

Alternatives to Perchloroethylene In Garment



Regional Multi-Program Meeting on Promoting Safer Garment Cleaning

Joy Onasch, P.E.

Community & Small Business Program Manager •



What is Perc and Why is it a Problem?

Able to dissolve most organic materials, perchloroethylene (PCE or perc) is the most widely used dry cleaning solvent in Massachusetts and nationally.

A typical dry cleaning machine...







Though perc machines have improved emissions over time, there is still exposure to workers and even co-located residences and clothes taken home.





- Dizziness, confusion
- Damage to liver & kidneys
- Neurotoxicity
- Reproductive toxicity
- Developmental toxicity
- Cancer



Misuse of perc can lead to soil and groundwater contamination.

75% of drycleaner sites in the US are contaminated.

Many are Superfund sites.



Alternatives Studied

- Wet cleaning
- CO₂
- High flash point hydrocarbon
- Acetals
- Propylene-glycol ethers
- Volatile methyl siloxanes
- n-Propyl bromide



Methods and Policy Report No. 27

2012

Perchloroethylene

Assessment of Alternatives to

for the Professional Garment

UMASS LOWELI

Key Criteria: 1st set

Technical/Performance
Cycle time and load capacity
Difficult materials
Pretreatment and finishing requirements

Economic
Equipment costs
Chemical costs
Energy costs



| Key Assessment Criteria | | Perc (reference) | Wet Cleaning ¹ | Carbon Dioxide | High Flashpoint Hydrocarbons | Acetal | Propylene Glycol Ethers | Siloxane | n Propyl Bromide |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Common Trade Names / Manufacturers of Equipment or Solvents | | | Wascomat, Miele, Continental, HwaSung, AquaSolo | Cool Clean Technologies, Solvair® | DF2000 TM Fluid, EcoSolv®, ShellSol D60, Caled Hydroclene | Solvon K4 | Solvair*, Rynex 3*, Impress*, Gen-X* | Green Earth* D5 solvent | Drysolv*, Fabrisolv™ XL |
| Solvent Chemical Identification [CAS#] | | Perchloroethylene [127-18-4] | Solvent: Water Detergents: See full report ¹ | Carbon Dioxide [124-38-9] | Naphtha (petroleum) hydrotreated heavy [64742-48-9]; C10-C13 Isoalkanes [68551-17-7] | 1-(butoxy methoxy) butane (butylal) [2568-90-3] | dipropylene glycol tert-butyl ether, [132739- 31-2]; di- propylene glycol n-butyl ether, [29911-28-2] | Decamethylcyclo- penta siloxane (D5) [541-02-6] | N Propyl Bromide (nPB) [106-94-5] |
| Technical / Performance ² | Cycle time (min) | 45 | 20-40 | 35-45 | 60-75 | 60-65 | >45 | 53-58 | 45 |
| | Load capacity (lb) | 50 | 20-75 | 60 | 35-90 | 40-90 | 43 | 55 | 50 |
| | Materials system may have difficulty with | Leather, suedes, beads, delicates | Leather, suede and fur | Triacetates, specially dyed acetates | Vinyl appliqués | Appliqués or decorations glued to fabric | None identified | None identified | Leather, suedes, beads, delicates |
| | Spotting requirements | Moderate | Low | High | Mo derate | Low | Low | High | Low |
| Financial | Equipment | \$40,000 - \$65,000 | \$36,000 - \$61,000 | \$100,000 - >\$150,000 | \$38,000 - \$75,000 | \$50,000 - \$100,000 | \$56,000 | \$30,500 - \$55,000 | \$40,000 - \$60,000 or retro fit costs |
| | Chemical cost per gallon | \$17 | \$0.007/gal (water); \$25-\$31/gal (detergent) | \$0.18/lb (CO ₂); \$40/gal (detergent) | \$14-\$17 | \$28-\$34 | \$25-\$30 | \$22-\$28 | \$40-\$64 |
| | Electricity usage ³ (kWh/100 lb) | 26.6 | 9.3 | 30.9 | 35.5 | Similar to hydrocarbon | Unavailable | 54.2 | Unavailable |
| | Typical cost per pound cleaned ⁴ | \$0.63-\$1.94 avg. \$1.02 | \$0.57-\$1.32 avg. \$1.10 | \$1.40 | \$0.73-\$1.02 avg. \$0.88 | Unavailable | \$1.14 | \$1.08-\$2.33 avg. \$1.71 | Unavailable |

Are Alternatives Effective and Affordable?

All options are technically feasible
Some may have impact on throughput
Some have limitations on the fabrics they
can handle

Most options are affordable CO₂-based options not economically feasible (for majority of smaller MA shops)



Key Criteria – 2nd set

Environmental

Persistence Bioaccumulation Aquatic Toxicity

Health and Safety

Exposure limits
CNS effects
Carcinogenicity
Repro/developmental toxicity
Flammability



| Key Assessment Criteria | | Perc (reference) | Wet Cleaning ¹ | Carbon Dioxide | High Flashpoint Hydrocarbons | Acetal | Propylene Glycol Ethers | Siloxane | n Propyl Bromide |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Enviro | Persistence ⁵ (water, soil, sediment, air) | M (water), H (soil, sed, air) | L (water, soil, air), M (sed) | NA | L (water, soil, air), M (sed) | L (water, soil, air), M (sed) | L (water, soil, air), M (sed) | L (water), M (soil), H (sed, air) | L (water soil), M (sed), (air) |
| Environmental | Bioaccumulation ⁶ | Low | Low | NA | Mo derate | Low | Low | Moderate | Low |
| | Aquatic Toxicity ⁷ | Moderate | Low to Moderate ⁸ | Low | High | Moderate ⁹ | Low | High | High |
| Human Health | Recommended Exposure limits ¹⁰ | 25 ppm | NE | 5000 ppm | 100 ppm ¹¹ | NE | NE | 10 ppm ¹² | 10 ppn |
| | Central Nervous System Effects | Yes | No ¹³ | No ¹⁴ | Yes | No data available | Yes | Som e evidence | Yes |
| | Carcinogenicity | IARC Probable human carcinogen | Not classified by IARC | Not classified by IARC | Not dassified by IARC | Not classified by IARC | Not classified by IARC | Some evidence | Clear evidence in anima studies b NTP |
| | Reproductive / Developmental Toxicity | Yes | Negligible ¹⁵ | No data available | No data available | No data available | No ¹⁶ | Studies indicate concern | Yes |
| Safety | Flash Point/ Flammability | NA / Not Flammable | NA / Not Flammable | NA / Not Flammable | 140-145°F / Combustible liquid | 144°F / Combustible liquid | 160-212°F / Combustible liquid | 171°F / Combustible liquid | NA ¹⁷ |



Are the Alternatives Safer than Perc?

All are less persistent; HC and Siloxanes are more bioaccumulative and toxic in aquatic environment

Most are safer to humans ... **EXCEPT ...**

- nPB is carcinogenic, reproductive toxic and neurotoxic **NOT** a safer alternative
- **Data gaps** present concern for alternatives that are new to the market (e.g., Solvon K4 acetals)



Key Criteria – 3rd set: Applicable Regulations

Hazardous Air Pollutants

Designated VOCs

Massachusetts regulations

- Listed toxics under TURA
- Environmental Results Program

Hazardous waste disposal issues

Wastewater discharge restrictions



| Key Assessment Criteria | | Perc (reference) | Wet Cleaning¹ | Carbon Dioxide | High Flashpoint Hydrocarbons | Acetal | Propylene Glycol Ethers | Siloxane | n Propyl Bromide |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|--|--------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Applicable Regulations | Clean Air Act Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) | Yes, HAP | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| | Clean Air Act NAAQS VOC ¹⁸ | No, Exempt ¹⁹ | No ²⁰ | No | voc | voc | voc | No, Exempt ¹⁹ | voc |
| | Massachusetts regulated (TURA, ERP) | TURA Higher Hazard Substance, ERP | No | No | No | No | No | No | TURA |
| | Hazardous waste disposal required | Yes - Listed hazardous waste | No | No | Yes Waste Oil = Hazardous Waste in MA | No | No | No | No; monit for residu perc if usi retrofitte machine |
| | Wastewater discharge restrictions | No | Discharge to sewer or holding tank ²¹ | No | No | No | No | No | No |



Are the Alternatives More Regulated than Perc?

Most options are combustible or flammable, requiring additional control for safety

Several options are VOCs

Most options involve industrial waste disposal, though not hazardous waste disposal

Wet Cleaning poses issues for facilities on septic

nPB newly regulated under TURA and now... HHS is coming!

TOXICS USE REDUCTION INSTITUTE

Have you seen something like this...











"Green Washing: Site Visit Data Summary

35 Cleaners visited

13 did not have "green" claims

- Drop store (1)
- Green Earth (8)
- Solvon K4 (3)
- Hydrocarbon (1)

22 did have "green" claims

- Drop store (2)
- Green Earth (13)
- Solvon K4 (5)
- Hydrocarbon & Wet Cleaning (2)



Wet Cleaning and CO2 are considered the most environmentally friendly options. Wet Cleaning technology is the more affordable of the two.

Washer and dryer use biodegradable detergents, and conditioners



Finishing equipment re-shapes and dries the slightly damp clothes







MA Conversions to Wet Cleaning

From 2008 through 2014 TURI has given 10 grants to dry cleaners to eliminate the use of perc and switch to dedicated professional wet cleaning

- Cleaners save money on solvent, waste, water, and electricity
- Cleaners are fully satisfied with the process and product; there is less regulatory oversight and risk of contamination
- The work environment is greatly improved
- Customers are very pleased with quality







