Homework Problems Green Engineering (458.701)

Youn-Woo Lee School of Chemical and Biological Engineering

155-741 San 56-1 Sillim, Gwanak, Seoul, Korea • ywlee@snu.ac.kr • http://sfpl.snu.ac.kr

Solve the Problems in Chapter 1:

5. Ozone Depletion Potential of Substitute Refrigerants (hint: read page 12 carefully)

Due date: March 17, 2011

Problem 2-5 (a), (b), (c) and (d)

Choice of a Safe Solvent for Photo-resist which consists of an acrylate monomer, polymeric binder, and photo-initiator.

Due date: March 31, 2011

Problem

- 1. Provide definitions for the following terms
 - a) pollution prevention
 - b) source reduction
 - c) in-process versus on-site versus off-site recycling
 - d) waste treatment
 - e) disposal
 - f) direct release

Further Reading in Engineering Ethics

- Process safety and environmental protection are not

the only responsibilities of professional engineers.

Engineers also have responsibilities to clients, to

colleagues and to the professions.

AIChE Web http://www.aiche.org/membership/ethics.htm

Problems 4-1 by April 6



Problems

5-1. 5-4.

Due date: Apríl 21, 2011

Homework #6

Problem 7-1

Due on Apríl 30, 2011

Problem 8-1

Due on May14, 2011

Ozone Depletion Potential of Substitute Refrigerants

A discussed in chapter 1, bromine is a much more potent ozone depletion substance compared to chlorine on a per-atom basis. Fluorine is thought to have no adverse ozone depletion effects. Therefore, substituting fluorine for chlorine on alternative refrigerants would help solve the ozone depletion problem. On the other hand, fluorine on hydrocarbon refrigerants is a potent greenhouse gas and fluorinated compounds have been found to accumulate in the body fat of animals as far away as the arctic, well away from any known sources of these compounds. Apparently the persistence of these fluorinated compounds combined with atmospheric transport over long distances creates exposure to these remote creatures.

5. Choice of a Safe Solvent for a Photoresist

a) Rank solvents based on toxicity from higher to lower hazard

| PEL (ppm) | |
|---------------------|-----|
| diethylemine | 25 |
| monomethyl ether | 25 |
| furfuryl alcohol | 50 |
| n-butyl acetate | 150 |
| methyl ethyl ketone | 200 |
| ethyl acetate | 400 |
| | |

b) Rank from higher to lower exposure potential using vapor pressure

| ess. (kPa @ | 25°C) |
|-------------|--|
| 30.1 | |
| 12.6 | |
| 12.1 | |
| 1.3 | |
| 1.3 | |
| 0.1 | |
| | ess. (kPa @ 30.1 12.6 12.1 1.3 1.3 0.1 |

c) Considering hazard and exposure, rank from higher to lower risk If we take the inverse of the PEL as a measure of potential hazard and multiply by the vapor pressure (a measure of exposure), we could estimate the overall risk potential by inhalation.

| 1/PEL • Vapor Press. | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| diethylemine | 1/25 • 30.1 = 1.20 | | | |
| methyl ethyl ketone | $1/200 \cdot 12.1 = 0.06$ | | | |
| monomethyl ether | 1/25 • 1.3 = 0.05 | | | |
| ethyl acetate | 1/400 • 12.6 = 0.03 | | | |
| n-butyl acetate | $1/150 \cdot 1.3 = 0.009$ | | | |
| furfuryl alcohol | $1/50 \cdot 0.1 = 0.002$ | | | |

Furfural alcohol is the solvent with the lowest risk.

d) To lower the risk even more, process modifications could be placed on the integrated circuits fabrication process to reduce the amount of vapor generated and to collect and recover any vapors prior to exposure to workers.

a) pollution prevention: Any act of source reduction, in-process recycle, on-site recycle, and off-site recycle that reduces the amounts of releases and the hazardous characteristics of those releases which ultimately reach the environment.

b) **source reduction**: Any modification of a manufacturing process or of production procedures which reduces the amount of components entering a waste stream or the hazardous characteristics of those components entering waste streams prior to recycle, treatment, or disposal.

c) in-process versus on-site versus off-site recycle: In-process recycle is the recovery and return of components that would otherwise become waste to the process unit where these components were generated, usually immediately after they are generated. Examples would be unconverted reactants leaving a reactor that are separated and returned to the reactor inlet. On-site recycle is the recovery of valuable stream components using process units within the same facility where those components were generated. Off-site recycle is the recovery of valuable components at a remote location from waste streams generated at a facility and the return of the valuable components to the facility.

d) waste treatment: Any process that renders a waste stream less hazardous prior to disposal or direct release through physical, biological, or chemical means. Examples are primary, secondary, and tertiary wastewater treatment, adsorption of volatile organic compounds from air, and landtreatment of petroleum hydrocarbon sludges from tank bottoms.

e) disposal: Long-term isolation of raw or treated waste components in a secured landfill. Examples include landfills for domestic and industrial hazardous and non-hazardous waste.

f) direct release: The direct release of components from processes to the air, land, or water. An example of this includes the release of volatile organic compounds from fugitive emission sources in chemical or petroleum refinery processes (from valves, fittings, pumps, flanges, connectors, etc.).

| Inherently Safer Design Concepts | Pollution Prevention Concepts |
|--|--|
| Intent : reduce catastrophic releases of hazardo us chemicals and the hazards of those releases by modifying the process to eliminate the sour ce of those hazards within the process. | Intent : reduce chronic releases of hazardous c hemicals and the hazards of those releases by modifying the process to make them more effi cient at using energy and mass. |
| Minimize : reduce the inventory of hazardous c hemicals within the process. | Source Reduction: reduce the generation and r elease of hazardous wastes from a process. |
| Substitute: replace hazardous materials with sa fer chemicals to reduce impacts of catastrophic releases. | Material Substitution: replace hazardous mater ials or materials that use excessive energy with more benign materials. |
| Moderate: Use less hazardous conditions to les sen the impacts of any catastrophic releases. | Process/Procedure Modifications: change proc ess conditions to reduce waste generation and energy consumption. |
| Simplify: design facilities to be less complex a nd less error prone, and forgiving of any errors that are made. | Process Modification: change the process contr ol strategy to more precisely achieve the desire d operating conditions. |

1. Estimate properties for nitrobenzene. Nitrobenzene has the molecular formula



Boiling Pt., from eqn. 5-1, $T_b(K) = 198.2 + \Sigma n_i g_i$ group g_i contribution NO_2 113.991 aaC30.76 (a substituted carbon bound to 2 aromatic carbons)5 aaCH5(28.53)

 $T_b(K) = 198.2 + 113.99 + 30.76 + 5(28.53) = 485.60 \text{ K} \bullet \text{estimated} = 484.12 \text{ K} \bullet \text{actual}$

$$\begin{split} T_b \mbox{ (corrected)} &= T_b - 94.84 + 0.5577 T_b - 0.0007705 (T_b)^2 \quad [T_b \le 700 K] \quad (Eqn. \ 5\text{-}2) \\ &= 485.6 - 94.84 + 0.5577 (485.6) - 0.0007705 (485.6)^2 = 479.9 \ K \\ T_b \mbox{ (corrected)} \ is \ in \ error \ by \ 0.87\% \ compared \ to \ the \ actual \ value. \end{split}$$

$$\frac{\text{Vapor pressure }(P_{\text{vp}})}{\ln P_{\text{vp}} = [\underline{A(T_b - C)^2}]} * [1/(T_b - C) - 1/(T - C)]$$
(Eqn. 5-7)
[0.97 R T_b]

 $A = K_F (8.75 + R \ln T_b) = 1.05(8.75 + 1.987 \ln(485.6)) = 22.09$ C = -18 + 0.19 T_b = -18 + 0.19(485.6) = 74.26

 $\ln P_{vp} = \underbrace{[22.09(485.6 - 74.26)^2]}_{[0.97 (1.987) (485.6)]} * [1/(485.6 - 74.26) - 1/(298 - 74.26)] = -8.139$ $P_{vp} = \exp(-8.13) = 2.92 \times 10^{-4} \text{ atm} = 0.22 \text{ mm Hg.}$

 $\begin{array}{ll} \underline{\text{Henry's Law constant (H)}} \\ -\log H &= \log (\text{air-water partition coefficient}) = \Sigma \ n_i \ h_i \ + \Sigma \ n_j \ c_j \ (\text{H unitless}) \\ 1 \ C_{\text{aromatic}} \text{-NO}_2 & n_i \ h_i = 2.496 \\ 6 \ C_{\text{aromatic}} \text{-} \ C_{\text{aromatic}} & n_i \ h_i \ = 6(0.2638) \\ 5 \ C_{\text{aromatic}} \text{-H} & n_i \ h_i \ = 5(-0.1543) \\ \text{No corrections factors} \\ -\log H \ = 2.2496 \ + \ 6(0.\ 2638) \ + \ 5(-0.1543) \ = \ 3.06 \\ \text{H} \ = \ 10^{-3.06} \ = \ 8.69 \times 10^{-4} \ \text{unitless} \ = \ 2.13 \times 10^{-4} \ \text{atm-m}^3/\text{mole} \\ \text{H} \ (\text{experimental}) \ = \ 2.40 \times 10^{-4} \ \text{atm-m}^3/\text{mole} \end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{l} \underline{Water \ solubility \ (S):} \ (S \ in \ mole/L) \\ log \ S = 0.796 - 0.854 \ log \ K_{ow} \ - \ 0.00728 (MW) + \Sigma \ h_j \ (used \ when \ melting \ pt. \ not \ available) \\ Corrections \ factors \qquad h_j = -.390 \ (aromatic \ nitro \ group) \\ log \ S = 0.796 - 0.854 (1.85) \ - \ 0.00728 (123.11) + -.390 = -2.07 \\ S = 10^{-2.07} = 8.51 x 10^{-3} \ moles/L = 1.05 \ g/L = 1,047.5 \ mg/L \end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{lll} & \underline{Soil\ sorption\ coefficient\ (K_{oc}):}\\ & \log K_{oc} = 0.53^{1}\chi + 0.62 + \Sigma\ n_{j}P_{j}\ (K_{oc}\ is\ ratio\ of\ \mu g/g\ carbon\ to\ \mu g/ml\ solution)\\ ^{1}\chi = \Sigma(\delta_{i}^{*}\ \delta_{j})^{-0.5}\ ,\ the\ first\ order\ molecular\ connectivity\ index\\ \delta_{i}\ , the\ connectedness\ of\ carbon\ or\ other\ heteroatom\ i)\\ & Bond\ connectedness\ (\delta_{i}^{*}\ \delta_{j})\\ & (N-O)\ (N=O)\ (N-C)\ 2(C-C)\ 4(C-C)\\ & (3,1)\ (3,1)\ (3,3)\ 2(3,2)\ 4(2,2)\\ ^{1}\chi = \Sigma(\delta_{i}^{*}\ \delta_{j})^{-0.5}\\ ^{1}\chi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{9}} + 2\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} + 4\frac{1}{\sqrt{4}} = 4.305\\ & \log K_{oc} = 0.53(4.305) + 0.62 - 0.632 = 2.27\\ & K_{oc} = 10^{2.27}\ = 186\end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{ll} & \underline{Octanol\text{-water partition coefficient (K_{ow}):} \\ & \log K_{ow} = 0.229 + \Sigma \; n_i \; f_i \; + \Sigma \; n_j \; c_j \\ & 6 \; C_{aromatic} & n_i \; h_i \; = 6(0.2940) \\ & \text{-NO}_2 (\text{aromatic attach.}) & n_i \; h_i \; = -0.1823 \\ & \text{No corrections factors} \\ & \log K_{ow} \; = 0.229 + 6(0.2940) + -0.1823 = 1.81 \\ & K_{ow} \; = 10^{1.81} = 64.67 \\ & \log K_{ow} \; (experimental) \; = 1.85 \end{array}$

Atmospheric half life:

The only significant reaction is addition to aromatic ring = $0.2437 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3/\text{molecule-sec}$. $t_{1/2\frac{1}{2}} = \ln(2) / (\text{k [OH·]}) = 0.693/((0.2437 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3/\text{molecule-sec})(1.5 \times 10^6 \text{ molecules}/\text{ cm}^3))$ $t_{1/2\frac{1}{2}} = 1.896 \times 10^6 \text{ sec} = 22 \text{ days}.$

Biodegradability:

 $I = 3.199 + a_1f_1 + a_2f_2 + \dots + a_nf_n + a_mMW$ Unsubstituted phenyl group a = 0.022Aromatic (NO₂) a = -.134 (used aromatic amine as substitute) Molecular weight a = -0.00221I = 3.199 + 0.022 - .134 + 123.11(-0.00221) = 2.81 (weeks to a month)

1. Atom and Mass Efficiency Calculations: Calculate mass and atom efficiencies

a) (Addition reaction) Isobutylene + methanol \rightarrow methyl,tert-butyl ether $C_4H_8 + CH_3OH \rightarrow (C_4H_9)-O-CH_3$ Mass efficiency: Feedstocks - 5(12) + 12(1) + 1(16) = 88 Product - 5(12) + 12(1) + 1(16) = 88 efficiency = 100% Carbon efficiency: Feedstocks - 5(12) = 60 Product - 5(12) = 60 efficiency = 100% Hydrogen efficiency: Feedstocks - 12(1) = 12 Product - 12(1) = 12 efficiency = 100% Oxygen efficiency: Feedstocks - 1(16) = 16 Product - 1(16) = 16 efficiency = 100%

b) (Substitution reaction) Phenol + ammonia \rightarrow aniline + water C_6H_5 -OH + NH₃ $\rightarrow C_6H_5$ -NH₂ + H₂O Mass efficiency: Feedstocks - 6(12) + 9(1) + 1(16) + 1(14) = 111 Product - 6(12) + 7(1) + 0(16) + 1(14) = 93 efficiency = 83.8% Carbon efficiency: Feedstocks - 6(12) = 72 Product - 6(12) = 72 efficiency = 100% Hydrogen efficiency: Feedstocks - 9(1) = 9 Product - 7(1) = 7 efficiency = 77.8% Oxygen efficiency: Feedstocks - 1(16) = 16 Product - 0(16) = 0 efficiency = 0% Nitrogen efficiency: Feedstocks - 1(14) = 14 Product - 1(14) = 14 efficiency = 100%

c) (Elimination reaction) Ethylbenzene \rightarrow styrene + hydrogen C₆H₅-C₂H₅ \rightarrow C₆H₅-C₂H₃ + H₂ Mass efficiency: Feedstocks - 8(12) + 10(1) = 106 Product - 8(12) + 8(1) = 104 efficiency = 98.1% Carbon efficiency: Feedstocks - 8(12) = 96 Product - 8(12) = 96 efficiency = 100% Hydrogen efficiency: Feedstocks - 10(1) = 10 Product - 8(1) = 8 efficiency = 80%

d) Other industrially important examples of additions, substitutions, and elimination reactions (see Wittkcoff, H.A. and Reuben, B.G. "Industrial Organic Chemicals", John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1996; and Weissermel, K. and Arpe, H.-J. "Industrial Organic Chemistry", VCH Verlagsgesellschaft mbH a Wiley company, Weinheim Germany, 1997).

1. Compare the carbonylation of dinitrotoluene and the amine-phosgene routes for the production of toluene diisocyanate (TDI) using a Tier 1 economic and environmental performance evaluation.

Amine - phosgene route: $C_6H_3(CH_3)(NH_2)_2 + 2 COCl_2 \rightarrow C_6H_3(CH_3)(-N=C=O)_2 + 4 HCl$ Carbonylation of nitrobenzene: $C_6H_3(CH_3)(NO_2)_2 + 6 CO \rightarrow C_6H_3(CH_3)(-N=C=O)_2 + 4 C O_2$

| Compound | Pounds produced or | Cost | PEL | Overall | Overall |
|------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|---------------|
| compound | nounds of raw | (\$/lb)** | $(u\sigma/m^3)$ | inhalation | oral toxicity |
| | material reavired | (0/10) | (µg/m) | toxicity | factor |
| | per pound of TDI* | | | factor | Jució |
| Amine - phosgene route | | | | | |
| toluene diamine | -0.76 | 0.576 | 0.1 (est.) | NA | NA |
| chlorobenzene | -0.01 | 0.550 | 350 | 100 | 100 |
| hydrochloric acid | 0.4 (est.) | 0.027 | 7 | 100 | 100 |
| phosgene | -1.26 | 0.610 | 0.4 | NA | NA |
| TDI | 1.00 | 1.340 | 0.14 | 100,000 | 100 |
| Carbonylation route | | | | | |
| dinitrotoluene | -1.04 (est.) | 0.365 | 1.5 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| carbon monoxide | -1.0 (est.) | 0.040 | 55 | NA | NA |
| TDI | 1.00 | 1.340 | 0.14 | 100,000 | 100 |
| carbon dioxide | 1.0 (est.) | - | 9000 | NA | NA |

Table of stoichiometric and toxicity data for each reaction pathway

Environmental and Economic Evaluation

 $\frac{\text{Environmental evaluation}}{\text{TLV Index}} = \sum_{i} |v_{i}| \times TLV_{i}^{-1} \text{ (PEL can be used instead of TLV)}$ (Equation 8-2) $\frac{\text{EPA Index}}{\sum_{i} |v_{i}|} \times (\text{maximum of oral and inhalation weighting factor})_{i}$ (Equation 8-3) $\frac{\text{Amine-phosgene route}}{\text{TLV Index} = (.76)(1/.1) + (.01)(1/350) + (.4)(1/7) + (1.26)(1/.4) + (1)(1/.14) = 17.95}$ $\frac{\text{EPA Index} = (.01)(100) + (.4)(100) + (.1)(100,000) = 100,041}{\text{Cost of Raw Materials} = (.76)(.576) + (.01)(.550) + (1.26)(.610) = $1.21/lb TDI}$

 $\frac{\text{Carbonylation Route}}{\text{TLV Index} = (1.04)(1/1.5)+(1)(1/55)+(1)(1/.14)+(1)(1/9000) = 7.85}$ EPA Index = (1.04)(1,000)+(1)(100,000) = 101,040 Cost of Raw Materials = (1.04)(.365)+(1)(.04) = \$0.42/lb TDI

Discussion: The TLV Index indicates that the carbonylation route is superior to the amine-phosgene route. The EPA Index indicates that both routes are about the same, but data is lacking for this index, so we should rely less on this index. The cost analysis indicates that the carbonylation route is superior.