

**ASSESSMENT, DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF LOW-VOC
MATERIALS FOR CLEANING ULTRAVIOLET AND ELECTRON BEAM
CURABLE COATINGS AND ADHESIVES**

Prepared for:
South Coast Air Quality Management District
Under Contract # 03133

Prepared by:
Mike Morris and Katy Wolf
Institute for Research and Technical Assistance

May 2006

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as a result of work sponsored and paid for in whole by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD). The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of AQMD. AQMD, its officers, employees, contractors, and subcontractors make no warranty, expressed or implied, and assume no legal liability for the information in this report. AQMD has not approved or disapproved this report, nor has AQMD passed upon the accuracy or adequacy of the information contained herein.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This analysis benefited considerably from the efforts of many persons within and outside the Institute for Research and Technical Assistance (IRTA). We would particularly like to acknowledge the valuable contributions made by Adewale Oshinuga, Lou Yuhas, Rizaldy Calungcagin and Lee Lockie of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. We are especially grateful to the companies that agreed to test alternative cleaning agents for this project and to the vendors who provided the alternative cleaning agents for testing. Finally, we appreciate the efforts of Amy Blume of IRTA in helping to prepare the document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) regulates VOC emissions in four counties in Southern California. One of the SCAQMD regulations specifies VOC limits for materials used for cleaning coating and adhesive application equipment. The VOC limit for the materials used for these purposes is 25 grams per liter.

The Institute for Research and Technical Assistance (IRTA) is a nonprofit organization established in 1989 to assist companies and industries in finding alternatives to ozone depleting, toxic and VOC solvents. A major focus of IRTA's work is cleaning alternatives.

In this project, IRTA identified, tested and demonstrated alternative low-VOC materials and methods for cleaning ultraviolet (UV) and electron beam (EB) curable coating and adhesive application equipment. Four facilities participated in the project. The first facility, Sandberg Furniture, is a major wood furniture manufacturer. The company uses UV curable coatings in a flat wood coating operation. The second facility, Medtronic Diabetes, is a medical device manufacturer. Medtronic has several operations that use UV curable adhesives. The third facility, DRS Sensors & Targeting Systems, is an aerospace facility that uses a UV curable conformal coating for electronic devices. The fourth facility, Huhtamaki, applies an EB clear coating to consumer packaging.

The alternative methods and cleaning agents tested during the project included not cleaning at all, plain water, water-based cleaners, acetone and methyl acetate. Acetone and methyl acetate are exempt from VOC regulations. All of the facilities that participated in the project found alternatives that met the VOC limit of 25 grams per liter for cleaning coating and adhesive application equipment. Alternatives were judged to be effective if they cleaned at least as well as the VOC solvents used currently for cleanup.

Table E-1 summarizes the results of the low-VOC alternatives used or tested at each of the facilities that participated in the project. The table lists the facility, the type of cleaning operation and the low-VOC material that performed most effectively in the operation.

**Table E-1
Results of Low-VOC Alternatives Testing**

<u>Company</u>	<u>Cleaning Task</u>	<u>Low-VOC</u>
<u>Alternative</u>		
Sandberg Furniture	Routine Maintenance	No Cleaning
	Periodic Maintenance	Acetone
Medtronic Diabetes	CAM/TAM Adhesive Equipment	Acetone
	PATCH Equipment	Water-Based Cleaner
DRS Sensors & Targeting Systems	Conformal Coating Equipment	Methyl Acetate
Huhtamaki	Floor Cleaning	Water
	Clear Coating Station	Water-Based Cleaner

Note: CAM and TAM are automated medical device assembly machines.

The cost of using the alternative low-VOC materials for cleaning UV and EB curable coatings and adhesives from application equipment could not be determined for one of the facilities. For one participating facility, the cost of using the alternatives for cleanup would be lower than the cost of using the high VOC cleaner. For one facility, the cost would be higher and for one facility, the cost would be the same.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Disclaimer i

Acknowledgements ii

Executive Summary iii

Table of Contents v

List of Figures vi

List of Tables vii

I. Introduction and Background 1

 Tests of Alternative and Low-VOC Cleaners 1

 Cost Analysis 2

 Report Structure 2

II. Analysis of the Alternative Cleaning Agents 3

 Sandberg Furniture Mfg. Co., Inc. 3

 Medtronic Diabetes 5

 DRS Sensors & Targeting Systems, Inc. 6

 Huhtamaki 8

III. Summary and Conclusions 10

Appendix A

Material Safety Data Sheets for High VOC and Low-VOC Cleaners 12

Appendix B

UV Coating Used at DRS Sensors & Targeting Systems 44

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1: Flat Line at Sandburg Furniture	4
Figure 2-2: Press at Huhtamaki	8

LIST OF TABLES

Table E-1:	Results of Low-VOC Alternatives Testing.....	iii
Table 2-1:	Facilities Participating in the Project	3
Table 2-2:	Annualized Cost Comparison for Medtronic Diabetes.....	6
Table 2-3:	Annualized Cost Comparison for DRS Sensors & Targeting Systems.....	8
Table 2-4:	Annualized Cost Comparison for Huhtamaki.....	9
Table 3-1:	Results of Low-VOC Alternatives Testing.....	10

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) emissions from solvent cleaning operations contribute significantly to the South Coast Air Basin's emission inventory. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD or District) periodically adopts an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). This AQMP calls for significant reductions in VOC emissions from cleaning and degreasing operations by 2010 to achieve attainment status.

The SCAQMD regulates VOC emissions from businesses located in the four county area including Los Angeles County, Orange County, San Bernardino County and Riverside County. One of the District's rules that focuses on cleaning applications is Rule 1171 "Solvent Cleaning Operations." One of the categories of cleaning regulated in Rule 1171 is cleaning of coating and adhesive application equipment. On July 1, 2005, the VOC limit for this type of cleaning was reduced from 550 grams per liter VOC to 25 grams per liter VOC. This is one of the VOC limits adopted by the District to reduce VOC emissions from cleaning operations in the Basin.

The Institute for Research and Technical Assistance (IRTA) is a nonprofit organization established in 1989. IRTA works with companies to test and demonstrate alternatives to ozone depleting, VOC and toxic solvents. IRTA also conducts projects that focus on finding low-VOC, low toxicity alternatives for whole industries. IRTA runs and operates the Pollution Prevention Center, a loose affiliation of local, state and federal governmental organizations and a large electric utility company.

The District contacted with IRTA to identify, test and demonstrate low-VOC alternative materials for cleaning coating and adhesive application equipment. IRTA completed that project in 2003 and reported the results in a document entitled "Assessment, Development and Demonstration of Low-VOC Cleaning Systems for South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1171." The work on cleanup of coating and adhesive application equipment in that project focused only on traditional coatings and did not address cleanup of ultraviolet (UV) or electron beam (EB) cured coatings or adhesives. The District contracted with IRTA to conduct a separate project to identify, test and demonstrate low-VOC materials for specifically cleaning UV and EB curable coating and adhesive application equipment.

Tests of Alternative Low-VOC Cleaners

Performance of the alternative cleaning agents at each facility was evaluated on a case-by-case basis. In each instance, plant personnel provided information on their requirements for the cleaning process. In some cases, IRTA obtained a sample of the coating or adhesive that required cleaning. IRTA conducted laboratory testing to screen cleaners that might be appropriate for testing in the operation. IRTA then provided or took to the facility cleaners that might be effective and they were tested. In terms of performance, a cleaning alternative was judged as successful if it cleaned as well as or

better than the cleaning process the company uses currently. When there were differences in the cleaning process, these were noted.

The alternative low-VOC materials that were used by or tested in the participating facilities included not cleaning at all, plain water, water-based cleaners, methyl acetate and acetone. Acetone and methyl acetate are exempt from VOC regulations and the water-based cleaners that were tested have a VOC content of 25 grams per liter or less. The UV or EB curable coatings or adhesives that require removal from the application equipment were not cured so cleaning could be performed effectively with these techniques and materials.

Cost Analysis

IRTA performed cost analysis and comparison for the alternatives that were successful at the participating facilities. There were no capital equipment costs for the facilities and none of the facilities indicated there would be different labor costs with use of the alternatives. The cost analysis and comparison was generally based on the cleaner cost and the cleaning material costs. No cost comparison was performed for one of the facilities because there were no records of the cost of cleaning.

Report Structure

This document reports the results of a project to find alternative low-VOC cleanup materials for UV and EB curable coatings and adhesives. During the project, IRTA worked with four facilities that used UV or EB curable coatings or adhesives. Section II of this document presents the work that was performed on alternatives for each of the facilities participating in the project. In each case, it describes the process used by the facility, discusses what material is used for cleanup of the application equipment currently, presents the results of the alternative low-VOC material testing and analyzes and/or compares the cost of using the high and low-VOC cleanup materials. Section III of the document summarizes the conclusions and results of the project.

II. ANALYSIS OF THE ALTERNATIVE CLEANING AGENTS.

This section presents the results of the tests of the alternative low-VOC cleaning agents. It focuses on four facilities that agreed to participate in the project. Table 2-1 lists the four facilities and describes their UV or EB operation.

**Table 2-1
Facilities Participating in the Project**

<u>Company</u>	<u>Description of Operation</u>	<u>Type of Adhesive or Coating</u>
Sandberg Furniture	Wood Furniture Manufacture	UV Curable Coatings
Medtronic Diabetes	Medical Device Manufacture	UV Curable Adhesives
DRS Sensors and Targeting Systems, Inc.	Aerospace Facility	UV Curable Conformal Coating
Huhtamaki	Consumer Packaging	EB Curable Coating

Sandberg Furniture, a major wood furniture manufacturer in the Basin, has a flat line that uses UV curable coatings. Medtronic MiniMed is a leader in manufacturing implantable medical devices; the company has several operations that involve the use of UV curable adhesives. DRS, an aerospace facility, applies a UV curable conformal coating to electronic devices. Finally, Huhtamaki manufactures consumer packaging; the company applies an EB curable clear coating over the printed material.

The companies that participated in the project were selected to represent the range of the different types of facilities in the Basin using UV and EB curable inks or adhesives. All of the facilities produce high quality products. This section presents the detailed testing and cost analysis results for the four facilities. No cost analysis or comparison is provided for Sandberg Furniture.

Sandberg Furniture Mfg. Co., Inc.

Sandberg Furniture, one of California’s longest standing premier manufacturers of bedroom and entertainment furniture is located in Vernon, California. The company was founded in 1918 and is still owned and operated by the fourth generation of the Sandberg family. The company has 450 employees. Sandberg manufactures medium priced master bedroom furniture, youth bedroom furniture and entertainment wall systems.

The Sandberg property consists of four buildings totaling 300,000 square feet, on 14 acres. The company purchases particleboard and medium density fiberboard and does its own laminating and finishing. The finishes used by Sandberg are applied by spray and roll coating. The coatings are UV cured. The flat line was engineered to use 100 percent solid UV curable coatings; components are finished first and then assembled. A picture of the flat line is shown in Figure 2-1.



Figure 2-1. Flat Line at Sandberg Furniture

After adopting the UV curable coatings, Sandberg reduced their 1990 VOC emissions by 92 percent. According to Phil Sweet, Vice President of Manufacturing, “As far as we know, Sandberg was the first wood production facility in the Los Angeles Basin to implement water-based topcoats, in 1991. And the first woodworking facility to install a 100 percent solid, sprayable zero VOC, UV-cured finishing line, in 1995.”

Prior to 1996, when the company purchased eight new Accuspray paint spray guns, the first two sets caused many opportunities; cleanup involved the use of VOC solvents. Originally, the cleanup process included flushing the lines with solvent and taking the guns apart and immersing them in solvent. Once the Accuspray guns were installed, the cleanup routine was simplified to a daily inspection of the filters and a weekly wipedown of the spray guns and roll coaters. The conveyor belt has a built in scraper to recover all excess coating on an ongoing basis. Small amounts of exempt solvents are used during the routine cleanup process. Sandberg performs the higher level of cleaning, with exempt solvents, every few months. When solvent cleaning is required, the company uses a small amount of acetone. An MSDS for acetone is shown in Appendix A. There are no non-exempt VOC emissions from the cleanup process.

VOC emissions at the Sandberg facility this year will be less than five tons. Facility emissions were permitted at 219 tons in 1990.

Medtronic Diabetes

Medtronic Diabetes is a business unit of Medtronic, Inc., the world's largest medical technology company. Located in Northridge, California, Medtronic Diabetes is the world leader in insulin pump therapy and continuous glucose monitoring systems for the treatment of diabetes. Medtronic Diabetes has three types of operations that use UV curable adhesives.

IRTA began work with Medtronic Diabetes as part of a project sponsored by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The project was designed to investigate whether low-VOC cleanup materials could be used to clean ultraviolet and electron beam curable coatings and adhesives. IRTA worked with Ginger Lichauco, Medtronic's Director of Safety, Security and Environmental Compliance, to test low-VOC alternatives for cleanup of the application equipment used to apply the adhesives.

In the disposable packaging area, Medtronic Diabetes has several machines that are used to apply adhesive to the packaging material.

In another area, the PATCH machine is used to bond polycarbonate sensors to a patch. Medtronic Diabetes wanted to start a new program of regular maintenance using a low-VOC cleaner for the application equipment.

IRTA obtained a sample of the adhesive used in the PATCH machine to conduct preliminary testing of low-VOC cleaning agents. Several alternatives, including plain water, a water-based cleaner made by Mirachem and a soy based cleaner, were tested. The Mirachem cleaner appeared to work well in the preliminary testing at 100 percent concentration without leaving a residue. An MSDS for the Mirachem cleaner, called Mirachem 500, is shown in Appendix A. IRTA provided samples of the Mirachem cleaner to Medtronic Diabetes and the cleaner was tested on the adhesive residue. According to the engineers performing the testing, the cleaner worked well.

For the CAM and TAM machines, which are automated medical device assembly machines, IRTA provided the company with several suggestions for cleaning the adhesive from the application equipment. The cleaner that worked best for this operation was acetone. The company wanted to continue using polywipes in the cleaning operation and polywipes are supplied with both IPA and acetone. Medtronic Diabetes uses 5 cases of clean room wipes containing IPA for cleaning the CAM and TAM application equipment each year. Each case contains 12 rolls of 100 sheets. The cost of each case is \$235. On this basis, the annual cost of using the IPA wipes is \$1,175. The acetone wipes have the same price as the IPA wipes. Assuming the same amount of wipes would be used, the cost of the acetone wipes is \$1,175 annually.

For the PATCH machine, Medtronic Diabetes estimates it will use one gallon per month of the Mirachem to clean and maintain the system. The Mirachem will be used at a one-third concentration in water. At a cost of \$18 per gallon including freight for purchases in five gallon quantities, the cost of using the Mirachem would amount to \$216 per year.

No cost comparison with other cleaning materials was performed because the regular maintenance program has just been initiated.

Table 2-2 shows the cost comparison for the CAM and TAM equipment cleaning at Medtronic Diabetes. The values show that the cost is the same for using the low-VOC wipes containing acetone and the high VOC wipes containing IPA.

Table 2-2
Annualized Cost Comparison for Medtronic Diabetes

	IPA Wipes	Acetone Wipes
Cleaning Wipes Cost	\$1,175	\$1,175
Total Cost	\$1,175	\$1,175

DRS Sensors & Targeting Systems, Inc.

DRS is located in Cypress, California. The company develops and prototypes EO sensors and targeting systems. One of the operations at DRS involves applying a conformal coating to electronic assemblies. The company uses a spray gun to apply a UV curable conformal coating.

IRTA began work with DRS as part of a project sponsored by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The project was designed to investigate whether low-VOC cleanup materials could be used to clean ultraviolet and electron beam curable coatings and adhesives. IRTA worked with DRS to test low-VOC alternatives for cleanup of the spray gun used to apply the UV curable conformal coating.

DRS uses isopropyl alcohol (IPA) to clean the application equipment. An MSDS for IPA is shown in Appendix A. After the conformal coating is applied, the DRS engineer puts a small amount of IPA into the spray gun cup to remove the uncured UV coating residue from the spraying operation. The engineer swirls the IPA and turns the cup upside down to ensure the IPA reaches all parts of the cup. The engineer uses a wipe cloth to wipe out the sides and bottom of the cup. Finally, the engineer then adds some additional IPA to the spray gun cup and flushes the gun. The cup is inspected under a black light which will show whether there is a residue remaining.

IRTA obtained a sample of DRS's coating from the vendor. An MSDS for the coating is provided in Appendix B. IRTA conducted screening tests to determine which low-VOC alternatives might be suitable for removing the coating. The alternatives that were tested included plain water, acetone, methyl acetate, a water-based cleaner called Mirachem 500 and a vegetable based cleaner called Soy Gold 2500. MSDSs for these materials are shown in Appendix A. IRTA also tested IPA so the cleaning capability of the alternatives could be compared to it. The results of the screening tests indicated that plain water appeared to clean the coating well, the Mirachem 500 cleaned well but was likely to require a rinse, the soy cleaner left a significant residue, acetone did not work as well as IPA and methyl acetate worked better than IPA.

IRTA then conducted field tests at DRS with the engineer in charge of the operation, Ray Salud. The protocol involved testing the cleaner in the cup, swirling it and turning it upside down to get good coverage, wiping the cup, then adding more IPA and spraying the gun into a bucket. After the cup was cleaned, it was inspected under a black light.

The results of the testing indicated that deionized water left a residue before the sides of the cup were wiped. After the sides were wiped, the residue was substantially less but was still evident. The results also indicated that the Mirachem 500 appeared to leave some solid particles in the cup. Acetone did not clean the cup as well as IPA. Methyl acetate was the best cleaner and it cleaned the coating better than IPA. IRTA and the DRS engineer decided not to test the soy based product because it, like the Mirachem cleaner, was likely to leave a residue that would require rinsing which would be an additional step.

IRTA performed a cost analysis of using IPA and using the alternatives that performed most successfully, acetone and methyl acetate. The DRS engineer estimates that the company uses about one-half gallon of IPA annually to clean the coating application equipment. IRTA assumed that the use of acetone or methyl acetate for this purpose would be the same. The company would only purchase one gallon of cleaner at a time, probably from a specialty lab. IRTA obtained costs for the three materials if purchased in one gallon amounts. The price of acetone is the lowest, at \$11.30 per gallon. The price of IPA is \$16 per gallon and the price of methyl acetate is \$35 per gallon. IRTA also obtained prices for the materials from a local chemical supplier that offers all three chemicals. Because the chemicals would be purchased in small one gallon quantities, he indicated he would charge \$50 per gallon for all three chemicals because of the handling.

The used IPA from the cleanup operation is shipped off-site as hazardous waste. The acetone and the methyl acetate would need to be handled in the same manner. Acetone and methyl acetate are much more volatile than IPA so emissions could be higher if they were used in the operation. This means that the waste volume of the two low-VOC alternatives might be lower. For purposes of analysis, IRTA assumed that the waste volume and cost of waste disposal would be the same for all three chemicals. The waste disposal cost, accordingly, was not included in the analysis.

Table 2-3 presents the annualized cost comparison for the cleanup solvents for DRS assuming the company would purchase the IPA, acetone or methyl acetate from a laboratory. The values indicate that using acetone is the lowest cost option and that using methyl acetate would more than double the cost of using the IPA baseline chemical. If the materials were purchased from the local chemical supplier, the materials would be more expensive but they would all carry an equal cost.

**Table 2-3
Annualized Cost Comparison for DRS Sensors & Targeting Systems**

	IPA	Acetone	Methyl Acetate
Cleaner Cost	\$8.00	\$5.65	\$17.50
Total Cost	\$8.00	\$5.65	\$17.50

Huhtamaki

Huhtamaki is located in Los Angeles, California. The company is international and the business entity in Los Angeles makes consumer packaging, primarily for ice cream cartons. Huhtamaki has an eight stage web press with seven color stations and a clear coating station. A picture of the press is shown in Figure 2-2. Huhtamaki is one of the few companies in the U.S. that uses an electron beam curable ink and an electron beam curable coating for the clear coat.



Figure 2-2. Press at Huhtamaki

IRTA began work with Huhtamaki as part of a project sponsored by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The project was designed to investigate whether low-VOC cleanup materials could be used to clean ultraviolet and electron beam curable coatings and adhesives. IRTA worked with Huhtamaki to test low-VOC alternatives on the clear coating station.

Historically, Huhtamaki used two 55 gallon drums per month of a VOC solvent called EB Wash for cleaning. An MSDS for this cleaner is shown in Appendix A. Half of the EB Wash, one drum per month or 660 gallons per year, was used for off-press cleaning and half was used for on-press cleaning as a blanket wash, a roller wash and a coating cleanup material. Huhtamaki estimates that about 93 gallons are used on-press for

cleaning the ink on each printing station annually and about one-tenth as much, or nine gallons per year, was used to clean the coating station annually. Of the nine gallons, one-half gallon was used to clean coating residue on the floor.

The alternative that was most effective in cleaning the coating is a water-based cleaner called Brulin GD 815 MX. An MSDS for this cleaner is shown in Appendix A. Through testing, it was found that plain water was effective in cleaning the coating residue on the floor. Several different concentrations of the Brulin cleaner were tested for cleaning the coating station and a concentration of 50 percent Brulin/50 percent water was found to be as effective as the EB solvent in cleaning the coating. Huhtamaki has converted to the Brulin cleaner for cleaning the coating station and plain water for cleaning the coating residue on the floor.

The cost of the EB Wash solvent is \$9.09 per gallon. Assuming that nine gallons of the solvent was used for coating cleanup, the annual cost of the solvent for this purpose amounted to \$82. The cost of the Brulin water-based cleaner is \$5.75 per gallon. Assuming that 8.5 gallons of the cleaner are used for cleaning the coating station and that a 50 percent concentration of the cleaner is required, the annual cost of the water-based cleaner amounts to \$24. The cost of the plain water for floor cleaning was assumed to be zero.

Table 2-4 shows the annualized cost comparison for Huhtamaki. The values indicate that the cost for cleanup with the water-based cleaner is significantly lower than the cost of cleaning with the high VOC solvent.

**Table 2-4
Annualized Cost Comparison for Huhtamaki**

	EB Wash Solvent	Water-Based Cleaner/ Water
Cleaner Cost	\$82	\$24
Total Cost	\$82	\$24

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

During this project, IRTA worked with four facilities in the South Coast Basin to document the use of and test alternative low-VOC materials for cleaning UV and EB curable coating and adhesive application equipment. The alternatives used or tested successfully by the facilities had a VOC content of 25 grams per liter or less. This is the current limit for materials used for cleaning coating and adhesive application equipment in SCAQMD Rule 1171.

Sandberg Furniture put in a UV coating flat line several years ago. Since then, the company does not need to use VOC solvents to clean the application equipment. Sandberg now does not clean routinely and, when periodic cleaning is required, uses acetone. Acetone is exempt from VOC regulations.

Medtronic Diabetes uses UV curable adhesives in several of their operations. The company has decided to use acetone premoistened wipes for cleaning the application equipment in some of the operations. The cost of converting to acetone for cleaning would be the same as the cost of using IPA. In another operation, the company plans to use a water-based cleaner for routinely cleaning the application equipment.

DRS Sensors & Targeting Systems historically used IPA for cleaning the application equipment used to apply UV curable conformal coatings to electronic devices. The testing indicated that the best alternative for this cleaning task is methyl acetate which performed better than IPA. The cost of converting to methyl acetate would increase DRS's cost of cleaning.

Huhtamaki applies a clear EB curable coating over ice cream carton packaging that is printed using a lithographic printing press. Plain water was found to be effective for cleaning the coating residue from the floor. A water-based cleaner was found to perform well for cleaning the coating application equipment station on the press. The cost of using the low-VOC alternatives would reduce Huhtamaki's cleaning cost.

Table 3-1 presents the facilities and the alternatives that worked most effectively for their operations.

**Table 3-1
Results of Low-VOC Alternatives Testing**

<u>Company</u>	<u>Cleaning Task</u>	<u>Low-VOC</u>
<u>Alternative</u>		
Sandberg Furniture	Routine Maintenance	No Cleaning
	Periodic Maintenance	Acetone
Medtronic Diabetes	CAM/TAM Adhesive Equipment	Acetone
	PATCH Equipment	Water-Based Cleaner
DRS Sensors & Targeting Systems	Conformal Coating Equipment	Methyl Acetate
Huhtamaki	Floor Cleaning	Water
	Clear Coating Station	Water-Based Cleaner

Note: CAM and TAM are automated medical device assembly machines.

The results of the project indicate that low-VOC alternatives can be used by facilities that employ UV and EB curable coatings in their operations. Alternatives that were tested successfully in the project include not cleaning at all, plain water, water-based cleaners, acetone and methyl acetate.

