

Reprinted from Coastal Zone '91
 Proceedings of 7th Symposium on Coastal & Ocean Management
 ASCE/Long Beach, CA/July 8-12, 1991

CHEMICAL TREATING AGENTS FOR OIL SPILL RESPONSE --RECENT RESEARCH RESULTS

Mervin F. Fingas¹ and Edward J. Tennyson²

ABSTRACT

Laboratory effectiveness tests have been developed for four classes of spill-treating agents; solidifiers, demulsifying agents, surface-washing agents and dispersants. Currently-available treating agents in these four categories have been tested for effectiveness. These results are presented.

Solidifiers or gelling agents solidify oil. Tests show that these require a large amount of agent to solidify oil - ranging between 16% by weight, to over 200%. Demoussifiers or emulsion breakers prevent or reverse the formation of water-in-oil emulsions. A newly-developed effectiveness test shows that only one product is highly effective, however many products will work, but require large amounts of spill-treating agent.

Surfactant-containing materials are of two types, surface-washing agents and dispersants. Testing has shown that an agent that is a good dispersant is conversely a poor surface-washing agent, and vice versa. Tests of surface-washing agents show that only a few agents have effectiveness of 25 to 40%, where this effectiveness is the percentage of oil removed from a test surface. Results using the "swirling flask" test for dispersant effectiveness are reported. Heavy oils show effectiveness values of about 1%, medium crudes of about 10%, light crude oils of about 30% and very light oils of about 90%.

INTRODUCTION

Many chemical agents for treating oil spills have been promoted in the past 20 years. The total number of agents proposed world-wide is estimated to be 600, of which only about 100 were tested in the lab or field, even in a limited way. The high level of activity causes difficulties to the potential buyer and to the environmentalist because they are unable to discriminate between

¹ Chief, Emergencies Science Division, River Road Environmental Technology Centre, Environment Canada, 3439 River Road, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0H3.

² Research Program Manager, Technology Assessment and Research Branch, U.S. Minerals Management Service, 335 Eldon Way, Herndon, Virginia, 22070

Proj. # 160 PQ

those products that will be beneficial and those that can cause further damage.

Effectiveness is the major problem with most treating agents. Effectiveness is generally a function of oil type and composition. Crude and refined oil products have a wide range of molecular sizes and composition including whole categories of materials like asphaltenes, alkanes, aromatics and resins. Agents that are effective for small asphaltene compounds in the oil may be ineffective on the large asphaltenes. Agents that are effective on an aromatic compound may not be effective on a polar compound. Additionally, the composition of crude oils varies widely. This leaves little scope for a universally-applicable and effective spill-control chemical.

Testing of spill-treating agents has involved two facets under the Environment Canada-U.S. Minerals Management Service joint project, the first is testing for aquatic toxicity and the second is effectiveness testing. Criteria for selection of test methods include; similarity to actual field test results and conditions, reproducibility of results, simplicity of apparatus and procedure, and correlation of results with those from other tests. Several projects have been initiated to develop tests and to complete testing of most currently-available spill-treating agents.

GELLING AGENTS OR SOLIDIFIERS

Gelling agents are those agents that change oil from liquid to solid. Also known as solidifiers, these agents often consist of polymerization catalysts and cross-linking agents. Agents which are in fact sorbents, are not considered to be gelling agents. Three solidifiers were tested by Environment Canada in the past:

1. The BP (British Petroleum) product which consisted of deodorized kerosene and a cross-linking agent,
2. A Japanese product consisting of an amine which forms a polymer, and
3. The solidification agent proposed by Professor Bannister of the University of Lowell, an agent which used liquefied carbon dioxide and an activating agent.

During tests conducted in the laboratory, all three agents functioned, but required large amounts of agent to solidify the oil effectively. Under some situations the oil became a viscous semi-solid, this transformation would not aid recovery. The BP agent worked better than the other agents and was tested in larger scale by the Canadian Coast Guard and the Canadian oil industry. In these large-scale tests even more agent was required to solidify the oil, in fact up to 40% of the oil volume. This is double the laboratory requirement. Both requirements were deemed to be far in excess of what was practical during a real spill. Because of the large amount of agent required, gelling agents have not been historically used nor stocked for use by spill responders.

A standard test was developed to assess new solidifiers. The test consists of adding solidifier to an oil under constant stirring until the oil is solid. The test results are repeatable within 5%. A summary of the test procedures is given in the Appendix. Results of testing some solidifiers are given in Table 1. Values are the weight percent of the agent required to solidify an oil completely.

TABLE 1 SOLIDIFIER TEST RESULTS

<u>Product Name</u>	<u>Percentage To Solidify</u>
Rawflex	16
Norsorex	19
Oil Bond 100	33
Oil Sponge	36
Petro Lock	44
Molten Wax	109
Powdered Wax	278

DEMOUSSIFIERS OR EMULSION BREAKERS

Several agents are available to break or prevent emulsions. Most agents are largely hydrophilic surfactants, surfactants with a strong tendency to make oil-in-water emulsions. Such surfactants can reverse the water-in-oil emulsion to two separate phases. The problem with a hydrophilic surfactant is that it is more soluble in water than in oil and will quickly leave the oil. Obviously such products cannot be successfully used on open water. Some recent products avoided this problem by using a less water-soluble surfactant and accepting the resulting decrease in effectiveness. One recent product, "Demoussifier", developed by Environment Canada, does not use surfactant in the normal sense of the word. This product does not suffer the limitations noted above.

Two commercial products, Exxon Breaxit and the Shell product, LA 1834, and a surfactant, sodium dioctyl sulfosuccinate were evaluated in one study (S.L. Ross Environmental Research, 1986). All three products functioned in a limited way, but only the Shell product prevented the formation of emulsions over a wide range of oils and conditions. The Shell and Exxon products are not commercially produced, but can be obtained in small quantities for testing.

The United States Minerals Management Service and Environment Canada joined forces to evaluate Demoussifier. Results of the extensive testing on this product have been widely published (Fingas and Tennyson, 1988; Bobra et. al., 1988a, 1988b; Seakem, 1990).

Demoussifier was developed at Environment Canada's River Road Environmental Technology Centre and functions both to break emulsions and prevent their formation. Demoussifier was tested on a large scale using the Esso test tank in Calgary, Alberta. The demoussifier prevented the formation of water-in-oil emulsions and did so at treatment ratios as low as 1:2000 (500

ppm). The product was then tested on a large scale offshore. The Demoussifier trials were performed by laying down a five-barrel oil slick, treating it with the product at the specified ratio, taking samples at subsequent intervals and measuring the water content and the viscosity. One slick was left untreated and then treated at the 240-minute interval to test Demoussifier's ability to break emulsion at sea. A large reduction in viscosity (105,000 to 22,600 Cst) occurred over the 30-minute sampling period, showing that the product worked well to break the emulsion. The product continued to work well over the five-hour test period to prevent the formation of emulsions.

A new laboratory test is under development at Environment Canada. The test is intended to provide a fast, convenient means of assessing emulsion preventers and breakers. A brief summary of the procedure is in the Appendix. Preliminary results of tests of some products are given in Table 2. The minimum operative concentration is defined as the lowest concentration at which the emulsion volume is reduced to half its initial value. The percent emulsion reduction is the percentage reduction in emulsion volume at a treating-agent concentration of 5000 ppm. The products tested included only one specifically intended for emulsion breaking. The others are dispersants or common household cleaners. Two products, Demoussifier and the dispersant Dasic Slickgone, show good performance in these preliminary tests.

Table 2 Preliminary Emulsion-Breaker Test Results

<u>Agent</u>	<u>Minimum Operative Concentration (ppm)</u>	<u>% Emulsion Reduction at 5000 ppm</u>
Demoussifier	< 1000	65
Dasic Slickgone	1000	69
Palmolive	6000	21
Enersperse 700	20000	21
Corexit CRX-8	40000	45
Corexit 9527	40000	42
Mr. Clean	inoperative	1

SURFACE-WASHING AGENTS

The most common and most promoted treating agents are those containing surfactants as the major ingredient. These agents can be considered as falling into two categories, dispersants and surface-washing agents. Dispersants are those agents that have approximately the same solubility in water and oil and will cause the oil to be dispersed into the water in the form of fine droplets. Surface-washing agents are those agents that remove oil from solid surfaces such as beaches by a mechanism known as detergency. As it turns out, the mechanisms of dispersancy and detergency are quite different and testing has shown that a product that is a good surface-washing agent is a poor dispersant and vice versa.

A test for surface-washing agents was developed by Environment Canada and several commercial products have been tested using this

protocol. The test measures how much oil is removed from a standard test surface when the surface-washing agent is allowed to soak into the oil and then rinsed with water. The Appendix contains a summary of the test procedures. Table 3 shows the results of these tests with a seawater rinse and the results of an aquatic toxicity test (lethal concentration to half the test population of Rainbow Trout over four days in mg/L; larger values suggest less toxicity) and a dispersant effectiveness test (swirling flask test, values represent percent oil put into the water column) for the same products. These latter data points were included to show the opposite nature of dispersant and surface-washing effectiveness. Low dispersant effectiveness is a benefit for any product that will be used as a surface-washing agent because oil can then be recovered rather than dispersed into the water column. Furthermore, because the two properties of surface-washing and dispersancy are orthogonal, highly effective products do not have significant dispersant effectiveness. Some products display neither property. The test oil for the surface-washing test is Bunker C and for the dispersant test is a light crude oil, Alberta Sweet Mixed Blend.

TABLE 3 SURFACE-WASHING AGENT TEST RESULTS

<u>Agent</u>	<u>Percent Oil Removed</u>	<u>Toxicity</u>	<u>Dispersant Effectiveness %</u>
D-Limonene	52	35	0
Penmul R-740	44	24	9
Corexit 9580	42	> 5600	0
Formula 2067	39	11	0
Citrikleen XPC	36	34	2
Formula 861	32	24	0
Corexit 7664	27	850	2
BP 1100 WD	21	120	6
Re-Entry	17	8	0
Palmolive dish soap	16	13	9
Breaker 4	13	340	0
Nokomis 3	13	110	0
Citrikleen FC1160	12	75	0
Con-Lei	12	70	0
Sunlight dish soap	12	13	9
Citrikleen 1855	12	55	0
Con-Lei	12	70	0
Bioversal	11	120	0
Mr. Clean	6	30	0
Gran Control	6	75	0
Corexit CRX-8	5	2	48
Formula 730	5	33	0
Corexit 9527	3	108	41
Tornado	3	1350	0

TABLE 3 ctd. SURFACE-WASHING AGENT TEST RESULTS

Agent	Percent Oil Removed	Toxicity	Dispersant
			Effectiveness %
Biosolve	2	9	0
Lestoil	1	51	0
Enersperse 700	1	50	56

DISPERSANTS

Early dispersant effectiveness testing was largely done in field situations. Over the past 12 years, 107 test spills have been laid out to test the effectiveness of oil-spill dispersants (Fingas, 1989). Most experimenters have not assigned effectiveness values, because mass balances are nearly impossible to determine under field conditions. Of those who did, some experimenters simply estimated effectiveness from visual appearances, but most based their measure on integrations of oil concentrations in the water column. This is not a correct means to perform the measurement because the underwater concentrations have little positional relationship to the surface slick. Underwater dynamics of the ocean are very different from surface dynamics (Brown and Goodman, 1988). Furthermore, all the experimenters who used underwater concentrations to estimate field effectiveness also used the method of dividing the water into different compartments and averaging concentrations. Mathematically this is not appropriate and can result in effectiveness values that are vastly exaggerated (Fingas, 1989). Surface measures are also inadequate at this time but may be possible with the development of new remote sensors (Goodman and Fingas, 1988).

Many laboratory studies have compared the test results from different apparatus and procedures. A review of these results shows that there is poor correlation in effectiveness results between the various test methods when these methods are followed as written (Fingas, Bobra and Velicogna, 1987). A recent study by the present author has shown that lack of correlation is primarily a function of oil-droplet settling time allowed between the time that the energy is no longer applied and the time that the water sample is taken from the apparatus (Fingas et. al. 1989). Another important factor is the oil-to-water ratio used in the apparatus. When these two parameters are adjusted to be the same and to larger values, test results from most apparatus are similar. Results from more energetic dispersant effectiveness tests are higher but when corrected for natural dispersion, these results are nearly identical to those from less energetic apparatus. Given that essentially identical results can now be obtained from almost any laboratory tests, a simple, repeatable and fast test can be chosen to make determinations of the dispersant effectiveness. One test developed by Environment Canada, called the "swirling flask" test meets these criteria and has been used to test many combinations of oils and dispersants. A summary of the procedures is in the Appendix. The values in Table 4 are an average of six runs of this test method.

TABLE 4 DISPERSANT EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Oil	Percent effectiveness with Dispersant			
	Corexit 9527	Corexit CRX-8	Enersperse 700	Dasic
Alberta	33	45	51	24
Arabian Light	17	9	22	33
Avalon	11	5	11	16
Bent Horn	17	20	23	30
Bunker C	1	2	2	1
California heavy	1	1	1	1
Endicott	7	8	6	14
Endicott weathered	6	2	6	3
Hibernia	6	6	10	14
Hibernia weathered	4	3	8	7
Lago Medio	5	5	13	15
Norman Wells	36	43	51	26
Nuguini	50	57	55	28
Panuk	96	78	96	40
Prudhoe Bay	7	7	10	14
Prudhoe Bay weathered 4		4	8	10
South Louisiana	31	36	48	42
Synthetic crude	63	41	61	25
Transmountain	8	8	28	27
Used motor oil	33	31	36	29

A few trends are seen in these data. First, there is little difference between dispersants other than the slight tendency of Dasic to disperse heavier oils better than the other dispersants, but lighter oils to a lesser degree. Second, the average effectiveness for heavy oils is about 1%, for medium crudes about 10%, for light crudes about 30% and for very light oils about 90%. Finally, weathered oils are dispersed to a lesser degree than their fresh counterparts.

Toxicity of three of these dispersants was measured and these data are presented in Table 3.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding for the studies was provided by Environment Canada and the United States Minerals Management Service.

APPENDIX A**REFERENCES**

Bobra, M., P. Kawamura, M. Fingas, and D. Velicogna, 1988a. Laboratory and Mesoscale Testing of Elastol and Brand M Demoussifier, Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual AMOP Technical Seminar, Environment Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, p. 391-415

Bobra, M.A., P.I. Kawamura, M.Fingas and D. Velicogna, 1988b. Mesoscale Application and Testing of An Oil Spill Demulsifying Agent and Elastol, Environment Canada Manuscript Report Number EE-104, Ottawa, Ontario

Brown, H.M. and Goodman, R.H., 1988. Dispersant Tests in A Wave Basin, Proceedings of The Eleventh AMOP Technical Seminar, Environment Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, p. 501-514

Fingas, M.F., M.A. Bobra and R.K. Velicogna, 1987. Laboratory Studies on the Chemical and Natural Dispersability of Oil, Proceedings of the 1987 Oil Spill Conference, American Petroleum Institute, Washington, D.C., p. 241-246

Fingas, M. and E. Tennyson, 1988. Evaluation of Two New Oil Spill Chemical Additives: Elastol and Demoussifier, Spill Technology Newsletter, Vol. 13, No. 2, p. 40-46

Fingas, M.F., 1989. Field Measurement of Effectiveness: Historical Review and Examination of Analytical Methods, Chemical Dispersants - Countermeasures For the 90's, M. Flaherty, Ed., ASTM 1084, American Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia, pp. 157-178

Fingas, M.F., D.L. Munn, B. White, R.G. Stoodley and I.D. Crerar, 1989. Laboratory Testing of Dispersant Effectiveness: The Importance of Oil-to-Water Ratio and Settling Time, Proceedings of the 1989 Oil Spill Conference, American Petroleum Institute, Washington, D.C., pp. 365-373

Goodman, R.H. and Fingas, M.F., 1988. The Use of Remote Sensing in The Determination of Dispersant Effectiveness, Proceedings of The Eleventh AMOP Technical Seminar, Environment Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, p. 377-384

Seakem Oceanography, 1990. Field Test of Two Spill Treating Agents, Environment Canada Manuscript Report Number EE-124, Ottawa, Ontario

S.L. Ross Environmental Research Ltd. 1986. An Experimental Study of Oil Spill Treating Agents That Inhibit Emulsification and Promote Dispersion, Report Number EE-87, Environment Canada, Ottawa, Ontario

APPENDIX B Summary Test Procedures**1. Solidifier Test**

1.a. Equipment: Stirrer stop watch analytical balance
1.b. Supplies: Jar ASMB(Alberta Sweet Mixed Blend) standard oil saltwater spatula

1.c. Procedure: 200 mL of seawater is placed into jar and 20 mL of the standard oil is weighed and placed on the water. A stirrer is placed at the oil-water interface and is turned on. After one minute, quantities of the solidification agent are added at 1-minute intervals from a pre-weighed container. A plastic spatula is used to test the solidity of the oil. When the oil is solid, the weight of solidifier added and weight of the oil are used to calculate the percentage required to solidify.

2. Preliminary Emulsion Breaker Test

2.a. Equipment: Wrist-action shaker vernier callipers stop watch
2.b. Supplies: 500 mL graduated cylinder salt water test oil(half Bunker C and half ASMB weathered 20%) pipettes

2.c. Procedure: Place 400 mL water in the cylinder and 1 mL oil on the surface of this water. Place the oil in the shaker and shake through an angle of 2 degrees for a period of 40 minutes. Stop the shaker and measure the height of the emulsion with the callipers both along the shaking axis and perpendicular to it. The height of the emulsion is taken as the average of these two numbers. The treating agent is added and the cylinder shaken for another 60 minutes. The height of the emulsion is taken again and used to calculate the percentage reduction for that quantity of treating agent. The minimum quantity is taken as the concentration of agent that cause a 50% reduction in emulsion height. (A new test using a rotating vessel is also being used and similar results achieved. This test is less subject to oil differences than the preceding test.)

3. Surface-Washing Agent Test

3.a. Equipment: analytical balance stainless steel trough (3/4 in. angle iron)

3.b. Supplies: test oil (Bunker C) pipettes 50 mL syringe tissue tweezers

3.c. Procedure: Place 0.15 mL of the test oil onto a 50 mm strip in the centre of the trough. Let the oil stand for 10 minutes and then weigh the oil and trough. Apply 0.03 mL of the surface-washing agent to the oil and distribute it along the test oil strip. Let the material soak for 10 minutes. Place the trough in a stand at 15 degrees from horizontal and using the 50 mL syringe with a 18 gauge needle as a funnel, flush the surface with 5 mL water. Let stand for another 10 minutes and flush again with the same amount of water. Let dry for 10 minutes and carefully remove any remaining water droplets with tweezers and a tissue. Weigh the trough to determine the weight of oil removed.

4. Dispersant Test (Swirling Flask Procedure)

4.a. Equipment: laboratory shaker visible spectrometer

4.b. Supplies: 125 mL Erlenmeyer flask with bottom spout test oil
pipettes salt water separatory funnels graduated cylinders

4.c. Procedure: Place 120 mL of water into the test flask and float 0.1 mL oil/dispersant on the water. Shake the flask(s) for 20 minutes at 150 rpm. Let stand for a further 10 minutes and take a 30 mL sample through the side-spout. Extract the oil with 3 successive aliquots of 5 mL of dichloromethane. Read the absorbency of the combined dichloromethane extracts in a spectrophotometer at 340, 370 and 400 nm. Using a calibration curve, determine the percent effectiveness at each wavelength and average for the final result.

The one drop procedure is performed as above but the dispersant (0.01 mL) is applied to the centre of the oil, after it has been placed on the water. The two drop test is performed in similar manner but the first drop of dispersant (0.05 mL) is placed at a point 1/3 across the diameter of the oil surface and the second drop 5 seconds later at the 2/3 point across the same diameter.

Calibration curves are prepared by adding the amount of oil calculated to yield a given percentage to 30 mL water and proceeding as though this were a regular run.