



Hazardous waste generation in Turkish pesticide industry

Fatos Germirli Babuna^{a,*}, Ismail Toroz^a, Edip Avsar^b, Ulku Yetis^c

^aEnvironmental Engineering Department, Istanbul Technical University, Maslak, Istanbul 34469, Turkey, Tel. +90 212 2856549; Fax: +90 212 2856587; emails: germirliba@itu.edu.tr (F. Germirli Babuna), toroz@itu.edu.tr (I. Toroz)

^bEngineering and Architecture Faculty, Environmental Engineering Department, Bitlis Eren University, Bitlis 13000, Turkey, email: edipavsar@hotmail.com

^cEnvironmental Engineering Department, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey, email: uyetis@metu.edu.tr

Received 18 December 2015; Accepted 2 February 2016

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to assess the contribution of pesticide industry to the total amount of hazardous waste generation in Turkey. Pesticide active ingredients, namely methamidophos, humic acid, copper sulphate production facilities and powder, granule and liquid pesticide formulation plants were covered. For pesticide synthesis sector values ranging from 7 to 56 kg of hazardous waste generation per ton of active ingredient produced were obtained. On the other hand, 45–80 kg of hazardous waste generation per ton production was found for pesticide formulation. The evaluation of the unit hazardous waste generation factors with the capacities of Turkish pesticide plants showed that 27,200–42,800 ton hazardous waste was produced annually from this sector. This amount yielded 2–3.2% of the total hazardous waste generation in Turkey.

Keywords: Hazardous waste; Industry; Pesticide; Active ingredients; Formulation; Methamidophos; Humic acid; Copper sulphate

1. Introduction

Since the wastes generated during the production of pesticides can be characterized as toxic and/or carcinogenic and/or bioaccumulative and/or refractory for treatment, this industry falls into the category of sectors which have a high potential to harm the environment [1–10]. On a global basis, around 500 compounds are inscribed as either pesticides or their metabolites [11]. When discharged in nature pesticides may undergo various transformations. Although their

fate and transport depends on their chemical structure as well as the environmental conditions of the site they released, necessary precautions must be taken to protect the environmental quality from their detrimental impacts. The wastes arising from both pesticide synthesis and formulation plants can peregrinate long distances with atmospheric movements, groundwater flow, etc. [12,13]. There are research activities dealing with the degradation of pesticides by various methods such as ozonation, photolysis, adsorption, biotreatment and their combinations [2,4,6,8,11,14–17]. However, degradation by-products can sometimes observed to be more hazardous than the parent pesticide [11].

*Corresponding author.

Presented at CEST2015 — 14th International Conference on Environmental Science and Technology, Rhodes, Greece, 3–5 September 2015

Substance recovery from segregated process waste streams is stated to be a promising future solution to waste problem in pesticide industry [10].

Within all the wastes generated from pesticide production industries, the most significant part in terms of negative impacts on the environment is quoted as the hazardous wastes. Knowing the amount of hazardous waste production for an industrial sector is of crucial importance in prescribing the in-plant control measures, treatment requirements and managing the disposal alternatives. Since the amount of hazardous waste generation per product depends on the production methods applied, a case-specific approach gathering the local discrepancies is required. Apart from few studies [18,19], in general reliable data on unit hazardous waste generation originating from pesticide industry are not available. One hundred and eighty kilograms of TOC/batch mother liquor are reported to be produced during pesticide manufacturing [20,21] (EU, 2006; IFC, 2007). Besides, 200 kg of waste generation per ton of active ingredient production and 3–4 kg of waste production per ton of formulation are stated in literature [20–22]. In another study, 208 kg waste generation per ton pesticide is reported [23]. The mentioned figures are not developed by separately quoting the hazardous wastes and they might cover solid wastes. Since the hazardous wastes can be solid or liquid in nature, it is important to differentiate it from other types of non-hazardous wastes, i.e. solid wastes and wastewaters.

Turkey is among the top 10 higher pesticide using countries in the world [24]. According to 2010 data, annually 60,792.4 ton pesticide is consumed on the total agricultural area of 390,120 km² in Turkey [24]. Although all the pesticide applied on land area are not manufactured in Turkey, there exist factories with different sizes producing pesticide active ingredients and formulation.

In this context, the objective of this study is to develop unit hazardous waste generation for Turkish pesticide manufacturing industry. In order to fulfil this aim, the production of methamidophos, humic acid, copper sulphate together with liquid, granule and powder pesticide formulations are evaluated. Using the obtained unit hazardous waste generation factors and the production capacities, the annual amount of hazardous waste production for Turkish pesticide industry is brought to light.

2. Adopted methodology

Hazardous waste list put forth by Commission Decision on Hazardous Wastes [25], is used as a base

format to determine the average unit hazardous waste generation factors expressed as “kg hazardous waste per ton product”. Table 1 tabulates the mentioned hazardous waste list defined for pesticide production [25].

The following information on Turkish pesticide manufacturing plants:

- (1) Production capacities related to different pesticide synthesis (i.e. glyphosate, trifluralin, copper sulphate and methamidophos).
- (2) Production capacities related to pesticide formulation (liquid, granule, powder).
- (3) The most commonly applied production technologies are gathered.

Pesticides with the highest production levels and the most commonly used production technologies are defined and further studies are concentrated on them. As a parallel task, a detailed investigation is carried out to enlighten the applied technologies and processes, raw material and auxiliary inputs, waste generating parts of the production processes, quantity and quality of wastes on a representative manufacturing plant. During the entire research, the opinion of a production expert (who is in the sector for more than 30 years) is used as an important tool.

The Ministry of Environment and Urban Planning collects data on the amount of hazardous waste generation arising from industrial installations on an annual basis. The declarations of the pesticide manufacturing plants (that are obtained from The Ministry of Environment and Urban Planning) and the findings of the field study are evaluated together with the help of expert opinion and the obtained results are given as average unit hazardous waste generation.

3. Results and discussion

Table 2 presents the unit hazardous waste generation figures for pesticide formulation. As can be seen from Table 2, between 45 and 80 kg of hazardous waste generation per ton of pesticide formulation is obtained.

Unit hazardous waste generation figures for the manufacturing of pesticide active ingredients are tabulated in Table 3. This table gathers the results attained in this study and the literature data. Except for acephate, all the figures are in accordance with each other. The high level of unit hazardous waste generation (200 kg hazardous waste/ton acephate) given by [19], can be attributed to the fact that this literature data considers most of the solid waste as hazardous waste.

According to the figures given in Table 3, values ranging from 10 to 56 kg of hazardous waste generation per ton of pesticide synthesis are observed.

It should be noted that the obtained unit hazardous waste generation figures corresponds to the most commonly applied production technologies in Turkey. As an example, the most frequently applied methamidophos production route is illustrated in Fig. 1 and that of tetramethrin, acephate and glyphosate are shown in Fig. 2. The unit hazardous waste generation figures presented in this study are developed for the mentioned production flowcharts.

Generation of hazardous wastes can be minimized by improving the process design and applying automation to maximize the incorporation of all the inputs into the final product; insulating the equipment to prevent leakages; reusing solvents as much as possible; scheduling the production into groups to minimize the cleaning requirements; using gravity

flow in lieu of pumps that may cause seepages; introducing liquids to a tank from the bottom to avoid spills and diminish splashes [20,21]. The application of the mentioned in-plant control measures is stated to reduce hazardous waste generation of certain sources by 10–15% [18].

By complying the data shown in Tables 2 and 3 with the data on realized pesticide production obtained from state agencies [26,27], the amount of annual hazardous waste generation originating from pesticide production is calculated as given in Table 4.

The total amount of hazardous waste generated by Turkish pesticide industry is in the range of 27,200–42,800 tons per year. On the other hand, the total amount of all hazardous wastes in Turkey is stated to be 1,350,000 tons per year [28]. Therefore, the contribution of pesticide sector to the total hazardous wastes is around 2–3.2%.

Table 1
Hazardous waste codes and related waste definition for pesticide manufacturing [25]

Waste code	Waste definition
07	Wastes from organic chemical processes
07 04	Wastes from the manufacture, formulation, supply and use (MFSU) of organic plant protection products, wood preserving agents and other biocides
07 04 01	Aqueous washing liquids and mother liquors
07 04 03	Organic halogenated solvents, washing liquids and mother liquors
07 04 04	Other organic solvents, washing liquids and mother liquors
07 04 07	Halogenated still bottoms and reaction residues
07 04 08	Other still bottoms and reaction residues
07 04 09	Halogenated filter cakes and spent absorbents
07 04 10	Other filter cakes and spent absorbents
07 04 11	Sludges from on-site effluent treatment containing dangerous substances
07 04 13	Solid wastes containing dangerous substances

Table 2
Unit hazardous waste generation figures for pesticide formulation

Waste code	Liquid pesticide formulation (kg hazardous waste/ton product)	Powder/granule pesticide formulation (kg hazardous waste/ton product)
07 04 01	30–40	30–40
07 04 03	5–10	3–5
07 04 04	10–20	5–10
07 04 09		1
07 04 10		1
07 04 11	4–6	4–6
07 04 13	1–4	1–4
Total	50–80	45–67

Table 3

Unit hazardous waste generation figures for the manufacturing of pesticide active ingredients (kg hazardous waste/ton product)

Name of the pesticide-active ingredient	Waste code									Total
	07 04 01	07 04 03	07 04 04	07 04 07	07 04 08	07 04 09	07 04 10	07 04 11	07 04 13	
2,4 D acid	20–30 ^a	5 ^a		5–10 ^a		1 ^a		3–5 ^a	1 ^a	35–56 ^a
Acephate	5–10 ^a		3–5 ^a		1 ^a		1 ^a	0.5 ^a	0.5 ^a	11–18 ^a 200 ^b
Tetramethrin	5–10 ^a		3–5 ^a		1 ^a		1 ^a	0.5 ^a	0.5 ^a	11–18 ^a
2,4 D isooctyl ester	5–10 ^a	2–4 ^a	1 ^a					1 ^a	1 ^a	10–17 ^a
Propanil (liquid)	10–20 ^a	3–5 ^a		1–3 ^a		0.5 ^a		3–5 ^a	0.5 ^a	18–34 ^a
Propanil (solid)	10–20 ^a	3–5 ^a		10 ^a		0.5 ^a		3–5 ^a	0.5 ^a	27–41 ^a
Glyphosate	5–10 ^a		3–5 ^a		1 ^a			1 ^a	10 ^a	20–27 ^a
Fenvalerate	10–20 ^a		5 ^a					1 ^a	1 ^a	17–27 ^a 20.4 ^b
Cypermethrin	10–20 ^a		5 ^a					1 ^a	1 ^a	17–27 ^a 31.9 ^b
Alfa cypermethrin	10–20 ^a		5 ^a				1 ^a	1 ^a	1 ^a	18–28 ^a
Trifuralin	15–30 ^a	5–8 ^a		10 ^a		0.5 ^a		3–5 ^a	0.5 ^a	34–54 ^a
Copper sulphate	5–10 ^c							1 ^c	1 ^c	7–12 ^c
Humic acid	5–10 ^c							1 ^c	1 ^c	7–12 ^c
Methamidophos	10–20 ^c		5 ^c					1 ^c	1 ^c	17–27 ^c

Notes: Waste codes 07 04 01: aqueous washing liquids and mother liquors, 07 04 03: organic halogenated solvents, washing liquids and mother liquors, 07 04 04: other organic solvents, washing liquids and mother liquids, 07 04 07: halogenated still bottoms and reaction residues, 07 04 08: other still bottoms and reaction residues, 07 04 09: halogenated filter cakes and spent absorbents, 07 04 10: other filter cakes and spent absorbents, 07 04 11: sludges from on-site effluent treatment containing dangerous substances, 07 04 13: solid wastes containing dangerous substances.

^aRef. [18].

^bRef. [19].

^cThis study.




Fig. 1. Methamidophos production flowchart.




Fig. 2. Tetramethrin, acephate and glyphosate production flowchart [18].

Table 4

The amount of annual hazardous waste generation in Turkish pesticide industry

Waste code	Amount of hazardous waste (ton/year)	
	Minimum	Maximum
07 04 01	16,696	22,409
07 04 03	2,513	4,854
07 04 04	4,757	9,499
07 04 07	73	111
07 04 08		055
07 04 09		155
07 04 10		149
07 04 11	2,240	3,357
07 04 13	572	2,218
Total	27,156	42,753

4. Conclusions

Three pesticide-active ingredients manufacturing (methamidophos, humic acid, copper sulphate) and powder, granule and liquid pesticide formulation industries in Turkey are investigated in terms of their hazardous waste generation. Values ranging from 7 to 56 kg of hazardous waste generation per ton of active ingredient produced are obtained for pesticide synthesis sector. About 45 to 80 kg of hazardous waste generation per ton of formulation is attained. With the aid of proper in-plant control measures applied during the manufacturing stage, it is possible to reduce the amount of hazardous waste generation by 10–15%. The evaluation of the unit hazardous waste generation factors and the realized pesticide production levels showed that 27,200–42,800 ton hazardous waste is produced annually by Turkish pesticide sector. Thus, it can be concluded that the contribution of pesticide production to the total hazardous waste generation in Turkey is 2–3.2%.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Mr Adil Kaya for sharing his valuable knowledge on pesticide production. This study was supported by the Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey within the scope of KAMAG 107G126 Project.

References

- [1] G.V. Maele-Fabry, V. Libotte, J. Willems, D. Lison, Review and meta-analysis of risk estimates for prostate cancer in pesticide manufacturing workers, *Cancer Causes Control*. 17 (2006) 353–373.
- [2] S. Chen, D. Sun, J.-S. Chung, Treatment of pesticide wastewater by moving-bed biofilm reactor combined with Fenton-coagulation pretreatment, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 144(1–2) (2007) 577–584.
- [3] G.V. Maele-Fabry, S. Duhayon, D.A. Lison, Systematic review of myeloid leukemias and occupational pesticide exposure, *Cancer Causes Control*. 18 (2007) 457–478.
- [4] R. Li, C. Yang, H. Chen, G. Zeng, G. Yu, J. Guo, Removal of triazophos pesticide from wastewater with Fenton reagent, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 167 (2009) 1028–1032.
- [5] WHO, The WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard and Guidelines to Classification, ISBN 978 92 4 154796 3, Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, Stuttgart, Germany, 2009.
- [6] N.A. Salles, F. Fourcade, F. Geneste, D. Floner, A. Amrane, Relevance of an electrochemical process prior to a biological treatment for the removal of an organophosphorous pesticide, phosmet, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 181 (2010) 617–623.
- [7] J. Ye, M. Zhao, J. Liu, W. Liu, Enantioselectivity in environmental risk assessment of modern chiral pesticides, *Environ. Pollut.* 158 (2010) 2371–2383.
- [8] J. Zolgharnein, A. Shahmoradi, J. Ghasemi, Pesticides removal using conventional and low-cost adsorbents: A review, *Clean* 39(12) (2011) 1105–1119.
- [9] H. Bouya, M. Errami, R. Salghi, A. Zarrouk, A.M. Assouag, H. Zarrok, A. Chakir, B. Hammouti, S.S. Al-Deyab, Electrooxidation of cypermethrin pesticide: A comparative study of SnO₂ and boron doped diamond anodes, *J. Chem. Pharm. Res.* 4(7) (2012) 3468–3477.
- [10] J. Shen, J. Huang, L. Liu, W. Ye, J. Lin, B.V. Bruggen, The use of BMED for glyphosate recovery from glyphosate neutralization liquor in view of zero discharge, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 260 (2013) 660–667.
- [11] P.V.L. Reddy, K.H. Kim, A review of photochemical approaches for the treatment of a wide range of pesticides, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 285 (2015) 325–335.
- [12] EU, Trifluralin-Dossier Prepared in Support of a Proposal of Trifluralin to be Considered as a Candidate for Inclusion in the Annex I to the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Persistent Organic Pollutants (LRTAP Protocol on POPs), European Commission, DG Environment, Brussels, 2007.
- [13] J.H. Syed, R.N. Malik, Occurrence and source identification of organochlorine pesticides in the surrounding surface soils of ittehad chemical industries, *Environ. Earth Sci.* 62 (2011) 1311–1321.
- [14] M.I. Maldonado, S. Malato, L.A. Perez-Estrada, W. Gernjak, I. Oller, X. Domanech, J. Peral, Partial degradation of five pesticides and an industrial pollutant by ozonation in a pilot-plant scale reactor, *J. Hazard. Mater.* B138 (2006) 363–369.
- [15] W.K. Lafi, Z. Al-Qodah, Combined advanced oxidation and biological processes for the removal of pesticides from aqueous solutions, *J. Hazard. Mater.* B137 (2006) 489–497.
- [16] S.K. Stylianou, K. Szymanska, I.A. Katsoyiannis, A.I. Zouboulis, Novel water treatment processes based on hybrid membrane-ozonation systems: A novel ceramic membrane contactor for bubbleness ozonation of emerging micropollutants, *J. Chem.* 2015 (2015) 12 pp. (Article Number 214927).

- [17] I.A. Katsoyiannis, S. Canonica, U. von Gunten, Efficiency and energy requirements for the transformation of organic micropollutants by ozone, O_3/H_2O_2 and UV/ H_2O_2 , *Water Res.* 45 (2011) 3811–3822.
- [18] F. Germirli Babuna, I. Toroz, E. Avsar, U. Yetis, Hazardous waste generation in pesticide synthesis sector in Turkey, *Pestic. Res. J.* 26(2) (2014) 181–188.
- [19] Z. Zhu, K. Wang, B. Zhang, Applying a network data envelopment analysis model to quantify the eco-efficiency of products: a case study of pesticides, *J. Cleaner Prod.* 69 (2014) 67–73.
- [20] EU, Reference Document on Best Available Techniques (BREF) for the Manufacture of Organic Fine Chemicals, Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC), European Commission, Sevilla, 2006. Available from: <http://eippcb.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reference/BREF/ofc_bref_0806.pdf> (accessed 18 October 2012).
- [21] IFC, Pesticide Manufacturing, Formulation and Packaging Environmental, Health and Safety Regulations, International Finance Cooperation, World Bank Group, Washington, DC, 2007.
- [22] World Bank Group, Pesticides Manufacturing, Pollution Prevention and Abatement Handbook, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 1998. Available from: <[http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/enviro.nsf/AttachmentsByTitle/gui_pestmfg_WB/\\$FILE/pestmfg_PPAH.pdf](http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/enviro.nsf/AttachmentsByTitle/gui_pestmfg_WB/$FILE/pestmfg_PPAH.pdf)> (accessed 15 February 2013).
- [23] M.S. Rahman, S. Datta, S. Islam, Waste generation and management practices in BSCIC Mymensingh, *J. Environ. Sci. Nat. Res.* 7(1) (2014) 47–51.
- [24] J.P. Verma, D.K. Jaiswal, Pesticide relevance and their microbial degradation: A-state-of-art, *Rev. Environ. Sci. Biotechnol.* 13(4) (2014) 429–466.
- [25] EU, European Commission Decision of 3 May 2000, 2000/532/EC, 2000. Available from: <<http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2000:226:0003:0024:EN:PDF>> (accessed 20 May 2012).
- [26] DPT, Ninth Development Plan-Chemical Industry Special Expert Commission Fertilizers-Plant Protection Products Report, State Planning Agency, Ankara, 2008 (in Turkish).
- [27] MARA, Statistical Information on Plant Protection Products, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Areas, Ankara, 2010 (accessed 12 August 2010).
- [28] HAWAMAN, Improvement of Industrial Hazardous Waste Management in Turkey, LIFE06 TCY/TR/000292, Ministry of Environment and Forest, Ankara, 2009 (in Turkish).