanethiol (methylmercaptan), CH₃SH (-; -; -; up to 55), ethanethiol (ethylmercaptan), C_2H_5SH (-; -; 2500; up to 14), HCN (up to 8.4; up to 16; up to 88; up to 65), acrylonitrile (prop-2-enenitrile, CH₂ = CHCN; -; 6.0; up to 63; up to 82), isocyanic acid (-; -; -; up to 717), formic acid, HCOOH (3.0; 8.7; up to 29; up to 48), trimethylamine, $(C_2H_5)_3N$ (-; -; -; up to 1.5), acetaldehyde (up to 45; up to 97; up to 1810; up to 6270), propionaldehyde (propanal), (C_2H_5) CHO (-; -; -; up to 24), 2-ethylhexylaldehyde $(C_4H_9CH(C_2H_5)CHO; -; -;$ up to 342; -), acrolein (propenal, CH₂ = CHCHO; -; 1.6; up to 57; up to 25), acetone (propan-2-one) (-; -; -; up to 98), methyl ethyl ketone (MEK, or butan-2-one), $CH_3C(O)C_2H_5$ (-; -; -; up to 28), methyl isobutyl ketone (MIBK, or 4methylpentan-2-on), $(CH_3)_2C_2H_3C(0)CH_3$ (-; -; -; up to 2.6), diethylether (ethoxyethane, (C₂H₅)₂O; -; -; 1.7; up to 24), MTBE (-; -; -; up to 9.4), 2ethoxyethanol, $(C_2H_5)O(CH_2)O(C_2H_5)$ (-; -; up to 47; up to 32), 2-ethoxyethyl acetate (-; -; -; up to 19), butyl acetate (-; -; -; up to 15), 2-(2-butoxyethoxy) ethyl acetate (-; -; -; up to 13), methyl metacrylate (methyl 2-methylprop-2enoate; -; -; -; up to 10), PH₃ (phosphine; -; up to 43; up to 144; up to 152), COS (up to 0.88; up to 6.1; up to 0.40; -), and last but not least SF₆ (-; -; up to 1.6; up to 1.5). The last compound is environmentally very important, as it is said – by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - to be the most potent greenhouse gas [25]. The measured BCWH emanation concentrations are also much higher (over 170000 times) than the highest ones measured at Mauna Loa fumaroles [26]. Calculated geometric means (whole series; with values for fit \geq 50% in the parentheses): 13 (2.3) for acetylene (n = 14 (31)), 25 (51) for propene (n = 9 (3)), 17 (29) for 1,3-butadiene (n = 15(5)), 0.76 for α -pinene (n = 6), 3.5 for limonene (n = 3), 6.2 for 3-carene (n = 4), 55 (9.7) for benzene (n = 34 (14)), 7.4 (21) for toluene (n = 11)(3)), 9.6 for styrene (n = 9), 9.9 (10) for *m*-xylene (n = 11 (8)), 13 for *p*-xylene (n = 7), 13 (13) for 1,3,5-TMB (n = 11 (8)), 11 for 1,2,4-TMB (n = 10), 4.5 for 1,2,3-TMB (n = 6), 15 (5.5) for methanol (n = 24 (4)), 32 (8.6) for ethanol (n = 26 (7)), 6.9 for *i*-propanol (n = 7), 23 for ethanethiol (n = 4), 4.2 (1.4) for tetrachloroethene (n = 31 (9)), 7.2 (5.9) for HCN (n = 47 (33)), 293 for isocyanic acid (n = 18), 1.2 for trimethylamine (n = 3), 47 (47) for acrylonitrile (n = 12 (9)), 15 (12) for formic acid (n = 35 (7)), 62 (28) for acetaldehyde (n = 50 (45)), 9.4 for propionaldehyde

(n = 4), 37 for 2-ethylhexylaldehyde (n = 3), 23 (28) for acrolein (n = 13 (9)), 21 for acetone (n = 22), 5.2 for diethylether (n = 10), 6.8 for 2-ethoxyethanol (n = 10), 7.7 for 2-ethoxyethyl acetate (n = 20), 4.8 for butyl acetate (n = 8), 5.1 for methyl metacrylate (n = 9), 12 for MEK (n = 8), 2.0 for MIBK (n = 5), 2.7 for MTBE (n = 4), 0.37 (0.41) for COS (n = 16 (13)), 72 (40) for PH₃ (n = 28 (10)), and 1.1 for SF₆ (n = 10). As such, acetaldehyde, HCN, PH₃, tetrachloroethene, ethanol, benzene, COS, methanol, acetylene, and 1,3-butadiene, isocyanic acid, acrolein, and likely acetone and 2-ethoxyethyl acetate seem to be the most frequent admixing gases in the BCWH exhausts studied.

The third operation mode is qualitative analysis of residual spectra, as thoroughly described in both my previous papers. This method allowed to list proposals of additional, very interesting, admixing gases, many of which were likely first documented in the nature. They include neutral hydroxides of Ca, Mg, Al, Fe(II), Fe (III), Zn, Cu; nitrosyls and carbonyls of Ti, V, Mn, Fe, Ag, Mo, Fe, Cu; hydrides of Al, Cu, Zn, Ge, Mo, Sb, and Hg; nitriles, azo and related compounds (azacyclopropenylidene, dicyanoacetylene, cyanogen isocyanate, cyanogen N-oxide, diazomethyl radical, hydrogen isocyanide, isocyanic acid, *m*-hydroxybenzonitrile, phenylnitrene radical; 2,4,6-trinitrene-1,3,5-triazine); amines (methyl(nitrosomethyl)amine); hypobromous and hydroiodic acids; hydrocarbons and halocarbons (cyclohexene, dibenz[*a*,*h*]anthracene, difluorovinylidene, hexachlorobenzene, hexachloroethane, 5methyl-1,3-didehydrobenzene, pentacene, phenanthrene, triphenylene); nitrosyl chloride and iodide, phosgene; organoboron compounds (fluoroisocyanatoborane) and compounds like CBrO and B₂O₂; organosulfurs (thiirene, thioacetaldehyde, thioxoethenylidyne radical), organophosphorus compounds (methylphosphine), and organosilicons (difluorosilane, disinale, silanenitrile, tribromosilane), organoiodine compounds (iodosomethane – an I³⁺-bearing compounds; iodocyanoacetylene), $HAlCl_2$, ClO_2^* , and dimeric NO, to mention some. Due to multiple coincidence possible these results should, however, be treated with care.

4. New *in situ* FTIR gas analysis results of the USCB heaps

Results presentation within this chapter has its main goal in enlarging the span of the knowledge on the concentration range of various (major and minor) components of the BCWH combustion gases, both by pFTIR and GC methods. **Table 1** shows data from Czerwionka-Leszczyny (18, that is, 10 vents / vent zones from zone CLD and 8 from the CL one). **Table 2** juxtaposes data for 10 additional, differently mineralized vents from the Radlin heap (RD), with that from a BCWH in Bytom (BTM, 7 vents / vent zones). **Table 3**, in turn, juxtaposed data for vents in a BCWH in Świętochłowice (SWC, 11 vents / vent zones), "Starzykowiec" heap in the Chwałowice part of Rybnik (RCH, 1 vent, surface and deep part), and "Ruda" heap in Zabrze-Biskupice (ZBB, 5 vents / vent zones). In total, data for additional 53 vents is reported. As in the case of the data presented in Kruszewski et al. [6, 12], gases were probed at the surface and from deeper parts of the vents, whenever possible. Temperatures were measured using an IR pyrometer.

Following are values describing maximum and geometric-mean concentrations of gaseous species as detected within fumarolic vents of the CLD, CL, RD, BTM, SWC, and ZBB sites (whole-series-maximums are underlined): H_2O , 18.12, 14.74; 7.30, 2.83; <u>27.14</u>, 23.04; 11.15, 9.83; 6.42, 4.68; 25.63, 23.19; CO₂, 2.85, 2.29; 27.00, 0.20; 29.89, 20.85; 8.12, 6.05; <u>38.41</u>, 33.89 [vol.%]; CO, 135, 110; 163, 9.4; 2430, 1002; 3590, 2675; 1090, 303; <u>26700</u>, 3257; NO, <u>112</u>, 96; 10, 6.4; 7.3, 7.3; -, -; 19, 15; -, -; NO₂, 44, 22; 368, 155; 2.0, 2.0; <u>1430</u>, <u>1430</u>; -, -; 66, 45; N₂O, 3.5, 2.3; 0.06, 0.02; <u>4.4</u>, <u>4.4</u>; 2.8, 2.8; 1.3, 1.3; -, -; NH₃, 21, 7.7; 30, 2.5; 19, 7.1; <u>65</u>, 55; 4.1, 2.4; 8.3,

CL2aA	45			7.30	27.00		163	lbdl	lbdl	65	30	671	5.8	6.6	0.03	31	1.7		2950	lbdl	729	17
CL2a	30			6.10	18.00		145	lbd	lbdl	368	18	119	6.5	lbdl	lbd	20	0.20		811	30	lbdl	152
CLdo	82			2.62	0.03		1.5	0.02	10	lbdl	1.4	2.4	0.63	lbdl	lbdl	2.1	lbdl		4.8	lbdl	8.2	lbd
CL1	50			0.75	lbd		lbd	lbd	1.6	lbdl	lbd	lbdl	0.01	lbdl	lbd	1.1	lbdl		0.51	lbdl	11	lbd
CLd	82			2.58	0.03		0.98	0.01	9.7	lbdl	1.4	1.9	0.58	lbdl	lbdl	2.1	lbdl		4.6	lbdl	13	lbd
CLdU	82			2.57	0.03		lbd	0.06	lbdl	lbd	0.23	lbd	0.08	lbd	lbd	1.9	0.16	1	6.8	lbd	3.1	lbd
CLdAr	06			2.65	0.03		3.1	0.04	9.6	lbd	1.0	lbd	0.76	lbd	lbd	1.9	lbd	atives, ppn	4.8	lbd	4.2	lbd
CLdA	06			2.68	0.03		6.4	0.02	6.9	lbd	lbd	lbd	1.5	lbd	lbd	2.2	lbd	their deriv	4.5	lbd	lbd	lbd
CLD7	09	TIR	cs, vol.%	18.12	2.85		103	0.57	lbdl	44	9.4	120	6.6	lbdl	lbdl	4.6	lbdl	rbons and	248	bdl	37	11
CLD602	35	\mathbf{pF}'	inorgani	17.65	2.54		94	lbdl	lbdl	11	11	20	7.6	lbdl	lbdl	6.3	lbdl	atic hydroca	253	lbdl	40	4.6
CLD60	35			17.62	2.39		132	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	10	lbdl	8.7	lbdl	lbdl	3.4	lbdl	c and arom	251	lbdl	lbdl	7.0
CLD50	35			16.88	2.08		101	lbd	lbdl	lbdl	21	lbdl	10	lbdl	lbd	3.8	lbdl	aliphati	262	lbdl	36	2.3
CLD5S	35			17.36	2.26		101	lbd	lbdl	lbdl	15	87	10	lbdl	0.62	5.3	lbdl		259	lbdl	42	4.6
CLD5	25			16.43	1.90		135 ³	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	10	lbdl	11	lbdl	lbdl	3.7	0.03		244	lbdl	34	2.6
CLD3	45			12.27	2.40		lbd	3.5	112	lbd	3.7	lbd	0.57	lbd	lbd	0.16	0.15		31	bdl	4.4	0.35
CLD2	45			12.22	2.34	s, ppm	lbdl	3.5	112	lbdl	3.6	lbdl	0.24	lbdl	lbdl	0.21	0.17		31	lbdl	4.4	0.31
CLD10	45			12.21	2.32	inorganic.	lbd	3.4	107	lbd	3.9	lbdl	lbd	lbd	lbd	0.06	0.08		31	lbdl	3.8	0.20
CLD1	40			9.77	1.96		lbdl	2.8	64	lbdl	4.4	4.2	0.04	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl		26	lbdl	6.9	1.8
vent ¹	T [°C]			H_2O^2	CO ₂		CO	N_2O	NO	NO_2	NH_3	SO_2	HCI	CC14	HF	SiF_4	AsH_3		CH_4	ethane	propane	hexane

CL2aA	62	159	12	lbdl	CL2aA	lbdl	lbdl	347	186	lbdl	lbdl	10		lbdl	177	lbdl	173		13	165	bdl
CL2a	37	368	17	4	CL2a	417	56	226	lbd	399	lbd	99		lbd	lbd	86	lbd		13	893	lbd
CLdo	lbdl	51	7.2	lbdl	CLdo	6.5	lbdl	57	6.3	1.7	lbdl	6.9		lbdl	lbdl	12	lbdl		0.42	lbdl	36
CL1	1.9	18	lbdl	lbdl	CL1	lbdl	lbdl	25	6.0	2.4	2.9	0.81		lbdl	lbdl	23	8.3		0.45	lbdl	17
CLd	lbdl	50	7.4	lbdl	CLd	6.4	lbdl	48	6.0	1.9	lbdl	7.1		lbdl	lbdl	12	lbdl		0.42	lbdl	36
CLdU	1.3	56	lbd	lbdl	CLdU	lbdl	lbdl	49	22	7.6	7.0	0.28		lbdl	lbdl	6.3	lbd		0.47	lbdl	31
CLdAr	lþd	65	5.1	lbdl	CLdAr	lþd	lbdl	45	14	1.3	3.2	2.2		lbdl	lbdl	2.3	lbdl		1.2	0.15	37
CLdA	2.2	52	lbd	lbd	CLdA	lbd	lbd	35	15	6.1	4.6	1.9		lbd	lbd	0.27	lbd		0.58	lbd	3.5
CLD7	6.6	20	lbdl	lbdl	CLD7	21	lbdl	68	lbdl	31	17	24	s, ppm	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	103	шd	5.7	51	5.6
CLD6o2	3.7	57	lbdl	lbdl	CLD602	lbdl	lbdl	43	lbdl	34	17	23	c compound	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	127	ompounds, p	5.3	31	85
CLD60	lbdl	141	7.2	lbdl	CLD60	lbdl	31	63	39	29	28	20	cyclic organı	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	er organic c	5.3	33	7.0
CLD50	lbd	71	lbd	lbdl	CLD50	lbd	lbdl	54	18	31	29	17	hetero	lbdl	lbd	lbd	191	oth	6.0	27	40
CLD5S	1.3	104	lbdl	lbdl	CLD5S	lbd	lbdl	4	bdl	30	lbdl	46		lbdl	lbdl	7.1	137		7.0	6.9	104
CLD5	lbd	73	lbdl	lbd	CLD5	66	lbdl	57	20	29	29	19		lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	192		12	62	66
CLD3	lbd	15	lbd	lbd	CLD3	lbd	lbd	4.8	lbd	5.5	4.0	0.37		lbd	0.18	lbd	lbd		lbd	11	28
CLD2	lbd	16	lbd	lbd	CLD2	lbd	lbd	4.4	lbd	6.4	4.2	0.41		lbd	1.3	lbdl	lbd		lbd	7.7	32
CLD10	lbd	10	lbd	lbd	CLD10	lbd	lbd	5.3	lþd	6.3	4.4	lbd		0.14	lbd	lbd	lbd		lbd	13	23
CLD1	lbd	17	lbd	lbd	CLD1	lbd	lbd	4.3	lbd	4.4	2.4	0.29		lbd	0.29	bdl	lbd		0.11	lbd	12
vent ¹	ethene	DCM	1,1-DCE	1,2-DCE	vent	1,1,1-TCE	1,2-DCP	1,1-DCEe	CIB	cumene	phenol	o-cresole		furan	THF	py	tph		fm	DMS	DMDS ⁾

							GC – ac	lditional c	ompounds, 1	шda								
vent	CLD1	CLD10	CLD2	CLD3 ⁴	CLD5	CLD5S	CLD50	CLD60	CLD6o2	CLD7	CLdA	CLdAr	CLdU	CLd	CL1	CLdo	CL2a	CL2aA
CH ₃ Cl	0.002			0.001	0.003			0.002		0.005					0.002	0.08	0.03	0.01
ethyne	0.001			0.001	0.001			0.001		0.01					0.003	0.01	0.01	0.0002
propene	0.0002			lbd	1.7			5.2		1.4					0.09	0.51	0.36	0.09
<i>i</i> -butane	0.0003			0.002	1.6			3.2		3.5					0.08	0.69	8.3	2.3
<i>n</i> -butane	0.001			0.002	2.4			5.4		3.6					0.15	1.1	12	3.9
1-butene	0.0001			0.001	0.14			0.40		0.13					0.02	0.03	0.08	0.03
<i>i</i> -butene	0.0001			0.002	0.41			0.32		0.52					0.03	0.04	1.3	0.42
t^{-2} -bu	0.00004			0.001	0.52			1.4		0.50					0.02	0.04	0.59	0.24
<i>c</i> -2-bu	0.00003			0.0005	0.29			0.80		0.23					0.01	0.02	0.17	0.06
vent	CLD1	CLD10	CLD2	CLD3	CLD5	CLD5S	CLD50	CLD60	CLD6 ₀ 2	CLD7	CLdA	CLdAr	CLdU	CLd	CL1	CLdo	CL2a	CL2aA
<i>i</i> -pentane	0.001			0.01	0.92			1.8		1.8					0.06	0.35	6.5	1.7
<i>n</i> -pentane	0.0003			0.01	1.1			2.3		1.5					0.06	0.35	6.0	1.9
t-2-pte	lbdl			0.002	0.20			0.57		0.19					0.01	0.01	0.36	0.18
c-2-pte	lbdl			0.001	0.08			0.23		0.07					0.004	0.003	0.09	0.04
<i>n</i> -heptane	lbdl			0.003	0.44			0.84		0.34					0.02	0.07	1.7	0.68
<i>n</i> -octane	lbd			0.002	0.36			0.65		0.10					0.01	0.04	0.64	0.32
<i>n</i> -nonane	lbd			0.0003	0.25			0.40		0.03					0.01	0.01	0.22	0.04
<i>n</i> -decane	lbdl			0.0001	0.16			0.20		0.003					0.001	0.002	0.03	0.04
2,3-DMBu	lbd			0.01	0.07			0.13		0.16					0.003	0.02	0.58	0.14
2-MPT	lbdl			0.01	0.41			0.76		0.75					0.02	0.11	3.0	0.82

vent	CLD1	CLD10	CLD2	CLD3	CLD5	CLD5S	CLD50	CLD60	CLD6o2	CLD7	CLdA	CLdAr	CLdU	CLd	CL1	CLdo	CL2a	CL2aA
3-MPT	0.0001			0.005	0.16			0.30		0.30					0.01	0.05	1.3	0.34
cpt	lbd			0.001	0.19			0.42		0.26					0.01	0.05	1.0	0.30
benzene	0.0004			0.002	2.1			3.3		0.06					0.05	0.27	1.1	0.41
toluene	0.001			0.02	2.0			3.4		0.01					0.02	0.11	0.05	0.02
EtB	0.0001			0.003	0.27			0.43		0.01					0.01	0.02	0.12	0.05
M-p-X	0.0003			0.01	1.3			1.9		0.19					0.02	0.09	0.06	0.22
0-X	0.0002			0.003	0.39			0.53		0.03					0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01
styrene	0.001			0.0001	lbd			lbd		lbdl					lbd	lbdl	lbdl	bdl
<i>i</i> -PrB	lbd			0.0002	0.03			0.05		0.03					0.001	0.001	0.06	0.03
<i>n</i> -PrB	lbd			0.0005	0.06			0.08		0.02					0.001	0.002	0.02	0.01
m-EtT	0.0001			0.001	0.18			0.24		0.06					0.004	0.01	0.01	0.01
$p ext{-EtT}$	lbd			0.0005	0.07			0.10		0.02					0.001	0.003	0.01	0.01
o-EtT	lbd			0.0005	0.08			0.10		0.02					0.003	0.002	0.01	0.01
1,3,5-TMB	0.0001			0.001	0.14			0.19		0.07					0.003	0.005	0.01	0.005
1,2,4-TMB	0.0001			0.002	0.27			0.32		0.05					0.01	0.01	0.04	0.03
1,2,3-TMB	0.0001			0.001	0.10			0.10		0.02					0.004	0.003	0.06	0.05
Values in parenti ¹ "A" – samples ta ² DCM Aichlourd	heses denote tken from tk	overrun of th te depth of 0.8	e upper r 3–1 m; "a	neasureme	ent range. - nearby 1	ents; "r" –	repeated a	nalysis; "S'	" – sulfur-mir	neralized	vent. D oblouid	L concerned	110 + 144		1000	Contraction of the second	terls the	and and fine

²DCM – dichloromethane, DCE – dichloroethane, DCEe – dichloroethane, TCE – trichloroethane, DCP – dichloropone, ClB – chlorobenzene, THF – tetrahydrofuran, py – pyridine, tph – thiophene, fm – formaldehyde, DMS – dimethyl sulfide, DMDS – dimethyl disulfide; t(c)-2-bu – trans(cis)-2-butene, c(t)-2-pte – cis(trans)-2-pentene, DMBu – dimethylbutane, MPT – methylpentane, cpt – cyclopentane, EtB – ethylbenzene, X – xylene, PrB – propylbenzene, EtT – ethyltoluene, TMB – trimethylbenzene; unyl chloride, acetic acid, isoprene, and 1,3-butadiene were analyzed but were below their detection limits. ³Notable (>100 ppm) enrichment given in bold. ⁴GC data for a nearby vent.

Table 1.

Results of the pFTIR and GC gas analyses of BCWH in Czerwionka-Leszczyny.

60			9.43	7.49		2210	2.8	lbd	lbd	41	281	6.3	lbd	lbd	lbd	3.4		554	lbd	lbd	138	35
115			11.02	8.12		3590	lbd	lbdl	lbdl	65	378	15	lbd	lbd	3.2	2.8		819	lbdl	242	543	78
62			11.15	7.58		3090	lbd	lbd	1430	62	532	19	1.1	lbd	lbd	0.79		808	281	694	608	84
150			10.67	5.25		2640	lbd	lbdl	lbd	61	139	5.4	lbdl	1.1	0.95	2.0		359	lbdl	lbdl	309	39
73			10.41	5.52		3090	lbd	lbd	lbdl	60	147	3.6	lbdl	0.07	1.7	1.3		421	lbdl	lbd	160	17
144			9.94	5.43		2830	lbd	lþd	lþd	60	139	3.3	lbdl	0.59	1.8	2.9	, ppm	437	lbd	lbd	148	16
115			6.92	4.08		1730	lbd	lbd	lbd	42	86	2.7	lbd	lbd	1.7	0.81	derivatives	285	lbd	lbd	88	4.7
76		,0	26.65	24.64	ш	1100	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	16	lbdl	2.3	7.8	lbdl	13	0.11	and their u	1150	lbdl	249	76	6.9
76	R	nts, vol. %	24.80	21.14	ganics, pp	1030	lbd	lbd	lbd	3.1	lbd	5.0	11	lbd	14	lbd	ocarbons .	1120	lbd	195	64	3.1
76	pFTI	и сотроне	16.94	11.96	inor	673	4.4	lbd	lbd	1.8	62	lbd	7.4	lbd	17	1.7	natic hydr	500	lbd	lbd	53	12
76		mai	26.61	21.24		832	lbdl	7.3	lbdl	5.0	lbdl	6.2	3.2	lbdl	18	0.56	ic and aron	1140	lbdl	213	71	12
107			22.25	21.32		813	lbd	lbd	lbd	19	193	2.6	6.9	lbd	15	1.4	aliphat	1160	lbd	230	67	7.6
17			27.14	26.16		1110	lbd	lbd	lbd	12	lbd	2.5	6.8	lbd	15	1.2		1120	lbd	291	06	9.3
187			18.26	13.94		502	lbd	lbd	lbd	6.9	57	2.9	4.4	lbd	16	0.49		713	lbd	lbdl	53	5.4
133			26.02	20.21		923	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	5.5	bdl	6.1	10	lbdl	21	0.93		1120	lbdl	202	70	12
06			24.62	29.89		2430	lbdl	lbdl	2.0	9.2	311	3.1	5.1	lbdl	13	1.3		3470	142	601	139	0.71
60			19.99	25.00		1580	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	9.2	388	4.5	6.3	0.12	15	lbdl		3190	lbdl	387	71	lbdl
[0C] T			H_2O^2	CO_2		CO	N_2O	NO	NO_2	$\rm NH_3$	SO_2	HCI	CCI ₄	HF	SiF_4	AsH_3		methane	ethane	propane	hexane	ethene
	T [°C] 60 90 133 187 77 107 76 76 76 76 115 144 73 150 79 115 60	T [°C] 60 90 133 187 77 107 76 76 76 76 115 144 73 150 79 115 60 pFTIR	T [°C] 60 90 133 187 77 107 76 76 76 15 144 73 150 79 115 60 pFTIR main components, vol. %	$ T [^{\circ}C] 60 90 133 187 77 107 76 76 76 76 115 144 73 150 79 115 60 \\ \hline PFTIR \qquad \qquad$	$ T \left[{}^{\circ}C \right] 60 90 133 187 77 107 76 76 76 76 115 144 73 150 79 115 60 112 110 100 110 110 110 100 1$	$ T \left[{}^{\circ}C \right] $ 60 90 133 187 77 107 76 76 76 76 75 15 144 73 150 79 115 60 115 140 73 150 79 115 60 115 1102 1102 1102 1102 1102 1102 1102												T [7]609013318777777777777TT	IT 0 10 13 </th <th></th> <th>111<th1< th=""><th></th></th1<></th>		111 <th1< th=""><th></th></th1<>	

2				2																	2		
BTM	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	BTM	20	519	lbdl	359	lbdl	107	35	76		293	388		2.1	50	lbdl		BTM	0.02	0.98
BTM104	lbd	lbd	lbdl	BTM104	lbd	lbd	28	205	206	lbd	67	73		lbd	201		17	9.6	1200		BTM104		
BTM103	bdl	bdl	bdl	BTM103	59	568	24	137	73	117	60	81		lbdl	689		17	35	1370		BTM1o3		
BTM1o2	84	16	38	BTM1o2	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	63	112	264	47	53		232	bdl		1.2	lbdl	1540		BTM1o2		
BTM10	74	lbdl	lbd	BTM10	1.0	39	11	47	61	50	42	48		lbd	lbd		0.91	2.2	243		BTM10		
BTM1A	68	lbdl	lbd	BTM1A	lbd	lbd	11	29	46	46	39	46		lbd	lbdl		0.77	lbd	219		BTM1A		
BTM1	11	lbd	lbd	BTM1	lbdl	lbd	lbd	38	62	38	18	27	ш	lbdl	63		0.74	lbd	172		BTM1	0.10	1.3
RD110	34	lbdl	lbdl	RD110	lbd	248	162	278	62	06	17	31	ounds, pp	12	391	nds, ppm	1.6	lbd	15	, ppm	RD110		
RD11U	102	lbdl	lbdl	RD11U	lbdl	251	189	203	17	114	11	30	ganic comp	6.1	556	uic compou	1.3	lbdl	27	spunoduu	RD11U		
RD11L	94	lbd	lbd	RD11L	21	108	155	lbdl	lbdl	105	lbdl	39	rocyclic or	4.1	301	other organ	1.4	lbdl	255	itional co	RD11L	0.01	0.43
RD080	111	lbd	lbd	RD080	lbdl	224	176	269	74	123	51	26	hete	8.7	344	9	5.5	lbdl	70	GC – add	RD080	0.02	2.1
RD08krA	25	lbdl	lbdl	RD08krA	36	175	123	283	lbdl	108	1.6	50		9.3	369		2.0	lbdl	16		RD08krA	0.03	0.16
RD08kr	104	bdl	bdl	RD08kr	29	264	164	248	11	101	21	34		lbdl	363		2.0	lbd	lbdl		RD08kr	0.03	0.88
RD08NA	29	lbdl	lbdl	RD08NA	33	42	101	187	lbd	36	lbd	40		3.1	385		1.4	lbd	401		RD08NA	1.4	2.6
RD08N	126	lbdl	lbdl	RD08N	21	75	195	276	lbd	119	49	25		lbd	337		2.6	lbd	47		RD08N	0.05	0.78
RD07A	18	lbdl	lbdl	RD07A	15	384	30	96	lbdl	126	15	65		96	257		lbdl	9.1	126		RD07A		
RD07	8.3	lbdl	39	RD07	29	124	81	416	lbdl	94	lbdl	37		43	164		lbdl	lbd	131		RD07	0.001	7.4
vent ¹	DCM	1,1-DCE	1,2-DCE	vent	1,1,1-TCE	1,2-DCP	1,1-DCEe	ViCl	CIB	cumene	phenol	o-cresole		THF	tph		fm	acac	DMS		vent	CH ₃ Cl	COS

vent	RD07 RD0;	7A RD08N	RD08NA	RD08kr	RD08krA	RD080	RD11L	RD11U RD110	BTM1	BTM1A	BTM10 I	BTM1o2	BTM103	BTM104	BTM2
ethyne	0.01	0.01	0.001	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.04		0.002						0.004
propene	0.47	0.91	0.93	0.01	0.03	3.8	1.5		8.5						0.62
<i>i</i> -butane	3.3	1.7	0.08	0.005	0.13	2.0	2.6		2.4						1.7
<i>n</i> -butane	8.7	3.6	0.21	0.01	0.03	4.6	3.4		5.9						2.6
1-butene	0.01	0.02	0.13	0.003	0.005	0.24	0.13		1.6						0.05
<i>i</i> -butene	0.06	0.08	0.51	0.002	0.01	0.98	0.38		6.6						0.26
t-2-bu	0.01	0.06	0.16	0.001	0.01	0.78	0.24		2.3						0.07
c-2-bu	0.01	0.03	0.12	0.0005	0.003	0.47	0.18		1.6						0.04
<i>i</i> -pentane	2.0	0.77	0.04	0.004	0.09	1.2	1.1		1.2						0.80
vent	RD07 RD(77A RD08N	I RD08NA	RD08kr	RD08krA	RD080	RD11L	RD11U RD116	0 BTM1	BTM1A	BTM10]	BTM1o2	BTM1o3	BTM104	BTM2
<i>n</i> -pentane	3.3	1.1	0.07	0.005	0.06	2.1	1.2		1.7						0.91
isoprene	bdl	0.002	0.03	0.0003	0.001	0.02	0.01		0.13						0.003
1,3-budi	lbdl	lbd	0.02	0.0002	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl		0.03						lbdl
t-2-pte	0.12	0.01	0.06	0.001	0.01	0.21	0.08		0.81						0.01
c-2-pte	0.05	0.003	0.03	0.0004	0.002	0.09	0.03		0.39						0.003
<i>n</i> -heptane	0.44	0.18	0.03	0.001	0.01	0.58	0.41		0.93						0.11
<i>n</i> -octane	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.0007	0.004	0.18	0.21		0.57						0.05
<i>n</i> -nonane	0.03	0.46	0.02	0.0003	0.001	0.08	0.15		0.44						0.10
<i>n</i> -decane	0.003	0.02	0.01	0.0001	0.0002	0.02	0.11		09.0						0.01
2,3-DMB	0.12	0.04	0.003	0.0002	0.004	0.09	0.08		0.08						0.06
2-MPT	0.64	0.22	0.01	0.001	0.02	0.53	0.43		0.33						0.28
3-MPT	0.26	0.10	0.02	0.001	0.001	0.22	0.17		0.11						0.17
cpt	0.70	0.25	0.01	0.0004	0.003	0.40	0.27		0.22						0.20

vent	RD07	RD07A	RD08N	RD08NA	RD08kr	RD08krA	RD080	RD11L	RD11U	RD110	BTM1	BTM1A	BTM10	BTM102	BTM1o3	BTM104	BTM2
benzene	5.3		3.2	4.3	0.13	0.46	5.5	33			21						1.3
toluene	0.16		0.27	0.66	0.005	0.13	1.6	0.53			7.6						0.27
EtB	0.01		0.08	0.08	0.0003	0.02	0.09	0.10			3.6						0.06
X-d/m	0.03		0.11	0.28	0.001	0.05	0.34	0.36			3.0						0.17
0-X	0.01		0.05	0.13	0.0004	0.01	0.18	0.15			1.1						0.07
styrene	0.001		0.01	0.005	0.00003	0.001	0.01	0.01			0.14						0.003
i-PrB	0.001		0.02	0.01	lbd	0.001	0.003	0.02			0.71						0.01
n-PrB	0.002		0.01	0.04	0.0001	0.002	0.003	0.02			0.27						0.01
m-EtT	0.01		0.05	0.11	0.0001	0003	0.01	0.08			0.54						0.05
$p ext{-EtT}$	0.002		0.02	0.05	0.00003	0.001	0.01	0.06			0.38						0.02
o-EtT	0.004		0.02	0.04	0.00005	0.001	0.01	0.05			0.25						0.02
1,3,5-TMB	0.01		0.02	0.05	0.0001	0.001	0.01	0.11			0.38						0.02
1,2,4-TMB	0.01		0.08	0.17	0.0001	0.003	0.02	0.13			1.0						0.05
1,2,3-TMB	0.01		0.05	0.07	0.0001	0.001	0.01	0.14			0.55						0.04
Values in paren ¹ the "A" add der "c" _{culfur min}	theses den notes sam]	tote overrur ples taken f	ı of the up _l ^c rom the de	per measurer. ?pth of 0.8–1	nent range. m (below th	ie ground leve	el), while "	o,, and "o	" denote nec	arby vents.	dən – ", :	eated mea	surement;	mowed – "d	et amorphic.	zone,	

"S" - sulfur-mineralized vent. ²Abbreviations explained under **Table 1**; ViCl – vinyl chloride; furan, pyridine and DMDS were analyzed but were below their detection limits. ³Notable (>100 ppm) enrichment given in bold.

 Table 2.

 Results of the pFTIR and GC gas analyses of the "Marcel" mine BCWH in Radlin (RD, second gas study) and a heap in Bytom (BTM).

BB3	100			1.13	8.41		6700	bdl	bdl	31	8.3	bdl	4.9	4.0	bdl	10	2.9		380	bdl	64	21	82	lbdl
BB20 Z	86			1.52 2	5.77 3		952 20	lþd	lþd	bdl	bdl	123	5.9	8.2	lþd	26	lbdl		130 8	277	40	23	76	bdl
ZBB2 Z	86			25.53 2	34.75 2		938	bdl	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	lbd	5.6	8.5	lbdl	28	0.19		1130 1	257	39	21	46	lbdl
BB1A Z	210			22.56	33.95		2600	lbdl	lbdl	99	lbdl	lbdl	1.2	8.5	lbdl	15	2.9		740	lbdl	69	19	142	lbdl
ZBB1 Z	150			25.63	38.31		1220 1	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	8.3	lbdl	4.3	6.0	lbdl	25	0.88		1110	233	38	18	92	lbd
CH1A	49			7.81	0.79		21	2.6	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	172	1.2	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	bdl		12	12	bdl	bdl	143	2.4
RCH1 R	30			7.28	0.11		21	bdl	100	lbdl	12	129	0.71	lbdl	lbdl	0.42	lbdl		9.8	11	lbdl	lbdl	173	11
VC3A]	300			4.50	lbdl		176	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	1.4	47	3.9	0.34	lbdl	3.5	0.37	шdd	lbd	215	lbdl	lbdl	39	lbdl
WC3 SV	43			1.43	bdl		172	bdl	bdl	bdl	2.0	39	3.7	.34	bdl	3.0	.38	erivatives,	bdl	208	bdl	bdl	36	lbd
C203 S ¹	5	R	nts, vol. %	37 4	lþ	, ppm	40	.2	lþ	lþ	lb	33	.3	dl (lþ	L.	dl (nd their d	Ip	6	lþ	5	39	04
02 SW(6	pFTI	і сотропе	9	q	inorganics	10	1	q	q	q	u)	8	q	q	4	p	ocarbons a	p	(7)	þ	8	18	1(
SWC2	65		main	6.24	bdl		1060	1.3	bdl	lbdl	lbdl	58	8.3	bdl	bdl	47	bdl	atic hydro	bdl	37	bdl	24	191	102
SWC20	180			6.37	lbdl		1070	1.3	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	59	8.3	lbdl	lbdl	48	lbdl	and arom	lbdl	37	lbdl	26	191	102
SWC2	180			6.42	lbd		1090	1.3	lbd	lbd	lbd	62	8.4	lbd	lbd	48	bdl	aliphatic	lbd	34	lbd	26	181	103
SWC10B	45			3.98	lbdl		144	lbdl	19	lbdl	3.0	14	0.94	0.11	lbdl	0.18	0.28		lbdl	85	lbdl	lbdl	20	lbd
SWC1oSW	100			4.29	lbdl		164	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	3.1	lbdl	2.7	lbdl	1.1	2.5	lbdl		lbdl	lbdl	bdl	2.3	28	lbdl
SWC10P	100			4.38	lbdl		166	lbdl	lbdl	lbd	4.1	46	2.9	0.06	lbdl	2.4	0.40		lbd	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	11	lbdl
SWC1r	45			3.91	lbdl		143	lbdl	15	lbdl	3.1	15	0.73	0.03	lbdl	0.08	0.09		lbdl	72	lbdl	bdl	19	bdl
SWC1	45			2.47	lbdl		92	lbdl	12	lbdl	1.5	lbdl	0.48	0.57	0.19	lbdl	0.04		lbdl	192	lbdl	lbdl	30	12
vent ¹	T [°C]			H_2O^2	CO_2		CO	N_2O	NO	NO_2	$\rm NH_3$	SO_2	HCI	CCI ₄	HF	SiF_4	AsH_3		methane	propane	hexane	ethene	DCM	1,1-DCE

ZBB3	60	lbd	ZBB3	lbd	56	97	67	153	36	16		lbd	lbd	lbd		2.2	120	lbd		ZBB3				
ZBB20	bdl	65	ZBB20	114	176	299	lbd	92	lbd	63		21	lbd	282		lbd	148	lbd		ZBB20				
ZBB2	lbdl	26	ZBB2	214	191	365	lbd	128	34	39		32	lbd	448		2.8	60	lbd		ZBB2				
ZBB1A	59	lbd	ZBB1A	lbdl	130	145	73	16	11	22		lbdl	lbdl	lbdl		1.2	153	lbdl		ZBB1A	0.21	0.45	0.02	
ZBB1	lbdl	23	ZBB1	61	166	323	lbdl	90	20	30		36	lbdl	496		lbd	65	lbd		ZBB1	2.0	2.1	0.02	
RCH1A	bdl	lbdl	RCH1A	67	221	lbd	24	39	bdl	52		lbd	lbd	lbd		1.9	17	12		RCH1A	0.001	0.01	0.004	
RCH1	lbdl	63	RCH1	54	206	lbdl	lbdl	42	lbdl	56		lbdl	lbdl	lbdl		1.6	23	7.1		RCH1	0.001	0.003	0.0001	
SWC3A	lbdl	lbd	SWC3A	lbdl	33	lbd	7.7	lbdl	lbdl	7.1		lbd	232	141		3.1	lbdl	321		SWC3A	0.04		0.24	
SWC3	lbdl	lbd	SWC3	lbdl	30	lbdl	8.3	lbdl	lbdl	6.2	uds, ppm	lbdl	231	151	udd	2.8	lbdl	322	unds	SWC3	0.01		0.02	
SWC203	lbdl	436	SWC203	lbdl	272	lbdl	24	50	lbdl	13	nic compoun	lbdl	lbdl	194	compounds,	9.4	lbdl	lbdl	nal compo	SWC203				
SWC2o2	lbdl	444	SWC2o2	bdl	272	bdl	39	62	bdl	12	rocyclic orga	bdl	lbdl	200	ther organic	7.5	bdl	bdl	3C – additic	WC202				
SWC20	lbdl	447	SWC20	bdl	274	bdl	22	64	bdl	13	hete	bdl	bdl	204	0	7.5	bdl	bdl	0	SWC20 S	0.06		0.0004	
SWC2	bdl	492	SWC2	lbdl	287	lbdl	19	66	lbdl	13		lbdl	lbdl	260		7.4	lbdl	lbdl		SWC2				
SWC10B	lbdl	lbdl	SWC10B	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	1.4		lbdl	206	149		0.31	lbdl	293		SWC10B				
SWC1 ₀ SW	lbdl	lbdl	SWC1oSW	bdl	21	lbdl	51	bdl	9.7	2.5		lbdl	168	lbdl		5.7	bdl	16		SWC10SW				
SWC10P	lbdl	1.8	SWC10P	bdl	27	lbdl	bdl	bdl	0.45	5.6		lbdl	19	26		7.1	lbdl	lbdl		SWCloP				
SWC1r	lbdl	lbdl	SWC1r	lbdl	lbdl	lbd	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	1.6		lbd	202	146		0.21	lbdl	289		SWC1r				
SWC1	lbdl	lbdl	SWC1	lbdl	7.2	lbdl	9.5	lbdl	4.9	2.4		lbdl	178	lbdl		1.8	lbdl	380		SWC1	0.001		0.001	
vent ¹	1,2-DCE	1,1,1-TCE	vent	1,2-DCP	1,1-DCEe	VC	CIB	cumene	phenol	o-cresole		THF	ру	tph		fm	DMS	DMDS		vent	CH ₃ Cl	COS	ethyne	

Environmental Sustainability - Preparing for Tomorrow

vent	SWC1	SWC1r	SWC10P	SWC1oSW	SWC10B	SWC2	SWC20	SWC202	SWC203	SWC3	SWC3A	RCH1	RCH1A	ZBB1	ZBB1A	ZBB2 Z	ZBB20 ZI	BB3
propene	lbd						0.01			0.65	1.6	0.001	0.001	1.6	0.03			
<i>i</i> -butane	0.002						0.001			0.15	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.53	0.03			
<i>n</i> -butane	0.004						0.002			0.55	0.27	0.01	0.13	2.0	0.07			
1-butene	lbdl						0.001			0.05	0.18	0.0002	0.0002	0.17	0.02			
<i>i</i> -butene	lbd						0.002			0.09	0.37	0.0003	0.0005	0.24	0.01			
t-2-bu	0.001						0.001			0.09	0.20	0.0001	0.0003	0.28	0.02			
c-2-bu	0.001						0.001			0.06	0.14	0.0001	0.0001	0.16	0.01			
<i>i</i> -pentane	0.003						0.001			0.10	0.04							
vent	SWC1	SWC1r	SWC1oP	SWC1oSW	SWC10B	SWC2	SWC20	SWC2o2	SWC2o3	SWC3 5	WC3A	RCH1	RCH1A	ZBB1	ZBB1A	ZBB2 Z	CBB20 ZF	3B3
<i>i</i> -pentane	0.003						0.001			0.10	0.04	0.002	0.01	0.34	0.01			
<i>n</i> -pentane	0.002						0.001			0.29	0.14	0.005	0.03	0.96	0.03			
isoprene	lbdl						lbdl			0.003	lbdl	0.001	0.00005	0.01	0.001			
1,3-budi	lbd						0.0001			0.01	0.04	lbdl	lbdl	lbdl	0.01			
t-2-pte	0.0002						0.0004			0.04	0.04	0.0002	0.001	0.09	0.01			
c-2-pte	0.0001						0.0003			0.02	0.02	0.0001	0.0002	0.04	0.002			
<i>n</i> -heptane	0.001						0.001			0.12	0.07	0.001	0.01	0.33	0.01			
<i>n</i> -octane	0.0002						0.001			0.10	0.05	0.0001	0.001	0.18	0.004			
<i>n</i> -nonane	0.0003						0.0003			0.08	0.03 0	.00004	0.001	0.07	0.003			
<i>n</i> -decane	0.0003						0.0003			0.06	0.02 0	.00004	0.001	0.04	0.0002			
2,3-DMBu	0.02						lbdl			0.01	lþd	0.0001	0.001	0.02	0.001			
2-MPT	0.26						0.001			0.05	0.03	0.001	0.004	0.15	0.003			
3-MPT	9.6						0.0002			0.02	0.01	0.0003	0.001	0.07	0.001			
cpt	0.0005						0.0002			0.04	0.01	0.0005	0.003	0.10	0.002			

vent	SWC1	SWC1r	SWC10P	SWC1oSW	SWC10B	SWC2	SWC20	SWC202	SWC203	SWC3	SWC3A	RCH1	RCH1A	ZBB1	ZBB1A Z	ZBB2 Z	BB20	ZBB3
benzene	0.0001						0.03			0.50	1.7	0.003	0.46	12	33			
toluene	0.01						0.005			0.22	0.41	0.002	0.002	2.7	0.01			
EtB	0.0004						0.001			0.03	0.04	0.001	0.001	0.09	0.004			
M/p-X	0.001						0.002			0.07	0.15	0.002	0.002	0.34	0.01			
0-X	0.001						0.001			0.03	0.06	0.001	0.001	0.13	0.005			
styrene	bdl						lbdl			0.003	lbd	0.00002	0.0003	0.02	0.0004			
<i>i</i> -PrB	0.0002						lbdl			0.002	0.004	0.00002	0.0002	0.003	0.001			
n-PrB	0.0004						0.0004			0.01	0.01	0.0001	0.0003	0.02	0.001			
m-EtT	0.001						0.0002			0.01	0.02	0.0003	0.001	0.04	0.003			
p-EtT	0.0004						0.0001			0.004	0.01	0.0001	0.001	0.02	0.001			
o-EtT	0.0002						0.0001			0.01	0.01	0.0001	0.0004	0.02	0.001			
1,3,5- TMB	0.001						lbdl			0.01	0.01	0.0001	0.0004	0.01	0.001			
1,2,4- TMB	0.001						0.0004			0.02	0.03	0.0005	0.001	0.05	0.01			
1,2,3- TMB	0.0004						0.0002			0.01	0.01	0.0002	0.001	0.03	0.004			
Values in parer ¹ The "A" add d	ntheses deno enotes samp	te overrun oles taken f	of the upper rom the dept	measurement : th of 0.8–1 m (.	vange. below the gro	nund level),	, while "a"	and "o" denc	ote nearby ve	nts; "r" - 1	epeated me	asurement;	norvq – "q"	let amorph	hic zone, "S"	- sulfur-	mineraliz	ed vent.

²Abbreviations explained under **Table 1**; ethane, furan and acetic acid were analyzed but were below their detection limits. ³Notable (>100 ppm) enrichment given in bold.

 Table 3.

 Results of the pFTIR and GC gas analyses of a BCWH in Świętochtowice (SWC), "Starzykowiec" heap of the "Chwałowice" mine in Rybnik (RCH), and "Ruda" heap in Zabrze-Biskupice (ZBB).

8.3; SO₂, 120, 31; 671, 25; 388, 160; 532, 202; 79, 40; 123, 123; HCl, 11, 2.4; 6.5, 0.58; 6.2, 3.6; 19, 6.1; 8.4, 3.0; 5.9, 3.8; CCl₄, -, -; 6.6, 6.6; 11, 6.5, 1.1, 1.1; 0.57, 0.15; 8.5, 6.8; HF, 0.62, 0.62; 0.03, 0.03; 0.12, 0.12; 1.1, 0.36; 1.1, 0.46; -, -; SiF₄, 6.3, 1.3; 31, 3.5; 21, 16; 3.2, 1.7; 48, 4.6; 28, 19; AsH₃, 0.17, 0.09; 1.7, 0.38; 1.7, 0.75; 3.4, 1.7; 0.40, 0.20; 2.9, 1.1; CH₄, 262, 107; 2950, 16; 3470, 1238; 819, 491; -, -; 1130, 984; ethane, -, -; 30, 30; 142, 142; 281, 281; -, -; -, -; propane, 42, 15; 729, 15; 601, 275; 694, 410; 215, 77; 277, 255; hexane, 11, 1.8; 152, 51; 139, 73; 608, 225; -, -; 69, 48; ethene, 6.6, 3.2; 79, 6.9; 12, 6.0; 84, 27; 26, 13; 23, 20; DCM, 141, 36; 368, 69; 126, 47; 84, 46; 191, 51; 142, 82; 1,1-DCE, 7.2, 7.2; 17, 8.9; -, -; 16, 16; 104, 67; -, -; 1,2-DCE, -, -; 77, 77; 39, 39; 38, 38; -, -; 60, 59; 1,1,1-TCE, 99, 46; 417, 26; 36, 25; 59, 11; 492, 150; 65, 34; 1,2-DCP, 31, 31; 56, 56; 384, 159; 568, 226; -, -; 214, 114; 1,1-DCEe, 77, 21; 347, 67; 195, 123; 28, 17; 287, 66; 191, 132; vinyl chloride, -, -; -, -; 416, 235; chlorobenzene, 39, 24; 186, 15; 77, 44; 206, 81; 51, 18; 73, 70; cumene, 34, 16; 399, 5.7; 126, 97; 264, 81; 66, 81; 153, 60; 153, 76; phenol, 29, 10; 7, 4.2; 51, 16; 67, 41; 9.7, 2.8; 36, 23; o-cresol, 46, 5.8; 66, 3.6; 65, 36; 81, 54; 13, 5.3; 63, 30; furan, 0.14, 0.14 (no records for other sites); THF, 1.3, 0.41; 177, 177; 96, 12; 293, 261; -, -; 36, 29; thiophene, 192, 146; 173, 38; 556, 332; 689, 241; 260, 143; 496, 397; formaldehyde, 12, 3.7; 13, 1.2; 5.5, 2.0; 17, 2.3; 9.4, 3.0; 2.8, 1.9; acetic acid, -, -; -, -; 9.1, 9.1; 50, 14; -, -; -, -; DMS, 62, 21; 893, 28; 401, 69; <u>1540</u>, 534; -, -; 153, 101; DMDS, 104, 28; 37, 21; -, -; -, -; 380, 194; -, -; ad pyridine, 7.1, 7.1; 86, 7.3; -, -; -, -; 232, 144; -, - [ppm]. As compared to these vents, the one at the RCH site. The geometric mean concentrations for the whole range are: H₂O 9.5, CO₂ 3.83 [vol.%], CO 350, NO 20, NO₂ 54, N₂O 0.51, NH₃ 7.5, SO₂ 72, HCl 2.5, CCl₄ 2.3, HF 0.26, SiF₄ 4.5, AsH₃ 0.53, methane 201, ethane 106, propane 58, hexane 29, ethene 11, DCM 54, 1,1-DCE 17, 1,2-DCE 53, 1,1,1-TCE 37, 1,2-DCP 127, 1,1-DCEe 60, vinyl chloride 165, chlorobenzene 30, cumene 36, phenol and *o*-cresol and THF 13, furan 0.14, thiophene 200, formaldehyde 2.2, acetic acid 13, DMS 65, DMDS 39, and pyridine 29.

5. Discussion

In general, the data provided for additional vents from additional BCWH probed allows to enlarge the span of the maximum observed values of only some compounds. They include (with excess in parentheses) CO (10x), SO₂, 1,1,1-TCE (12x), 1,1-DCEe (2.5x), cumene (2x), formaldehyde (3x), and pyridine (21x). Higher than previously observed geometric mean values are also observed for NO₂, CCl₄, ethane (2x), propane, ethene, and thiophene. This is clearly seen in the case of the latter two compounds, with more frequent positive determinations than within the previous studies. Similar levels of geometric means are found for HCl, AsH₃, chlorobenzene, phenol, and DMDS. As formerly observed, concentration ranges are usually extremely variable. Cumene is a good example of a compound with very high maximum but very low geometric mean. So is true, though less clearly, for, e.g., *o*-cresol. Some compounds often show large contents but single records. For many BCWHs there are large discrepancies between the geometric mean values and maximums, while for less number of the objects studied the amounts emitted are at very steady level. Some constituents, like vinyl chloride and even methane, may show very high concentrations (>100 ppm) but may be "absent" (below detection limits) at other BCWHs or vents. As explained in the former papers, this results from very high dynamics of the local combustion processes. The *ex situ* GC values obtained are, again, usually much lower than those observed by *in situ* FTIR, thus confirming their uncertain and, possibly, semi-quantitative value. On the other hand, two compounds not observed within the previous GC data are now determined: CH₃Cl (chloromethane or methyl chloride) and cyclopentane.

At the time of the BCWH gas analyses the author could not find paper showing the usage of FTIR for environmental studies. Stockwell et al. [27] used this method to measure H_2O , CO_x , NO_x , HCl, SO_2 , NH_3 , methane, acetylene, ethene, propane, formaldehyde, formic acid, methanol, acetic acid, HCN, furan, glycolaldehyde, and HONO (the latter also initially reported in [6]) in biomass emissions, though in a Fire Lab at Missoula Experiment. A more *in situ* type of work, engaging airborne FTIR, is by Yokelson et al. [28] who measured African savanna fires, with 14 compounds analyzed.

It is noteworthy that numerous organic and organo(semi)metallic compounds (or similar ones) detected in the BCWHs exhausts are also detected in volcanic fumaroles (mainly via GC, or modeled, as summarized by Wahrenberger [29]) or algal emissions (by GC–MS; [30]). Examples of interesting species include CO₂, COS, CS₂, S₂, S₈, SO₂, AsH₃, HCl, HF, HBr, CHCl₃, NO₂, propanal, methanol, acetaldehyde, 1,1,2-trichlorotrifluoroethane, hexafluoropropene, tetrachloroethene, vinyl chloride, *i*-butene, hexane, octane, octane, butadiene, benzene, toluene, α-pinene, *i*- and *n*-propanol, methylacrolein, MEK, acetone, 1,4-dioxane, dimethyldifluorosilane, thioformaldehyde, ethylthiophene, trimethylborane, methylphosphine, and uncertain [N-(phenyl-2-pyridinylmethylene)benzeneamine-N,N']-irontricarbonyl and silver benzoate; geosmin, cyclopentane, cyclohexane, acetic acid, acetamide, glucopyranose, dibutyl phthalate, cholest-5-en-22-one, benzaldehyde, hydrazine, 8-amino-2-naphthalenol, ethanethioimide, thiourea, 1,3-oxathian-2-one, tetrahydro-2,5-dimethylthiophene, 6-methylbenzo[*b*]thiophene, 3,3,5,5,-tetramethyl-1,2,4-trithiolane, thiirane, C₂H₇O₂B borane, trimethylsilane, butytrimethylsilane, or undecanoic acid 11-chloro- and 11-fluorotrimethylsilyl esters.

Acknowledgements

This work was financed by the NCN (Narodowe Centrum Nauki, or National Science Centre) grant no. 2013/11/B/ST10/04960.

Author details

Łukasz Kruszewski Institute of Geological Sciences, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warszawa, Poland

*Address all correspondence to: lkruszewski@twarda.pan.pl

IntechOpen

© 2021 The Author(s). Licensee IntechOpen. This chapter is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/ by/3.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

References

[1] Nasdala, L., Pekov, I.V., 1993. Ravatite, $C_{14}H_{10}$, a new organic mineral species from Ravat, Tadzhikistan. European Journal of Mineralogy, 6, 669–705.

[2] Cebulak, S., Smieja-Król, B., Tabor,
A., Misz, M., Jelonek, I., Jelonek, Z.,
2005. Oxyreactive Thermal Analysis
(OTA) – A Good and Cheap Method of the Estimation of Coal Self-Ignition in Bingsteads – Preliminary Research Results. Geological Publishing Houses
(Geological Institute, Warsaw, Poland),
135–138 [in Polish].

[3] Sokol, E.V., Maksimova, N.V., Nigmatulina, E.N., Sharygin, V.V., Kalugin, V.M., 2005. Combustion Metamorphism. Publishing House of the SB RAS, Novosibirsk, Russia [in Russian, with fragments in English], 312 pp.

[4] Stracher, G.B., 2007. The origin of gas-vent minerals: isochemical and mass-transfer processes. In: Stracher, G.
B. (ed.), Geology of Coal Fires: Case Studies from Around the World, v. 18.
The Geological Society of America, Reviews in Engineering Geology, USA, 91–96.

[5] Colman, J.J., Swanson, A.L., Meinardi, S., Sive, B.C., Blake, D.R., Rowland, F.S., 2001. Description of the Analysis of a Wide Range of Volatile Organic Compounds in Whole Air Samples Collected During PEM-Tropics A and B. Analytical Chemistry, A-I. American Chemical Society, 73(15), 3723–3731.

[6] Kruszewski, Ł., Fabiańska, M.J., Ciesielczuk, J., Segit, T., Orłowski, R., Motyliński, R., Moszumańska, I., Kusy, D. 2018. First multi-tool exploration of a gas-condensate-pyrolysate system from the environment of burning coal mine heaps: An in situ FTIR and laboratory GC and PXRD study based on Upper Silesian materials. Science of the Total Environment, 640-641, 1044–1071.

[7] Wickenheiser, B., Michalke, K., Hensel, R., Drescher, C., Hirner, A.V., Rutishauser, B., Bachofen, R., 1998. Volatile compounds in gases emitted from the wetland bogs near Lake Cadagno. In: Peduzzi, R., Bachofen, R., Tonolla, M. (Eds), Lake Cadagno: a meromictic Alpine lake. Documenta dell'Istituto italiano di idrobiologia, 63, 137–140.

[8] Craig, P.J. (ed), 2003.
Organometallic Compounds in the Environment, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, West Sussex, UK, 415 pp.

[9] Khoury, J., Lewis, R., Sattler, A., Linsley, B., Magers, K., Lee, J., 2008. Analysis of volatile arsenic compounds in landfill gas. WEF/A&WMA Odors and Air Emissions 2008, Water Environment Federation, 630–641.

[10] Kruszewski, Ł., 2013a. Komora termiczna jako narzędzie do zrozumienia procesów przeobrażenia materiałów odpadowych [Thermal chamber as a tool for understanding the processes of trasformation of waste materials; presented on: 4th Meeting of the Users of the Bruker Systems]. IV Spotkanie Użytkowników Systemów Firmy Bruker, Poznań 03–04.10.2013, 59–60 [poster #6; in Polish].

[11] Kruszewski Ł., 2013b: Supergene sulphate minerals from the burning coal mining dumps in the Upper Silesian Coal Basin, South Poland. International Journal of Coal Geology, 105, 91–109.

[12] Kruszewski, Ł., Fabiańska, M.J., Segit, T., Kusy, D., Motyliński, R., Ciesielczuk, J., Deput, E., 2020. Carbonnitrogen compounds, alcohols, mercaptans, monoterpenes, acetates, aldehydes, ketones, SF6, PH3, and other fire gases in coal-mining waste heaps of Upper Silesian Coal Basin (Poland) – a re-investigation by means of in-situ FTIR extremal database approach. Science of the Total Environment, 698, 134274.

[13] Kruszewski Ł. 2006. Oldhamitepericlase-portlandite-fluorite
assemblage and coexisting minerals of burnt dump in Siemianowice Śląskie –
Dąbrówka Wielka area (Upper Silesia, Poland) – preliminary report.
Mineralogia Polonica, 28, 118–120.

[14] Kruszewski Ł. 2008: Apatiteellestadite solid solution and associated minerals of metacarbonate slags from burning coal dump in Rydułtowy (Upper Silesia). Mineralogia Special Papers, 32, 100.

[15] Kruszewski, Ł., Ciesielczuk, J., Misz-Kennan, M., 2014a. Mineralogy of some metacarbonate rocks from burned coal-mining dump in Przygórze (Lower Silesian Coal Basin) and its analogy to "olive" rocks from the Hatrurim Formation. 4th Central-European Mineralogical Conference - CEMC 2014 (Proceedings of the international symposium CEMC 2014; ISBN 978–80– 210-6832-2), p. 77.

[16] Kruszewski, Ł., Ciesielczuk, J., Misz-Kennan, M., Fabiańska, M., 2014b. Chemical composition of glasses and associating mineral species in various pyrometamorphic rocks from coalmining dumps of the Lower Silesia. Mineralogia – Special Papers, 42, 70–71.

[17] Kruszewski, Ł., 2012. Unique chloride assemblage of exhalative origin from burning coal mining dump in Radlin (Rybnik Coal Area, S Poland).
Mineralogia – Special Papers 40, 90–92.

[18] Fabiańska M., Ciesielczuk J., Kruszewski Ł., Misz-Kennan M., Blake D.R., Stracher G., Moszumańska I. 2013: Gaseous compounds and efflorescences generated in self-heating coal-waste dumps – A case study from the Upperand Lower Silesian Coal Basins (Poland). International Journal of Coal Geology, 116-117, 247–261.

[19] Kruszewski, Ł., Sierny, W., 2019.
Radlin coal fire heap: thiosulfate- and dithionate-bearing alkaline
mineralization; Cu, Fe, As, and P
mineralization; and second worldwide
occurrence of tsaregorodtsevite.
Mineralogia – Special Papers, 49, 54.

[20] Fabiańska, M., Ciesielczuk, J., Nádudvári, Á., Misz-Kennan, M., Kowalski, A., Kruszewski, Ł., 2019.
Environmental influence of gaseous emissions from self-heating coal waste dumps in Silesia, Poland. Environmental Geochemistry and Health, 41(2), 575–601.

[21] Lewińska-Preis, L., Szram, E., Fabiańska, M., Nádudvari, Á., Misz-Kennan, M., Abramowicz, A., Kruszewski, Ł., Kita, A., 2020. Selected ions and major- and trace elements as contaminants in coal-waste dump water from the Lower- and Upper Silesian Coal Basins (Poland). International Journal of Coal Science and Technology, DOI: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-35061/v1 (preprint).

[22] Kruszewski, Ł., Ciesielczuk, J., and Misz-Kennan, M., 2012. What have meteorites to do with coal fires? A case of Upper and Lower Silesian Coal Basins. Mineralogia – Special Papers 40, 28–29.

[23] Kruszewski Ł., Fabiańska, M., Ciesielczuk, J., Segit, T., 2017. Coal fires – Titan – interstellar medium – life: what do they have in common? Potential gaseous bio-precursors in burning mining heaps. Life Origins 2017 conference (Early Earth and ExoEarths: origin and evolution of life), Book of Abstracts, 51–52.

[24] Kruszewski, Ł., Matlakowska, R.,2018. Burning coal-mining waste heaps

versus biological activity – a potential model for survivability in a harsh environment?; Life Origins, COST Workshop 2018, Bertinoro, Italy, March 19–23 (poster, unpublished).

[25] Myhre, G., Shindell, D., Breón, F.-M., Collins, W., Fuglestvedt, J., Huang, J., Koch, D., Lamarque, J.-F., Lee, D., Mendoza, B., Nakajima, T., Robock, A., Stephens, G., Takemura, T., Zhang, H. 2013. Antrhropogenic and natural radiative forcing. Chpt. 8, in: Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S.K., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., Midgley, P.M. (eds), Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of the Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Changes, Cambridge University Press, Cambride, UK, and New York, NY, USA, www.ghghprotocol.org, 640–659.

[26] ESRL, 2019. Earth System Research Laboratory GMD (Global Monitoring Division), www.esrl.noaa.gov/mgd/dv/ iadv (accessed on 08.03.2019).

[27] Stockwell, C.E., Yokelson, R.J., Kreidenweis, S.M., Robinson, A.L., DeMott, P.J., Sullivan, R.C., Reardon, J., Ryan, K.C., Griffith, D.W.T., Stevens, L., 2014. Trace gas emissions from combustion of peat, crop residue, domestic biofuels, grasses, and other fuels: configuration and Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) component of the fourth Fire Lab at Missoula Experiment (FLAME-4). Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 14, 9727–9754.

[28] Yokelson, R.J., Bertschi, I.T., Christian, T.J., Hobbs, P.V., Ward, D.E., Hao, W.M., 2003. Trace gas measurements in nascent, aged, and cloud-processed smoke from African savanna fires by airborne Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (AFTIR). Journal of Geophysical Researchm 108(D13), 8478. [29] Wahrenberger, C.M., 1997. Some aspects of the chemistry of volcanic gases. Ph.D. thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, Switzerland, 233 pp.

[30] Ali, G., 2004. Identification of volatile organic compounds produced by algae. Egyptian Journal of Phycology, 5, 71–81.