





Conf-9208150-7

Cleaning Solvent Substitution in Electronic Assemblies

Kansas City Division

Gerald J. Meier

KCP-613-5279

Published September 1993

Prepared Under Contract Number DE-AC04-76-DP00613 for the
United States Department of Energy



DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Printed in the United States of America.

This report has been reproduced from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P. O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831; prices available from (615) 576-8401, FTS 626-8401.

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service, U. S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, Virginia 22161.

A prime contractor with the United States
Department of Energy under Contract Number
DE-AC04-76-DP00613.

AlliedSignal Inc.
Kansas City Division
P.O. Box 419159
Kansas City, Missouri
64141-6159

KCP-613-5279
Distribution Category UC-704

CLEANING SOLVENT SUBSTITUTION IN ELECTRONIC ASSEMBLIES

Gerald J. Meier

Published September 1993

Paper submitted to Second International Congress on Environmentally Conscious
Manufacturing
August 29 - September 1
Arlington, Virginia

Technical Communications
Kansas City Division

MASTER

 **AlliedSignal**
AEROSPACE

REPRODUCTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLAWFUL

102

CLEANING SOLVENT SUBSTITUTION IN ELECTRONIC ASSEMBLIES

Gerald J. Meier, Senior Engineer
AlliedSignal Inc.
Kansas City Division*
P.O. Box 419159 D/343 MY40
Kansas City, Missouri 64141-6195

ABSTRACT

Alternatives to chlorinated and fluorinated solvents have been identified, qualified, and implemented into production of complex electronic assemblies. Extensive compatibility studies were performed with components, piece-parts, and materials. Electrical testing and accelerated aging were used to screen for detrimental, long-term effects. A terpene, *d*-limonene, has been selected as the solvent of choice for cleaning complex electronic assemblies, and has been found to be compatible with the components and materials tested. A brief history of the overall project will be presented, along with representative cleaning efficiency results, compatibility results, and residual solvent data.

1. INTRODUCTION.

For many years, complex electronic assemblies have been successfully cleaned with trichloroethylene (TCE), rinsed with isopropyl alcohol (IPA), and dried with trichlorotrifluoroethane (FREON). Spray cleaning by hand and vacuum baking have been used in production at the Kansas City Division for over twenty years, and are the preferred methods for cleaning and drying electronic assemblies. This cleaning process has been extremely effective in removing the intentional surface contaminants (solder fluxes and mold releases) and any unintentional contaminants (silicones, greases, lotions, and oils) from electronic assemblies prior to encapsulation.

However, a variety of environmental, safety, and health concerns exist over use of these chlorinated and fluorinated solvents. Sandia National Laboratories, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories, and the Kansas City Division of AlliedSignal combined efforts to find alternative cleaning solvents and processes which are effective, environmentally safe, and compliant with local, state, and federal regulations. Work was performed to identify, qualify, and implement the alternatives to the chlorinated and fluorinated cleaning solvents. *d*-Limonene, a terpene, has been selected as the solvent of choice to replace TCE and FREON in electronic assembly cleaning.

* Operated for the U.S. Department of Energy under contract number DE-AC04-76-DP00613.

© Copyright 1993, AlliedSignal Inc.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.

In January 1989, the future availability of halogenated cleaning solvents was in jeopardy. There was growing concern over the environmental impacts of FREON usage and an increased awareness of TCE toxicity. New development programs were reluctant to select baseline cleaning processes because of the uncertainty of halogenated solvents. The search for alternative cleaning solvents began at the Kansas City Division, and was primarily driven by draft requirements to reduce and eliminate use of chlorofluorocarbons (CFC's) and chlorinated hydrocarbons (CHC's) in traditional cleaning processes. Since then, increasing numbers of regulations have been issued by federal, state, and local regulatory agencies to ban, or to place more stringent controls on the production, use, and disposal of these halogenated solvents. In addition, company policy also dictated that usage of CFC and CHC materials at the Kansas City Division be eliminated. A new development project, consisting of a final unit with twelve subassemblies, was selected as the pilot project. Solvent selection and evaluation plans were implemented, and within two years, a new solvent was incorporated into the manufacturing processes. Now all new development projects at the Kansas City Division are using environmentally safe cleaning solvents in the production of complex electronic assemblies.

3. CLEANING EVALUATIONS.

Seven different cleaning solvents and processes (two aqueous, three terpenes, a hydrocarbon, and an alcohol) were evaluated. They are listed below:

- 1) An aqueous mixture of ethanol amines (5% solution in deionized water), rinsed with deionized water and then isopropyl alcohol.
- 2) An aqueous solvent based on n,n-dimethylacetamide, rinsed with deionized water and then isopropyl alcohol.
- 3) A terpene (*d*-limonene) with emulsifiers, rinsed with deionized water and then isopropyl alcohol.
- 4) A terpene (*d*-limonene) with phase separation agents, rinsed with isopropyl alcohol only.
- 5) *d*-Limonene (Food Grade--97% pure), rinsed with isopropyl alcohol only.
- 6) A hydrocarbon solvent based on octadecyl acetate, rinsed with isopropyl alcohol only.
- 7) Isopropyl alcohol (solvent and rinse).

Four "must" requirements were defined for the solvents:

- not compromise quality or reliability,
- not require a design change,
- be acceptable to the Environmental, Safety, and Health Departments, and
- have cleaning comparable to TCE.

Only after meeting these four must requirements would the new solvents be judged against other requirements, including:

- compatibility,
- corrosion-resistance,
- cleaning effectiveness,
- environmental, safety, and health conformance,
- manufacturing efficiency, and
- low implementation and operating costs.

A solvent evaluation matrix was defined to screen each solvent. The matrix contained four general categories:

- 1) Cleaning Evaluations, consisting of solvent cleaning, ionic contamination testing, organic contamination testing, AES/XPS surface analysis, and process development;
- 2) Solvent Analysis, consisting of composition, removal, and residuals;
- 3) Material Compatibility, consisting of screening tests, individual evaluations, and physical properties; and
- 4) Hardware Evaluations, consisting of accelerated aging and electrical performance testing.

There were three categories of contaminants that each replacement solvent had to remove from various substrates. The categories were: solder flux, mold release, and general contaminants consisting of resins, curing agents, cover coats, waxes, greases, oils, lubricants, plasticizers, and other contaminants found in a typical manufacturing environment. Other solvent evaluation methods used to screen the candidate cleaners were adhesion strength testing, high voltage testing, corrosion testing, and the thermal characteristics of each solvent.

For solder flux and mold release removal, the hydrocarbon solvent and the three terpenes were comparable to TCE. For removing the general contaminants, only the hydrocarbon solvent and the terpene containing emulsifiers were comparable to TCE for all of the general contaminants. *d*-Limonene and the terpene containing phase separation agents were able to remove all of the general contaminants, but more time and solvent were necessary. Generally speaking, *d*-limonene was not quite as effective as the terpene containing phase separation agents, which was not quite as effective as the terpene containing emulsifiers.

Test results from adhesion strength testing, high voltage testing, and corrosion testing agreed with the solvent cleaning results mentioned above: the hydrocarbon solvent and the terpene containing emulsifiers are comparable to TCE; *d*-limonene was not as effective as the terpene containing phase separation agent, which was not as effective as the terpene containing emulsifiers. However, *d*-limonene had the best thermal characteristics of the three terpenes.

4. SOLVENT SELECTION.

The hydrocarbon solvent and the terpene containing emulsifiers were chosen for further evaluation. However, the terpene containing emulsifiers was used with only an isopropyl alcohol rinse, to make its cleaning process similar to the hydrocarbon solvent's, and to avoid anticipated compatibility problems from cleaning with water. Both solvents were eventually eliminated, though, because solvent residue from either solvent could not be removed from the actual assemblies with the isopropyl alcohol rinse. Next the terpene containing phase separation agents was evaluated. It did not require any deionized water rinse, which eliminated the compatibility concerns from using water. Once again, the isopropyl alcohol rinse could not remove the residual solvent.

During the cleaning evaluations, two extreme formulations of the terpenes were detected. While most of the formulations contained 90% *d*-limonene, one formulation contained nearly 100% *d*-limonene. The key discovery was not finding the two extreme formulations but in the observed cleaning results. There were no differences in the cleaning efficiencies of the two extreme formulations. The presence of the additives (which remained on the assemblies after the cleaning process) did not affect the cleaning ability of the *d*-limonene. When this was determined, the terpenes were replaced with food grade *d*-limonene (97% pure). The existing cleaning processes had little difficulty removing the residual *d*-limonene, and since the additives were no longer present, the amount of residual solvent remaining in each assembly was substantially decreased.

5. COMPATIBILITY EVALUATIONS.

Compatibility studies involving accelerated aging, functional testing, solvent absorption, and residual solvent removal were performed on all of the components, piece-parts, and materials in the assemblies. The materials were divided into two categories: organic and inorganic. The inorganic materials compatibility testing consisted of corrosion studies on copper and solder dipped copper. The organic materials were further divided into adhesives, encapsulation foams, and a general category consisting of polyurethanes, acrylics, polycarbonates, silicones, polyolefins, epoxies, solder masks, cables, inks, and others.

No adverse affects were observed in the inorganic material corrosion studies or in the organic material encapsulation foam studies. As for the remaining organic materials, only one known material was determined to be completely incompatible with *d*-limonene: polystyrene. Other organic materials that are known to absorb *d*-limonene are: polyurethane elastomers, polyolefin sleeves, some nylon tie wraps, acrylics, silicones, and rubbers (EPDM). Note that these conclusions were based upon worst-case *d*-limonene exposure testing--soaking and/or saturated vapor. Vacuum baking processes are effective in minimizing actual amounts of absorbed solvent in these materials. All other organic materials, and all of the components and piece-parts tested were judged to be compatible with *d*-limonene.

Ten complete sets of modules and five complete final units were built for the accelerated aging testing. The units were separated into three groups of five. Within each group, one set was cleaned with TCE and aged in a nitrogen environment, while four sets were cleaned with *d*-limonene and aged in a saturated *d*-limonene environment. Each unit completed 99 thermal cycles from -54 to 71°C (-65 to 160°F) and six months of isothermal aging at 71°C (160°F). After the accelerated aging testing was complete, all ten module sets and all five final units were judged to be compatible with *d*-limonene.

6. RESIDUAL SOLVENT ANALYSIS.

A gas analysis technique was developed and optimized to quantitatively determine the amount of *d*-limonene remaining in a final unit. The *d*-limonene concentrations were measured as a function of time. Aging canisters containing units cleaned with *d*-limonene were evacuated through a liquid nitrogen cold trap. The trap was washed with methylene chloride, and the wash solution was analyzed using gas chromatography (flame ionization detection). Known quantities of *d*-limonene were used to characterize and optimize the process. After six generations of improvement, recovery efficiencies from 92% (for a 50 mg sample) to 99.5% (for a 2000 mg sample) were achieved. Three *d*-limonene units were tested three repetitive times using this gas analysis process (one unencapsulated unit, one encapsulated unit, and one alternate encapsulated unit). Test results concluded that negligible amounts of *d*-limonene were detected in these assemblies. The results are tabulated below.

	<u>Sample 1</u>	<u>Sample 2</u>	<u>Sample 3</u>
Unencapsulated Unit:	1.26 mg	1.70 mg	1.08 mg
Encapsulated Unit:	2.75 mg	0.31 mg	< .01 mg
Alternate			
Encapsulated Unit:	< .01 mg	< .01 mg	< .01 mg

7. CONCLUSIONS

Halogenated cleaning solvents used to clean complex electronic assemblies have been replaced with *d*-limonene, an environmentally safe, terpene cleaning solvent. This enhances the hazard elimination efforts at the Kansas City Division by following company policy to eliminate CFC and CHC usage, and complies with environmental regulations by eliminating the emission of CFC's (known ozone depleters) and the exposure to CHC's (suspect carcinogens).

All materials tested in this evaluation were judged to be compatible with *d*-limonene under routine, everyday operating conditions. Through accelerated aging testing, the long-term compatibility of the modules and final assemblies *d*-limonene was verified. Functional testing of complex electronic assemblies was completed. No electrical failures were caused by the use of *d*-limonene. New analytical techniques were developed and used to measure and quantify residual solvent levels in the assemblies. Only trace amounts were detected in each of three consecutive tests.

DATE
FILMED

12/27/93

END

