

WASTE MANAGEMENT AND TREATMENT IN AN AUTOMOBILE BRAKE MANUFACTURING FACILITY

CHAN YOKE MUN

**Dissertation submitted to University of Malaya for partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Technology (Environmental Management)**

**Institute of Postgraduate Studies and Research
University of Malaya
50603 Kuala Lumpur**

1999

Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya



A505619790

	Page
Content	i
Acknowledgment	v
Abstract	vi
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	x
List of Plates	xiii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 GENERAL	1
1.2 OVERVIEW OF DON BRAKE (M) SDN. BHD	3
1.3 RELATED REGULATIONS	8
1.4 PROJECT SUMMARY	9
1.5 OBJECTIVES	11
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.1 AUTOMOBILE BRAKE LINING INDUSTRY & ASBESTOS	12
2.1.1 History of Friction Materials	13
2.1.2 Asbestos	14
2.1.3 Background and Recent Development of Asbestos Regulations for Friction Materials in The United States of America	16
2.1.4 Substitute for Asbestos	19
2.1.5 The Manufacturing Process of Brake Pads	20

2.2	WASTE MINIMIZATION	22
2.2.1	Definition of Industrial Waste	22
2.2.2	Cost Associated with the Waste Generated	23
2.2.3	Benefits of Waste Minimization	23
2.2.4	Developing and Implementing Waste Minimization Program	25
2.2.5	Waste Audit	28
2.2.6	Waste Minimization Techniques	30
2.3	WASTE MINIMIZATION PROGRAM IN MALAYSIA	35
2.4	WASTE MINIMIZATION PROGRAM IN OTHER COUNTRIES	36
2.5	SOLIDIFICATION/STABILIZATION TECHNOLOGIES	38
2.5.1	Grout/Cement-Based Techniques	43
2.5.2	Polymer Encapsulation	48
2.5.3	Evaluating Performance of S/S	51
CHAPTER 3	WASTE AUDIT AND MATERIAL RECOVERY	57
3.1	INTRODUCTION	57
3.2	DESCRIPTION OF WASTE AUDIT PROCEDURES	58
3.2.1	Determination of Audit Scope	58
3.2.2	Collection of Background Information	58
3.2.3	Identification and Characterization of Input Materials, Product and Waste Streams	59
3.2.4	Comprehensive Plant Analysis	59

3.3	WASTE AUDIT RESULTS	60
3.3.1	Audit Scope	60
3.3.2	Collection of Necessary Background Information	61
3.3.3	Identification and Characterization of Input Materials, Product and Waste Streams	62
3.3.4	Comprehensive Plant Analysis and Data Evaluation	67
3.4	MATERIAL RECOVERY - RECYCLING OF BRAKE LINING DUST	71
3.4.1	Preparation of Brake Lining Samples	71
3.4.2	Performance Testing	73
CHAPTER 4	SOLIDIFICATION/STABILIZATION (S/S) STUDIES	77
4.1	MATERIALS & METHODS	78
4.1.1	Collection of Samples	78
4.1.2	Materials	79
4.1.3	Preparation of Apparatus	81
4.1.4	Preparation of Sample Specimens for Cement-Based S/S	81
4.1.5	Preparation of Sample Specimens for Polymeric Encapsulation	83
4.2	LEACHING TESTS	85
4.2.1	Toxicity Characteristics Leaching Procedure (TCLP)	85
4.2.2	American Nuclear Society ANSI/ANS 16.1 (Modified)	86
4.3	PHYSICAL TEST	90
4.3.1	Hardening Time	90
4.3.2	Compressive Strength Test	91

4.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	93
4.4.1	TCLP results	93
4.4.2	Effects of Final pH of TCLP Extract on Metals Leaching	100
4.4.3	ANS 16.1 (Modified) Results	112
4.4.3	Physical Characteristics	140
4.5	COST EVALUATION	146
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION		148
5.1	WASTE AUDIT	148
5.2	MATERIAL RECOVERY	148
5.3	SOLIDIFICATION/STABILIZATION	149
5.3.1	TCLP Results	149
5.3.2	ANS 16.1 (Modified)	151
5.3.3	Physical Characteristics	153
5.4	CONCLUSION	154
5.5	SUGGESTIONS	155
REFERENCES		157
Appendix 1		170
Appendix 2		176

Acknowledgement

I wish to extend my greatest appreciation to my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. P. Agamuthu, co-supervisor Associate Professor Dr. Sen Gupta and the consultant, Professor R. Mahalingam from Washington State University, for their invaluable directions and consultations during the project and preparation of this dissertation.

I am very grateful to Ms. Jayanthi and Mr. Greg Simpson from Don Brake (M) Sdn. Bhd. For allowing me to conduct part of my project in the plant and collect samples from the plant. I would like to express my gratitude to all the staff who helped me when the project was carried out at the plant. Special thanks to Don Brake (Australia) Ltd. For conducting the performance tests on the brake lining samples.

To the staff of IPSP and Engineering Faculty, particularly, Encik Osman, Encik Jasmi and Encik Yusoff, thank you for assisting me during the course of the research.

Last, but not the least, I would like to thank all my family members, coursemates and friends, especially Tan Giok Hui, Md. Shameem Hasan, Looi Chee Choong and Jacob for their assistance, guidance and supports.

ABSTRACT

The brake lining device is designed to slow/to stop the movement of a mechanism or an automobile for our convenience and safety purposes. However, the use of asbestos as a major component in the brake lining manufacturing process, particularly the waste generated, posed high risk both to the environment and human health. This project is focused on waste audit and recycling possibility of the brake lining dust, as well as the laboratory studies on Solidification/Stabilization (S/S) disposal of brake lining dust.

Audit on manufacturing of brake lining showed that the grinding process contributed the highest percentage of weight loss (10.64 - 13.03%). Cutting the billet into smaller sizes contributed the biggest amount of brake lining dust, which was approximately 30%, followed by drilling (2.17 - 6.87%) and chamfering (0.49 - 1.07%).

The performance test on the brake lining samples made from brake lining dust indicated that the brake lining samples containing 10% recycled brake lining dust showed greater potential for recycling than the samples with 5% brake lining dust.

The Toxicity Characteristic Leachability Procedure (TCLP) results revealed that cement was able to immobilize the heavy metal BA, Zn, Pb, Cu and Fe. The percentage of leachable fraction of the heavy metals were in the range of 15.69 - 33.82%, except for BA (34.76 - 51.50%). Addition of activated carbon to cement reduced the leaching of heavy metals by 4 - 24%. Polymeric resins, Polymal and Hetron reduced the percentage of leachable fraction of the heavy metals to less than 15% and 16% respectively.

The final pH of TCLP extract for untreated dust, cement and cement with activated carbon treated samples increased drastically from 4.92 - 4.95 to 10.49 - 11.87, whereas only a slight increased in pH (5.98 - 5.19) was observed in the polymeric resins treated TCLP extract.

The results of ANS 16.1 (modified) revealed that Ba in cement treated samples showed the highest leaching rate, followed by Zn, Pb, Cr, Cu and Fe. The leaching rate of heavy metals slowed down as time progressed. The heavy metals in cement with activated carbon treated samples demonstrated similar leaching trend but at a lower leaching rate. In polymeric resins treated samples, the leaching of Zn, Ba and Pb only can be detected. The detected heavy metals demonstrated a lower leaching rate as compared to the cement-based treated samples.

The linear relationship obtained between cumulative fraction leached (CFL) and square root of leaching time in all cement-based and polymeric resin treated samples indicated that diffusional process is the main transport phenomenon for the leaching of heavy metals. The Leachability Indices, L_i , obtained (7.5 - 10.0) exceeded the guidance value of the leachability index of 6, clearly indicating that heavy metals were well retained in the solidified specimens. The L_i for polymeric resins treated samples were higher than the L_i obtained for cement-based treated samples.

The cement-based binder took 30 - 96 hours to harden, whereas hardening time was reduced to 1.5 - 12 hours for polymeric resins. Hardening time reduced as the amount of MEK initiator increased. Polymeric resin solidification presents greater compressive strength (53 - 68% Mpa) than the cement-based solidification (1 - 12 MPa) as the days progressed over 28 days.

Polymeric encapsulation was superior than the cement-based solidification in both heavy metals retention efficiency and compressive strength of the solid. Polymal showed better performance on heavy metals retention capability, whereas Hetron exhibits higher compressive strength.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Production volume of various friction materials in Don Brake (M) Sdn. Bhd.
Table 2.1	Major species in Serpentine and Amphibole family
Table 2.2	Summary of some commercially available proprietary S/S processes
Table 2.3	Summary of advantages and disadvantages of cementitious S/S
Table 2.4	Summary of advantages and disadvantages of polymeric encapsulation processes
Table 3.1	Status of availability of background information
Table 3.2	Summary of the waste type generated at each step
Table 3.3	Total weight loss per piece of brake lining
Table 3.4	Generation rate of brake lining dust for the years of 1996 and 1997
Table 3.5	Waste management cost and disposal cost for the years of 1996 and 1997
Table 3.6	Component of material in virgin mix (D381), Batch 1 (DX410) and Batch 2 (DX411)
Table 3.7	Results of SG test for virgin mix (D381), Batch 1 (DX410) and Batch 2 (DX411)
Table 3.8	Results of performance testing
Table 4.1	Standard guidance for solidified waste forms
Table 4.2	Typical chemical composition of the OPC used in this project
Table 4.3	Physical data for the two resins used in this project
Table 4.4	Test run conditions for cement-based solidification
Table 4.5	Test run conditions for polymeric encapsulation
Table 4.6	Grain size distribution of the brake lining dust

- Table 4.7 Summary of TCLP leaching data with initial extraction fluid pH and final pH of the extract
- Table 4.8 Heavy metals composition in OPC
- Table 4.9 Sample calculation of leaching rate for Zn, l (cm/day), in cement treated sample with cement:dust ratio of 60:40
- Table 4.10 Sample calculation of CFL for Zn in cement treated sample with cement:dust ratio of 60:40
- Table 4.11 Sample calculation of Diffusivity Coefficient and Leachability Index for Zn in cement treated samples with cement:dust ratio of 60:40 at each interval
- Table 4.12 Annual cost for (a) cementitious S/S and (b) polymeric resin encapsulation

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.1 Annual revenue for Don Brake (M) Sdn. Bhd.
- Figure 1.2 Flow chart for the manufacturing process of brake lining
- Figure 1.3 Flow diagram of Waste Minimization Program and Disposal Options
- Figure 2.1 General flow diagram of the manufacture of brake pads
- Figure 2.2 Various aspect of cost incurred from waste generation
- Figure 2.3 Various benefits accrued from the implementation of waste minimization program
- Figure 2.4 Approach of developing and implementing a waste minimization program
- Figure 2.5 Waste Minimization Techniques
- Figure 3.1 Manufacturing process of brake lining and the waste generated at each step
- Figure 3.2 Weight loss of brake lining at each step of the manufacturing process
- Figure 3.3 Simplified material balance for the brake lining production
- Figure 4.1(a) The percentage of leachable fraction of the heavy metals of concern in the leachate from cement treated samples
- Figure 4.1(b) The percentage of leachable fraction of the heavy metals of concern in the leachate from cement with activated carbon treated samples
- Figure 4.1(c) The percentage of leachable fraction of the heavy metals of concern in the leachate from Polymal treated samples
- Figure 4.1(d) The percentage of leachable fraction of the heavy metals of concern in the leachate from Hetron treated samples
- Figure 4.2 Solubilities of metal hydroxides as a function of pH
- Figure 4.3 The percentage of leachable fraction and the pH changes for the heavy metals of concern in the TCLP extract of cement treated samples

- Figure 4.4 The percentage of leachable fraction and the pH changes for the heavy metals of concern in the TCLP extract of cement with activated carbon treated samples
- Figure 4.5 The percentage of leachable fraction and the pH changes for the heavy metals of concern in the TCLP extract of Polymal treated samples
- Figure 4.6 The percentage of leachable fraction and the pH changes for the heavy metals of concern in the TCLP extract of Hetron treated samples
- Figure 4.7 Leaching rate of the heavy metals of concern in cement treated samples at cement:dust ratio of (a) 60:40, (b) 50:50, (c) 40:60 and (d) 30:70
- Figure 4.8 Leaching rate of the heavy metals of concern in cement with activated carbon treated samples at ac:cement:dust ratio of (a) 4:56:40, (b) 5:45:50, (c) 6:34:60 and (d) 7:23:70
- Figure 4.9 Leaching rate of the heavy metals of concern in Polymal treated samples at Polymal:Dust ratio of 60:40 with (a) 3% and 5% MEK initiator, 50:50 with (c) 3% and (d) 5% MEK initiator and (e) 45:55 with 5% MEK initiator
- Figure 4.10 Leaching rate of the heavy metals of concern in Hetron treated samples at Hetron:Dust ratio of 60:40 with (a) 3% and 5% MEK initiator, 50:50 with (c) 3% and (d) 5% MEK initiator and (e) 45:55 with 5% MEK initiator
- Figure 4.11 Cumulative fraction leached for the heavy metals of concern in cement treated samples at the cement:dust ratio of (a) 60:40, (b) 50:50, (c) 40:60 and (d) 30:70
- Figure 4.12 Cumulative fraction leached of the heavy metals of concern in cement with activated carbon treated samples at ac:cement:dust ratio of (a) 4:56:40, (b) 5:45:50, (c) 6:34:60 and (d) 7:23:70

- Figure 4.13 Cumulative fraction leached of the heavy metals of concern in Polymal treated samples at Polymal:dust ratio of 60:40 with (a) 3% and 5% MEK initiator, 50:50 with (c) 3% and (d) 5% MEK initiator and (e) 45:55 with 5% MEK initiator
- Figure 4.14 Cumulative fraction leached of the heavy metals of concern in Hetron treated samples at Hetron:dust ratio of 60:40 with (a) 3% and 5% MEK initiator, 50:50 with (c) 3% and (d) 5% MEK initiator and (e) 45:55 with 5% MEK initiator
- Figure 4.15 Leachability Index for the (a) cement and (b) cement with activated carbon treated samples
- Figure 4.16 Leachability Index for the (a) Polymal and (b) Hetron treated samples
- Figure 4.17 Hardening time of the four binding systems at different ratios
- Figure 4.18 Compressive strength of solids after 1, 7, 14 and 28 days of solidification of (a) cement, (b) cement with activated carbon, (c) Polymal and (d) Hetron treated samples

LIST OF PLATES

- Plate 3.1 Brake lining
- Plate 3.2 Brake lining dust collected from hopper
- Plate 4.1 Brake lining dust
- Plate 4.2 Solidified specimens used for ANS 16.1 (modified) leaching test
- Plate 4.3 Suspended sample specimen in beaker
- Plate 4.4 Solidified specimens for compressive strength test
- Plate 4.5 Hydraulic compressive strength apparatus (model ELE)