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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Effects of Small Halocarbons on Reverse Osmosis Membrane Performance

by

Robert Cheechun Cheng

Doctor of Philosophy in Civil Engineering

University of California, Los Angeles, 1990

Professor Michael K. Stenstrom, Chairperson

The effects of small halocarbons, CHCl₃, CHBr₃, and CCl₄ at 50 mg/L on the performance of three typical RO membranes were examined. Cellulose acetate, polyamide, and advanced composite membranes were used. Five parameters were evaluated for each membrane/halocarbon combination. Flux, total dissolved solids rejection, halocarbon rejection, partition coefficient, and void volume tests were conducted in order to evaluate the effects of halocarbon addition. In general, the halocarbons were poorly rejected by all three membranes, increased rate of flux decline, and increased total dissolved solids rejection over controls without halocarbons. Partition tests revealed advanced composite membranes absorb all three halocarbons much more strongly than either cellulose acetate or polyamide membranes. The strong halocarbon adsorption for the composite was proposed as the main mechanism for membrane swelling which caused flux decrease and total dissolved solids rejection increase. The strong affinity for halocarbons suggests that the advanced composite membranes should not be used for treating waters containing halocarbons.
1. Introduction

Reverse osmosis (RO) is an advanced demineralization technique for water purification. RO was initially conceived as a method to compete with distillation to obtain potable waters from seawater; recently, RO applications have expanded to other areas such as reclamation of municipal, agricultural, and industrial wastewaters. Each of these waters exhibits very different characteristics such as turbidity, organic content, and salinity. In order to design an effective RO treatment plant for these waters, the engineer must know how membranes respond to a specific water.

The major obstacle to widespread usage of RO as a treatment scheme is a phenomenon known as fouling. Fouling is a decline in product water throughput or flux, and/or a decline in product water quality measured as total dissolved solids (TDS). Fouling results from various sources, one of which is caused by an interaction with organic materials. This type of fouling results because the organic compounds react with membranes in such a way as to lower product water flux and/or quality.

The organic compounds examined in this study are a series of halogenated methanes: chloroform (CHCl₃), bromoform (CHBr₃), and carbon tetrachloride (CCl₄). These organics are byproducts of chlorination or bromination of surface waters and are normally present in trace concentrations (> 10 mg/L). Studies at Yuma Desalting Plant Facility (YDPF) in Yuma, AZ detected the presence of these constituents in Yuma's feedwaters and are thought to be partially responsible for rapid membrane performance decline. YDPF, located on the Colorado River, is the world's largest facility for reclaiming irrigation water.
utilizing RO.

The key to successful RO operations lies in the pretreatment scheme. The goal of pretreatment is to remove, as economically as possible, components from the water which may cause membrane degradation or fouling. Operational cost is increased when membrane cost increases due to membrane replacement. Operational cost is increased when membrane fouling occurs due to additional pumping and cleaning expenses. In either case, downtime for membrane cleaning or replacement incur additional operational costs.

The goals of this dissertation research are threefold. The first goal is to determine whether halocarbons affect various membranes' abilities to produce potable waters. The three membrane types used in this study were provided by DuPont: cellulose acetate (CA), aromatic polyamide (PA), and advanced composite membrane (ACM). Once the effects were determined, possible hypotheses were proposed as to the causes of the halocarbon fouling/damage. If fouling occurs, the reversibility of this effect has to be determined. Knowledge of the causes and effects of membrane fouling/damage by halocarbons will aid in the successful design of wastewater pretreatment.

This work was inspired by the previous research (Kaakinen, 1985; Glater, 1989) performed at YDPF and the Los Banos Desalting Facility in California's San Joaquin Valley, both of which indicated organic matter may cause deleterious effects on membrane performance. The latter facility was operated under the supervision of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in order to study the economic feasibility of reclaiming agricultural drainage water. Since DWR is responsible for agricultural water quality management in California, the organic matter interaction with membranes was of sufficient interest to warrant further research.
2. Membrane Processes

Abbé Nollet first cited the osmosis phenomenon in 1748 when he noted that a wineskin made of animal bladder had the ability to separate wine and water. In 1865, Fick proposed his now famous diffusion law for interaction between a solution and a membrane. In 1861, Graham set forth his theory on selective gas diffusion dialysis. Van't Hoff, in 1865, discussed principles of osmosis and proposed the formula for osmotic pressure which bears his name to this day. Traube, in 1864, manufactured the first synthetic membrane from cuprous ferrocyanide (Cu₂Fe(CN)₆).

Commercial membranes were manufactured as early as 1929 by the Sartorius Werke GmbH in Göttingen, Germany from cellulose nitrate and cellophane for microfiltration and dialysis. Millipore Corporation in the United States started developing bacteriological analysis for membranes in 1945. Besides these two companies, Toagepast Natuurwetenschappelijk Onderzoek in the Netherlands and Ionics Corporation in the United States also developed membranes for electrodialysis (Belfort, 1987).

The United States Office of Saline Water Research was the first consolidated effort in the US to provide major funding for synthetic membrane research. Under this organization's guidance, Reid and Breton at the University of Florida manufactured the first RO membrane with good salt rejection and acceptable product water flux in 1959. In the early 1960's, Loeb and Sourirajan perfected the first asymmetric cellulose acetate membrane at the University of California, Los Angeles; this type of membrane is the most common type used for low salinity water desalination in the world today.

Table I (Lonsdale, 1982) shows various membrane process characteristics.
Table I: Membrane Separation Processes *(from Lonsdale, 1982)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials Passed</th>
<th>Driving Force</th>
<th>Materials Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialysis</td>
<td>Ions and Low Molecular Weight Organics (Urea)</td>
<td>Concentration Difference</td>
<td>Dissolved and Suspended Materials with Molecular Weight &gt;1000 amu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrodialysis</td>
<td>Ions</td>
<td>Voltage, Typically 1-2 V/cell Pair</td>
<td>All Non-Ionic and Macromolecular Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse Osmosis</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Pressure Difference, Typically 100-800 psi</td>
<td>Virtually All Suspended and Dissolved Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultrafiltration</td>
<td>Water and Salts</td>
<td>Pressure Difference, Typically 10-100 psi</td>
<td>Biological, Colloids, and Macromolecules, Variable Molecular Weight Cutoffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Separation</td>
<td>Gas and Vapors</td>
<td>Pressure Difference, Typically 1-10 atm</td>
<td>Membrane-Impermeable Gases and Vapors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiltration</td>
<td>Water and Dissolved Species</td>
<td>Pressure Difference, Typically 10 psi</td>
<td>Suspended Materials (Silica, Bacteria, etc.). Variable Particle Cutoffs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RO (or hyperfiltration as it has been known) is the only membrane process which allows water to pass through without other matter entering the product side. Another difference between RO, ultrafiltration, and microfiltration is that RO operates at a much higher pressure. Therefore energy cost for pumping is a higher consideration for RO systems.

In the 1960's, RO emphasis was primarily on desalination for reclaiming potable water from seawater. More recently, usage for RO has expanded to include such varied applications as reclamation of municipal wastewaters, agricultural drainage, and industrial waters. In all these cases, waters which are reclaimed usually do not meet drinking water standards but meet discharge standards for the environment. RO is also used extensively for high-purity water applications such as producing rinse water for semiconductor chips.

**Municipal Wastewater**

In recent years, one RO application which has met with a good degree of success is reclamation of wastewater from municipal sources. One example of such an application is the Water Factory 21 Plant located in Orange County, CA. Product water from this plant is injected into the groundwater supply to prevent seawater intrusion into groundwater tables; water from this aquifer serves as a potable water supply for Orange County (Argo, 1979).

Feedwater undergoes an elaborate pretreatment scheme before RO treatment. Feed is first coagulated with CaO to produce a lime sludge which is settled out in a clarifier. The water is then fed through a series of ammonia stripping towers followed by recarbonation with CO₂ to lower the pH. Next, mixed media filters remove supracolloidal particles are followed by granular activated carbon adsorbers for organics removal and disinfection using
chlorine. A portion of the water is treated using RO (Allen, 1979).

This plant was completed in 1977 at a cost of $18 million (1977 dollars) and processes a total flow of 15 million gallons per day (MGD). Feedwater for this plant is activated sludge process effluent with a total dissolved solids (TDS) content of 1,100 mg/L. The amount of product from RO process totals 6 MGD with an effluent TDS of 40 mg/L. This effluent is blended with 6 MGD of deep well water and 9 MGD of none-RO treated tertiary water. The blended water has a TDS content of less than 500 mg/L; and conforms to standards set by the state of California (Potts, 1981) for drinking water.

Industrial Water

Reverse osmosis membranes have been used for industrial water treatment as well. In 1974, the Toray Company of Japan built a pilot plant to test the feasibility of recovering wastewater from a chemical plant. The plant operated for three years using spiral-wound modules, processing 26,420 gallons per day (gal/d) with a feed water TDS of 700 - 2,000 mg/L and effluent TDS of less than 84 mg/L. RO pretreatment consists of coagulation, sand filtration, precision filtration, chlorination, and addition of scale inhibitors. Feed is passed through a 10 µm filter before entering the RO units. Feedwater quality after pretreatment is 151 mg/L TDS. Flux decreased by 19% in the test period which is within acceptable industry standards (Kojima, 1977).

The Swissair Maintenance and Overhaul Base in Zurich, Switzerland uses RO as the final wastewater treatment step. Wastewater is generated from various industrial operations, including plating baths and engine cleaning lines. This plant was started in 1977 and has a capacity of 0.19 MGD. Feed to RO modules has an influent quality of 545 mg/L TDS, and product water quality is
17 mg/L TDS. Product water is reused within the plant (Potts, 1981).

**Agricultural Drainage Water**

The largest example of a RO plant for recovering agricultural drainage water worldwide is at Yuma, AZ. The Yuma Desalting Plant Facility (YDPF) has a design capacity of 72.4 MGD. YDPF services the Wellton-Mohawk irrigation district located at the US-Mexican border. The once pristine Colorado River water at its source has a salinity level of 800 - 1,200 mg/L TDS when it reaches the Mexican border.

Increase in salinity may be attributed to irrigation return flows and numerous reservoirs along the river which increase evaporative surfaces. Excess irrigation water carries minerals such as sodium chloride (NaCl) and calcium sulfate back into the Colorado River. When this water reaches the Mexican farmers, the TDS is of greater than 5,000 mg/L, which prevents its use for agricultural purposes. Under a 1974 agreement with the Mexican government, the US agreed to deliver 1.5 million acre-feet of water with a quality of 115 ± 30 mg/L TDS.

The current anticipated operational date for this facility is in 1991. The plant was originally designed to begin production in 1983, but has been plagued by RO membrane problems. The US government contracted two companies to provide membrane and hardware requirements of this plant. The Fluid Systems Division (FSD) of Universal Oil and Petroleum (UOP) was contracted to provide RO equipment capable of handling 50 MGD; Hydranautics Water Systems (HWS) was contracted to provide for the remaining 22.4 MGD. Initial membrane testing using Wellton-Mohawk drainage water showed much greater than anticipated decrease in membrane performance (Kaakinen, 1985).
A schematic for this plant is presented in Figure 1. RO pretreatment at this facility consists of chlorination for disinfection, sedimentation for grit removal, lime and ferric sulfate addition for sludge thickening, dual media filtration for turbidity removal, a clearwell for effluent storage, and finally sulfuric acid and/or sulfur dioxide addition for lowering the pH to meet the membrane manufacturers' requirements (Applegate, 1984). Even with the described pretreatment scheme, membrane lifetimes do not meet the manufacturers' guarantees.

RO feedwater analysis revealed trihalomethane (THM's) concentrations to be approximately 120 to 140 μg/L. Colloidal matter in the form of various clays, including montmorillonite, kaolinite, and illite was between 0.045 and 0.105 g/m² of membrane area, depending on the exposure time. The majority of clays (> 90%) had diameters under 2 μm, which was found to contribute to the majority of membrane colloidal fouling (Winfield, 1979). The colloids were estimated to have a high surface area of 250 m²/g. Calculations performed on the water indicated that clays present are in sufficient quantity to completely cover the membranes between 4.5 to 10.5 times over (Kaakinen, 1985).

A possible interaction between the THM's and stable colloids present in the RO feed water was proposed by Kaakinen. He speculated that the presence of THM's may cause colloidal destabilization and therefore membrane performance decline was attributed to some synergistic interaction between the two constituents (Kaakinen, 1985). Preliminary tests using the Wellton-Mohawk water indicate the effects of fouling are more severe than if either colloids or THM's alone had been present in the feedwater.

Studies performed at the Los Banos Desalting Facility in Central California's San Joaquin Valley showed evidence that THM's affect membrane
Flow Diagram for Yuma Desalting Plant Facility
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performance. A demonstration plant was set up at this location to establish the economic feasibility of agricultural water reclamation/reuse. The feed used for this facility comes from tile drainage water produced from overirrigation. The TDS content of this water averaged 9,600 mg/L while the dissolved organic carbon content (DOC) averaged approximately 7.75 mg/L (Glater, 1989). These reported values are nearly double the concentration of the Yuma water.

Analysis of the Los Banos tile water reveals a total trihalomethane concentration of 122 μg/L, of which CHBr₃ makes up 44% of the total and CHCl₃ is nonmeasurable (Wilson, 1988). Prior to RO treatment, the feed water undergoes pretreatment, including primary chlorination, clarification, dual media filtration, clearwell chlorination, and ion exchange. It was found after the primary chlorination stage THM concentrations increase approximately by 400%.

While the primary focus of Wilson's (1988) study was to analyze the composition of the Los Banos tile water, he also performed a series of preliminary tests on various RO membranes to examine for adverse effects on performance from THM addition. It was found in this testing membrane flux declined faster with the addition of THM's. The THM's were not rejected well by the membranes. Since the initial tests in this area look promising, this study further explores the phenomenon of THM fouling.
3. Membrane Hardware Configurations

Membranes are housed in four different configurations: tubular, spiral-wound, hollow fine fiber, and flat-plate. Each of these configurations have inherent advantages and disadvantages and are discussed below.

**Tubular Configuration**

Figure 2 (Eisenberg, 1986) shows the tubular configuration schematic. Material is either coated onto or inserted into the surface of a porous tube. The function of the tube is to provide a support for the delicate membrane. Pressurized feed is introduced from one end of the tube and product water exits through the tube walls. The solute concentrated stream exits through the end of the tube. This configuration was commercially popular during the late 1960's; however, due to the low membrane surface area to membrane volume ratio, and the tendency to foul rapidly, this configuration is not economically feasible.

**Spiral-Wound Configuration**

Figure 3 (Eisenberg, 1986) shows the spiral-wound membrane configuration schematic. Two sheets of membranes with the active layer pointed outwards are glued together with a piece of tricot or nylon membrane spacer separating the two membranes in the center. The space between the membranes is commonly called the tricot product water collection channel. This assembly, "the leaf", has one edge which is not glued together. The membranes at this edge are bent outwards and away from each other. The open edge of the leaf is glued
Multiple tubes normally connected in series or parallel to form complete module

**Figure 2: Schematic for Tubular RO Configuration** *(from Eisenberg, 1986)*
Figure 3: Schematic for Spiral-Wound RO Configuration (from Eisenberg, 1986)
onto a plastic tube with holes predrilled at various locations on the tube. Product water passes through the middle of the leaf via the collection channel into the tube middle. The leaf is wrapped spirally around the tube, hence the name.

In order to allow feed and brine water to pass through this spiral wrap, a plastic netting is placed between each leaf wrap. In this configuration, feed enters one end of the assembly and flows axially with brine exiting the opposite end. A solute concentration gradient is established since brine is more concentrated further down the RO tube. The plastic netting, known as feed-channel spacer, also serves to promote turbulence in the tube and lessens the solute buildup effects on the membrane surface.

A common practice with spiral-wrap membranes is to stagger multiple leaves and glue them onto the product collection tube. In this manner, one may obtain tremendous membrane surface area which is the principal advantage of this configuration. The main disadvantage in this configuration is the difficulty of cleaning. The majority of RO installations in the world presently use this membrane configuration.

**Hollow Fine Fibers Configuration**

Figure 4 (Eisenberg, 1986) shows the hollow fine fiber (HFF) configuration schematic. This design was perfected by DuPont in 1970 with an aromatic polyamide membrane. Asymmetric fibers with an active solute rejecting surface and a hollow core are extruded from a polyamide resin. The fibers have an outer diameter of 85 μm and an inner diameter of 42 μm. As many as 4.5 million of these fibers are bundled together with the product end bonded with an adhesive and the brine end epoxied together into a nub.
Figure 4: Schematic for Hollow Fine-Fiber RO Configuration (from Eisenberg, 1986)
Feed flows into a plastic center tube to be distributed to the individual fibers. Feed flows radially from the center of the fibers. Product water travels outwards from the fiber and is collected on the outer spaces between individual fibers; brine travels through the center of the fibers and passes out from the assembly (Applegate, 1984).

The primary advantage of this membrane assembly configuration is the tremendous surface area. Another advantage of the HFF assembly is the low feed flow rate which is required; this minimizes energy requirements. The disadvantage of this assembly is the difficulty of membrane cleaning. Since individual fibers are so fine, the feedwater pretreatment must be extensive in order to achieve a reasonable membrane life.

**Flat-Plate Configuration**

Figure 5 (Eisenberg, 1986) shows the flat-plate membrane configuration schematic; this is the oldest RO configuration. Two velocities exist in this system, an axial velocity which carries feed and brine across the membrane face and a transmembrane velocity which carries feed through the membrane. Product water flows out the top of the assembly and brine flows out the side opposite from the feed entrance.

The primary advantage to the flat-plate assembly is ease of membrane replacement or cleaning. The primary disadvantage of this configuration is the low membrane surface area. This configuration is not widely used for commercial applications due to its low surface area. The primary use of the flat-plate assembly is for membrane testing and was used in this study.
Figure 5: Schematic for Flat-Plate RO Configuration (from Eisenberg, 1986)
4. Membrane Types

Three membrane types are presently in commercial use: *cellulose acetate*, *aromatic polyamide*, and *advanced composite*. Each of these membrane compositions have inherent advantages and disadvantages and not every type of membrane is suitable for every application. Typically, molecular size removal for RO membranes is between 1 to 10 Å which makes its application for demineralization ideal (*Selleck, 1984*). One rule common for product flow is the thinner the membrane, the higher the volume of product output.

In examining material feasibility for RO membranes, two prerequisites appear to be necessary. The materials must contain bonds which bear O and N functional groups, since these groups have been found ideal for hydrogen bonding. Secondly, the materials usually contain five- or six- member rings. These characteristics appear in all of the currently available commercial membranes.

**Cellulose Acetate Membranes**

Cellulose acetate (CA) is the oldest and most widely used synthetic membrane material available for RO applications. Reid and Breton at the University of Florida synthesized the first cellulose membrane which possessed desalination capabilities in 1959 (*Reid, 1959*). However, product water flux from this membrane was too small to be of any commercial importance. Loeb and Sournirajan at UCLA devised the first functional asymmetric cellulose acetate membrane in 1960 (*Loeb, 1980*). The membrane's asymmetric structure raised solute rejection and product water flux to a level which allowed commercial utilization to be feasible.
A CA membrane is comprised of three layers; a thin, dense active layer, a thicker layer known as the porous substrate, and a fabric support. The purpose of the active layer is to block out dissolved solids, such as salts, in the feed while allowing water to pass through. Typical thickness for this layer is approximately 1 µm. Porous substrate, formed from the same cellulose acetate as the active layer, provides support for the delicate active layer and is typically 5 to 10 µm thick. The fabric support sits on the bottom of this sandwich and is approximately 89 to 96 µm thick. This support may be composed of either fabric or paper.

Formulation for CA membranes is depicted in Figure 6 (Kesting, 1977). Many attempts were carried out before a membrane with high rejection and flux was found. CA membrane performance depends on three factors: nature of casting solution, evaporation time, and curing temperature. The casting solution is dependent on type of CA used, acetone percentage, and type and percentage of swelling agent used.

CA is made from a solution of cellulose, acetic anhydride, acetic acid, and sulfuric acid. Cellulose is acetylated by the addition of acetic anhydride under these conditions (Malm, 1971). The completely acetylated product is known as cellulose triacetate (CTA) and has three acetate groups substituted for the hydroxyl groups on the cellulose unit. CTA is a sparingly soluble polymer and is deacetylated by water to form cellulose diacetate (CDA). The CA that is used in membrane casting solutions is a blend of CTA and CDA.

The degree of substitution on cellulose may range from zero to three, depending on the number of hydroxyl groups which are replaced by acetate subunits. Varying this parameter yields very different membrane performance. One trend which has been noted in cellulose processing is the higher the
Formation of Cellulose Acetate

Acetic Anhydride + Cellulose → Cellulose Acetate

Figure 6: Formation of Cellulose Acetate (from Kesting, 1977)
degree of substitution, the more ordered or crystalline the polymer structure becomes. A degree of substitution of three (CTA) causes an increase in rejection of sodium chloride (NaCl) salts and a decrease in product flux. The lack of hydroxy groups on cellulose is one possible reason for causing poor product water flux in CTA. Hydroxy groups enable hydrogen bonding to occur which facilitates transport of water molecules through the membrane. Zero substitution (pure cellulose) yields a high product flux but poor NaCl rejection. Most of the CA’s used in casting solutions for membranes have a degree of substitution of 2.4 to 2.5. This enables the membrane to have good rejection characteristics of CTA and good product flow characteristics of CDA (Kesting, 1977).

Acetone in the casting solution allows evaporation of excess water from deacetylation and hydrolysis of CTA and controls the degree of swelling achieved from addition of swelling agents. The swelling agent used in CA processing is usually magnesium perchlorate or formamide. The function of these agents is to increase membrane water content which correlates positively with product permeability as well as to produce proper pore sizes for product water transport through the membrane (Kesting, 1977). Too much swelling agent in the casting solution will cause larger membrane voids, which results in a membrane skin too thin to maintain structural integrity. To yield a membrane with good flux and rejection characteristics, a careful balance must be maintained among CA, acetone, and swelling agent used in casting.

Evaporation time and curing temperature are also important factors for establishing proper flow and rejection characteristics. Increasing both time and temperature result in "tighter" membranes, that is, membranes which have good rejection but poor flux characteristics. Water is driven out of the membrane.
structure by both these methods, and in doing so, decreases membrane permeability.

CA membranes are currently the most popular membrane types, and may be formed into flat-plate, tubular, HFF, or most commonly, spiral wound configurations. They have favorable rejection and flux performance characteristics for lower salinity waters but are unsuitable for seawater applications. CA may be used under pH conditions from 3 to 8, operating pressures from 400 to 600 psi, and operating temperatures from 32 to 104 °F. CA withstands exposure to free chlorine resulting from disinfection much better than other membrane types. However, CA is subjected to hydrolysis at high pH (basic conditions) or when it is exposed to ozone. CA is also susceptible to bacteriological attacks.

Aromatic Polyamide Membranes

DuPont introduced their version of the aromatic polyamide (PA) membrane in 1975. The structure is presented in Figure 7 (Petersen, 1986). This membrane has the ability to form crosslinked hydrogen bonds between different chains. This crosslinking yields a more rigid membrane than CA, and for this reason less pressure compaction is likely to occur. Also, this crosslinking leads to higher product flow and enhances the membrane's ability to withstand biological and chemical attacks.

PA membranes are made from reacting diacid chloride with m-phenylenediamine. Products formed from this reaction are polyamides and hydrochloric acid. This polymer is formed in the same manner as CA membranes. Fifteen parts of polyamide are added to 85 parts of N,N-dimethyl formamide with slats to create pores in the membrane (Sundet, 1983). The
Formation of Polyamide

Figure 7: Formation of Polyamide (from Petersen, 1986)
solution is filtered through a 5 μm filter and the filtrate is cast onto clean glass at 100 °C. The membrane is dried and extracted in quench water for one hour. Afterwards, the membrane is annealed in 55 °C water for 30 minutes.

PA membranes may be found in flat-plate, spiral wound, or HFF configurations. Its active layer may be as thin as 0.1 μm which makes PA ten times thinner than cellulose acetate and allows more water to be passed through with the same pressure. PA membranes may be used at pressures varying from 350 to 400 psi and at temperatures from 32 to 104 °F. The HFF configuration is widely used for demineralizing seawater. PA membranes are also used for other applications such as municipal and industrial water treatment since they are resistant to changes in feedwater conditions.

**Composite Membranes**

Fluid Systems Division of Universal Oil and Petroleum is the first company credited with the manufacture of a thin film composite membrane which was not formed out of cellulose (Petersen, 1986). Since their development, various polymer membranes have been formed and installed for demineralization purposes. DuPont manufactures a composite membrane dubbed the advanced composite (AC) membrane to improve upon cellulose acetate properties.

The formation of AC membrane is depicted in Figure 8 (Pohland, 1989; Sundet, 1987) This membrane is formed from aliphatic 1,3,5-cyclohexane tricarbonyl chloride (HT) and aromatic m-phenylene diamine (MPD) via interfacial polycondensation. In interfacial polycondensation, reactants are contacted at an interface; the active layer for the membrane forms here. Another membrane is formed from reacting aromatic 1,3,5-benzyltricarbonyl chloride with MPD to yield a fully aromatic membrane. The aliphatic/aromatic
Formation of DuPont ACM
(from Pohland, 1988)

Figure 8: Formation of DuPont's ACM (from Pohland, 1988)
configuration yields a membrane which has better flow and rejection characteristics as well as higher durability than the fully aromatic version. This membrane is structurally stronger than aromatic membranes since it contains more hydrogen bonds (Pohland, 1989).

Composite membranes are composed of four layers. The active layer, composed of HT/MPD, is between 250 to 500 Å thick or nearly 20 to 40 times thinner than the average CA active layer. The thinness of this layer offers much less resistance to water transport than CA membranes, therefore, higher product fluxes are attainable with ACM than CA. The second layer in this membrane is known as the intermediate transport layer. This colloidal gel-like layer is composed of polyether/polyamide blend and offers a support for the active layer. The next layer in this sandwich is the porous support layer which may be formed of polysulfone. On the bottom of the membrane is fabric which provides further support for the sandwich.

ACM has distinct advantages over cellulose acetate membranes in almost every area. ACM may tolerate a wider range of operating conditions than CA membranes. Whereas CA membranes are used in the pH region between 3 to 8, ACM may tolerate pH levels ranging from 1 to 11. ACM may be used at pressures between 150 to 600 psi and temperatures between 32 to 115 °F. Unlike CA, ACM is not subject to hydrolytic attacks which may severely reduce membrane life. ACM also has a thinner active layer than CA which translates to higher product fluxes at the same operating pressure. ACM is also resistant to biological attacks which presents a problem for CA. Since ACM has a higher degree of cross-linking than CA, this membrane is also more resistant to pressure compaction effects.
Summary

Table II summarizes the important characteristics of the three membrane types discussed in this chapter. The main advantage of AC membrane is its operational range which is wider than CA and PA. AC membrane has fully cross-linked bonds, extending into three dimensions, which allows it to retain its structure better under pressure than other membranes. The main advantage of CA over ACM is in its ability to withstand the effects from free chlorine. Another advantage of CA over ACM is cost; CA is less expensive than AC membrane. PA's physical and operational characteristics are between CA's and ACM's; its cost is also between CA and ACM.

Table II: Comparison of CA, PA, and AC Membrane Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membrane Type</th>
<th>Active Layer (μm)</th>
<th>Active Layer Material</th>
<th>Cross-Linking</th>
<th>pH Range</th>
<th>Temp Range (° F)</th>
<th>Pressure Range (psi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Cellulose Acetate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 - 8</td>
<td>32 - 104</td>
<td>400 - 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>0.1 - 1.0</td>
<td>Aromatic Polyamide</td>
<td>Partial (2D)</td>
<td>4 - 10</td>
<td>32 - 104</td>
<td>350 - 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>0.05 - 0.2</td>
<td>HT/MPD</td>
<td>Full (3D)</td>
<td>1 - 11</td>
<td>32 - 115</td>
<td>150 - 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Modeling Membrane Performance

Since the discovery of cellulose acetate membranes, scientists and engineers have attempted to characterize membrane performance to predict the useful life based on flux and rejection. Two sets of equations seem to work best for quantifying membrane performance. The first set, containing Equations 1 and 2, known as Merten's equations, applies only to steady state conditions. Merten's (1967) equations are useful for comparing different membranes' performances at steady state. High water transport coefficients (A) and low solute transport coefficients (B) are desirable since high A's are associated with high water fluxes and low B's are associated with high percent TDS rejections. Equation 3 is a modified form of Van't Hoff's equation used to predict osmotic pressure.

\[
J_w = A(\Delta P - \Delta \pi) \quad \text{(1)}
\]

\[
J_s = B(\Delta C) \quad \text{(2)}
\]

\[
\Delta \pi = \frac{(\Delta C)RT}{MW} \quad \text{(3)}
\]

\[
\Delta C = C_f - C_p \quad \text{(4)}
\]
where

\begin{align*}
A &= \text{water transport coefficient (gal/ft}^2\text{-day-psi)} \\
B &= \text{solute transport coefficient (ft/day)} \\
C_f &= \text{feed concentration (mg/L)} \\
C_p &= \text{product concentration (mg/L)} \\
J_s &= \text{solute flux (lb/day)} \\
J_w &= \text{water flux (gal/ft}^2\text{-day (GFD))} \\
MW &= \text{molecular weight of solute (g/mol)} \\
R &= \text{universal gas constant (0.0821 L-atm/mol-K)} \\
T &= \text{temperature (K)} \\
\Delta C &= \text{concentration difference (mg/L)} \\
\Delta P &= \text{operating pressure (psi)} \\
\Delta \pi &= \text{osmotic pressure difference (psi)}
\end{align*}

The second set of equations was also coined by Merten, modified by Wechsler (1977) and applied to unsteady state conditions.

\[ F_t = Kt^m \quad (5) \]

Upon integration, this equation is transformed from,

\[ \int_0^Q F_t = \int_0^t Kt^m \]

...to the following form,

\[ Q = \frac{K}{m+1} (t^{m+1} - t_o^{m+1}) \quad (6) \]
where

\[ F_t = \text{water flux at any time } t \text{ (gal/ft}^2\text{-day)} \]
\[ K = \text{membrane constant (gal/ft}^2\text{-day)} \]
\[ m = \text{log-log flux decline index (unitless)} \]
\[ Q = \text{amount of permeate per unit area membrane (gal/ft}^2\text{)} \]
\[ t = \text{time (days)} \]
\[ t_0 = \text{initial time (days)} \]

Assuming \( t_0 \) be 0 and and taking logs of both sides of the equation, the following expression is obtained.

\[
\log Q = \log\left(\frac{K}{m + 1}\right) + (m + 1) \log (t) \tag{7}
\]

If log \( Q \) vs. log \( t \) is plotted, the slope is \( m + 1 \) and the intercept is \( \log \left(\frac{K}{m + 1}\right) \).

From these, \( m \) and \( K \) are estimated easily. Wechsler (Wechsler, 1977) states this equation is only valid in periods between membrane cleanings; however, some authors have overlooked this limitation. Since the log-log flux decline index \( m \) is negative, it is desirable for this parameter to be as small as possible in order to extend the useful membrane life. It is also desirable for the membrane constant \( K \) to be as high as possible for high permeate fluxes.

Another useful parameter for membrane performance characterization is percent rejection. Percent rejection is defined as follows.

\[
\% R = \left(\frac{C_f - C_p}{C_f}\right) \times 100 \% = \left(1 - \frac{C_p}{C_f}\right) \times 100 \% \tag{8}
\]
It is desirable for a membrane to have a high percent rejection since this determines permeate quality. In this study, Equation 8 is used to calculate TDS and halocarbon percent rejections.

A parameter which gives an indication of RO efficiency is known as percent recovery or conversion.

\[
Y = \frac{Q_P}{Q_f} \times 100\% = \frac{V_P}{V_f} \times 100\%
\]  

where

- \(C_f\) = feed concentration (mg/L)
- \(C_P\) = product concentration (mg/L)

High Y values reflect higher efficiency and more water is recovered than at lower Y values. One common problem when operating at high Y values is concentration polarization. Concentration polarization is a buildup of solutes on the membrane surface. Solutes at the membrane surface are usually swept away by the reject or brine water. In a case of high Y's, there is very little reject water to sweep solutes from the membrane surface. This deposition presents a hindrance to product water flow.

An important factor in determining membrane life is the degree of feedwater...
pretreatment. Although there is no total agreement within the industry, the most widely accepted empirical test performed on waters presently is the silt index test (SDI) described in a DuPont bulletin (DuPont, 1982). In this test, one runs a stream of water at a pressure of greater than 40 psig through a pressure regulator set precisely at 30 psig. This water is passed through a 0.45 \( \mu \text{m} \) Millipore\textsuperscript{®} filter. One measures the time required to collect a 500 mL sample initially and another 500 mL sample at 15 minutes after test startup. In operations involving RO, feed SDI is usually taken after water has been subjected to clarification. The SDI is defined as:

\[
SDI = \frac{\% P_{30}}{t_f} = 100 \times \left( \frac{1-\frac{t_f}{t_i}}{t_f} \right)
\]  

(10)

where

- \( P_{30} \) = percent plugging at 30 psig feed pressure
- \( t_f \) = final time, in seconds, required to collect 500 mL sample after test time \( t_i \) (usually 15 minutes)
- \( t_i \) = initial time, in seconds, required to collect 500 mL sample
- \( t_t \) = total time in minutes (usually 15, but may be less if 75 percent plugging in less in 15 minutes)

Equation 10 is used to determine adequacy of water pretreatment. An SDI reading of 1 indicates a very high purity water which needs no pretreatment. Surface waters have SDI values of 10 to 175 which may be attributed to colloidal suspensions. A positive correlation exists between SDI values and a water's fouling tendencies; the higher the SDI of a water, the shorter lifespan one may expect for a membrane. Most manufacturers guarantee their
membranes' lifetimes at prescribed SDI levels for the feedwater.

Although SDI is a widely used parameter in the membrane and its associated industries as the indicator of a feed water's quality, there are still some problems with this test. Since the pore size of the filter used in SDI testing is 0.45 μm, any fouling attributable to particles less than this size is not detected. The problems at Yuma stress this point since colloidal particles, which are suspected to be a major source of fouling, are between 10 Å and 1 μm in size and may easily pass through this filter. Another potential foulant which the SDI test does not detect is the presence of organic matter which may foul the membrane.

A parameter which may be helpful in determining the attraction of organic compounds to a membrane is known as the partition coefficient described by Equation 11 (Pusch, 1976).

\[ K_s = \left( \frac{\text{mol organic}}{\text{kg wet membrane}} \right) / \left( \frac{\text{mol organic}}{\text{kg solution}} \right) \]  

(11)

where

- \( K_s \) = organic distribution coefficient (unitless)

\( K_s \) is very similar to \( K_{ow} \), the octanol-water coefficient with one difference. Whereas \( K_{ow} \) measures the ratio of the affinity of an organic matter for octanol and for water at equilibrium, \( K_s \) quantifies the distribution of organics between the membrane phase and the solution phase at steady state. \( K_s \) values less than 1 indicate the organic compound prefers the solution phase while \( K_s \) values greater than 1 indicate the organic prefers the membrane phase. \( K_s \) values of 1 indicate equimolar distribution of the organic between solution and
membrane phases.

Pusch found phenol prefers the membrane phase to the solution phase with $K_s$ values ranging from 10 to 40 for different types of CA membranes at 25 °C and pH of approximately 7. The large amounts of phenol sorbed by the membranes displaced the water in their structure and thus altered the membrane's performance characteristics. Pusch also discovered the phenol-membrane interactions were irreversible. $K_s$ indicates the degree of interaction between organics and a membrane and may provide indications of how membrane performance characteristics are affected by organic addition.

Another parameter of interest in membrane research is a quantity known as membrane void fraction, $\varepsilon$. This quantity relates the volume of voids to the volume of the entire membrane and is described by Equations 12 and 13 (Pintauro, 1980).

$$\varepsilon_v = \frac{\Delta V}{1+\Delta V}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

and

$$\Delta V = \frac{\rho_d (W_w - W_d)}{\rho_e W_d}$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where

$w_d$ = weight of dry membrane (g)
$w_w$ = weight of wet membrane (g)
$\rho_d$ = density of dry membrane (g/cm$^3$)
$\rho_e$ = density of solution (g/cm$^3$)
$\varepsilon_v$ = membrane void fraction (unitless)
$\Delta V$ = change in volume (cm$^3$)
This parameter may also be thought of as the ratio of void volume to membrane volume. If total membrane volume remains relatively constant over the course of an experiment, then any changes in $\varepsilon$ may be attributed to changes in void volume. In this case, $\varepsilon$ quantifies the changes in the membrane void volume. Decreases in $\varepsilon$ indicate decrease in the membrane void volume while increases in $\varepsilon$ indicate increase in the membrane void volume.
6. Membrane-Chemical Interactions

Membranes may experience two classes of interactions with chemicals during time of operation: degradation, fouling, and permeation. Membrane degradation is often a relatively fast, irreversible phenomenon while membrane fouling occurs over longer periods of time and may be reversible or irreversible. Another difference between degradation and fouling is how the product flux and quality are affected. Flux increases and quality decreases over time for membrane degradation; flux decreases and quality may remain the same or increase for membrane fouling. In permeation, the chemicals pass through the membrane without any chemical interactions.

Membrane Degradation

Membrane degradation involves polymer changes and the effect is usually irreversible. Degradation is caused by chemicals which may break membrane structural bonds. For example, strong acids may cause CA membrane hydrolysis and revert it back to the cellulose form. Cellulose allows both water and solutes to pass through indiscriminately.

Bacterial attacks may also degrade CA membranes. Microbes attach to membrane surfaces and metabolize acetyl groups; with this accomplished, microbes attack cellulose chains, thus breaking membrane bonds and allowing excess water and solutes to pass through the membrane (Lepore, 1988). Substrates for bacterial growth are often found in RO feedwaters.

Composite membranes are less susceptible to acid or microbial attacks; nevertheless they may be degraded when exposed to halides such as bromide (Br\textsuperscript{−}) or chloride (Cl\textsuperscript{−}). In one study (Glater, 1981) benzanilide, used as a model
for DuPont's B-9 aromatic polyamide membrane, was placed into a solution of 6,000 mg Br⁻/L and soaked for 260 hours. Infrared analysis revealed halide uptake and halogen substitution into the aromatic ring structure. Halogen substitution disrupts polymeric intermolecular hydrogen bonding and allows more solutes and water to pass through. This process is irreversible and membrane replacement is required to restore efficiency.

Membrane Fouling

Fouling is the most common problem in membrane process operations. Although there are various definitions of fouling, one of the best found in the literature is by Eykamp (1976).

Fouling is a condition in which a membrane undergoes plugging or coating by some element in the stream being treated, in such a way that its output or flux is reduced and in such a way that the foulant is not in dynamic equilibrium with the stream being ultrafiltrated. In another words, something has occurred that makes the microenvironment near the membrane a nonsteady state situation.

Although there are a variety of foulants, Potts (1981) classifies foulants in four broad categories, 1) slightly soluble inorganics such as salts from calcium or sodium, 2) colloidal or particulate matter, 3) dissolved organic compounds, and 4) biological foulants.

Inorganic Foulants

Potts classifies inorganic foulants as commonly including Ca²⁺, Mg²⁺, CO₃⁻², SO₄⁻², silica, and iron. The degree of fouling from these inorganics worsens as
percentage recovery increases. Under these circumstances, more water is passed through the membrane which increases inorganic concentration on the feed side. Above a critical concentration, solubility limit for inorganic salts may be exceeded which will result in precipitation, which is commonly known as scaling. Scale formation greatly reduces water transport through the membrane. Besik(1972) and Wechsler(1977) noted these inorganic foulants become a serious problem at recovery levels exceeding 90 - 95%. In a recent study (Allegrezza, 1988) of operating practices at some commercial RO facilities, 10% recovery is a satisfactory guideline used for the prevention of this type of fouling from occurring. In this study, our recovery level is less than 10% so scale formation is not expected to be a problem.

Particulate Foulants

Particulate foulants in water may either be organic or inorganic and vary in size and shape. Cruver (1973) states common inorganic particulates in water are composed of iron, aluminum, and silica with aluminum silicate clays (d_p of 0.3 - 1 μm) being the most ubiquitous. In this case, silica fits into both inorganic and particulate foulant categories.

There is much disagreement among authors on the classification of different sizes of particles which exist in waters. Rudolfs (1952) arrived at the following scheme for classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Size Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settleable solids</td>
<td>&gt; 100 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supra-colloidal solids</td>
<td>1 μm - 100 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloidal solids</td>
<td>10 Å - 1 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved solids</td>
<td>&lt; 10 Å</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Although waters vary from source to source, Rickert and Hunter (1967) found dissolved solids constituted 69% of the total solids in municipal wastewaters. Some researchers have hypothesized colloidal and dissolved solids fractions make the largest contributions to particulate fouling. Winfield (1979) noted removal of particles larger than 5 μm did not decrease membrane fouling and theorized larger particles do not significantly affect fouling since they are carried away by convection. Sugahara (1979) concluded particles less than 45 Å tended to foul membranes more than ones larger than 45 Å.

**Dissolved Organic Foulants**

In this study dissolved organics are the foulant type which are of the most interest. Organic particulates may be composed of larger constituents such as bacteria or smaller constituents such as humic acids and carbohydrates. Humic acids may further be cleaved or functional groups may break off as a result of exposure to various halogens such as Br⁻ and Cl⁻ to form CHBr₃, CHCl₃, and various intermediates. These organics are known as trihalomethanes (THM's), and are purgeable and therefore detectable by purge and trap gas chromatography (GC) analysis. Potts (1982) noted dissolved organics together with colloids contribute most to membrane fouling since they are the hardest to remove during pretreatment. Wojcik (1980) noted THM's and phenols present no fouling problems since they permeate easily through the membrane and should not cause any blockage of membrane pores.
Biological Foulants

Biological fouling is caused by viruses or live or dead bacterial cells. This fouling may occur on the membrane surface or in the pores; typical thicknesses for the bacterially-fouled layer is on the order of 10 to 20 μm (Lepore, 1988). Cellulose acetate membranes were found to be the most susceptible to fouling by bacteria and fouling effects increased as the SDI increased (Arora, 1983).

Bacterial growth patterns on CA membranes were established by Ridgway (1985) in tests conducted at the Water Factory 21 Treatment Plant in Orange County, CA. *Mycobacterium* dominated bacterial growth for the initial five week period, followed by a wide variety of bacterial growth including *Acinetobacter, Pseudomonas,* and *Flavobacterium.* Longer growth periods revealed presence of *Moraxella, Klebsiella, Alcaligenes,* and *Shigella.* Optimum pH conditions for growth were observed at between 6 and 6.5. This pH range is also favorable for prevention of CA hydrolysis.

Fouling Effects

In membrane fouling the most recognizable effect is a decline in product flux over time. The reason for this arises from buildup of a foulant layer on the membrane surface or from membrane pore pluggage. Fouling may either be reversible or irreversible. Reversible fouling is characterized by partial or full recovery of product water flux through cleaning. Cleaning procedures include chemical addition, backflushing, or sponge-ball cleaning depending on membrane configuration and its ability to withstand chemical addition. By definition, membrane performance recovery is not possible with irreversible fouling.
Plasticization is another cause for decrease in membrane performance. In plasticization, the addition of certain organics, e.g. phenol, will cause the CA membrane to soften and subsequently harden, reducing product water flux. This effect is reversible at low phenol concentrations; at higher phenol concentrations, asymmetricity loss is permanent and the effect is irreversible (Andersen, 1981).

**Membrane Permeation**

Chemical permeation through membranes is a three step process; *surface adsorption, membrane absorption, and desorption*. In surface adsorption, the chemicals attach themselves to available spaces on the membrane surface. In membrane absorption, the chemicals permeate into the membrane structure but no chemical bonds result. In desorption, the chemicals which were absorbed are transported out of the membrane to the other side. Throughout the permeation process, no chemical bonds are formed.

**Trace Organics in Wastewaters**

Trihalomethanes (THMs) are one class of organics which have come under close scrutiny by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). THMs are methanes substituted with three halogens which are formed through reactions with humic acids commonly found in natural bodies of water. Humic acids result from decomposition byproducts of organic matter, such as vegetation. When humics react with bromide, which is also found naturally in water, the result is various methanes substituted with Br. Only tribrominated methane (CHBr$_3$) is considered a THM. Another source of THMs is the reaction
of chlorine with humic acids during disinfection. Chloroform (CHCl₃) is one
byproduct of this reaction and also a THM. Various other brominated and
chlorinated methanes, i.e. CHBr₂Cl, CHBrCl₂, are also THMs.

\[
\text{from chlorine addition}
\]

\[\text{HOCl} + \text{Br}^- \rightarrow \text{HOBr} + \text{Cl}^-\]

\[\text{HOBr} + \text{HOCl} + \text{Humics} \rightarrow \text{CHBr}_3 + \text{CHCl}_3 + \text{other organics}\]

\[(Wilson, 1988)\]

In 1974, THM's were reported in drinking water and on November 29, 1979,
the USEPA passed regulations limiting levels in drinking water to 0.1 mg/L total
THM concentration. THMs are the most common organic chemicals found in
drinking water and occur at the highest levels. The National Academy of
Sciences (NAS) state prolonged exposure to THM's would impose an added
health risk to the general population. Although evidence is not conclusive in
humans, chloroform is a carcinogen to rats and mice and NAS recommended
its regulation in drinking water. During passage of this regulation, a clear and
distinct line had not been drawn between effects of chloroform and other THM's
on laboratory rats and mice. Hence it was decided to place an overall limit on all
THMs. The figure of 0.1 mg/L THM's was decided on not because it was the
safe limit for humans but because it achieved a reasonable balance between
water treatment economics and health safety (Cotruvo, 1981). Some of the
halocarbon properties used in this research are listed in Table III (Weast, 1989).
Table III: Selected Properties of Halocarbons Used in This Study
(from Weast, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Solubility (mg/L)</th>
<th>Density (g/mL)</th>
<th>M.W. (amu)</th>
<th>Dipole Moment (debye)</th>
<th>Dielectric Constant ( \varepsilon ) (C/V-m)</th>
<th>Diameter (Å)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCl(_4)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>153.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHBr(_3)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.890</td>
<td>252.77</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4.390</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHCl(_3)</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>119.39</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.806</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researchers have examined rejection of various inorganics and organics by RO membranes. Several generalizations are listed in Table IV. Factors 1 and 3 apply mostly to organic rejection while 2 and 4 apply more towards inorganic solute rejections.

Another factor which may be related to percent rejection of organic molecules is the *dielectric constant*. Dielectric constant is defined by the following relationships for two point charges \( Q \) and \( Q' \) at a distance \( r \) apart.

\[
F = \frac{Q'Q''}{\varepsilon r^2}
\]  
(14)

where

\[
F = \text{force of attraction between two charges (N)}
\]

\[
Q' = \text{charge of one body (C)}
\]

\[
Q'' = \text{charge of one body (C)}
\]

\[
r = \text{distance between charges (m)}
\]

\[
\varepsilon = \text{dielectric constant of medium (C/V-cm)}
\]

and

\[
\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_0
\]  
(15)
Table IV: Factors Influencing Rejection by RO Membranes

1) In general, larger molecules are rejected more than smaller molecules.

2) Decreasing order of rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divalent</th>
<th>Univalent</th>
<th>Univalent capable of H⁺ bonding</th>
<th>Covalent molecules capable of H⁺ bonding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca⁺², SO₄⁻² &gt; Na⁺, Cl⁻ &gt; NH₄⁺, NO₃⁻, OH⁻ &gt; H₂NCNH₂ (Urea)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glucose</td>
<td>alcohols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Longer chains and more highly branched molecules are rejected more than shorter chains and less branched molecules.

| CH₃ | OH |
|----------------|
| CH₃-C-CH₃ > CH₃-C-CH₂-CH₃ > CH₃-CH₂-CH₂-CH₂OH |
| OH | H |

4) Protonated species are rejected less than nonprotonated species.
where
\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon_r & = \text{relative permittivity of medium (unitless)} \\
\varepsilon_0 & = \text{relative permittivity of vacuum (8.854 x 10^{-14} \text{ C/V-cm})}
\end{align*}
\]

Dielectric constant is dependent on polarity of solvent molecules. For example, the \( \varepsilon_r \) for water is 78 and is reduced by nearly two orders of magnitude compared with using air as a medium. Higher values of \( \varepsilon_r \) help to reduce attractive forces between two charges. Dielectric constant is directly related to the dipole moment of a molecule.

A permanent dipole moment, measured in debyes, is a characteristic which gives molecular structure information \((Atkins, 1982)\). More commonly, it is used for testing the suitability between solids and solutes in solvent systems; for example, a polar solvent such as water will dissolve an ionic solute, such as NaCl. The dipole moment is directly related to the polarity of a molecule. Symmetrical molecules, such as CH\(_4\) are nonpolar with a dipole moment of zero, and have low dielectric constants. Water is polar and possesses a large dielectric constant.

The dielectric constant of organic molecules may be correlated with rejection. Molecules which have lower dielectric constants, i.e. non or less polar molecules, are rejected more favorably than molecules with higher dielectric constants. Correlations of organic rejection with dielectric constants are simple since dielectric constant data are readily available.
7. Fouling/Degradation Mechanisms

Hypothesis

In considering halocarbon effects on membrane performance, two questions must be answered. The first question is do halocarbons cause measurable changes in membrane performance? The second question is if observable changes do occur, do the halocarbons cause this by altering membrane structure (i.e. chemical changes) or are the changes physical which involve no chemical bonding between the halocarbons and membrane? Several hypotheses may be proposed for membrane changes and are listed below.

1) Mechanical swelling caused by halocarbons penetrating the membrane but not chemically bonding to the membrane. Halocarbon molecules would cause membrane "swelling", thereby decreasing pore space size for water transport. The noted effect would be a decrease in the transport of both solute and product water over time. This phenomena could either be reversible or irreversible.

2) Weak hydrogen bonding of halocarbons to O or N atoms in the membrane. This may cause acetate group hydrolysis in CA membranes and intermolecular hydrogen bonding and membrane structure weakening in PA and AC membranes. The result will be solute and product increases over time for all membrane types. This chemical interaction is irreversible.

3) Physical adsorption of halocarbons to the membrane. Halocarbons would attach to membrane polymer and cause water channel pluggage; the result is product and solute flux reductions. Physical adsorption is not chemical bonding
and is reversible.

4) *Polymer attachment* by halocarbons to the membrane. These substitutions would occur on the polymer, resulting in formation of new bonds which cause membrane structural changes. The results may be a lower flux and/or lower rejection due to a change in the selective properties of the membrane. This effect is a more pronounced form of hypothesis 2.

A series of experiments may be performed to test whether membrane performance changes are caused by fouling or degradation. Once these effects are determined, instrumental analyses may be used to establish which of the four aforementioned mechanisms occur in the membrane to cause degradation/fouling. The next section details the procedures used in this study.

**Membrane Performance Tests**

Impact of halocarbons on membrane performance may be determined by measuring product volume, solute (TDS) rejection, and halocarbon rejection over an extended period of time. Flux is determined by measuring product water volume collected as a function of time. A control test is first performed on tap water. Then, individual halocarbons are added to the system and product water volume was monitored over time. A reduction in water volume with halocarbons present indicates membrane fouling or swelling; an increase in product volume with halocarbons present indicates membrane degradation.

TDS rejection also indicates whether membrane fouling or degradation occurs. Measurements of influent and product TDS indicate the membrane's ability to reject solutes. In the case of membrane fouling, solute flow will
decrease with time and TDS rejection will increase. If membrane degradation occurs, solute flow will increase with time and TDS rejection will decrease.

Halocarbon rejection tests are valuable for demonstrating the membrane's ability to separate these organics from water. The possibility of membrane degradation is decreased if a halocarbon permeates through the membrane easily. If the membrane rejects a halocarbon strongly, halocarbon concentration buildup occurs on the membrane surface and the possibility of fouling or degradation is increased. Molecular size, charge, and dielectric constant are all factors influencing halocarbon transport through or rejection by the membrane. Seemingly, larger molecules should be more strongly rejected than smaller molecules. Halocarbons used in this study have molecular diameters of approximately 6 Å and should be rejected well since membrane pores exclude size range from 1 to 10 Å. However, since membranes do not act purely as filters, charge has more influence on molecule and ion rejection. For example, salts such as NaCl may be rejected on the order of 99% + since they are highly ionized and have considerable charge to mass ratio. A combination of charge and molecular diameter determines the behavior of halocarbon transport through membranes.

Another factor which causes the difference in rejections between inorganics and organics is the hydration radius. Inorganic ions such as Na\(^+\) and Cl\(^-\) have hydration spheres of approximately 6 to 9 water molecules. The extra waters on the Na\(^+\) and Cl\(^-\) ions increase their sizes and increases their rejection (Luck, 1984).

Static soak tests were performed on the three membranes to determine the halocarbon uptake. These tests quantify the affinity of the halocarbons to the membranes under nonpressurized situations. Another goal of these soak tests
is to quantify if any changes occur in the void volumes of the membrane. If decreases in the void volume occur with the addition of halocarbons, then this change signifies that halocarbons shrink the water passage channels within the membranes.

Several instrumental techniques, Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy, nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy, and scanning electron microscopy (SEM) may be used to discern membrane surface or structural changes. FTIR is an instrumental technique which measures rotational and vibrational bending and modes of energy adsorption; these data are correlated with functional groups. Since the membrane structures are known, a comparison between membrane spectra before and after exposure to halocarbons will reveal what type of structural changes have taken place.

NMR is another instrumental technique which can provide insight into the presence or absence of functional groups. NMR involves irradiating a material in a magnetic field with constant frequency and varying strength. Since resonance strengths for different compounds and functional groups are known, comparisons of membrane spectra before and after halocarbon exposure will reveal chemical changes.

SEM detects physical changes on membrane surface through enlarging and photographing the surface via electron microscopy. Cross-sectional SEM photomicrographs reveal a membrane's internal physical changes; the difficulty of obtaining a sharp cross-section makes this technique more difficult and the outcome more dubious than for SEM. Comparisons between membrane SEM's before and after halocarbon exposure should reveal a membrane's physical changes, i.e. buildup of foulant layer, pluggage of pores, or structural breakdown.
8. Materials and Methods

Experimental Apparatus

Membrane performance tests are commonly carried out on an apparatus similar to the one shown in Figure 9. Flux decline, TDS rejection, and halocarbon rejection tests were performed on this apparatus. Tapwater held in a 200 L holding tank is fed into a 10μm Orlon prefilter before entering the pump. The pump is a Milton-Roy 221A positive displacement pump capable of delivering a maximum of 12.5 gal/min. Halocarbons are fed into a tee junction in the pump suction. Halocarbons in 20 and 40 L feed holding tanks are injected into the pump suction by a Masterflex® pump. Feed is split into two parallel membrane holders after exiting the pump. The holders contain membranes with dimensions of 1 inch by 2 inches with a surface area of 2 in² and were custom made. Permeate is forced out into a teflon tube from the top of the membrane holder and brine exits the side. Brine is collected together and fed into a back-pressure regulator set at 400 psi to maintain constant pressure. Brine is drained after passing through the regulator.

Analytical Methods

TDS measurements were conducted with a YSI model 35 conductance meter attached to a YSI probe, model 3403 with cell constant (K) of 1 cm⁻¹. The probe was first calibrated by using a series of NaCl and deionized water solutions between concentrations of 5 to 5,000 mg/L. pH measurements were taken with a Beckman model Φ 21 pH meter with a Beckman model 39836 probe. The pH probe was calibrated using two buffer solutions, one at pH of 4.0
Figure 9: Schematic of One Pass RO Test Unit
and the other at pH 10.

Halocarbon detection was performed using a purge and trap/gas chromatograph (GC). The purge and trap concentrator was a Varian/Tekmar model 00-996367-00 set to the following time and temperature program: 11 minutes purge at 30 °C, 4 minutes desorb at 180 °C, and 8 minutes bake time at 180 °C. The trap was made of Tenax, silica gel, and charcoal and is 12 inches long and 1/8 inch I.D.. The purge and trap concentrator was attached to a Hewlett-Packard model 5890 GC equipped with a flame-ionization detector (FID). FID was chosen over electron capture detector (ECD) since ECD is too sensitive for use with our concentration ranges. The GC capillary column used was a J&W DB-624 silica column, liquid phase, with a 1.8 μm film thickness and dimensions of 30 m by 0.32 mm diameter. GC time and temperature program were: 35 °C initial temperature, 140 °C final temperature, 4 minutes initial hold time, 1 minute final hold time, and a 8 °C/minute temperature program. GC and purge/trap gases flowrates were: helium carrier gas at 5.58 ± 0.07 mL/min, hydrogen combustion gas at 47.2 ± 0.7 mL/min, and dry air purge gas at 315 ± 4 mL/min. The Hewlett-Packard model 3392A integrator used to record GC output had the following settings: attenuation of 2, chart speed of 0.2 cm/sec, peak width of 0.04, and threshold of -1.

Halocarbon concentrations were calibrated by injecting several solutions of concentrations between 1 to 100 mg/L into the purge and trap/GC. The integrated areas were then plotted against halocarbon concentrations to yield a calibration curve. Recovery efficiency of the GC column was also found by injecting a sample to the purge and trap/GC three times. Results of the three runs were totalled and the result from the first run was divided by the total to obtain the recovery efficiency.
FTIR analysis was performed by a FTIR spectrophotometer using a Biorad/Digilab Division model FTS 60 with a scanning resolution of 2 cm\(^{-1}\). The spectrophotometer was a Fourier Transform type using a Michaelson infraromter. A ZnSe disc supported 100 \(\mu\)m thick membrane samples. Scans were performed using a FTIR microscope.

\(^1\)H (proton) NMR analysis was performed using a Brucker AF 200 spectrophotometer set at 200.133 MHz frequency. The solvents used to dissolve the membranes' active layer were dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) and acetone supplied by Cambridge Isotope Laboratories at 99% and 99.5% product purity. The glass tubes used in NMR analysis were supplied by the Wilmad Glass Company with a 5 mm ID.

Membrane samples were prepared and SEM photographs were taken by the Department of Microbiology and Immunology at the University of Arizona in Tucson. The membrane fixation technique (Table V) was described by Kutz (1985) and the instrument used was an International Scientific Instruments model DS-130 scanning electron microscope. Photographs were taken at two magnifications, 367x and 3,670x, at an accelerating voltage of 20 keV. In addition AC membrane samples were also examined under 9,600x magnification.

**Experimental Procedure**

Twelve sets of measurements were conducted in this project, each with a duration of 125 hours with the exception of the AC membranes which were run for a period of 175 hours. Procedures for sample collection were the same for all tests. Feed SDI was taken via a procedure described in DuPont Bulletin 504 (DuPont, 1982). Total product volume was collected over a known period of
**Table V: RO Membrane Fixation for SEM Examination (from Kutz, 1985)**

1. Fix membrane samples overnight in 4% glutaraldehyde in 0.1 M Millonig's buffer at pH of 7.2.
2. Rinse the samples three times in Millonig's buffer for 5 minutes each time.
3. Rinse the samples three times in HPLC grade water for 5 minutes each time.
4. Fix the membrane for 30 minutes in 1% ruthenium tetroxide solution.
5. Rinse nine times in HPLC grade water.
6. Incubate membrane for 30 minutes in a saturated thiocarbazide solution. Prior to use, the thiocarbazide should be allowed to stand for one hour at 50 °C in solution. Decant the liquid and add solution until the color has reached a pale straw tint. Allow temperature to cool before using. Use only HPLC grade water.
7. Rinse nine times in HPLC grade water.
8. Incubate in 2% osmium tetroxide solution for 30 minutes.
9. Rinse nine times in HPLC grade water.
10. Repeat steps 4 through 9 once more.
11. Dehydrate through an ethanol series (30% to 100%).
12. Critical point dry with CO₂.
13. Sputter coat the sample with 30 nm of Au/Pd alloy (60/40).
14. Observe under microscope with voltages of up to 20 keV.
time, i.e. one hour. Feed, permeate, and brine specific conductances were measured at the time of product volume collection. If CHBr₃, CHCl₃, or CCl₄ were fed into the system, feed, product, and brine samples were collected for gas chromatograph (GC) analysis once every two hours. Product water was collected in 7 mL capped bottles with a teflon tube inserted through the cap top; this minimized volatile halocarbon loss. Temperatures and pHs of the feed and brine were also measured at the time of product volume collection.

Three different membrane types were used: CA, PA, and AC. Four experiments were performed for each membrane type. The initial test established baseline performance by using filtered tapwater as feed. GC analyses showed tapwater halocarbon levels were below detection limits; therefore, no GC analyses were performed in baseline tests. In subsequent tests, CHBr₃, CHCl₃, and CCl₄ were added to feedwater to maintain constant halocarbon concentration of 50 mg/L.

Fouling reversibility tests were performed on an AC membrane with a total test time of 175 hours. In these tests, the AC membranes were exposed to 50 mg/L of the respective halocarbons for the initial 125 hours. After 125 hours, halocarbon feed was shut off and the membranes were only exposed to tapwater for an additional 50 hours. The product volumes and TDS data were collected for the entire 175 hours while GC analyses were performed for the first 125 hours.

Static soak tests were also performed on the three membranes using mixtures of CHBr₃, CHCl₃, and CCl₄ and DI water in concentrations of 0, 50, 100, 250, 500, 1,000, and 2,000 mg/L. Two pieces of membrane, each with a diameter of 2 inches, were placed in 20 mL vials with aluminum lined caps and the vials were completely filled with the halocarbon mixtures. After 10 days, both
pieces of membrane from each vial were removed and rinsed and blotted dry. One piece was used for weight and thickness measurements. Thicknesses were measured by using a Starret Model Number 1230 Micrometer, accurate to ± 0.0005 in. These membranes were then placed in a oven set at 104 °C for four days. After this drying period, the membranes were removed from the oven and reweighed and the thicknesses remeasured. The data were subsequently used to calculate the membrane void fraction using equations 12 and 13.

The other piece of membrane was placed in a 10 mL aluminum-capped vial and filled with 8 mLs of trimethylphosphosphate (TMP) for extraction. The membranes were removed from the vials after four days. A 0.5 mL aliquot of the TMP/halocarbon solution was then diluted with 9 mLs of DI water and mixed. A 5 mL sample was then injected into the purge and trap/GC for concentration analysis. The concentration of the adsorbed halocarbons on the membrane was subsequently backcalculated from this data.

FTIR analysis was performed by scanning a membrane sample mounted onto a ZnSe disc. Absorbances were plotted against their respective wavenumbers. The peaks and wavelengths were compared to IR spectra of known functional groups in the literature (Socrates, 1980). Since membrane functional groups are known, any changes detected by FTIR may be quickly observed.

$^1$H NMR analysis was performed by soaking CA membrane in acetone and PA in DMSO. The glass tubes holding the membranes and solvents were passed rapidly over a Bunsen burner for warming; this ensured the dissolution of the membranes' active layer into the solvent. The membranes were then removed and approximately 1 mL of the solvent with extract was poured into the NMR tubes for observation.
Data Analysis

Six graphs were generated to compare baseline, CHBr₃, CHCl₃, and CCl₄ effects on each membrane. The first graph compared total product volume vs. time. This was plotted by totaling permeate volume and graphed as a function of time. Weschler's equation (Equation 7) along with linear regression were used to evaluate membrane constants m and K. Equation 5 was used to calculate flux once these values were known; flux data were also plotted against time.

Percent TDS and halocarbon rejections were calculated in similar fashions. Concentrations of TDS and halocarbons of the feed, product, and brine streams were calculated by using prepared calibration plots. Equation 8 was used to calculate percent rejection. These data were also plotted against time.

The water transport coefficient (A) and the solute transport coefficient (B) were calculated and plotted against time. This procedure involved several calculations. Water fluxes were calculated from volume data and osmotic pressures were calculated from Equations 3 and 4. Coefficient A was evaluated by using Equation 1. Coefficient B was evaluated by first calculating solute flux $J_s$ by multiplying water flux with product flux with product TDS. $J_s$ was then divided by osmotic pressure to yield B. These coefficients may be plotted against time.

Statistical analyses (Student t-tests) were performed on the data to make comparisons between baseline runs and runs with halocarbons added to be sure the differences noted were not due to experimental error. Confidence intervals (95%) were calculated based on variances in the data. If overlap existed between two sets of confidence intervals, the comparison was deemed nonsignificant and attributable to experimental error.
Partition coefficients ($K_s$) were calculated and plotted against concentration. This procedure involves several backcalculations. First, sample concentration was obtained by injecting a 5 mL sample into the purge and trap/GC and divided by the column efficiency. Since the sample injected into the GC was made up by membrane extraction in 8 mL of TMP and 0.5 mL of this was diluted with 9 mL of water, these quantities are taken into account when calculating the halocarbon concentration originally in the membrane. $K_s$ for each membrane was calculated by Equation 11.

The membrane void fraction $\varepsilon$ was calculated by Equations 12 and 13. The dry and wet membrane densities were calculated by dividing the respective weights by their volumes. Membrane volumes were calculated by multiplying the areas by the measured thicknesses. $\varepsilon$ was plotted as a function of halocarbon concentration.
9. Results and Discussion

SDI Tests

A total of 12 runs were made for silt density index (SDI) calculations on feedwater, prior to each experiment, yielded an average value of 6.47 ± 0.11. Initial times needed to collect the 500 mL volume ranged between 30 to 90 seconds while final times for the 500 mL collection ranged between 32 to 40 minutes. Our results indicate the water used in this experiment is of poor quality.

Cellulose Acetate Membranes

Figure 10 shows total product volume vs. time plot for DuPont 7460 CA. The data are present in clusters since no data were collected at night. Normally, each cluster of data points represent one experimental day. The baseline and CHCl₃ lines are parallel, i.e. same flux, while CHBr₃ and CCl₄ lines decline after approximately 40 hours. Addition of CHBr₃ causes a larger flux decline than the addition of CHCl₃ or CCl₄. The predicted lines in Figure 10 were calculated from Equation 6. Predicted and actual volumes are in good agreement with correlation coefficients of 0.999.

Figure 11 shows calculated flux vs. time plot for DuPont's CA. The lines for this graph were generated by Equation 5. This plot further illustrates the impact of adding CHBr₃ to the system. While baseline flux decreases from 24.5 GFD to 22.5 GFD over the experiment, CHBr₃ flux drops from 24 GFD to 17 GFD. This is a 8% decrease as opposed to a 29% decrease in flux, a statistically significant change after their respective 95% confidence intervals were calculated. Both CHCl₃ and CCl₄ experiments indicate flux increases over time.
Total Product Volume vs. Time

DuPont 7460 CA, 400 psi, One Pass

Figure 10: Total Product Volume vs. Time for DuPont 7460 CA
Figure 11: Calculated Flux vs. Time for DuPont 7460 CA
CHCl₃ flux shows a 37% increase over initial flux and CCl₄ flux shows a 12% increase over course of the experiment. Increase in flux indicate membrane degradation may be present.

Figure 12 shows TDS rejection over time for DuPont's CA. Baseline data show an initial rejection of 87% and quickly reaching equilibrium between 97% and 98%. TDS rejection for CHCl₃ also shows rapid equilibration from 84.5% to 99.5% within 16 hours. CHBr₃ and CCl₄ both reach equilibrium rejection between 98% and 99%. While the halocarbons decrease total product volume from baseline, they actually increased percent TDS rejection. This may be accounted for by membrane swelling which results in flux declines and TDS rejection increases.

Figure 13 shows halocarbon rejection vs. time for DuPont's CA. Although some data scatter exists, average percent halocarbon rejections for CHCl₃, CHBr₃, and CCl₄ are 4.6 ± 0.4%, 13.2 ± 1.3%, and 31.9 ± 1.7%, respectively. (Note: the number before the ± sign represents the average data value and the number after ± represents the 95% confidence interval range for the data.) Even though CCl₄ is rejected more strongly than CHCl₃ or CHBr₃, the halocarbons all passed easily through the CA membrane. The results of soak tests, shown later in this chapter, confirms that the halocarbons do permeate through the membranes readily.

Figure 14 shows calculated water transport coefficient A vs. time for the CA membrane. CHCl₃ and CCl₄ lines actually increase over time, indicating the membrane allows more water to pass through over the experimental time period. This observation supports the flux increases presented in Figure 11. The final values for coefficient A for CHCl₃, CCl₄, CHBr₃, and baseline are 0.058 ±0.001, 0.048 ± 0.001, 0.041 ± 0.001, and 0.041± 0.001 GFD/psi, respectively.
Figure 12: TDS Rejection vs. Time for DuPont 7460 CA
Figure 13: Halocarbon Rejection vs. Time for DuPont 7460 CA
Figure 14: Water Transport Coefficient (A) vs. Time for DuPont 7460 CA
The same values obtained for both baseline and CHBr₃ addition indicates CHBr₃ does not hinder the CA membrane's ability to transport water.

Figure 15 shows calculated solute transport coefficient B for the CA membrane as a function of time. Baseline, CHCl₃, CHBr₃, and CCl₄ B coefficients at the end of the test period are 0.045 ± 0.002, 0.027 ± 0.001, 0.016 ± 0.001, and 0.011 ± 0.004 ft/day, respectively. Since a lower B coefficient corresponds to less solutes being transported across the membrane, this in turn indicates a higher percent TDS rejection. The data from this graph reinforce the results in Figure 12 that the addition of either CHBr₃ or CCl₄ results in the highest TDS rejection by the CA membrane, followed by CHCl₃ addition, and finally the baseline run.

**Polyamide Membrane**

Figure 16 shows total product volume vs. time for DuPont's 5930 PA membrane. In the presence of CHCl₃ and CHBr₃, product flux is greatly reduced. Without halocarbons present, 6.85 ± 0.13 L of product are collected over the 125 hour period and with the two THM's present, the total product volume collected is only 5.15 ± 0.08 L; this represents a 24.8% decrease. With CCl₄ present, only 5.52 ± 0.08 L of product are collected, representing a 19.4% decrease compared to baseline performance. The lines in this figure represent predictions based on Equation 6 and show good agreement with the actual volume data. Linear regression of the data shows correlation coefficients in excess of 0.999.

Figure 17 shows calculated flux vs. time for PA membrane. CHCl₃ and CHBr₃ fluxes are very similar while CCl₄ flux is nearly constant in the experiment. Comparing fluxes at the end of the experiments, baseline, CHBr₃,
Figure 15: Solute Transport Coefficient (B) vs. Time for DuPont 7460 CA
Figure 16: Total Product Volume vs. Time for DuPont 5930 PA
Figure 17: Calculated Flux vs. Time for DuPont 5930 PA
CHCl₃, and CCl₄ yield fluxes of 25, 20.5, 21.5, and 24.5 GFD respectively. Additions of CHBr₃, CHCl₃, and CCl₄ decrease fluxes by 18%, 14%, and 2% respectively, from baseline. Addition of CHBr₃ and CHCl₃ cause nearly the same effects in flux decline while CCl₄ showed no appreciable decline.

Figure 18 shows TDS rejection vs. time for DuPont’s PA membrane. Baseline TDS rejection stabilized between 96% and 97%. CHCl₃ did not affect TDS rejection since equilibrium value stayed around 97.7 ± 0.2 %. Additions of CHBr₃ and CCl₄ actually decreased TDS rejection from baseline, showing identical equilibrium rejection values of 91.5 ± 0.5 %. This observation indicates an inconsistency with total product volume and flux data since both graphs indicate decreases from baseline. In the presence of fouling, flux usually decreases but TDS rejection increases.

Figure 19 shows halocarbon rejection as a function of time for DuPont’s PA membrane. Although some data scatter occurs, average CHCl₃, CHBr₃, and CCl₄ rejections are 10.1 ± 1.4%, 11.5 ± 2.0 %, and 59.3 ± 2%, respectively. These data show the PA membranes reject the two THM’s to the same extent, while CCl₄ is rejected more strongly. The same order of halocarbon rejection occurs with PA as with the CA membrane with CCl₄ being rejected more strongly than CHBr₃ which in turn is rejected more strongly than CHCl₃.

Figure 20 shows calculated water transport coefficient A plotted against time for the PA membrane. No steady-state values were reached in the experimental time. CHCl₃, CHBr₃, and CCl₄ values at the end of the experimental period are nearly identical, indicating similar halocarbon influences on PA’s water flux. The coefficients for baseline, CCl₄, CHBr₃, and CHCl₃ are 0.049 ± 0.001, 0.045 ± 0.001, 0.041 ± 0.001, and 0.039 ± 0.001 GFD/psi, respectively, at the end of the experiment. These data indicate halocarbons reduce the flux of PA membranes.
Figure 18: TDS Rejection vs. Time for DuPont 5930 PA.
Figure 19: Halocarbon Rejection vs. Time for DuPont 5930 PA
Figure 20: Water Transport Coefficient (A) vs. Time for DuPont 5930 PA
Figure 21 shows the calculated solute transport coefficient B vs. time for DuPont's PA membrane. This coefficient does not reach equilibrium within the experimental time span which is similar to coefficient A. These results support Figure 18 results. At the end of 125 hours, the solute transport coefficient for CHCl$_3$, baseline, CCl$_4$, and CHBr$_3$ are 0.047 ± 0.002, 0.088 ± 0.005, 0.22 ± 0.01, and 0.21 ± 0.01 ft/day, respectively. As may be seen, data for CCl$_4$ and CHBr$_3$ are nearly identical. Since a lower B value indicates better solute rejection abilities, adding CHCl$_3$ to the feed improves this membrane's solute rejection capability while additions of CCl$_4$ and CHBr$_3$ hinder the PA's solute rejection ability.

**Advanced Composite Membrane**

Figure 22 presents the results from the product volume experiment for DuPont's 89006 AC membrane. Merten's unsteady-state equation overpredicts the baseline membrane performance while the calculated lines and experimental data are in good agreement for halocarbon additions with correlation coefficients of 0.999. Halocarbon addition decreases the membrane's flux since all product volume lines are below the baseline value. The CCl$_4$ and CHCl$_3$ tests were conducted for 170 hours since we were also testing for fouling reversibility. At 125 hours, total product volume collected for baseline, CHCl$_3$, CHBr$_3$, and CCl$_4$ are 7.81 ± 0.08, 5.91 ± 0.08, 5.88 ± 0.09, and 5.43 ± 0.08 L, respectively. CHCl$_3$ and CHBr$_3$ caused approximately 25% decrease in the ACM membrane's flux while CCl$_4$ caused a 30.5% decrease.

Figure 23 shows calculated flux vs. time curve for DuPont's AC membrane. The shapes of curves for baseline, CHCl$_3$, and CCl$_4$ are nearly identical while CHBr$_3$'s shape is nearly flat. Based on predictions from Equation 5, final
Figure 21: Solute Transport Coefficient (B) vs. Time for DuPont 5930 PA
Figure 22: Total Product Volume vs. Time for DuPont 89006 ACM
Figure 23: Calculated Flux vs. Time for DuPont 89006 ACM
calculated fluxes for baseline, CHBr\textsubscript{3}, CHCl\textsubscript{3}, and CCl\textsubscript{4} are 23.54, 21.79, 21.61, and 17.83 GFD. CHBr\textsubscript{3} and CHCl\textsubscript{3} cause approximately 8% decrease in flux while CCl\textsubscript{4} causes 24.3% decrease from baseline flux. This reflects the same general trend as depicted in Figure 22.

Figure 24 shows TDS rejection vs. time data for DuPont's AC membrane. While no equilibrium is achieved in these experiments, the general trend is all halocarbons improve the membrane's rejection capability. At the end of 125 hours, TDS rejection for CHBr\textsubscript{3}, CCl\textsubscript{4}, CHCl\textsubscript{3}, and baseline cases are 97.5 ± 0.2%, 96.6 ± 0.2%, 94.3 ± 0.2% and 90.3 ± 0.3%. This data, combined with the volume data presented in Figure 22, indicate membrane swelling is occurring.

Figure 25 presents data obtained for halocarbon rejection vs. time experiments for the AC membrane. Although data scatter is present, average values obtained for CCl\textsubscript{4}, CHBr\textsubscript{3}, and CHCl\textsubscript{3} are 80.3 ± 2.5%, 48.9 ± 1.7%, and 36.4 ± 1.3%, respectively. Although the AC membrane rejects halocarbons better than both CA and PA membranes, the order of halocarbon rejection is the same for all three: CCl\textsubscript{4} > CHBr\textsubscript{3} > CHCl\textsubscript{3}.

Figure 26 shows the calculated water transport coefficient A as a function of time for the AC membrane. Equilibrium is established after approximately 50 hours and it is evident halocarbons cause decreases in A from baseline. The values for baseline, CCl\textsubscript{4}, CHBr\textsubscript{3}, and CHCl\textsubscript{3} cases are 0.059, 0.050, 0.050, and 0.043 GFD/psi, respectively. CCl\textsubscript{4} and CHBr\textsubscript{3} cause a 15.4% decrease from baseline value and CHCl\textsubscript{3} causes a 27.1% decrease. These decreases are consistent with the trends observed in the volume data.

Figure 27 shows the calculated solute transport coefficient B vs. time for the AC membrane. These data show halocarbon additions decrease B values from baseline which translate to a higher TDS rejection. Solute transport coefficients
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Figure 24: TDS Rejection vs. Time for DuPont 89006 ACM
Figure 25: Halocarbon Rejection vs. Time for DuPont 89006 ACM
Figure 26: Water Transport Coefficient (A) vs. Time for DuPont 89006 ACM
Figure 27: Solute Transport Coefficient (B) vs. Time for DuPont 89006 ACM
for CHBr₃, CCl₄, CHCl₃, and baseline are 0.064 ± 0.003, 0.085 ± 0.005, 0.139 ± 0.015, and 0.28 ± 0.01 ft/day, respectively. This data reinforces the TDS rejection trends presented in Figure 24.

Fouling Reversibility Tests

Fouling reversibility test data performed on AC membranes are presented in Figures 22 to 27. The membranes were subjected to 50 mg/L of halocarbon during the first 125 hours, after which the halocarbon feed pump was shut off. Between 125 and 175 hours, the final shutdown, the membranes were exposed to only tapwater. If fouling was reversible, increases in flux and rejection would have occurred. In these figures, no visible increase in volume and TDS rejection data could be detected from the previous 125 hours. The conclusion is halocarbon fouling is irreversible with AC membranes under these conditions. One possible method to recover performance is to flush the membrane with a polar solvent such as an alcohol; this was not tried in our experiments.

Membrane/Halocarbon Partition Coefficients

Figure 28 presents data for the dependence of the partition coefficient $K_s$ on halocarbon concentration with DuPont's CA membrane. The membranes were soaked for 10 days before extraction and $K_s$ values were calculated according to Equation 11. These data show the partition coefficient is nearly constant above halocarbon concentrations of 250 mg/L. In the region where $K_s$ is not concentration dependent, the partition coefficients for CHBr₃, CHCl₃ and CCl₄ are 0.46 ± 0.02, 0.32 ± 0.02, and 0.09 ± 0.01. This shows CHBr₃ partitions 30% greater than CHCl₃ and 80% greater than CCl₄ into the CA membrane. These
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Figure 28: $K_s$ vs. Halocarbon Concentration for DuPont's CA Membrane
data also show haloforms prefer the solution phase to the membrane phase since all the $K_s$ values are significantly less than 1.

Figure 29 shows partition coefficient $K_s$ vs. halocarbon concentration using DuPont's PA membrane; this graph and Figure 28 are very similar. None of the halocarbons partition strongly into the PA membrane; the value for CHBr$_3$ with an external concentration of 2,000 mg/L is 0.36 which indicates these halocarbons partition more into the solution phase than the membrane phase. Again, the halocarbon partitioning order is CHBr$_3$ partitions greater than CHCl$_3$ which partitions greater than CCl$_4$ into the PA membrane. The concentration independent region appears to start above a halocarbon concentration of 500 mg/L; the values for CHBr$_3$, CHCl$_3$, and CCl$_4$ in this region are $0.36 \pm 0.02$, $0.24 \pm 0.02$, and $0.02 \pm 0.001$. This indicates CHBr$_3$ partitions 33% more than CHCl$_3$ and 94% more than CCl$_4$ into the PA membrane. Comparisons between CA and PA data show the halocarbons consistently partition greater into the CA membrane.

Figure 30 shows partition coefficient $K_s$ vs. halocarbon concentration using DuPont's AC membrane. Halocarbons partition more strongly into the AC membrane than either CA or PA. The halocarbon partitioning order changes slightly with CHCl$_3$ > CHBr$_3$ > CCl$_4$. No concentration independent region exists; for comparison purposes we will use the average values above 500 mg/L halocarbon concentration. The values for CHCl$_3$, CHBr$_3$ and CCl$_4$ here are $2.49 \pm 0.23$, $1.82 \pm 0.29$, and $0.72 \pm 0.06$. This indicates CHCl$_3$ partitions 27% greater than CHBr$_3$ and 71% greater than CCl$_4$ into the AC membrane.

Figure 31 presents a comparison between the $K_s$ values for the three halocarbons with CA, PA, and AC membrane at halocarbon levels of 2,000 mg/L. This graph shows AC membrane adsorbs halocarbons much more
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Figure 29: $K_s$ vs. Halocarbon Concentration for DuPont's PA Membrane
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Figure 30: $K_s$ vs. Halocarbon Concentration for DuPont's AC Membrane
Figure 31: Comparison of $K_s$ for DuPont Membranes
strongly than either CA or PA membranes which adsorb halocarbons almost equally. We noted before that AC membrane rejects halocarbons better than either CA or PA membranes. From this graph, it seems AC membrane is not rejecting the halocarbons; instead ACM adsorbs the halocarbons.

**Void Fraction Tests**

Figure 32 shows the results obtained from void fraction vs. halocarbon concentration test. The points presented were calculated by using Equations 12 and 13. As may be seen, each membrane’s void fraction decreased with increasing halocarbon concentration. If we examine Equation 12, the decrease in ε may occur as a result of a decrease in numerator ΔV or an increase in the denominator 1 + ΔV. If the numerator represents the membrane void volume and the denominator is the total membrane volume, including the voids, and if we assume total membrane volume remains constant over the course of the experiment, the decrease in ε may be attributed solely to the decrease in the void volume. If the previous assumption holds true, then the addition of halocarbons cause the void volume in the membranes to shrink. This observation supports the theory that halocarbon fouling causes membrane swelling which reduces the size of water passage channels in the membrane.

The data show that all three void fractions decreased with halocarbon addition. A comparison between the void fractions at 0 mg/L and 2,000 mg/L halocarbon addition show the percentage decreases for AC, CA, and PA membranes to be 50%, 40%, and 23%, for one sample of each membrane, respectively. This indicates AC membrane’s void fraction is reduced the most by halocarbon addition while PA’s void fraction is decreased the least. This trend parallels the pattern shown in the halocarbon uptake experiments where ACM
Figure 32: Void Fraction vs. Halocarbon Concentration for DuPont Membranes
adsorbed the greatest amount of halocarbon and PA adsorbed the least. Based on this data, one might conclude the decrease in membrane void fraction is attributable to the membranes' halocarbon uptake capabilities.

**Membrane Performance Summary**

Figure 33 shows total product volumes collected at 125 hours for all three membranes and Figure 34 shows the percent change from baseline which occur upon halocarbon addition. The AC membrane yields higher fluxes than either CA or PA but is affected more by halocarbon addition. CA has the lowest baseline flux and is affected the least by halocarbon addition. CHBr$_3$ affects all three membranes equally by decreasing product volume collected by approximately 20%. In addition, both CHBr$_3$ and CHCl$_3$ decrease PA and AC membranes' flux by 20%.

Figure 35 shows TDS rejection at the end of the 125 hour test period and Figure 36 shows percent change from baseline TDS rejection caused by halocarbon addition with the membranes. CA shows the best baseline TDS rejection followed by PA and AC membranes. Halocarbon addition improves TDS rejection slightly for CA membrane, ranging from 1 to 1.5% increase, while AC membrane's TDS rejection characteristic improved by 4 to 8%. Additions of both CHBr$_3$ and CCl$_4$ decreased PA's TDS rejection capabilities. These two figures show flux decreases are accompanied by TDS rejection increases except for PA membrane; this supports the membrane fouling hypothesis caused by membrane swelling.

Figure 37 shows average halocarbon rejection for the three membranes. CA shows the worst halocarbon rejection of the three membranes with a maximum rejection for CCl$_4$ of 32%. PA rejects the two THM's poorly at less than 12% but
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Figure 37: Average Halocarbon Rejections for CA, PA, and ACM Membranes
it rejects CCl$_4$ well at approximately 60%. ACM shows the best halocarbon rejection, ranging from 38% for CHCl$_3$ to 83% for CCl$_4$. In each case, CHCl$_3$ is rejected the least and CCl$_4$ is rejected the most by each membrane. This observation supports the theory that larger molecules in this study of test compounds are rejected better than smaller molecules.

**Organic Rejection vs. Dielectric Constant ($\varepsilon$)**

Figure 38 shows the relationship between dielectric constant and percent organic rejection using DuPont’s CA membrane. Data points for CHBr$_3$ and CHCl$_3$ were obtained from this experiment. The rest of the data were obtained from DuPont’s literature (Pohland, 1989). This figure shows that as a compound’s dielectric constant increases, i.e. worse insulators, its rejection decreases. Also, this figure shows that organic rejection does not just depend on its size.

**Comparison of Different Membrane Types**

Table VI shows comparisons between different membrane's log-log flux decline indices and K values. Membranes with higher initial flux values (K), such as AC and PA membranes, have higher flux decline coefficients than lower flux membranes such as CA. Flux decline coefficients were in the following order, ACM > PA > CA, for all cases. This indicates the addition of halocarbons affected AC membrane more, i.e., faster flux decline than either CA or PA membranes. The phenomena of high flux membranes fouling faster than low flux membranes has been documented previously (Beckman, 1973).
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Figure 38: Dielectric Constant $\varepsilon$ vs. % Organic Rejection
Table VI: Comparison of m and K values for CA, PA, and AC Membranes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>m CA</th>
<th>m PA</th>
<th>m ACM</th>
<th>K (GFD) CA</th>
<th>K (GFD) PA</th>
<th>K (GFD) ACM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>-0.0185 ± 0.0033</td>
<td>-0.0923 ± 0.0076</td>
<td>-0.178 ± 0.007</td>
<td>23.69 ± 0.34</td>
<td>29.43 ± 2.20</td>
<td>33.91 ± 2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHCl₃</td>
<td>0.0645 ± 0.0018</td>
<td>-0.0247 ± 0.0053</td>
<td>-0.090 ± 0.001</td>
<td>21.24 ± 0.75</td>
<td>21.94 ± 1.03</td>
<td>23.96 ± 2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHBr₃</td>
<td>-0.0738 ± 0.0017</td>
<td>-0.0589 ± 0.0059</td>
<td>-0.006 ± 0.003</td>
<td>19.05 ± 0.31</td>
<td>22.40 ± 1.23</td>
<td>22.04 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCl₄</td>
<td>0.0237 ± 0.0068</td>
<td>-0.0002 ± 0.0095</td>
<td>-0.052 ± 0.006</td>
<td>19.52 ± 0.92</td>
<td>24.43 ± 2.11</td>
<td>20.30 ± 1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Experimental and Literature m Values

Table VII presents comparisons of our experimental m values with values obtained from literature for CA-type membrane. As may be seen, the m values obtained in our experiment are much larger than ones obtained from the literature, signifying higher flux declines. The water used as feed for the Kaakinen experiment was actual Colorado River water from Yuma while the water used in the Milstead paper was a synthetic feed mixed up to simulate the conditions for the feedwater at Yuma. The duration of the Milstead test was approximately 530 hours or 22 days (Milstead, 1982) and the Kaakinen tests lasted between 484 and 1829 hours, averaging 76 days (Kaakinen, 1985). Table VII also shows flux decreases from baseline upon CHBr$_3$ addition for the three experimental time periods. Although there is a large variation in this comparison due to different feedwater conditions and membranes used, Table VII nevertheless serves to illustrate higher flux declines occur at higher halocarbon concentrations.

FTIR Results

Table VIII shows the absorption bands and characteristic groups which were examined experimentally. From analysis performed on the CA membrane, some changes in FTIR scans are observed with both CHCl$_3$ and CHBr$_3$ additions. If structural changes occur either new absorbance peaks would show up or the sizes of the existing absorbance peaks would change. For CA membranes, one would expect any reactions to occur in either the hydroxyl groups or in the carbonyl groups.

Figures 39 to 41 show typical scans obtained from FTIR analysis. Every
Table VII: Comparison of Experimental and Literature m Values for CA-Type Membranes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Milstead, 1982</th>
<th>Kaakinen, 1985</th>
<th>This Work, 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline m</td>
<td>-0.0012</td>
<td>-0.0284</td>
<td>-0.0185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHBr₃ m</td>
<td>-0.0076</td>
<td>-0.0610</td>
<td>-0.0721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHBr₃ conc.</td>
<td>10 mg/L</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>50 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change from baseline, 5 days</td>
<td>1.02 %</td>
<td>5.11 %</td>
<td>8.52 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change from baseline, 22 days</td>
<td>1.96 %</td>
<td>9.59 %</td>
<td>15.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change from baseline, 76 days</td>
<td>2.73 %</td>
<td>13.17 %</td>
<td>21.30 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table VIII: Absorption Bands of Characteristic Groups**
*(from Socrates, 1980)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absorption Bands (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Vibrations Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4500 - 4200</td>
<td>Aliphatic C-H stretch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200 - 4000</td>
<td>Aromatic C-H stretch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3650 - 3100</td>
<td>O-H stretch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550 - 3200</td>
<td>C=O stretch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300 - 2500</td>
<td>O-H stretch on C-OH group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2950 - 2800</td>
<td>C-H stretch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 - 1630</td>
<td>C=O stretch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445 - 1330</td>
<td>C-H bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320 - 1210</td>
<td>O-H stretch on R-C-OH group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1190 - 1070</td>
<td>C-O-C asymmetric stretch, saturated aliphatic ethers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995 - 980</td>
<td>C-H out of plane bending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880 - 785</td>
<td>Benzene ring vibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 - 595</td>
<td>C-Cl stretch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690 - 515</td>
<td>C-Br stretch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 41: FTIR Spectrum for CA Membrane ($CHBr_3$ added)
major absorbance band was accounted for and was identified by Table VIII. Some changes in the sizes of the absorbance peaks were seen in Figure 40. In the sample with CHCl₃ added, increases may be seen in the O-H stretch region (3357 cm⁻¹) and in the C-O-C stretch region (~ 1039 cm⁻¹). The small peak in Figure 40 at 686 cm⁻¹ may be accounted for by the C-Cl stretch in CHCl₃. However, a strong decrease may be seen in the C=O stretch in the R-COOH group.

In comparing the spectra for the CHBr₃ added case and the baseline case, one may see some increases in C=O stretch (1765 cm⁻¹), C-H bend (1368 cm⁻¹), C-H out of plane bending (957 cm⁻¹), and benzene ring vibration (833 cm⁻¹). Two new peaks showed up, the C=O stretch (3542 cm⁻¹) and C=O stretch in COOH group (2969 cm⁻¹). Some changes in these spectra were observed; however, the weights of the samples used for the FTIR analysis was not known. Without these data, how much of the changes from the spectra are attributable to chemical bonding and how much of the changes are due to different sample weights may not be quantified.

**NMR Results**

NMR spectrometric analyses were performed on both dissolved CA and PA membranes. From the graphs obtained (not presented in this work), no new functional groups were seen with halocarbon addition. Each absorbance peak in the NMR scans for all the membranes exposed to halocarbons may be attributed to a normal functional group in the unexposed membrane. No new absorbance peaks were found in the scans, signifying no new bonds were formed. However, the dissolved form of these membranes may not exhibit the same chemical characteristics as the undissolved form. Hence, one has to be
careful in drawing conclusions from this analysis.

Zachariah(1982) performed similar analysis on B-9, a PA polymer variation. In that work, benzanilide was exposed to Cl\(^-\) and Br\(^-\). NMR scans were taken at regular intervals; it was found halogens attached to the ortho- and para-positions on the benzanilide rings. These attachments caused intramolecular hydrogen bond disruptions which led to membrane failure.

Chemical changes in the membrane are much less likely to occur with halocarbons since they are much less reactive than halogens. The NMR results show tentative results that no changes have occurred in the dissolved membrane samples with the addition of halocarbons. However, the question remains whether the dissolved samples exhibit the same chemical characteristics as the undissolved membrane samples.

**SEM Results**

Figure 42 shows SEM photographs for an unused CA membrane, CA used in baseline testing, and CA exposed to CHBr\(_3\), CHCl\(_3\), and CCl\(_4\), respectively. These pictures are taken at 3670x magnification and an accelerating voltage of 20 keV. In comparing the unused and baseline test samples, the most striking difference is in pore sizes. The pores, represented as dark dots, are larger in the unused sample than in the used samples. This suggests that compaction from pressure has occurred. No change from the baseline sample is observable in the sample exposed to CHBr\(_3\). Some caking appeared on the surface of the sample exposed to CHCl\(_3\) which indicates that fouling occurred. Sample cracks resulted from the fixation process that is used for SEM preparation, not from membrane defects. Some surface bacterial adhesion may be seen in the sample exposed to CCl\(_4\).
Figure 42: SEM Photographs for CA Membrane, 3670x Magnification
Figure 43 shows SEM photographs for an unused PA membrane, PA used in baseline testing, and PA exposed to CHBr₃, CHCl₃, and CCl₄, respectively. The experimental conditions are the same as for the CA membranes presented earlier. Visible differences between an unused sample and one used in baseline testing may be seen. Whereas the surface on the unused sample is smooth, the baseline test sample reveals depressions caused by pressure. The spheres are approximately 0.83 to 1.7 μm in diameter and differ in size due to depth of field; smaller spheres are further away from the microscope. The PA samples appear similar to sintered metals. Sintering is a technique which fuses spheres together to create a structure which has a high surface to volume ratio. PA membranes do not exhibit typical "pores" in the same manner as CA membranes. The sample exposed to CHBr₃ shows surface fungal growth and bacterial adhesion. This may account for decreases in solute and product water fluxes through the membrane. The sample exposed to CHCl₃ exhibited no apparent surface fouling but depressions are evident; the cracks present resulted from membrane fixation. Significant surface fouling is present in the PA sample exposed to CCl₄, evident as white areas of the membrane. In this photograph, the top layer of spheres are no longer present; this suggests CCl₄ might have stripped away some of the bonds between top and bottom layers of the spheres.

Figure 44 shows SEM photographs for an unused AC membrane, AC membrane used in baseline testing, and AC membrane exposed to CHBr₃, CHCl₃, and CCl₄, respectively. Again, these pictures are all taken under the same conditions as CA and PA samples. The spheres are interconnected by polymeric strands and have uniform diameters of 2 μm. No surface fouling is evident in the samples exposed to CHBr₃ and CHCl₃; however, polymeric
Figure 43: SEM Photographs for PA Membrane, 3670x Magnification
a) Unused

b) Baseline
c) CHCl₃ = 50 mg/L
d) CHBr₃ = 50 mg/L
e) CCl₄ = 50 mg/L

Figure 44: SEM Photographs for AC Membrane, 3670x Magnification
strands are no longer evident. This suggests some membrane dissolution may have occurred upon addition of these two chemicals.

As a further test of the ability of CCl₄ to dissolve the active layer of AC membrane, a piece of this type membrane was placed into a beaker of undiluted CCl₄ for one hour. At the end of this period, the membrane was removed and rinsed with DI water. After the rinsing, the membrane was placed into the membrane test apparatus and the water flux as well as TDS rejection were measured. The result showed the CCl₄ caused the membrane to be transparent to the solution, allowing both water and salts to pass through.

The membrane exposed to CCl₄ used for SEM examination was not the same sample used for testing as mentioned in previous sections. This sample failed after being on-line 100 hours. Membrane degradation is very evident in this ACM sample. The larger holes present in the photograph are the water transport holes beneath the active polymeric layer. The active layer appears to have been completely stripped away in some areas, thereby offering no resistance to water and solute transport. One explanation for the active layer stripping away is CCl₄ may dissolve the adhesive linking the active and porous backing layer. Once this occurs, water and solute flow may have roughed this sensitive area enough to create a hole. It is believed that this membrane sample was suddenly exposed to high CCl₄ concentration, thereby causing the failure.
11. Conclusions

The goals of this dissertation are threefold:

1) to examine if low weight molecular weight halocarbons cause membrane fouling/degradation,
2) to evaluate some hypotheses to account for the observed effects, and
3) to examine if fouling effects are reversible.

The four hypotheses proposed for membrane fouling/degradation effects are:

1) *Membrane swelling* resulting in decreased product flux and increased TDS rejection.
2) *Weak hydrogen bonding* resulting in increased product flow and decreased TDS rejection.
3) *Physical adsorption* resulting in decreased product flux and increased TDS rejection.
4) *Halocarbon attachment* to polymer resulting in decreased product flow and decreased TDS rejection.

The conclusions drawn from our experiments are as follows.

Flux Tests

The modified form of Merten's unsteady-state equation predicts product water volume as a function of time accurately for all cases with CA, PA, and AC membranes. The correlation coefficients between the predicted and actual data are in excess of 0.999.

High flux membranes such as AC foul faster than low flux membranes such
as CA with the same degree of pretreatment. Results from log-log flux decline parameter m evaluation show AC fouls most rapidly while CA fouls least rapidly; the exception to this trend is with addition of CHBr$_3$ where the order is reversed.

**Organic Rejection**

A correlation exists between an organic's dielectric constant and its rejection by RO membranes. Molecules with lower dielectric constant are rejected more strongly than molecules with higher dielectric constant in the case of CA membranes. Although we could not demonstrate this effect as conclusively for PA and AC membranes, this relationship holds since the rejection for all three membranes are in the same order: CCl$_4$ > CHBr$_3$ > CHCl$_3$.

The order of the dielectric constants are as follows: CHCl$_3$ > CHBr$_3$ > CCl$_4$.

Halocarbon rejection also seem to depend on membrane structure and pore size. CA has the "loosest" and AC has the "tightest" structure due to varying degrees of cross-linking. CA has the largest pores while AC contains the smallest pores of the three membranes. Our data indicate organics are rejected most strongly by AC and least strongly by CA.

**Halocarbon Partitioning**

Halocarbons partition the greatest into the AC membrane and equally for CA and PA membranes. CHBr$_3$ has the highest partition coefficient for both PA and CA membranes while CHCl$_3$ has the highest partition coefficient for AC membrane. Since a higher partition coefficient signifies higher adsorption, one would expect CHBr$_3$ to cause the most fouling on CA and PA and CHCl$_3$ to foul AC membrane the most. Comparing the values obtained for the log-log flux
index, we see this hypothesis is substantiated. In both CA and PA cases, CHBr₃ addition resulted in the lowest m values and CHCl₃ addition resulted in the lowest m value for AC membrane.

**Membrane Fouling**

**Physical swelling**

This hypothesis is substantiated by a combination of the void fraction tests and flux/TDS tests. The test results show decreasing void fraction with increasing concentrations of halocarbons. Also, AC void fraction decreased the most due to halocarbon addition; this is supported by the partition coefficient data which show halocarbons absorb into AC membranes.

**Physical adsorption**

This hypothesis is supported by partition coefficient tests as well as flux/TDS tests. We find greater partition coefficients signify greater fouling tendencies on the membrane (i.e. greater m values).

**Weak hydrogen bonding**

This hypothesis is not substantiated by the FTIR test. Although some changes may be seen in the sizes of the absorbances in the spectra, we may not conclude that the changes in the absorbance sizes are due to chemical changes since the membrane weight data were not known.

The NMR data shows no changes in the functional groups for the dissolved membrane samples in the cases of halocarbon exposure compared to the baseline cases. However, we would still need to know if there were changes in the chemical functional groups from the dissolved to the undissolved...
membranes to verify that the halocarbons do cause changes in the chemical bonding.

_Halocarbon attachment to polymer_

This hypothesis is not substantiated by either FTIR nor NMR analysis. See explanation under _Weak hydrogen bonding._

_Fouling Reversibility_

Fouling reversibility was not demonstrated in this work with AC membranes. The performance of the AC membranes did not recover as anticipated Milstead's work with CA membranes (Milstead, 1982). The concentrations used in our experiment were much higher than in Milstead's work. Furthermore, AC membrane seems to have a greater affinity for halocarbons than CA, as evidenced by the partition coefficient experiments.
11. Recommendations for Future Work

Membrane Fouling

Physical swelling
Replicates of the void fraction tests should be performed to demonstrate the data obtained in this study are reliable.

Weak hydrogen bonding and halocarbon attachment to polymer
Further work could be done using FTIR and NMR analyses to quantify the chemical bonding changes on these membrane samples. In the FTIR analyses, careful notes of the membrane weights should be taken to alleviate the problems shown in this work.

Fouling Reversibility

In future tests, one could try a polar solvent such as ethyl alcohol may be used to flush the membranes after exposure to halocarbons. After the flushing process for a specified time, one could resume operations without halocarbons in the feed to examine reversibility.

Effects of Concentration on Fouling

One could vary the concentration of halocarbons in the feed to examine the effects on fouling.
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## Appendix

### Representative Raw Data and Sample Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Du Pont</th>
<th>89006 ACM</th>
<th>CCl₄ added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hrs.</th>
<th>Feed</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>GC Area</th>
<th>X 10⁷</th>
<th>Vol (L)</th>
<th>pH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>6.675</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>15.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>4.092</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>9.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>3.430</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>7.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>3.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>3.192</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>3.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Calculations

% TDS Rejection

Conductance Probe Calibration Equation:
\[ C = 0.5969 \times K - 4.105 \]
where: \( C \) = Concentration (mg/L)
\( K \) = Conductivity (μmho)

Taking data from time at 8 hours, \( K = 536 \), \( K_A = 34.9 \), \( K_B = 18 \)

\[ C_I = 0.5969 \times 536 - 4.105 = 315.8 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \]
\[ C_A = 0.5969 \times 34.9 - 4.105 = 16.7 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \]
\[ C_B = 0.5969 \times 18 - 4.105 = 6.6 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \]

Using Equation 8, \( \% R = (1 - \frac{C}{C_I}) \times 100 \% \)

\[ \% R_A = (1 - \frac{16.7}{315.8}) \times 100 \% = 94.7\% \]
\[ \% R_B = (1 - \frac{6.6}{315.8}) \times 100 \% = 97.9\% \]

\[ \% R_{AVG} = \frac{94.7\% + 97.9\%}{2} = 96.3\% \]

% CCl₄ Rejection

Gas Chromatograph Calibration Equation:
\[ C_{CCl₄} = GCA \times 12.5 \times 10^{-7} - 0.01751 \]

where: \( C_{CCl₄} \) = concentration of CCl₄ (mg/L) in DI water
\( GCA \) = CCl₄ area from gas chromatograph

Taking data from time at 8 hours, \( GCA_I = 4.092 \times 10^7 \), \( GCA_A = 0.964 \times 10^7 \), \( GCA_B = 0.853 \times 10^7 \)
Water Transport Coefficient (A) Calculations

Using Equation 1, $J_w = A(\Delta P - \Delta \pi)$, and data from $t = 8$ hours

\[ C_{\text{CCl}_4,f} = (4.092 \times 10^{-7}) \times 12.5 \times 10^{-7} - 0.01751 = 51.13 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \]
\[ C_{\text{CCl}_4,A} = (0.964 \times 10^{-7}) \times 12.5 \times 10^{-7} - 0.01751 = 12.03 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \]
\[ C_{\text{CCl}_4,B} = (0.853 \times 10^{-7}) \times 12.5 \times 10^{-7} - 0.01751 = 10.64 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \]

\% $R_{\text{CCl}_4,A} = \left(1 - \frac{12.03}{51.13}\right) \times 100 \% = 76.5\%$

\% $R_{\text{CCl}_4,B} = \left(1 - \frac{10.64}{51.13}\right) \times 100 \% = 79.2\%$

\% $R_{\text{AVG}} = \frac{76.5\% + 79.2\%}{2} = 77.8\%$

Osmotic Pressure Calculation

Assumption: Molecular weight of solids = molecular weight of NaCl

Using Equation 4, $\Delta \pi = \frac{(\Delta C)RT}{MW}$, and data from time at 8 hours

\[ MW = 22.98 \frac{\text{g}}{\text{mol}} (\text{Na}) + 35.45 \frac{\text{g}}{\text{mol}} (\text{Cl}) = 58.43 \frac{\text{g}}{\text{mol}} = 58430 \text{ mg mol}^{-1} \]
\[ R = 0.0821 \text{ L-atm mol}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1} \]
\[ T = 23.7 \text{ °C} = 296.9 \text{ °K} \]

\[ \pi_f = \frac{315.8 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \times 0.0821 \frac{\text{L-atm}}{\text{mol-°K}} \times 296.9 \text{ °K}}{58430 \text{ mg mol}^{-1}} = 0.13 \text{ atm x 14.7 psi atm}^{-1} = 1.94 \text{ psi} \]

\[ \pi_A = \frac{16.7 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \times 0.0821 \frac{\text{L-atm}}{\text{mol-°K}} \times 296.9 \text{ °K}}{58430 \text{ mg mol}^{-1}} = 0.007 \text{ atm x 14.7 psi atm}^{-1} = 0.10 \text{ psi} \]

\[ \pi_B = \frac{6.6 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \times 0.0821 \frac{\text{L-atm}}{\text{mol-°K}} \times 296.9 \text{ °K}}{58430 \text{ mg mol}^{-1}} = 0.003 \text{ atm x 14.7 psi atm}^{-1} = 0.04 \text{ psi} \]

Water Transport Coefficient (A) Calculations

Using Equation 1, $J_w = A(\Delta P - \Delta \pi)$, and data from $t = 8$ hours
\[ J_{WA} = 0.045 \frac{L}{hr} \times 24 \frac{hr}{day} \times \frac{1 \text{gal}}{3.78 \text{L}} \times \frac{1}{2 \text{in}^2} \times 144 \text{in}^2 \frac{\text{ft}^2}{22 \text{ft}^2} = 22.22 \frac{\text{gal}}{\text{ft}^2 \cdot \text{day}} \text{ (GFD)} \]

\[ \Delta P = \text{applied pressure} = 400 \text{ psi} \]

\[ \Delta \pi = \pi_f - \pi_A = 1.94 \text{ psi} - 0.10 \text{ psi} = 1.84 \text{ psi} \]

Rearranging Equation 1, we get

\[ A_A = \frac{J_w}{\Delta P - \Delta \pi} = \frac{22.22 \text{ GFD}}{400 \text{ psi} - 1.84 \text{ psi}} = 0.056 \frac{\text{GFD}}{\text{psi}} \]

**Solute Transport Coefficient (B) Calculations**

Using Equation 2, \( J_S = B(\Delta C) \), and data from \( t = 8 \) hours

\[ J_{SA} = C_A \times J_{WA} = 16.7 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{L}} \times 22.22 \frac{\text{gal}}{\text{ft}^2 \cdot \text{day}} \times 3.78 \frac{\text{L}}{\text{gal}} = 1402.7 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{ft}^2 \cdot \text{day}} \]

\[ \Delta C = C_f - C_A = 315.8 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{L}} - 16.7 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{L}} = 299.1 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{L}} \]

Rearranging Equation 2, we get

\[ B_A = \frac{J_{SA}}{\Delta C} = \frac{1402.7 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{ft}^2 \cdot \text{day}}}{299.1 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{L}} \times 28.32 \frac{\text{L}}{\text{ft}^3}} = 0.166 \frac{\text{ft}}{\text{day}} \]

**Partition Coefficient (K_p) Calculations**

Procedure: Soak round pieces of membrane with 2 in. diameters in solutions of known concentration for 10 days. Extract halocarbons using 8 mLs of TMP. Dilute 0.5 mLs of TMP extract in 8.5 mLs of DI water and inject into GC column.

Data: Wet membrane weight + pan = 1.3240 g

Dry membrane weight + pan = 1.2352 g

Pan weight = 1.0210 g
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Wet membrane thickness = 0.0070 in
Dry membrane thickness = 0.0072 in
Membrane diameter = 2 in
Membrane type = DuPont 89006 ACM
CHCl₃, CHBr₃, CCl₄ Concentration = 2,000 mg/L

\[
GCA_{\text{CHCl}_3} = 2.09 \times 10^7 \\
GCA_{\text{CHBr}_3} = 6.11 \times 10^6 \\
GCA_{\text{CCl}_4} = 2.63 \times 10^6
\]

\( \eta_{\text{CHCl}_3} = \text{GC column efficiency for CHCl}_3 \text{ detection} = 99.78\% \)
\( \eta_{\text{CHBr}_3} = \text{GC column efficiency for CHBr}_3 \text{ detection} = 90.19\% \)
\( \eta_{\text{CCl}_4} = \text{GC column efficiency for CCl}_4 \text{ detection} = 99.75\% \)

GC calibration equation for CHCl₃:
\[
C_{\text{CHCl}_3} = \frac{GCA_{\text{CHCl}_3} \times 5.59 \times 10^{-7} - 0.01798}{\eta_{\text{CHCl}_3}}
\]

GC calibration equation for CHBr₃:
\[
C_{\text{CHBr}_3} = \frac{GCA_{\text{CHBr}_3} \times 12.8 \times 10^{-7} + 0.00532}{\eta_{\text{CHBr}_3}}
\]

GC calibration equation for CCl₄:
\[
C_{\text{CCl}_4} = \frac{GCA_{\text{CCl}_4} \times 12.5 \times 10^{-7} - 0.01751}{\eta_{\text{CCl}_4}}
\]

Taking CHBr₃ adsorption as an example:
\[
C_{\text{CHBr}_3} = \frac{(6.11 \times 10^6) \times 12.8 \times 10^{-7} + 0.00532}{0.9019} = 8.67 \text{ mg/L (diluted soln)}
\]

This is the diluted concentration.
To find the concentration in TMP:

$$C_{\text{CHBr}_3} = \frac{8.67 \frac{\text{mg}}{L} \text{ dilute soln} \times 9 \text{ mL of dilute soln}}{0.5 \text{ mL} \text{ TMP}} = 156.1 \frac{\text{mg}}{L} \text{ TMP}$$

To find the mols of CHBr$_3$ per g of wet membrane:

$$\frac{156.1 \frac{\text{mg}}{L} \text{ TMP} \times 0.008 \text{ L TMP}}{(0.303 \text{ g wet membrane}) \times 252770 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{mol}}} = 1.63 \times 10^{-5} \frac{\text{mol CHBr}_3}{\text{g wet membrane}}$$

To find the mols of CHBr$_3$ per g of soaking solution:

$$\frac{2000 \frac{\text{mg}}{L}}{252770 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{mol}} \times 1000 \frac{\text{g soln}}{\text{L soln}}} = 7.91 \times 10^{-6} \frac{\text{mol CHBr}_3}{\text{g soln}}$$

Using Equation 11, $K_s = \left(\frac{\text{mol organic}}{\text{kg wet membrane}}\right)^0 \left(\frac{\text{mol organic}}{\text{kg solution}}\right)$, we get

$$K_s = \frac{1.63 \times 10^{-5} \frac{\text{mol CHBr}_3}{\text{g wet membrane}}}{7.91 \times 10^{-6} \frac{\text{mol CHBr}_3}{\text{g soln}}} = 2.06$$

$K_s$ for the other halocarbons, concentrations, and membranes were performed similarly.

**Membrane Void Fraction (ε) Calculations**

Using the above data, calculate dry and wet membrane densities

$$v_w = \pi \times (1 \text{ in})^2 \times 0.0070 \text{ in} = 0.022 \text{ in}^3 \times \left(\frac{2.54 \text{ cm}}{\text{in}}\right)^3 = 0.36 \text{ mL}$$

$$v_d = \pi \times (1 \text{ in})^2 \times 0.0072 \text{ in} = 0.023 \text{ in}^3 \times \left(\frac{2.54 \text{ cm}}{\text{in}}\right)^3 = 0.38 \text{ mL}$$

$$w_w = 1.3240 \text{ g} - 1.0210 \text{ g} = 0.303 \text{ g}$$
$$w_d = 1.2352 \text{ g} - 1.0210 \text{ g} = 0.2142 \text{ g}$$

$$\rho_w = \frac{0.303 \text{ g}}{0.36 \text{ mL}} = 0.84 \text{ g/mL}$$

$$\rho_d = \frac{0.2142 \text{ g}}{0.38 \text{ mL}} = 0.56 \text{ g/mL}$$

Using Equation 13, \( \Delta V = \frac{\rho_d (w_w - w_d)}{\rho_d w_d} \), we get

$$\Delta V = \frac{0.56 \text{ g/mL} \times (0.303 \text{ g} - 0.2142 \text{ g})}{0.56 \text{ g/mL} \times 0.2142 \text{ g}} = 0.414$$

Using Equation 12, \( \varepsilon = \frac{\Delta V}{1+\Delta V} \), we get

$$\varepsilon = \frac{0.414}{1+0.414} = 0.293$$