



Standard Guide for Use of Membrane Technology in Mitigating Hazardous Chemical Spills¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation F 1525; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This guide covers considerations for the use of membrane technology in the mitigation of dilute concentrations of spilled chemicals into ground and surface waters.

1.2 This guide addresses the application of membrane technology alone or in conjunction with other technologies.

1.3 The values stated in SI units are to be regarded as the standard. The values given in parentheses are for information only.

1.4 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.* In addition, it is the responsibility of the user to ensure that such activity takes place under the control and direction of a qualified person with full knowledge of any potential or appropriate safety and health protocols.

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:

F 1127 Guide for Containment by Emergency Response Personnel of Hazardous Material Spills²

3. Terminology

3.1 Definitions of Terms Specific to This Standard:

3.1.1 *concentrate, retentate*—in reverse osmosis and nanofiltration, respectively, the portion of the feed solution that does not pass through the membrane is called concentrate, while the term retentate is more commonly used for ultrafiltration and microfiltration.

3.1.2 *crossflow filtration*—a filtration process in which the feed flows almost parallel to the filter or membrane surface. It is also called tangential flow.

3.1.3 *flux*—a measure of the rate at which the permeate (or filtrate) passes through the membrane per unit area of membrane. It is reported in units of L/m²/day, m³/m²/day, or gal/ft²/day.

3.1.4 *fouling*—the accumulation of unwanted deposits or

scales on a membrane that results in a flux reduction.

3.1.5 *Langelier Saturation Index (LSI)*—a method used to determine the calcium scaling potential, that is, calcium carbonate of a membrane at concentrations below 5000 ppm TDS.

3.1.6 *membrane technology*—separation of the components of a fluid by means of a pressure gradient and a semipermeable membrane. The various classes of membrane technology are differentiated primarily by the size or molecular weight, or both, of rejected material. The main divisions are (1) microfiltration (MF), (2) ultrafiltration (UF), (3) nanofiltration (NF), and (4) reverse osmosis (RO).

3.1.7 *microfiltration (MF)*—a pressure-driven process whereby a contaminated liquid stream is separated using a filtration process involving a compatible membrane. Dead-ended and crossflow techniques are used. Suspended solids and macromolecules are removed on the basis of size. Pore size is normally 0.1 to 5.0 μm , and operating pressures usually range from 20 to 350 kPa (3 to 50 psig). Membrane materials, such as polypropylene, polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE), and metal oxides, are frequently less susceptible to chemical degradation than those used for other branches of this technology.

3.1.8 *nanofiltration (NF)*—a pressure-driven process whereby a contaminated liquid stream is separated and purified by a process involving filtration, diffusion, and chemical potential across a compatible membrane. Divalent and multivalent species with a molecular weight above 80 are removed as are uncharged and univalent molecules with a molecular weight above 200. Operating pressures normally run between 1380 and 2760 kPa (200 and 400 psig).

3.1.9 *osmotic pressure*—as related to membrane technology, the pressure that must be applied to the more concentrated solution to halt flow of the solvent from the less concentrated solution through a semipermeable membrane into the more concentrated side.

3.1.10 *permeate, filtrate*—the stream that has passed through the membrane and is therefore free of, or has a much reduced concentration of, contaminants. Permeate is commonly used for the treated water obtained from nanofiltration and reverse osmosis processes, while filtrate is more commonly used for the treated fluid obtained by ultrafiltration and microfiltration operation.

3.1.11 *pervaporation (PV)*—a vacuum-driven membrane process applicable to the separation of liquid mixtures. During

¹ This guide is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee F-20 on Hazardous Substances and Oil Spill Response and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee F20.22 on Mitigation Actions.

Current edition approved April 10, 1996. Published June 1996.

² *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, Vol 11.04.

the separation, the dissolved, more volatile constituents are removed from a less volatile carrier stream, as a vapor, through a semipermeable membrane and then condensed on the downstream side. This energy-intensive process is still in the development stage, but it has the potential of being a very promising spill mitigation technology.

3.1.12 *reverse osmosis (RO)*—a pressure-driven process in which a liquid stream is separated and hence purified by passing it over the surface of a semipermeable membrane. Both dissolved and suspended materials in a molecular weight range from 40 to 200 are removed, with charged species being removed more easily. In the case of nonpolar molecules, molecular structure “bulkiness” becomes important. Some are rejected well with a molecular weight of 60, while others with a molecular weight of 100 are not. Differences among membrane material can be very important in this aspect. This process discriminates between solutes on the basis of their ability to either (1) preferentially adsorb onto the membrane pore surfaces and move through the membrane pores by capillary action, or (2) dissolve in and diffuse through the membrane. Reverse osmosis uses applied pressures between 1380 and 10 350 kPa (200 and 1500 psig). As the concentration difference between the solutions on the two sides of the membrane increases, the osmotic pressure of the solution increases and, in turn, the applied pressure requirement. In general, solutions containing organic and inorganic compounds ranging from low ppm up to 55 000 ppm are commonly treated with this technique.

3.1.13 *semipermeable membrane*—membranes that are selective in the components that they allow to pass through them.

3.1.14 *ultrafiltration (UF)*—a pressure-driven process whereby a contaminated liquid stream is separated and purified by a crossflow filtration process involving a compatible membrane. Suspended solids and dissolved molecules in the 500 to 300 000 molecular weight range are removed mainly on the basis of size. This represents a membrane that has a pore size ranging between 0.0015 and 0.2 μm . Ultrafiltration uses pressures of 105 to 1380 kPa (15 to 200 psig).

4. Significance and Use

4.1 *General*—This guide contains information regarding the use of membrane technology to recover and concentrate hazardous materials that have entered surface and ground water as the result of a spill. Membrane technology may be applied alone or in conjunction with other treatment techniques, as follows:

4.1.1 Different types of membrane are used in series with filters to treat highly contaminated solutions reaching concentration levels of several parts per million of organic and inorganic materials.

4.1.2 Different types of membranes are applied in series to treat very dilute concentrations (parts per billion level) of organic and inorganic compounds. Each membrane type has the ability to remove specific compounds, thus producing a concentrated fraction. This fraction may require final off-site treatment but provides a significant reduction in transportation costs due to the large volume reduction achieved.

4.1.3 Membranes may be used in conjunction with destruction technologies such as advanced oxidation processes

(AOPs). This method is recommended for dilute solutions. The membrane technology portion concentrates the compounds to an optimum level for AOP destruction.

5. Constraints on Usage

5.1 *General*—Application of membrane technology to the cleanup of spills results in the generation of two streams. The first stream is treated and has a reduced concentration of contaminants, while the second is concentrated and has an increased concentration of contaminants. This concentrated stream must be destroyed, reprocessed, or disposed of in an appropriate manner. There may also be constraints that are created by the physical and chemical sensitivity of membranes and, as a result, characteristics of a membrane system must be taken into consideration whenever membrane units are used. These considerations are described as follows.

5.1.1 *Membrane Material:*

5.1.1.1 The material used to construct the membrane is crucial to its success. In general, for spill remediation, the UF, NF, and RO membranes require materials that have a good temperature and pH resistance, as well as chemical stability, to ensure that the membrane is unaffected by the solution being treated. The increasing demands on the performance of membrane materials are exceeding the capability of organic polymers currently available. Consequently, inorganic membranes have been developed in order to satisfy the need for better performance. Today, high-quality organic and inorganic membranes are commercially available.

5.1.1.2 Inorganic membranes are classified in four groups: ceramic, carbon, metal, and polymer analog. Many developments in inorganic membranes have been achieved, but many inconveniences have yet to be overcome, such as their high cost and low surface area/volume, which retards the expansion of their application. In the case of organic materials, several kinds of polymers are used that allow for the development of membranes with various properties. The following improvements might be noticed: lower cost, longer life time, lower replacement rates, reduced chemical consumption, reduced operating pressure for given flux level, use in a broader range of pH, higher ion rejection, easier cleaning due to effective foulant removal and reduced biological attack, lower energy consumption, as well as reduction of capital cost. Polymeric membranes with very high performance have been designed, but their great complexity makes commercialization difficult. Polymeric membranes currently on the market are available in symmetric and asymmetric configurations.

5.1.1.3 Asymmetric membranes are more commonly available than the symmetric type, especially for UF, NF, and RO. These asymmetric membranes are made of two layers of the same polymer. They have a thin and dense surface skin and a porous substructure that adds strength and support to the thin skin without reducing the permeate flow. The symmetric configuration has a homogenous structure that provides a very high hydraulic resistance. Another type of membrane, very similar to the asymmetric, is the thin film composite. The most obvious difference is that the two layers are made individually, from two different kinds of polymers for better performance. The characteristics of several polymeric materials currently available are listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1 Features of Several Polymeric Materials

Polymers	Hydrophilic	Maximum Operating Temperature, °C	Chemical Resistance	Cost	UV Resistance	pH Range Resistance
Cellulosic CA, CN, CN/CA	yes	126	fair	low	good	fair
Nylon 6, 66 polyamide	yes	135	good	low	good	good
PVDF	no	135	good	medium	poor	good
PVDF modified	yes	135	good	high	poor	good
PTFE, film	no	135	excellent	high	poor	excellent
Polysulfone	no	135	good	medium	good	excellent
Polysulfone modified	yes	135	good	medium	good	excellent
Polyacrylonitrile	yes	...	fair	low	good	fair
PAN/PVC	no	...	good	good	good	fair
Polyvinyl-chloride	no	...	fair	low	good	good
Polycarbonate	no	...	fair	medium	good	good
Polycarbonate modified	yes	140	fair	medium	good	good
Polyester	no	135	excellent	medium	good	excellent
Polypropylene	yes	...	excellent	low	fair	excellent
Polyethylene	yes	...	excellent	low	fair	excellent

5.1.2 Pretreatment:

5.1.2.1 Pretreatment of the feed is of primary concern when membranes are used in spill cleanup. Although each membrane configuration is affected differently by inorganic foulants, most membranes are affected adversely by oil, grease, and parts per million concentrations of inorganic compounds, including iron, manganese, magnesium, calcium, carbonate ion, and sulphate species. Some organic species, especially at high ppm levels, may also have detrimental effects and cause irreversible damage to the membranes.

5.1.2.2 The pH of the feed solution is often adjusted to dissolve or precipitate inorganics, to prevent membrane fouling on the membrane surface that leads to a performance decline (that is, lower permeate flow rate and increased pressure drop between the feed and concentrate sides). The degree of pretreatment required will depend on the concentration of foulants in the feed stream, membranes used, and membrane cleaning schedule.

5.1.3 Membrane Cleaning Agents:

5.1.3.1 A membrane cleaning schedule will depend on the severity of membrane fouling. As mentioned above, a decrease in permeate flow of more than 10 % of the normal flow rate will generally be an indication that cleaning or flushing, or both, is required. It is also good practice to conduct membrane cleaning during periodic maintenance or before long shutdown periods. It is useful to determine the type of foulants on the membrane surface before cleaning. Chemical analysis is the best method; however, in situations in which this may not be possible, foulants may be determined by other means such as visual inspection. Chemical cleaning clears the membrane surface by dissolving the fouling substances with reagents. Table 2 provides a description of common inorganic foulants.

5.1.3.2 Each major foulant type will require a specific cleaning procedure. If the performance does not improve

sufficiently after the first cleaning procedure, the application of another procedure may lead to a better result. Fouling on the membrane surface is usually complex and often requires several cleaning procedures successively. For example, successive cleaning with detergent and citric acid results in generally more effective cleaning than either alone. Table 3 lists several of the common cleaning agents used for membranes.

5.1.4 Flushing and Cleaning Procedures:

5.1.4.1 *Flushing*—One of the most convenient foulant removal procedures is flushing. Flushing cleans the membrane surface using a large quantity of feedwater at low pressure. It is effective for cleaning membranes that have been slightly fouled. The general operating conditions are as follows:

- (1) *Flushing Water*—Permeate (treated water),
- (2) *Pressure*—190 to 590 kPa (28 to 86 psi),
- (3) *Water Flow Rate*—High flow rate but pressure drop limited to less than 10 psi/element,
- (4) *Temperature*—Ambient but less than 30°C (86°F), and
- (5) *Period*—0.5 h.

5.1.4.2 *Cleaning (Polymer Membranes Only)*—Chemical cleaning is ordinarily used after the flushing procedure. A flush is also recommended after chemical cleaning to wash off dissolved solids and suspended solids in the modules. The general operating conditions for UF membranes are as follows: It is important to realize that the operating conditions differ according to the type of membrane used. Therefore, it is strongly recommended to refer to the manufacturer's directions before proceeding. If no instructions are available, the following operating conditions for UF membranes may be used:

- (1) *Chemical Cleaning Agents*—As listed in Table 3.
- (2) *Cleaning Water*—Permeate 40 to 80 L (11 to 22 gal)/200-mm (8-in.) module and 10 to 20 L (3 to 5 gal)/100-mm (4-in.) module.
- (3) *Pressure*—Less than 345 kPa (50 psi).
- (4) *Feed Flow Rate*—150 to 230 L/min (40 to 60 g/m)/200-mm (8-in.) vessel and 40 to 60 L/min (10 to 15 g/m)/100-mm (4-in.) vessel.
- (5) *Temperature*—As high as possible but less than 40°C (104°F).
- (6) *Period*—1 to 4 h.
- (7) *Method of Cleaning*—Circulation and soaking.

TABLE 2 Common Membrane Foulants

Foulant	Description
Ferric hydroxide	brownish color
Calcium silica biological fouling	white or beige color
Calcium scale, inorganic colloids	crystalline appearance
Biological fouling organic material	slimy appearance

TABLE 3 Chemical Cleaning Agents for Polymer Membranes

Fouling Substance	Chemical Reagent	Cleaning Conditions
Calcium scale	citric acid HCl	1 to 2 % solution, pH 3 to 4 adjusted with NH ₄ OH 1 to 2 % solution, pH 2 adjusted with NH ₄ OH
Metal hydroxide	citric acid	1 to 2 % solution, pH 3 to 4 adjusted with NH ₄ OH
Organic matter	detergent, membrane dependent	in accordance with the manufacturer's directions
Inorganic matter	citric acid	1 to 2 % solution, pH 3 to 4 adjusted with NH ₄ OH
Bacterial matter	peroxide OR sodium meta-bisulfite, membrane dependent detergent	0.5 to 1.0 % solution, 0.5 to 1.0 % by wt, in accordance with the manufacturer's directions dependent on specific membrane

5.1.5 *Membrane Storage*—Membranes must remain full of water at all times to prevent drying. Once a membrane has dried out, it can no longer be used. The recommended temperature range is from 0 to 35°C (32 to 95°F). A 10 % glycerine solution should be added to the storage solution when temperatures fall below freezing.

5.1.6 *Shutdown Periods:*

5.1.6.1 *Six Days or Less*—The unit should be flushed every day for 1 h. The chlorine concentration of feed must be maintained between 0.5 and 1.0 ppm.

5.1.6.2 *Seven Days or More*—Circulate a 0.5 to 1.0 % peroxide (or sodium meta-bisulfite, depending on the membrane material) at low pressure of approximately 345 kPa (50 psi) for 1 h before continuous shutdown. The chemical concentration should be checked periodically.

5.2 *Membrane Configurations*—There are four basic membrane configurations, and each has its advantages and limitations. Table 4 lists the advantages and disadvantages for various modules.

5.2.1 *Tubular Membranes*—Tubular membranes can operate on large amounts of suspended solids and are the least sensitive to particulate fouling of all of the configurations. They are also cleaned more easily. As such, the level of pretreatment necessary may simply be screening to remove large solids. There is a trade-off of a much lower production of the purified stream per unit volume than is possible with other configurations because of the low surface area to volume ratio.

5.2.2 *Spiral-Wound Membranes*—Spiral-wound membranes have a high production of purified product per unit of membrane volume. This is accomplished through the large membrane surface area. This results in much closer tolerances than with the tubular configuration. Therefore, pretreatment will involve the removal of large solids before the feed is introduced to the membrane. “Wide spacer” and “Cage wrap” membranes are less affected, but the trade-off is a lower surface area per unit volume, with a consequent lower production of purified product.

5.2.3 *Hollow Fiber Membranes*—Hollow fiber membranes are intermediate between tubular and spiral-wound configurations concerning their need for pretreatment. More than simple screening will be necessary, and the possibility of fouling from low-solubility inorganics (that is, iron and calcium) will be a consideration. As a result, adequate pre-filtration and pH adjustment may be necessary. If the pretreatment system is optimized, these membranes have the highest production rate when compared to alternate geometries.

5.2.4 *Flat Sheet Membrane*—Flat sheet membrane configurations used in plate and frame systems offer ease of cleaning but relatively low permeate fluxes for NF and RO applications. However, the flat MF and UF sheets used in plate and frame systems normally produce much higher flux rates than other configurations, primarily due to the higher degree of turbulence that occurs within the flow channel. However, the capital cost of this type of system is relatively high. Pretreatment requirements are intermediate between tubular and spiral wound configurations. The systems tend to be bulky, with low surface areas per unit volume.

5.3 *Compatibility*—Membrane feed compatibility is probably the most important factor to be considered when membranes are being used. Their life expectancy is not as long as membranes used for water purification or spill remediation when compared to traditional seawater application. A complete analysis of the spill solution will ensure that the feed solution does not interact with the membrane surface, backing, or glue, or with system seals, so as to interfere with their performance. If possible, the membrane manufacturer should be contacted for advice.

5.4 *Pretesting*—The first step in remediating a spill using membrane technology is to conduct a preliminary study prior to commencing work in the field. This may involve contacting manufacturers and discussing the membranes' capabilities to withstand and separate the chemical to be treated. A laboratory study should be conducted on samples of the contaminated water in question to confirm the manufacturer's information

TABLE 4 Module Type: Advantages and Disadvantages

Module Types	Advantages	Disadvantages
Spiral wound	Spacer between membranes allows for less pretreatment of feed and easier cleaning High rejection Can be used in series in pressure vessel	Difficult to sanitize Can be permanently fouled by high contaminants in the feed
Hollow fiber	High output per module volume Operates at high product rates	Only one element per pressure vessel can be used Very prone to rupture Requires more sophisticated pretreatment than other module types
Tubular	Handles high solids concentrations	High energy costs/membrane area High capital and replacement cost Low membrane area per module
Flat sheet	Easier to clean High permeate flux for MF and UF separation	Relatively high capital cost Low permeate flux for NF and RO separation

and the membrane’s capabilities to withstand not only the target species but other chemicals that may possibly be in the contaminated water. This will assist in the determination of pretreatment requirements. If samples of the actual solution are not available, synthetic solutions may be made by dissolving the target species in aqueous solution. However, the results will not be as reliable.

5.5 *Analysis*—One of the most important factors in spill or leachate treatment by membranes is analysis. This will be required by regulatory agencies before the purified stream can be discharged. For inorganics, analytical results during the cleanup should show little variation with time. Any loss of rejection is probably the result of membrane or seal problems. This is not, however, the case for organics. Particularly with spill-contaminated water, analytical results can vary by an order of magnitude. This is caused by two factors: (1) the concentration of the organic in the water may change rapidly, and (2) “slugs” of contaminant may cross the membrane barrier on a random basis. In any event, unless the membrane system is being damaged by compounds in the feed solution, the time-average of the concentration in the purified stream should not vary greatly.

5.6 *Monitoring*—The permeate/filtrate production should be monitored regularly, as it provides an indication of membrane system performance. It is a measure of the rate at which the problem is being treated that provides an indication of the interaction between the feed solution and the membrane. Fouling, swelling, or degradation are indicated by changes in flux. Thus, proper monitoring can, over the short and medium term, provide the information on which to base cleaning cycles or, if necessary, membrane replacement. Over the long term, it can provide a measure of the problem that technology has been called upon to solve. This is frequently not readily available at the onset of the cleanup.

6. Practical Applications

6.1 Emergency Situations:

6.1.1 Membrane technology will normally be used following the containment and storage of the spill-contaminated water in question. However, if the situation requires immediate cleanup due to severe toxicity and environmental impact, it may be necessary to use this technology without complete pretesting.

6.1.2 Analysis becomes paramount in this case. The responder will be feeding a solution to a membrane whose compatibility has been determined solely from available literature or manufacturer’s advice. This may be based on short-term testing and may not be entirely reliable for a cleanup. Under no circumstances should a membrane be used in a cleanup unless the manufacturer can supply data concerning testing on the same or similar chemical solutions.

6.1.3 For a spill, under an emergency cleanup situation, the membrane technology user must perform the following:

6.1.3.1 Monitor feed, permeate, and concentrate stream analyses closely.

6.1.3.2 Monitor flux and separation.

6.1.3.3 Use holding tanks prior to discharge in order to buffer changes in discharge concentrations.

6.1.3.4 Make changes in procedure as found necessary on

the basis of the above.

6.1.4 The extent to which the solution is being concentrated will also be determined from the analyses and flux monitoring, particularly in the case of RO. The regulators will designate contaminant concentration levels in the clean stream.

6.2 *Nonemergency Cleanup Situations*—Once the initial emergency is over, more complete testing and preparation can be performed by the mitigator prior to treatment. Pretesting and manufacturer’s information will determine the best membrane for the purpose and the pretreatment required. However, this will not reduce the importance of closely monitoring all aspects of the data. Sudden and dramatic flux increases could indicate either irreversible fouling or swelling due to incompatibility.

6.3 *Final Comment*—In all cases, when using membranes in spill mitigation, the ultimate fate of the concentrate must be considered prior to commencing the operation. There is little to be gained by concentrating the target chemical if the concentrated stream is more expensive to manage than the original problem.

6.4 *Typical Field Scale Results*—Table 5 and Table 6 provide a summary of the removal of specific contaminants by

TABLE 5 Typical Values for Membrane Field Trials

Contaminant	Concentration, ppm		Removal, %	Reference ³
	Feed	Permeate		
Acenaphthene	32.00	24.00	25	(13)
Acetone	26.81	15.99	40	(11)
Barium ion	0.11	0.04	64	(12)
Barium ion	0.26	0.00	99	(13)
Benzene	1.31	0.47	64	(12)
Benzene	6.90	0.80	88	(13)
Benzoic acid	10.92	0.40	96	(11)
Boron ion	0.09	0.06	33	(12)
Boron	1.81	<0.01	>99.99	(10)
Bromoform	31.03	0.53	98	(11)
Calcium ion	35.70	0.49	99	(10)
Calcium ion	70.00	3.30	95	(13)
Carbonate ion	204.30	58.30	71	(10)
Chloride ion	95.30	7.14	93	(12)
Chloride ion	18000.00	81.00	>99.99	(10)
Chlorophenol	510.00	0.01	>99.99	(9)
Chlorophenol	1655.00	0.02	>99.99	(9)
t-1,2-dichloroethane	22.08	14.44	35	(11)
Ethylbenzene	0.23	0.13	43	(12)
Ethylbenzene	22.00	2.80	87	(13)
Hydroxide ion	362.10	85.80	76	(10)
Iron ion	9.24	0.12	99	(12)
Iron ion	143.57	0.04	100	(13)
Magnesium ion	10.73	0.89	92	(12)
Magnesium ion	10.98	9.60	13	(13)
Manganese ion	1.10	0.04	96	(12)
Phenanthrene	14.00	7.80	44	(13)
Phenol	300.00	66.00	78	(13)
Phenol	300.00	91.00	70	(13)
Phenolics	270.00	100.00	>99.99	(10)
Potassium ion	4.02	0.74	82	(12)
Silicon silicates	4.21	0.28	94	(12)
Sodium ion	45.87	6.48	88	(12)
Sodium ion	8900.00	154.00	98	(10)
Strontium ion	0.36	0.03	92	(12)
Strontium ion	0.44	0.01	98	(13)
Sulfate ion	18.80	0.06	100	(12)
Toluene	0.09	0.03	67	(12)
Toluene	120.00	14.00	88	(13)
Xylene	2.74	0.75	73	(12)
O-xylene	13.35	1.70	87	(11)
Zinc ion	0.24	0.01	96	(12)

TABLE 6 Typical Values for Pervaporation Bench-Scale Trials

Component	Concentration, ppm		Removal, %	Reference
	Feed	Permeate		
Ethylene dichloride	12.13	3.17	74	(8)
Trichloro ethylene	127.57	6.51	95	(8)
Toluene	76.42	5.28	93	(8)
	63.2	6	91	(8)

RO and pervaporation field-scale trials.³

7. Keywords

7.1 concentration; filtrate; filtration; hazardous spill mitigation; membrane; microfiltration; nanofiltration; permeate; pervaporation; retentate; reverse osmosis; ultrafiltration

³ The boldface numbers in parentheses refer to the list of references at the end of this guide.

REFERENCES

- (1) Whittaker, H., "Applications Testing with the Environment Canada Mobile Reverse Osmosis Unit," *U.S. EPA National Technology Seminar*, December 1988.
- (2) Sourirajan, S., "Reverse Osmosis and Synthetic Membranes—Theory Technology Engineering," National Research Council of Canada, 1977.
- (3) *Membrane Technology Reference Guide*, Ontario Hydro, 1990.
- (4) Beauséjour, I., *Review of Current Membranes*, EED in-house student report, Environment Canada, 1991.
- (5) Peterson, R., "Reverse Osmosis," *Membrane Technology/Planning Conference*, Filmtec Corp., 1983.
- (6) Johnson, J. S., "Materials of Construction for Membranes," *Membrane Technology/Planning Conference*, Micron Separation Inc., 1984.
- (7) Johnson, J. S., "Polymeric Membranes for Microfiltration," *Membrane Technology/Planning Conference*, Micron Separation Inc., 1986.
- (8) *A Cross-Flow Pervaporation System for Removal of VOC's from Contaminated Water*, Zenon Environmental Inc., November 1991.
- (9) Straforelli, J. B., and Whittaker, H., "Reverse Osmosis for Clean-Up of Spilled Wood Protection Solution," *Proceedings of the Second Annual Technical Seminar on Chemical Spills*, 1985.
- (10) Tremblay, J., "Membrane Technology Applications in Western Canada," *Proceedings of the Third Annual Technical Seminar on Chemical Spills*, Environment Canada, Toronto, Ont., 1986.
- (11) Whittaker, H., Kady, T., Evangelista, R., and Goulet, C., "Reverse Osmosis and Ultraviolet Photolysis/Ozonation Testing at the PAS Site—Oswego, N.Y.," *Proceedings of the Sixth Technical Seminar on Chemical Spills*, Calgary, Alta., June 1989.
- (12) *Development and Demonstration of a Mobile Reverse Osmosis Adsorption Treatment System for Environmental Emergency Clean-Ups*, Contract No. 52SS.KEI 45-5-0715, Zenon Environmental Inc., October 1987.
- (13) *Field Demonstration of Membrane Technology for Treatment of Landfill Leachate*, RAC Project No. 439C, Zenon Environmental Inc., December 1991.

The American Society for Testing and Materials takes no position respecting the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any item mentioned in this standard. Users of this standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, are entirely their own responsibility.

This standard is subject to revision at any time by the responsible technical committee and must be reviewed every five years and if not revised, either reapproved or withdrawn. Your comments are invited either for revision of this standard or for additional standards and should be addressed to ASTM Headquarters. Your comments will receive careful consideration at a meeting of the responsible technical committee, which you may attend. If you feel that your comments have not received a fair hearing you should make your views known to the ASTM Committee on Standards, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, West Conshohocken, PA 19428.

This standard is copyrighted by ASTM, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States. Individual reprints (single or multiple copies) of this standard may be obtained by contacting ASTM at the above address or at 610-832-9585 (phone), 610-832-9555 (fax), or service@astm.org (e-mail); or through the ASTM website (<http://www.astm.org>).