C. Development of Technology for Removal of PCBs and Other Substances of Concern (SOCs) from Shredder Residue

Principal Investigator: Bassam Jody
Argonne National Laboratory
9700 S. Cass Ave., Argonne, IL 60439
(630) 252-5279; fax: (630) 252-1342; e-mail: bjody@anl.gov

Field Project Manager: Edward J. Daniels
Argonne National Laboratory
9700 S. Cass Ave., Argonne, IL 60439
(630) 252-4206; fax: (630) 252-1342; e-mail: edaniels@anl.gov

Technology Area Development Manager: Joseph A. Carpenter
(202) 586-1022; fax: (202) 586-1600; e-mail: joseph.carpenter@ee.doe.gov
Field Technical Manager: Philip S. Sklad
(865) 574-5069; fax: (865) 576-4963; e-mail: skladps@ornl.gov

Participants:
This project is conducted as part of the Collaborative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) between DOE's Argonne National Laboratory, USCAR's Vehicle Recycling Partnership, and the American Plastics Council.
CRADA Partner Principal Investigators:
Michael Fisher, American Plastics Council, (703) 741-5599; e-mail: mike_fisher@plastics.org
Gerald Winslow, VRP, DaimlerChrysler Corp., (248) 512-4802; e-mail: grwx@DCX.com
Claudia Duranceau, VRP, Ford Motor Co., (313) 390-0504; e-mail: cdurance@ford.com
Candace Wheeler, VRP, General Motors Corp., (586) 986-1674; e-mail: candace.s.wheeeler@gm.com

The Polyurethane Recycle and Recovery Council (PURCC) is also participating and cost-sharing in this project.
PURCC Project Lead: Steve Niemic

Contractor: Argonne National Laboratory
Contract No.: W-31-109-Eng-38

Objective

- Develop viable strategies and technology for the control and minimization or elimination of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and other substances of concern (SOCs) from recycled automotive materials.

Approach

- Identify efficient and environmentally acceptable process solutions for removal of contaminants, including PCBs, from materials recovered from shredder residue.
- Define variances in analytical procedures/test results for PCB analysis.

Accomplishments

- Conducted washing/cleaning tests of plastics recovered from shredder residue in:
  - Proprietary solvent-based solutions and in CO_2 and
  - Equipment using aqueous solutions with surfactants.

- Conducted laboratory tests to develop an understanding of the variability inherent in the analytical procedures for PCB analysis.
- Completed bench-scale screening of 11 surfactants and three organic solvents for removal of PCBs and other contaminants from polymers derived from shredder residues and specified preferred surfactant/cleaning solutions.
- Conducted a seminar with experts to further identify issues with regard to variability in analytical results for PCBs.
- Investigated impact on the analytical results of sample size, extraction solvent, and number of extractions used.

Future Direction

- Conduct additional testing on PCBs removal methods, including steam stripping.
- Integrate washing/cleaning system with the process for polymers recovery from shredder residue and identify necessary modification to facilitate the integration.
- Conduct a cost analysis of modified systems.

Summary

The objective of this project is to develop techniques and/or technology to identify and/or cost-effectively remove polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and other substances of concern (SOCs) from recycled automotive materials.

SOCs can impact the recyclability of automotive materials in a number of ways. Certainly, their presence in either recycled materials and/or materials source stream impact the overall costs of recovering recyclable materials. In some cases, their presence at parts-per-million levels, such as in the case of PCBs, can prevent the reuse of the recovered materials, such as polymers and polyurethane foams.

The strategy that is required for control of the SOCs may vary regionally. For example, requirements are different in Europe, North America, and Asia for various SOCs. Strategies for controlling SOCs can also depend on the technology that is being proposed for recycling the automotive material.

The presence of SOCs in current vehicles and/or in other durable goods that are presently recycled with end-of-life vehicles is likely to impact the materials recycle stream for the foreseeable future. Consequently, the control of certain SOCs will require technology that will effectively remove the SOCs from recovered materials consistent with current regulatory requirements and consistent with the market requirement for the recovered material.

The initial focus of the work in this project is on the development of options and technology for the removal of PCBs from potentially recyclable materials recovered from shredder residue. PCBs, at parts-per-million levels, are routinely found in shredder residue. The source of the PCBs is not completely understood, but historically it has been associated with liquid PCB-containing capacitors and transformers that inadvertently escape the scrap inspections and control process at the shredders.

Evaluation and Testing of Solvent-Based Washing Systems

Three companies with equipment and/or proprietary washing solvents and solutions that could potentially be used for non-aqueous removal of PCBs from plastics recovered from shredder residue were identified by Troy Polymers, Inc. (TPI):

- Environmental Technology Unlimited (Wilmington, North Carolina);
- Cool Clean Technologies, Inc. (Burnsville, Minnesota); and
- ITec Environmental Group, Inc. (Oakdale, California).

Each company was supplied with a sample of plastics with the assigned (determined) concentration of PCBs of 11 ppm. Samples were washed at the three companies, and the washed samples were evaluated for PCB levels.

Environmental Technology Unlimited uses a proprietary METHEX solvent-based system and aqueous-based systems. Environmental Technology Unlimited performed six treatments of shredder residue plastics, and five out of the six washed samples reduced the PCBs concentration to below 2 ppm. The METHEX solvent-based system was superior to the aqueous system.

Cool Clean Technologies technology used CO_2 only. The washing failed to remove the PCBs.
ITec Environment Group reduced PCB levels in the plastics from 11 ppm to 2.8 ppm via solvent washing; no CO_2 treatment, which normally follows the basic process, was used.

On the basis of these results, it appears that Environmental Technology Unlimited and ITec Environmental Group have the technology that could remove PCBs to below 2 ppm. However, at this time, only ITec has the full-scale equipment ready to be integrated with a plastics recycling process.

Evaluation and Testing of Commercially-Available Aqueous-Based Washing Systems

Before testing the solvent-based systems, large-scale cleaning/washing tests were conducted using plastics from shredder residue by means of aqueous solutions and a surfactant previously identified earlier as the most promising from among many tested. The objective was to identify the limitations of the various types of existing washing equipment. Testing was done by using an ALMCO rotary-drum washer equipped with a dryer and SeKoN centrifuge equipment. The tests were carried out on approximately 100 lb of plastic chips each. The particles were between 0.2 and 0.5 in. in size. Under a CRADA contract, GraPar Corporation built, for Troy Polymers, Inc. (TPI), and tested a specially designed machine that has a design capacity of about 300 lb/hour of plastics. TPI conducted further testing on this machine in its facilities.

In each of these large tests, the washed material was "visually" clean in terms of dirt and oils. However, PCBs analyses were highly variable and indicated that in some cases, the PCBs concentration had increased after washing. As a result, it was determined that the PCBs analysis procedures should be reexamined, as is discussed in the next section.

The results suggest that existing aqueous-based equipment, as is, is not likely to reduce the concentration of PCBs to acceptable levels. Modifications are necessary to wash small chips (1/8 to 1/2 in.) of plastics — such as what will be recovered from shredder residue — efficiently and economically.

Evaluation of the Variability of PCB Sampling and Analytical Procedures

The large variability in the analytical results raised questions about the analytical sampling and analyses procedures. Therefore, laboratory experiments were performed to develop an understanding of the variability in PCB analytical procedures and explain the variability in the results.

The variability may be due to a number of factors, including sample size, plastics particle size, PCBs extraction procedure, analytical procedures, and/or interference from other compounds. A one-day seminar was held and attended by analytical experts from the United States and overseas to develop recommendations for improved sampling and analysis techniques specific to plastics chips recovered from shredder residue.

To investigate the possible interference of phthalates in the PCBs analysis, a sample of plastics chips derived from shredder residue was thoroughly mixed and then divided into four parts. The first part was analyzed by using Gas Chromatography and an Electron Capture Detector (GC-ECD) and by using Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectroscopy (GC/MS). The other three parts were spiked with different quantities of phthalates, as shown in Table 1, and the spiked samples were analyzed by using the same

Table 1. Effect of phthalates on PCBs analysis

Weight-Percent of Phthalates added	PCBs Concentration (ppm) by GC/ECD	PCBs Concentrations (ppm) by GC/MS
0	4.6+/-0.3	7.9+/-1.0
0.5	4.7+/-0.3	7.4+/-0.2
1.0	5.1+/-0.6	7.0+/-0.4
2.5	4.8+/-0.3	7.4+/-0.3

two methods. The results show no apparent interference of the phthalates in the PCBs analysis.

To investigate the effects of plastics particle size on extraction efficiency of PCBs, a series of laboratory experiments were conducted at TPI on 300-g samples of plastics with two different particle sizes (one made of chips about 0.2 inch in size and the other was granulated to about 0.04 to 0.08 inch in size). Typically in PCBs analyses, extractions are done on a few grams of material, even though the dirt, oil, and the PCBs are not evenly distributed on the shredder residue plastics.

Samples of the plastics before and after washing were analyzed directly by three different laboratories by using standard PCBs analytical procedures. Extracts from nine sonications of 300-g samples were also analyzed for PCBs by three laboratories. The results (Tables 2–5) show that:

The three labs are fairly consistent for each set of samples.

1. Direct analysis of the samples from the three labs showed that the concentration of PCBs in the granulated plastics was about 5 ppm, and for the un-granulated, it was 10 ppm. Obviously, the granulated samples have larger surface area per unit mass than the other samples. Therefore, more efficient extraction of PCBs from the plastics would be expected in the case of the granulated chips. Because this was not the case, the results indicate that the particle size does not affect the PCB results. Further, the results indicate that the PCBs are on the surface of the plastics and not absorbed in the plastics. After extraction, the samples all had less than 2 ppm of PCBs, except for one sample that showed 2.8 ppm.
2. Calculation of the concentration of PCBs in the original samples based on the determined PCBs in the hexane extracts (prepared via 9 sonications of 300-g samples) showed that the concentrations of PCBs in the granulated samples were comparable with those of the ungranulated samples. These results further indicate that the PCBs are predominantly on the surface of the plastics and not absorbed in the plastics, otherwise the granulated samples would have shown higher concentrations.

In addition, two of the laboratories identified Aroclor 1242 as the only PCB present, while the third laboratory identified Aroclors 1232 and 1254 as the only two present. Each of these Aroclors consists of multiple congeners.

TPI also conducted an analysis of various plastics samples by using GC-ECD and GC-MS methods. The results are compared in Table 6. Results from the two methods are in reasonable agreement, even though the GC-MS method seems to consistently predict higher values.

Evaluation of Soxhlet Method for PCBs Extraction

Successful commercialization of technology for recovering polymers and other materials from shredder residue depends on a reliable and inexpensive technique to analyze samples for PCBs in the recovered polymers in the field. The U.S. EPA and European protocols for PCBs analysis were reviewed and experiments were conducted to gain a good understanding of the requirements for reliable on-site analysis. A Soxhlet-based method appears to be appropriate for testing because of its simplicity and because it is among the methods specified in both the U.S. EPA protocols and in the European protocols (Table 7). Experiments to define the operating conditions for the Soxhlet method were conducted. The results are discussed below.

Selection of a Solvent

Two solvents were tested: hexane and toluene. Three 120-g samples were extracted with hexane for 8 h, and another three 120-g samples were extracted with hexane for 24 hours. Similarly, three 120-g samples were extracted with toluene for 8 h, and another three 120-g samples were extracted with toluene for 24 hours. All extractions were carried out while maintaining the siphoning time at 8- to 10-minute intervals. This procedure resulted in 24 samples of extracts and 12 samples of extracted plastics that were analyzed. The results are summarized in Table 8. The results indicate that hexane is a better solvent because it resulted in less PCBs remaining in the extracted plastics.

Table 2. Concentration of PCBs (ppm) in plastics before and after extraction with hexane (granulated and ungranulated) — analysis by standard PCBs analysis procedures

	Aroclor 1232	Aroclor 1242	Aroclor 1254	Total
Designation	ppm	ppm	ppm	ppm
	Laboratory #1			
Ungranulated before extraction	10.34 +/-1.53	N/D	1.27 +/- 0.29	11.6 +/- 1.51
Ungranulated after extraction	1.06 +/- 0.32	N/D	0.07 +/- 0.01	1.13 +/- 0.32
Granulated before extraction	4.54 +/- 0.84	N/D	0.06 +/- 0.16	5.14 +/- 0.98
Granulated after extraction	0.54 +/- 0.33	N/D	0.07 +/- 0.01	0.60 +/- 0.34
	Laboratory #2			
Ungranulated before extraction	N/D	8.69 +/- 1.02	N/D	8.69 +/- 1.02
Ungranulated after extraction	N/D	2.8 +/- 0.98	N/D	2.8 +/- 0.98
Granulated before extraction	N/D	5.31 +/- 2.04	N/D	5.31 +/- 2.04
Granulated after extraction	N/D	0.75 +/- 0.18	N/D	0.75 +/- 0.18
	Laboratory #3			
Ungranulated before extraction	N/D	9.93 +/- 4.67	N/D	9.93 +/- 4.67
Ungranulated after extraction	N/D	1.57 +/- 0.17	N/D	1.57 +/- 0.17
Granulated before extraction	N/D	3.07 +/- 0.26	N/D	3.07 +/- 0.26
Granulated after extraction	N/D	0.68 +/- 0.27	N/D	0.68 +/- 0.27

Table 3. Concentration of PCBs in the ungranulated samples, as calculated from the analysis of the hexane solution extracts

	Aroclor 1232	Aroclor 1242	Aroclor 1254	Total
Designation	ppm	ppm	ppm	ppm
	Laboratory #1			
Extract 1	8.67 +/- 0.87	N/D	1.02 +/- 0.29	9.69 +/- 0.99
Extract 2	4.59 +/- 1.52	N/D	0.28 +/- 0.05	4.86 +/- 1.49
Extract 3	0.51 +/- 0.09	N/D	0.14 +/- 0.01	0.65 +/- 0.10
Total	**13.76 +/- 2.47**	**N/D**	**1.43 +/- 0.34**	**15.19 +/- 2.57**
	Laboratory #2			
Extract 1	N/D	7.62 +/- 0.58	N/D	7.62 +/- 0.58
Extract 2	N/D	1.44 +/- 0.04	N/D	1.44 +/- 0.04
Extract 3	N/D	0.62 +/- 0.04	N/D	0.62 +/- 0.04
Total	**N/D**	**9.67 +/- 0.65**	**N/D**	**9.67 +/- 0.65**
	Laboratory #3			
Extract 1	N/D	6.56 +/- 0.67	N/D	6.56 +/- 0.67
Extract 2	N/D	1.52 +/- 0.23	N/D	1.52 +/- 0.23
Extract 3	N/D	0.64 +/- 0.03	N/D	0.64 +/- 0.03
Total	**N/D**	**8.71 +/- 0.92**	**N/D**	**8.71 +/- 0.92**

Table 4. Concentration of PCBs in the granulated samples, as calculated from the analysis of the hexane solution extracts

	Aroclor 1232	Aroclor 1242	Aroclor 1254	Total
Designation	ppm	ppm	ppm	ppm
	Laboratory #1			
Extract 1	18.62 +/- 8.99	N/D	2.20 +/- 0.61	20.81 +/- 9.59
Extract 2	2.30 +/- 2.56	N/D	0.25 +/- 0.06	4.86 +/- 1.49
Extract 3	0.62 +/- 0.14	N/D	0.11 +/- 0.01	0.65 +/- 0.10
Total	**21.52 +/- 11.69**	**N/D**	**2.55 +/- 0.67**	**24.07 +/- 12.25**
	Laboratory #2			
Extract 1	N/D	7.24 +/- 0.34	N/D	7.24 +/- 0.34
Extract 2	N/D	1.01 +/- 0.03	N/D	1.01 +/- 0.03
Extract 3	N/D	0.42 +/- 0.03	N/D	0.42 +/- 0.03
Total	**N/D**	**8.67 +/- 0.40**	**N/D**	**8.67 +/- 0.40**
	Laboratory #3			
Extract 1	N/D	6.29 +/- 1.98	N/D	6.29 +/- 1.98
Extract 2	N/D	1.10 +/- 0.06	N/D	1.10 +/- 0.06
Extract 3	N/D	0.48 +/- 0.03	N/D	0.48 +/- 0.03
Total	**N/D**	**7.87 +/- 2.06**	**N/D**	**7.87 +/- 2.06**

Table 5. Comparison of PCBs concentration (ppm) in the starting plastics samples by direct analysis and by calculation based on the amounts in the hexane extracts

Plastics Sample	PCB Concentration by Direct Analysis	PCB Concentration Calculated from PCBs in the Hexane Extracts
Ungranulated, Lab-1	11.6 +/- 1.51	15.19 +/- 2.57
Ungranulated, Lab-2	8.69 +/- 1.02	9.67 +/- 0.65
Ungranulated, Lab-3	9.93 +/- 4.67	8.71 +/- 0.92
Granulated, Lab-1	5.14 +/- 0.98	24.07 +/- 12.25
Granulated, Lab-2	5.31 +/- 2.04	8.67 +/- 0.4
Granulated, Lab-3	3.07 +/- 0.26	7.87 +/- 2.06

Table 6. Comparison of PCBs analysis using GC-ECD and GC-MS methods (extraction was carried out using hexane at 2,000 PSIA and 100°C)

Sample Type	PCB Concentration, Using GC-ECD (ppm)	PCB Concentration, Using GC-MS (ppm)
Ungranulated Chips	7.55	9.67
Ungranulated Chips	3.70	5.07
Ungranulated Chips	1.50	3.3
Ungranulated Chips	1.35	2.66
Granulated Chips	7.56	9.37
Granulated Chips	0.93	1.82
Granulated Chips	0.82	2.11
Hexane Solution	9.93	9.50
Hexane Solution	8.3	11.13
Hexane Solution	1.41	1.72
Hexane Solution	0.78	0.92
Hexane Solution	0.53	0.65

Table 7. Protocols for PCBs analysis

Parameter	European Protocols	U.S. EPA's Protocols	Recommended Protocols
Particle size (mm)	0.5	Not specified	1
Sample size for extraction (g)	3	30	30
Extraction equipment	Soxhlet	Sonication Soxhlet Pressurized fluid	Soxhlet
Extraction time	Not specified	Not specified	>/= 4 h Siphoning cycles at 8–10-min intervals
Solvent	Toluene	Hexane 50/50 Hexane/acetone 50/50 Methylene chloride/acetone	Hexane
Analytical method	MS	GC/ECD MS	MS
Quantification method	6 congeners multiplied by 5	Aroclors	Aroclors

Table 8. Results of the extractions of the 120-g samples with hexane and toluene

Solvent	Extraction Time (h)	Average PCBs in Extract (ppm)	Standard Deviation (ppm)	Average PCBs in Extracted plastics (ppm)	Standard Deviation (ppm)
Hexane	24	9.4	1.5	N.D	0
Hexane	8	9.3	0.8	N.D.	0
Toluene	24	9.8	2.4	1.4	0.2
Toluene	8	9.7	0.9	3.0	0.6
Hexane	4	14.5	2.9	N.D. in samples no. 1 and 2; 1.0 in no. 3	1.0

Determination of Extraction Time

In addition to the experiments discussed above, three additional 120-g samples were extracted with hexane for 4 hours each. This procedure resulted in six samples of extracts and three samples of extracted plastics that were analyzed. The results are also given in Table 8 and indicate that a Soxhlet extraction time of 4 hours is adequate because it reduced the PCBs concentration in the extracted plastics to below the detectable limits in two of the three samples and reduced it in the third to 1 ppm, even though these samples apparently had more PCBs initially as evidenced by the higher level of PCBs in the solvent.

Determination of Adequate Sample Size

In addition to the six 120-gram samples extracted for 24 hours discussed above, six additional 60-gram samples and six additional 30-g samples were processed and sampled in the same manner as before (24-hour extraction time and same siphoning intervals) by using hexane. The results are summarized in Table 9. The results indicate that a sample size of 30 g appears to be adequate.

Sample preparation was also investigated. The results indicated that a well-mixed plastics sample of at least one pound should be granulated to a size of 1 mm and mixed before sampling and analysis is done.

Comparison of the U.S. EPA and the European Quantification Methods

Four of the extracts from the 120-g samples that were extracted with hexane for 24 hours and two of the 120-g samples that were extracted with hexane for 8 hours were also quantified by using the European method. The results were essentially identical within analytical errors (Table 10).

These results lead to the following conclusions:

1. A conventional Soxhlet extractor using hexane is effective for PCBs extraction from plastics.
2. A total extraction time of 4 hours with siphoning intervals of 8–10 min is adequate for complete extraction of the PCBs.
3. The EPA and the European quantification methodologies yield very close results.
4. This method is simple enough to be adopted for field applications.

Publications

Overview of Washing Systems for Commercial Cleaning of Plastics Separated from Automotive Shredder Residue, Sendijarevic, I.; Sendijarevic, V.; Winslow, G.R.; Duranceau, C.M.; Simon, N.L.; Niemiec, S. F.; and Wheeler, C.S., SAE Paper No. 2005-01-0851.

Screening Study to Evaluate Shredder Residue Materials, Sendijarevec, V.; Simon, N.; Duranceau, C.; Winslow, G.; Williams, R.; Wheeler, C.; Niemiec, S.; and Schomer, D., SAE Paper No. 2004-01-0468.

Table 9. Results of the 24-h extractions with hexane of different size samples

Sample size (g)	Average PCBs in Extract (ppm)	Standard Deviation (ppm)	Average PCBs in Extracted Plastics (ppm)	Standard Deviation (ppm)
30	10.8	1.9	N.D	0
60	25.5	12.6	N.D.	0
120	9.4	1.5	N.D.	0

Table 10. Comparison of the U.S. EPA and the European quantification methods

Extraction Time (h)	PCBs According to the EPA Method (ppm)	PCBs According to the European Method (ppm)
24	10.8	9.8
24	9.8	10.9
24	8.0	10.7
24	11.2	11.5
8	11.7	12.3
8	10.8	10.8