

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB NO. 0704-0188		
<p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA, 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</p>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 04-11-2014		2. REPORT TYPE Final Report		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 1-Jun-2006 - 31-Jul-2014	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Final Report: Surface Chemistry of CWAs for Decon Enabling Sciences			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER W911NF-06-1-0111		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 106013		
6. AUTHORS John R. Morris			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAMES AND ADDRESSES Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State Unive North End Center, Suite 4200 300 Turner Street, NW Blacksburg, VA 24061 -0001			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS (ES) U.S. Army Research Office P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) ARO		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) 49379-CH.13		
12. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.					
14. ABSTRACT The primary objectives of this work have been to: (1) characterize the chemistry of chemical warfare agents (CWAs) on metal, oxide, and polymeric surfaces, (2) make the first direct comparisons of the surface chemistry of CWA simulants and the agents themselves, including GB, VX, and HD, and (3) explore the chemistry of surface decontamination strategies including exposure to vaporous H2O2 and ClO2. These goals have been addressed through a concerted research effort along two fronts: CWA simulant studies at Virginia Tech and a new comprehensive effort that provides unique capabilities at the Edgewood Chemical Biological Center (ECBC) for					
15. SUBJECT TERMS surface science, CWA, uptake, decomposition, decontamination, filtration, XPS, FTIR, TPD, MS, UHV					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT		15. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UU	b. ABSTRACT UU	c. THIS PAGE UU	UU		John Morris
				19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER 540-231-2472	

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE 2014	2. REPORT TYPE N/A	3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Final Report: Surface Chemistry of CWAs for Decon Enabling Sciences		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
		5b. GRANT NUMBER	
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)		5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
		5e. TASK NUMBER	
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University North End Center, Suite 4200 300 Turner Street, NW Blacksburg, VA 24061 -0001		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited			
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
14. ABSTRACT The primary objectives of this work have been to: (1) characterize the chemistry of chemical warfare agents (CWAs) on metal, oxide, and polymeric surfaces, (2) make the first direct comparisons of the surface chemistry of CWA simulants and the agents themselves, including GB, VX, and HD, and (3) explore the chemistry of surface decontamination strategies including exposure to vaporous H2O2 and ClO2. These goals have been addressed through a concerted research effort along two fronts: CWA simulant studies at Virginia Tech and a new comprehensive effort that provides unique capabilities at the Edgewood Chemical Biological Center (ECBC) for studying the surface chemistry of CWAs.			
15. SUBJECT TERMS			
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified	SAR
			18. NUMBER OF PAGES 36
			19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Report Title

Final Report: Surface Chemistry of CWAs for Decon Enabling Sciences

ABSTRACT

The primary objectives of this work have been to: (1) characterize the chemistry of chemical warfare agents (CWAs) on metal, oxide, and polymeric surfaces, (2) make the first direct comparisons of the surface chemistry of CWA simulants and the agents themselves, including GB, VX, and HD, and (3) explore the chemistry of surface decontamination strategies including exposure to vaporous H₂O₂ and ClO₂. These goals have been addressed through a concerted research effort along two fronts: CWA simulant studies at Virginia Tech and a new comprehensive effort that provides unique capabilities at the Edgewood Chemical Biological Center (ECBC) for studying the surface chemistry of CWAs. Specifically, a new state-of-the-art surface science instrument was developed at ECBC, which is the first of its kind to couple precision CWA dosing capabilities with mass spectrometry, infrared surface spectroscopy, photoelectron spectroscopy, and temperature programmed desorption methods. These techniques are providing time-resolved studies of CWA surface chemistry on important materials including those found in buildings or vehicles, within sensitive equipment, and on new coatings designed for soldier protection.

Enter List of papers submitted or published that acknowledge ARO support from the start of the project to the date of this printing. List the papers, including journal references, in the following categories:

(a) Papers published in peer-reviewed journals (N/A for none)

<u>Received</u>	<u>Paper</u>
08/31/2011	1.00 Dimitar A. Panayotov, Steven Burrows, Mihail Mihaylov, Konstantin Hadjiivanov, Brian M. Tissue, John R. Morris. Effect of Methanol on the Lewis Acidity of Rutile TiO, Langmuir, (06 2010): 8106. doi: 10.1021/la100861n
09/10/2013	7.00 Dimitar A. Panayotov, Paul A. DeSario, Jeremy J. Pietron, Todd H. Brintlinger, Lindsey C. Szymczak, Debra R. Rolison, John R. Morris. Ultraviolet and Visible Photochemistry of Methanol at 3D Mesoporous Networks: TiO, The Journal of Physical Chemistry C, (07 2013): 15035. doi: 10.1021/jp312583w
09/10/2013	8.00 Wesley O. Gordon, Erin Durke Davis, Diego Troya, Brent A. Mantooth, Amanda R. Wilmsmeyer, Teri A. Lalain, John R. Morris. Infrared Spectra and Binding Energies of Chemical Warfare Nerve Agent Simulants on the Surface of Amorphous Silica, The Journal of Physical Chemistry C, (08 2013): 15685. doi: 10.1021/jp404265s
09/10/2013	9.00 Diego Troya, Angela C. Edwards, John R. Morris. Theoretical Study of the Adsorption of Organophosphorous Compounds to Models of a Silica Surface, The Journal of Physical Chemistry C, (07 2013): 14625. doi: 10.1021/jp404065n
10/31/2012	3.00 Dimitar A. Panayotov, Steven P. Burrows, John T. Yates, John R. Morris. Mechanistic Studies of Hydrogen Dissociation and Spillover on Au/TiO ₂ , The Journal of Physical Chemistry C, (11 2011): 0. doi: 10.1021/jp2065024
10/31/2012	4.00 Steven P. Burrows, John R. Morris, Dimitar A. Panayotov. Infrared Spectroscopic Studies of Conduction Band and Trapped Electrons in UV-Photoexcited, H-Atom n-Doped, and Thermally Reduced TiO, The Journal of Physical Chemistry C, (02 2012): 0. doi: 10.1021/jp2053103
10/31/2012	5.00 Dimitar A. Panayotov, Steven P. Burrows, John R. Morris. Photooxidation Mechanism of Methanol on Rutile TiO, The Journal of Physical Chemistry C, (03 2012): 0. doi: 10.1021/jp209215c
10/31/2012	6.00 Joshua Uzarski, Patrick J. Barrie, John R. Morris, Amanda R. Wilmsmeyer. Interactions and Binding Energies of Dimethyl Methylphosphonate and Dimethyl Chlorophosphate with Amorphous Silica, Langmuir, (07 2012): 0. doi: 10.1021/la301938f
11/04/2014	10.00 Amanda R. Wilmsmeyer, Wesley O. Gordon, Erin Durke Davis, Brent A. Mantooth, Teri A. Lalain, John R. Morris. Multifunctional ultra-high vacuum apparatus for studies of the interactions of chemical warfare agents on complex surfaces, Review of Scientific Instruments, (01 2014): 0. doi: 10.1063/1.4846656
11/04/2014	11.00 Erin Durke Davis, Wesley O. Gordon, Amanda R. Wilmsmeyer, Diego Troya, John R. Morris. Chemical Warfare Agent Surface Adsorption: Hydrogen Bonding of Sarin and Soman to Amorphous Silica, The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters, (04 2014): 0. doi: 10.1021/jz500375h
TOTAL:	10

Number of Papers published in peer-reviewed journals:

(b) Papers published in non-peer-reviewed journals (N/A for none)

Received Paper

TOTAL:

Number of Papers published in non peer-reviewed journals:

(c) Presentations

Presentations since most recent interim report for this project:

"Photochemistry of Methanol at 3-D Networked Aerogels of TiO₂ and Au-TiO₂"
National Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Spring 2014

Number of Presentations: 1.00

Non Peer-Reviewed Conference Proceeding publications (other than abstracts):

Received Paper

TOTAL:

Number of Non Peer-Reviewed Conference Proceeding publications (other than abstracts):

Peer-Reviewed Conference Proceeding publications (other than abstracts):

Received Paper

TOTAL:

Number of Peer-Reviewed Conference Proceeding publications (other than abstracts):

(d) Manuscripts

Received

Paper

05/02/2012 2.00 Amanda Wilmsmeyer, Joshua Uzarski, Patrick Barrie, John R. Morris. Interactions and binding energies of dimethyl methylphosphonate and dimethyl chlorophosphate with amorphous silica, Journal of Physical Chemistry C (05 2012)

11/04/2014 12.00 Amanda R. Wilmsmeyer, Angela C. Edwards, Wesley O. Gordon, Erin M. Davis, Christopher J. Karwacki, Diego Troya, John R. Morris, Joshua Abelard. Adsorption of 2-CEES on Silica: The Binding Mechanism and Energy of a Bifunctional Hydrogen-bond Acceptor at the Gas-surface Interface, J Phys Chem C (10 2014)

TOTAL: 2

Number of Manuscripts:

Books

Received

Book

TOTAL:

Received

Book Chapter

TOTAL:

Patents Submitted

Patents Awarded

Awards

Graduate Students

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PERCENT SUPPORTED</u>	Discipline
Joshua Abelard	0.00	
FTE Equivalent:	0.00	
Total Number:	1	

Names of Post Doctorates

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PERCENT SUPPORTED</u>
FTE Equivalent:	
Total Number:	

Names of Faculty Supported

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PERCENT SUPPORTED</u>	National Academy Member
John R. Morris	0.00	
FTE Equivalent:	0.00	
Total Number:	1	

Names of Under Graduate students supported

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PERCENT SUPPORTED</u>
FTE Equivalent:	
Total Number:	

Student Metrics

This section only applies to graduating undergraduates supported by this agreement in this reporting period

The number of undergraduates funded by this agreement who graduated during this period: 0.00

The number of undergraduates funded by this agreement who graduated during this period with a degree in science, mathematics, engineering, or technology fields:..... 0.00

The number of undergraduates funded by your agreement who graduated during this period and will continue to pursue a graduate or Ph.D. degree in science, mathematics, engineering, or technology fields:..... 0.00

Number of graduating undergraduates who achieved a 3.5 GPA to 4.0 (4.0 max scale):..... 0.00

Number of graduating undergraduates funded by a DoD funded Center of Excellence grant for Education, Research and Engineering:..... 0.00

The number of undergraduates funded by your agreement who graduated during this period and intend to work for the Department of Defense 0.00

The number of undergraduates funded by your agreement who graduated during this period and will receive scholarships or fellowships for further studies in science, mathematics, engineering or technology fields:..... 0.00

Names of Personnel receiving masters degrees

<u>NAME</u>
Total Number:

Names of personnel receiving PHDs

<u>NAME</u>
Total Number:

Names of other research staff

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PERCENT SUPPORTED</u>
FTE Equivalent:	
Total Number:	

Sub Contractors (DD882)

Inventions (DD882)

Scientific Progress

See Attachment

Technology Transfer

The development of our UHV surface science instrument at ECBC has led to many very productive and fruitful interactions with DoD scientists. Most importantly, we work closely and on a daily basis with Dr. Wesley Gordon and Dr. Chris Karwacki, Team Leader CBR Filtration Research and Technology Directorate at ECBC. Through this collaboration, we have established a facility for the study of agent surface chemistry at ECBC that is furthering our understanding for how to better decontaminate and filter agents.

Chemistry of Vaporous H₂O₂ and ClO₂: Reactions with Bare and Simulant-Covered Surfaces

John R. Morris
Virginia Tech
Final Report (W911NF-06-1-0111)

The primary objectives of this work have been to: (1) characterize the chemistry of chemical warfare agents (CWAs) on metal, oxide, and polymeric surfaces, (2) make the first direct comparisons of the surface chemistry of CWA *simulants* and the agents themselves, including GB, VX, and HD, and (3) explore the chemistry of surface decontamination strategies including exposure to vaporous H₂O₂ and ClO₂. These goals have been addressed through a concerted research effort along two fronts: CWA simulant studies at Virginia Tech and a new effort that provides unique capabilities at the Edgewood Chemical Biological Center (ECBC) for studying the surface chemistry of CWAs. Specifically, we constructed a new state-of-the-art surface science instrument at ECBC, which is the first of its kind to couple precision CWA dosing capabilities with mass spectrometry, infrared surface spectroscopy, photoelectron spectroscopy, and temperature programmed desorption methods. These techniques are providing time-resolved studies of CWA surface chemistry on important materials including those found in buildings or vehicles, within sensitive equipment, and on new coatings designed for soldier protection. By more completely understanding the reaction pathways and rates of CWAs on a variety of surfaces, we aim to help provide more effective strategies for developing useful materials and decontamination approaches for CWAs. Perhaps most importantly, this project has established a scientifically fruitful relationship between Virginia Tech and ECBC that will continue to yield novel scientific discoveries, provide critical information about CWA surface chemistry, and serve as a conduit for training the next generation of scientists in this field. Through this new initiative, we have achieved the following milestones. In addition, this report provides a detailed description of the main objective of this work, the design and construction of a new capability that now resides at ECBC. This facility enabled the successful completion of the other milestones and publications contained within the remainder of this report.

Major Accomplishments

- Designed, fabricated, constructed, and benchmarked a new state-of-the-art surface analytical instrument that houses three agent dosing sources of gas, a quadrupole mass spectrometer, an X-ray photoelectron spectrometer, infrared spectroscopic capabilities for characterizing gas-surface uptake and reaction pathways, and rapid surface sample transfer capabilities from a surety hood facility
- Characterized the uptake mechanism, residence times, and energetics of organophosphate/onate adsorption on model glass and particulate silica (one of the top two most abundant materials on the planet)
- Provided the first direct correlations between organophosphate/onate simulants (DIMP, DMMP, TMP, DMCP, and DMCP) and agents (GB, GD, and XV)
- Developed high-level computational methods for modeling the adsorption of agents (GB, GD, VX, and HD) on hydrogen bonding materials
- Elucidated the mechanism of charge transfer and dipolar interactions in the formation of hydrogen bonds between the nerve agents GB, GD, and VX and a model hydrogen bonding surface
- Measured the binding energy and mechanism for HD uptake on silica materials
- Correlated the surface adsorption (hydrogen bonding) energy of HD to the simulant 2-CEES
- Characterized the surface morphology and chemical composition of a typical CARC sample and observed morphological changes following a CWA simulant challenge
- Recorded the first X-ray photoelectron spectroscopic measurements of CARC following an agent challenge
- Obtained the first FTIR spectrum of CARC and agent-challenged CARC
- Tracked the desorption of VX on CARC and identified possible reaction products
- Began a systematic study of how CARC formulation, additives, and morphology affect agent uptake, residence times, and evaporation
- Studied the uptake, thermal, and photochemistry of agent simulants on TiO₂ surfaces
- Initiated experiments on the uptake and decomposition chemistry of CWAs and simulants on next-generation filtration materials
- Trained numerous graduate students and postdoctoral associates in the field of CWA surface science; two of whom have begun successful careers at ECBC where they work on surface chemistry relevant to filtration sciences

I. INTRODUCTION

Detailed knowledge about the interfacial chemistry and physics of chemical warfare agents (CWAs) is critical to developing a fundamental understanding of the processes that influence the effectiveness of decontamination¹⁻⁸, protection^{3,9}, and sensing^{4,9-11} technologies as well as to accurately predict environmental fate¹²⁻¹⁵ of agents. Unfortunately, little is known about the mechanisms, rates and probabilities of agent-surface adsorption, diffusion, reactions. For example, fundamental knowledge of how surface functionality of military paints and coatings impacts chemical resistance would enable the fine-tuning of the surface to improve performance. However, many surface sensitive methods can be expensive and challenging to implement, particularly for complex military materials. This problem is compounded by the cost, safety, and legal challenges, of working with super toxic chemicals. As a result, a large body of existing work has focused on exploring the surface chemistry of CWA simulants (less toxic analogues of the agents), rather than the live agents.¹⁶⁻³² While direct comparisons between agents and simulants have been made through computational studies, little experimental data exists for the development of agent-simulant correlations. The instrumentation described here is focused on advancing knowledge about the surface chemistry of highly toxic compounds in a way that will empower improvements in technologies and methods to mitigate the threat of chemical warfare or chemical terrorism.

While surface sensitive chemical studies of simulant adsorption and reaction are now common,³³ few surface-science focused studies of the agents have been conducted. One of the initial reports of the surface chemistry of live chemical agents was provided by Vanbokhoven et al.³⁴⁻³⁶. Their work focused on studies of the reaction kinetics of sarin on gamma alumina surfaces. This work was followed by investigations of organophosphate CWA decomposition on alumina.³⁷ In addition, Wagner and colleagues have employed solid state NMR to study the

decomposition of CWAs on MgO,³⁸ AgY and NaY zeolites,³⁹ CaO,⁴⁰ and Al₂O₃⁴¹. More recently, the decomposition of sarin on Al₂O₃ nanoparticles⁴² studied by ATR FTIR and the desorption of sarin from silica surfaces was investigated via reverse gas phase chromatography.⁴³ This body of work, while valuable, is limited in its ability to simultaneously track surface-bound and gas-phase reaction products in a way that provides overall reaction rates on surfaces that are well characterized with surface-sensitive methods such as photoelectron spectroscopy. Moreover, most of the published studies that employ actual CWAs have been conducted in solution or under atmospheric conditions,^{38,39,41,44-46} which preclude the application of surface analytical instrumentation. Here, we describe the design, construction, and testing of a novel multi-functional ultra-high vacuum (UHV) instrument for study of the surface interactions and chemistries of live CWAs on model and actual military surfaces.

The UHV chamber combines vacuum compatible chemical dosing methods with reflection absorption infrared spectroscopy (RAIRS), mass spectrometry (MS), and x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) to probe the surface chemistry of CWAs. The ability to cool or heat samples enables observation over the full range of thermally driven events from adsorption to desorption or reaction. Due to the hazardous nature and unique handling requirements of the chemicals involved, novel dosing and safety features were developed and integrated into the overall instrument to ensure worker safety. In section II we describe the instrument in general terms, and the requirements that were used for the final instrument design. We then provide a detailed description of each component. In section III, we demonstrate the instrumental capabilities through an initial study into the adsorption of simulants and live CWAs on model particulate surfaces.

II. INSTRUMENT DESIGN

Overview and design criteria. One of our primary objectives was to design and construct a surface science instrument capable of characterizing the chemistry of extremely toxic chemical warfare agents in one integrated system. Therefore, we constructed a UHV surface science apparatus (Fig. 1) capable of *in situ* vibrational spectroscopy to track the breaking and formation of surface bonds during exposure of a sample to an agent of interest while, at the same time, monitoring the emergence of gas-phase products from the surface. These goals were accomplished by combining precision vapor dosing capabilities through a custom-designed source for CWAs, a doubly-differentially pumped mass spectrometer, and reflection (or transmission) Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy. These methods afford the simultaneous monitoring of surface-bound and gas-phase products during a reaction. Pre and post surface elemental analysis is performed in this system with an X-ray photoelectron spectrometer and temperature-programmed desorption (TPD) methods.

Although many of the instruments incorporated into the system are standard surface analytical tools, the safety challenges posed by conducting experiments with live chemical warfare agents required several unique design considerations: (1) The surface sample introduction and removal load-lock system must be completely contained within a custom chemical hood that is regularly inspected and certified for CWA operations, (2) All roughing and backing pumps, along with every exhaust line, must be fully contained within engineering controls and vent to filters appropriate for CWA work, (3) Exposure of a surface to an agent of interest must be accomplished from a source containing no more than microgram quantities of agent that is fully contained within the chemical hood or the UHV chamber at all times, (4) The chamber must be decontaminated via hot gas and pumping cycles prior to removal of any flange,

and (5) The entire chamber must be maintained under negative pressure during maintenance with the exhaust properly filtered. The apparatus that was designed and constructed to meet these requirements is shown schematically in Fig. 1. Table I provides the key experimental and safety requirements of the instrument along with how they were accomplished. Below, we highlight several of the most critical and novel features of the apparatus.




Figure 1.A. Schematic (not to scale) of the UHV system showing the primary equipment. A) transfer arm, B) load lock chamber and pump, C) chemical agent vapor dose manifold, D) gate valve, E) IR light entrance optics, F) capillary array doser, G) apertures and differential pumping stage, H) mass spectrometer chamber and pump, I) cryostat for solid sorbent doser, J) directional agent vapor doser, K) IR light exit optics and detector, L) XPS system and ion gun, M) Venturi tube ventilation system, N) foreline pumps for all the turbomolecular pumps.

Table I. Design requirements and approach (letters correspond to Fig. 1)

Design Requirement	Experimental Approach
dynamic pressure range: 10^{-9} to 10^{-2} Torr	2200 l/s main turbo with variable speed and gate valve
contained rapid sample introduction	load-lock transfer system coupled to chemical hood (B)
precision CWA dosing with μg quantities	<i>in vacuo</i> solid sorbent dosing system (O coupled to I)
pre and post surface characterization	TPD (H), FTIR (E, K), and specially-resolved XPS (L)
controlled surface temperature and position	precision manipulator with heater and LN_2 cooling
gas-phase product identification	quadrupole mass spectrometer (H)
<i>in situ</i> monitoring of surface adsorbates	reflection or transmission FTIR (E, K)
mass analysis of surface adsorbates	temperature-programmed desorption (H)
reaction probability measurements	line-of-site uptake probability measurements (H)
kinetics measurements	time-resolved IR and mass spectrometry (E, K and H)
CWA-contaminated exhaust handling	all metal seals, foreline pumps vent into chemical hood (A, B, N)




Figure 1. B. AutoCad design and assembly drawing for the system. The technical drawings of the central chamber are provided in the following figure.




Figure 1. C. Technical designs of main surface science chamber.




Figure 1. D. Dr. Erin Davis performing the first experiments with the surface science instrument at ECBC.

A. Chamber construction, pumping, and safety

The central instrumental scaffold is a custom designed multiport 23 L UHV chamber constructed out of 316L stainless steel (SS) with all ports equipped with con-flat® flanges (Kurt J. Lesker Company (KJLC)). The chamber is evacuated by a 2200 L/s magnetically levitated turbomolecular pump (A2200C, Edwards Vacuum), which can be isolated from the main chamber by a 12” gate valve (KJLC). This pump is backed by an oil-free scroll pump (Edwards XDS-35). The turbomolecular pump was chosen for this system because of its high pumping speed and significant compression ratio for mid-sized organic molecules, such as CWAs. These pumping characteristics are critical for performing experiments under high gas flux conditions. In addition, the pumping speed can be varied by reducing the rotation speed of the turbines, thereby enabling experiments to be performed under low-vacuum conditions. Finally, this pump cleanly removes gases from the chamber through a foreline pump located within a controlled environment, ensuring that agent vapors are quickly and continually exhausted to the hood and away from the laboratory personnel.

The chamber is designed to allow multiple bake-out cycles and hot gas purges to eliminate residual CWA contamination that may exist following a study. These cycles are accomplished by encasing the system in a custom-designed thermal tent equipped with a controlled heating system (Hemi Heating, Inc.). The tent and associated heaters provide even distribution of heat throughout the system. The chamber can be heated to 373 K at a rate of ~ 0.2 K/min and then held at that temperature, under vacuum, for extended periods of time. While heating, the chamber can be scrubbed by introducing N_2 or CO_2 through an auxiliary dosing line. Several fill-evacuation cycles effectively reduce chamber contamination, as monitored by the mass spectrometer and XPS analysis of test sorbent materials that are positioned within the main

chamber during chamber cleaning. A tool has also been developed to enable solvent wetted swab samples to be collected on chamber walls to confirm decontamination prior to maintenance. Briefly, a polyurethane foam swab (Techspray P/N 2302-50) is wetted with 5 mL of isopropyl alcohol, attached to the reach in tool, and wiped over $\sim 10 \text{ cm}^2$ of chamber surface. The absorbed material extracted from the swab in isopropyl alcohol (10 mL) and analyzed via LCMS, which is sensitive to lower than 0.1 monolayer quantities of chemical agent on the chamber surface.

Because the chamber can be coupled to high-pressure gas cylinders for cleaning cycles and other surface chemistry experiments, there exists a remote danger of inadvertent over-pressurization of the system. Over-pressurization may occur, for example, if a regulator were to fail while the pumping system was isolated. In addition, there is a liquid nitrogen reservoir contained within the main chamber to cool the sample holder, which also poses an over-pressurization danger in the event that one of the liquid nitrogen feed lines were to fail. Over-pressurization of a closed system can cause catastrophic failure of the chamber resulting in injury or exposure of laboratory personnel to hazardous chemicals. To mitigate this risk, a custom-designed ASTM-certified burst disk assembly (MDC Vacuum) was incorporated into the system. In this design, a standard conflat-flanged UHV burst disk was welded to a conflat half-nipple and connected to metal hosing which exhausts into the chemical hood system. In the event of over-pressurization, the disk will burst and the vapor will be directed into the hood where it exhausts from the laboratory through surety (certified for agent use) filters.

In any UHV surface science system, regular instrument maintenance is required to keep components operating properly and to make repairs on malfunctioning components. Maintenance for this system, is accomplished by first performing several cycles of hot-gas cleaning followed by RGA and XPS analysis to verify the general safety of the system. However, the complete

absence of trace amounts of CWAs from the system is never guaranteed. Therefore, prior to venting the chamber and opening a flange, the chamber is vented with UHP N₂ to slightly below atmospheric pressure, then the main chamber is opened to the load-lock chamber, which is located inside of the surety hood. The load lock chamber is coupled to a 1,500 cfm Venturi blower (McMaster-Carr). This design provides a constant negative pressure inside the vacuum chamber and is operated continually while the system is open to atmosphere. Laboratory air is continually pulled through any open flange through the main and auxiliary chambers and exhausted into the surety hood. In this way, residual vapors do not escape the system during system maintenance. Continual sampling and monitoring of the laboratory air ensures the safety of laboratory personal during maintenance as well as during normal operation of the system.

The system pressures, temperatures, and pump status are continuously monitored through a custom-built interlock system with electromagnetic switches, National Instruments (NI) Fieldbus hardware for communication and control, and manual 3-way control switches. In the event of a power outage, loss of communication with the control computer, a pressure excursion, or loss of pressurized air for the pneumatic valves, all valves are closed and pumps turned off. A battery back-up enables the computer to maintain operation of pumps and valves in the event of short power interruptions. The 3-way switches allow for manual override if needed for maintenance or troubleshooting. All equipment is controlled using custom NI LabView® software to control instrumentation, collect and log data from gauges and other sensors, and to prevent accidental operation of sensitive equipment under high pressure conditions.

B. Surface sample manipulator and transfer

Surface samples are introduced into the UHV chamber via a load-lock system that is coupled to the surety chemical fume hood adjacent to the main chamber. The load-lock chamber itself

resides inside the hood and is connected to the main UHV chamber through an air-tight seal around a 4" tube. The location of the load-lock chamber inside of the hood enables the safe and efficient introduction or removal of samples to and from the main chamber. Inside of the hood, the spherical load-lock chamber is evacuated by a 70 L/s turbomolecular pump (Pfeiffer) backed by a scroll pump (Edwards Vacuum, nXDS6iC). A gate valve (KJLC) separates the load lock from the UHV chamber, and a linear, magnetically-coupled rotary transfer arm with one meter of travel is used for sample handling and transfer. A load lock gimbal is used to ensure proper alignment of the sample mount with the docking receptacle on the manipulator.

Surface samples are mounted onto a molybdenum platen, which is in turn secured onto the linear transfer arm via a spring-loaded fork (customized STLC transfer system, Thermionics Inc.). Once the load-lock chamber is evacuated, the isolation gate valve is opened and the sample is transferred into the main chamber where it mates with the receiver on the manipulator. The precision sample manipulator provides 6 cm of travel in the plane of the gas source and detectors, 20 cm of vertical travel, 360° of rotation, and tilting capabilities in the X and Y directions. The removable platen can accommodate panels of military paint samples, polymeric materials, or any other vacuum compatible sample up to 30 mm in diameter and 4 mm in thickness. The sample can be heated up to 1000 K via resistive heating of tungsten filaments behind the sample platen and is controlled with an integrated power supply coupled to a proportional–integral–derivative controller. Liquid cooling enables sample temperatures as low as 100 K, when using cryogenic fluids. The sample platen also includes a transferrable type K thermocouple for measuring surface temperature, while a second thermocouple spot welded to the mount provides an independent reference temperature reading. The sample platen is electrically isolated from the chamber but is in contact with an electrical feedthrough to enable biasing or measuring of ion current on electrically conducting samples.

C. Effusive gas sources

Once the samples are mounted onto the manipulator, they are laser-aligned such that they are positioned at the focal point of the three effusive gas sources, the infrared spectrometer, and the quadrupole mass spectrometer. Two dosers have been designed especially for handling extremely toxic CWAs, with either high or low vapor pressures. The requirements for CWA dosers are threefold: 1) the CWAs remain contained within the surety hood or the UHV chamber at all times, 2) the quantity of agent employed in the dosing must be on the microgram scale, and 3) dosing should be performed *in situ* with FTIR and mass spectrometric measurements. These design requirements were met by using a solid sorbent doser and a directional vapor doser.

1. Solid sorbent doser

The CWA solid sorbent doser (Fig. 2) was designed specifically for dosing low vapor pressure molecules. This doser is based on a transferrable, sealable, solid-sorbent-containing cartridge (Fig 2, No. 1) that can be charged with agent while inside the surety hood. All of the cartridge components are machined from 400 series, magnetic stainless steel. Much of the stainless steel cartridge is bored to retain a solid sorbent material for the physisorption of agent. The cartridge, once charged with agent, is sealed via a reverse-threaded o-ring sealed cap (Fig 2, No. 2) and mounted onto the linear translator transfer arm (Fig 2, No. 3) inside of the load-lock chamber. The mating of the sealed cartridge to the transfer arm is secured with two alignment posts on the cartridge and two rare earth magnets press fit into the transfer arm adapter. Following evacuation, the load-lock chamber is opened to the main chamber and the sorbent cartridge is translated through the main chamber (with the surface sample raised out of the path of the translator) and mounted via clockwise rotation onto the variable temperature UHV cryostat (Janis, ST-400) capable of operation from 80 to 500 K. Once mounted onto the

cryostat receiver, the transfer arm is removed and the cartridge assembly is cooled well below the sublimation temperature of the CWA. Once cooled, the cap can be removed (via clockwise rotation of the linear rotatable transfer arm) when one is ready to begin an experiment. Following removal of the cap, the surface sample can be re-positioned into the line-of-sight of the doser. Then, the doser is translated forward to within 1/8" of the sample and is heated until the CWA desorbs from the sorbent material within the cartridge. As the molecules desorb from the cartridge, they impinge on the surface sample and the uptake is monitored with the FTIR. To remove the cartridge, the transfer arm adapter-cap assembly, is aligned with the cartridge and the arm is rotated counter-clockwise. This rotation begins to screw the cap back on then unscrews the cartridge from the cryostat. The cartridge can then safely be removed from the main chamber and preparations can be made for the next experiment. In this way, the entire lifespan of the cartridge, sorbent, and agent is spent either within the surety hood or the main UHV chamber. The solid sorbent doser has been successfully used to dose a surface sample with the chemical agent VX using an initial volume of <10 μL .




Figure 2. Solid sorbent doser components; (1) machined cryostat mount with threaded hole, (2) agent cartridge with a) threading to mate with the cryostat mount b) posts to mate with the transfer mount, c) fine threaded hole to mate with the cap, (3) sealing cap, and (4) mounting adapter d) hole to mate with the cartridge, e) press fit rare earth magnets to secure cap, f) set screw to secure the transfer mount to the transfer arm (g).

2. Directional vapor doser

A second directional CWA doser that is coupled to the chamber through a stainless steel gas line and valve assembly is used for high vapor pressure liquids. Because the reservoir for this liquid source resides within the confines of the chemical fume hood, even highly toxic compounds can be dosed with this method. The reservoir is composed of a custom cartridge, which can be loaded with the liquid (typically 10-30 μL for semi-volatile compounds). The cartridge is mounted onto a multi-valve stainless steel manifold via VCR connections. Standard freeze pump thaw cycles are used to degas the liquid sample and remove any air remaining in the cartridge. Once the sample is purified, an evacuated heated transfer line is used to transport the vapor into the UHV chamber via a precision leak valve. On the UHV side of the leak valve, a stainless steel tube wrapped in a coiled heater (OEM) directs the vapor toward the sample. The entire dosing manifold can be heated to high temperatures for decontamination and features

redundant valves to ensure worker safety. The dosing system has successfully exposed samples to the simulants DMMP, DIMP, and 2-CEES; as well as the CWAs GB (sarin), GD (soman), and HD (sulfur mustard). An example of the real-time uptake of GB (dose of 0.5 μL based on pressure measurements) as studied by *in situ* FTIR is presented in Section III.

3. Microcapillary array doser

In addition to the CWA dosers, the system is equipped with a variable flux microcapillary array doser with similar design to other previously-described systems.⁴⁷ Briefly, a vacuum manifold with known volume is backfilled to a desired pressure with the gas, as measured by a capacitance manometer (MKS Instruments). A low dead volume valve is then opened to allow the gas to flow through a calibrated 10 μm orifice and into the chamber through a customized hollow linear feedthrough (Huntington Vacuum, L-2220 series). The gas then encounters a baffle to randomize gas flow, and enters the chamber as a directed beam after passing through a glass microcapillary array. The hollow feedthrough is capable of translation to bring the gas source within 1 mm of the sample surface.

D. Surface analysis: IR, XPS, and TPD

During exposure of the sample to a gas of interest, via the CWA solid sorbent doser or the *ex vacuo* vapor sources, the surface chemistry can be tracked with infrared spectroscopy. The FTIR can operate in either reflection mode, as illustrated in Fig. 1, or in transmission mode for IR transparent materials by directing the beam straight through the chamber. Infrared spectroscopy is well-suited for surface science studies because it is nondestructive, surface-sensitive, and sensitive to sub-monolayer coverages of adsorbates. Reflection-absorption infrared spectroscopy (RAIRS) has been employed for structural determination and *in situ* interrogation of reaction mechanisms of self-assembled monolayers on flat gold surfaces and the exploration

of the uptake of CWA simulants on nanoparticulate materials.^{21,48} In addition, many polymeric coatings, such as some paints, are sufficiently reflective to enable the use of RAIRS on these complex materials.

For RAIRS, a vacuum infrared spectrometer (Bruker Vertex 80V, with time-resolved and step-scan capabilities) has been modified to mate with the UHV system. Specifically, radiation (SiC glowbar) is first focused ($f = 180$ mm) onto a variable aperture selection wheel that defines the spot size prior to entering into the interferometer. Upon exiting the interferometer, the beam is directed to a custom designed external optics compartment that includes an $f = 250$ mm parabolic mirror for directing the beam through a differentially pumped KBr window and focusing it onto the surface sample. The beam size at the center of the chamber is estimated to be approximately 9 mm x 6 mm. The angle of incidence for reflection from a flat surface is 86° with respect to the sample plane. After exiting the chamber through a second differentially-pumped KBr window, the diverging reflected beam is then focused with an ellipsoidal mirror ($f_1/f_2 = 250/40$ mm) onto the sensor element of a liquid nitrogen-cooled mercury cadmium telluride (MCT) detector. The entire beam path is under vacuum, which is important for removing background gases from the spectra and enables spectroscopic studies in the far-IR region of the electromagnetic spectrum. In addition, high reflectivity Au-coated mirrors are employed throughout the beam path to minimize loss of photons.

Although infrared spectroscopy yields information about the vibrational frequencies of surface adsorbates, complete molecular characterization often requires complementary data such as molecular mass or elemental composition. To this end, temperature-programmed desorption (TPD) can be employed to help identify adsorbates by providing mass spectra of species that desorb from the surface sample during a post-dosing thermal ramp. In addition, kinetic analysis

of TPD data can be employed to determine the activation energy for desorption of molecular adsorbates.

TPD is performed by first exposing the surface to a species of interest. During this initial exposure, RAIRS is employed to monitor surface uptake and estimate coverage. Initial dosing is typically performed at low surface temperatures where residence times are sufficient to ensure constant coverage following dosing and before thermal annealing. Following dosing, the temperature of the surface is increased by driving the sample heater with a power supply under proportional-integral-derivative control (Thermionics LPS-800-1). With the liquid nitrogen reservoir on the sample holder filled, the temperature can be ramped at a rate of 0.1 to 10 K/s with approximately ± 1 K precision. During the thermal ramp, IR and mass spectra (see description, below) are recorded to track desorption from the surface. Mass spectral intensity versus surface temperature represents the rate of desorption, which is governed by the surface adsorbates' activation energy for desorption. In the absence of chemical reactions, the desorption rate curves can be analyzed for flat or particulate surfaces to reveal properties about the activation energy for desorption.^{49,50}

Surface elemental analysis is critical for the assignment of IR spectral peaks and identification of molecular structures from mass-resolved TPD data. Elemental analysis is accomplished in this system with X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy. The XPS system consists of a dual anode ($\text{AlK}\alpha$ and $\text{MgK}\alpha$) x-ray source (Omicron Nanotechnology, DAR 400) and is equipped with a Z translation stage with 5° X-Y tilt for alignment with the sample. Detection of photoelectrons is achieved with an Omicron Sphera hemispherical analyzer with a five-channel electron multiplier mounted at a 45° angle relative to the X-ray source. This particular instrument is capable of providing elemental surface maps with spacial resolution on the order of 50 μm . In addition, the XPS is complemented by the depth-profiling capabilities provided by a

differentially pumped 5 kV ion gun (Phi-Ulvac FIG-5) that is capable of generating ions from inert and reactive gases. The ion gun is positioned to enable real-time XPS monitoring of surface species during sputtering.

E. Vapor analysis: mass spectrometry

As products are released from the surface during reaction or parent molecules desorb from the surface during TPD, they are tracked with a doubly-differentially pumped quadrupole mass spectrometer, (Extrel, MAX1000 $m/z = 1-1000$). Each differential stage is evacuated by a 480 L/s magnetically levitated turbomolecular pump (Edwards STP-451C), which enables up to three orders of magnitude pressure differential between the main chamber and mass spectrometer chamber during an experiment. The line-of-sight of the mass spectrometer is defined by a series of apertures that separate the differential pumping stages such that the ionizer of the QMS views a 1 cm^2 spot on the surface when the surface is located at the focal point of the main chamber. The acceptance angle of the spectrometer is 1° in polar and azimuthal angles. As indicated in the schematic, the mass spectrometer is aligned such that it views the surface during dosing and while performing IR spectroscopic measurements. In this way, changes in surface vibrational modes and concentrations during dosing can be directly correlated with the mass spectra of species desorbing from the surface at any point in time.

In addition to the differentially-pumped mass spectrometer, the UHV system houses an additional mass spectrometer (Stanford Research Systems, RGA300M, residual gas analyzer) that resides in the main chamber for analysis of uptake probabilities (via the King and Wells technique⁵¹), which requires a non-line-of-sight detector that samples the vapor in the main chamber. In this method, an inert surface (bulk Au foil) is placed in the path of the gas source during sample exposure and the partial pressure of the gas of interest, P_i , is measured. The inert surface is then removed, exposing the sample to the gas source and the new chamber pressure,

P_f , is determined. These partial pressures are proportional to the fluxes and the overall uptake probability is given by $\gamma = (P_i - P_f)/P_f$. γ is equal to the long-time sticking probability for systems in which uptake involves only adsorption. However, if uptake is mediated by chemical reactions, γ provides information about reaction probabilities. RAIRS, TPD, and XPS, in conjunction with the mass spectrometer, help to distinguish between these two cases and identify systems for which adsorption and reactions are competing channels.

III. SYSTEM PERFORMANCE: CWA uptake on silica nanoparticles

Following extensive testing with simulants, we have studied the interactions of live CWAs with amorphous silica nanoparticles. Silica (Aerosil, 200m²/g, 20 nm particle diameter) was chosen as the first surface to study because the adsorption of many organophosphate molecules (simulants) to silica has been previously studied, both computationally and experimentally.^{49,50,52} Initial benchmark experiments with both high and low vapor pressure CWAs were used to demonstrate system performance and highlight capabilities. (CAUTION: CWAs are highly toxic and should only be handled by well-trained individuals in compliance with government safety procedures and regulations.)

A. Uptake of sarin (GB) on silica

The silica sample was exposed to GB, GD, and HD using the vapor doser. Flux of the molecules at the surface was controlled by the precision leak valve, but maximum flux was determined by the vapor pressure of the CWA and the temperature at which the heated vapor line was maintained. Flux of GD and GB at the surface could be controlled up to approximately 1 Langmuir/s, while for HD the surface flux was slightly lower (~0.4 Langmuir/s). The total pressure within the chamber during the experiments was $\sim 5 \times 10^{-7}$ Torr during the dosing, otherwise the pressure was below 5×10^{-9} Torr. Agent uptake probability on silica dropped to zero after exposure to approximately 600 Langmuirs for all three CWAs.

Figures 3A and 3B shows several difference IR spectra of a silica nanoparticulate surface as it is exposed to sarin. The reference spectrum for this data is that of a clean silica surface, thus any positive peaks represent new modes on the surface and negative peaks show modes removed from the surface. Given the density of hydroxyl groups on this sample, 2 nm^{-2} (under our sample preparation conditions), and the signal-to-noise ratio of a typical IR spectrum, we estimate that the instrument is sensitive to approximately 1 % of a monolayer of adsorbates on this material. During exposure, the sharp peak at 3745 cm^{-1} , indicative of free OH groups on the surface, is converted into a red-shifted, peak at 3200 cm^{-1} , representing the formation of a hydrogen-bonded mode. Characteristic modes of the sarin molecule itself are also observed. These experimental results show that the uptake of sarin, and other CWAs, can be monitored with IR. Furthermore, the IR data suggests that sarin adsorbs to the surface via the same hydrogen-bonding, physisorption mechanism as previously studied organophosphorus simulants.




Figure 3. A, B. IR difference spectra of silica (225 K) exposed to GB dosed with the vapor doser. The vertical bars indicate the scale in absorbance units. Arrows indicate the increase or decrease of absorbance during exposure. C. TPD spectrum of GB desorption from silica (ramp rate 1 K/s, monitoring mass fragment 99 amu).

The strength of the sarin-silica interaction can be estimated from the change in frequency of the $\nu(\text{SiO-H})$ mode as observed in Fig 3A. For the common sarin simulant, dimethyl methylphosphoante (DMMP), a red shift of 601 cm^{-1} has been reported for this mode.⁴⁹ For sarin, we observe a shift of 550 cm^{-1} , suggesting that sarin interacts more weakly with the silica surface than does DMMP.

While infrared spectroscopic measurements can provide an estimate of adsorption strength, a more direct method for measuring the activation energy for desorption is temperature-programmed desorption (TPD). For TPD experiments, an adsorbate-saturated surface is heated at a constant rate and gas-phase species are detected with a mass spectrometer. For the electron-impact ionization method employed here, the signal is directly proportional to desorption rate.

Data from a typical TPD experiment for the desorption of sarin from silica is shown in Figure 3C. As the silica surface is heated at 1 K/s, the rate of desorption increases (simple

exponential dependence of the rate constant on temperature) then the rate decreases (as the surface concentration of sarin diminishes). The TPD profile obtained here is typical for first-order desorption kinetics, which is expected for molecular desorption of sarin.⁴⁹ Based on the signal to noise ratio and the coverage, we estimate that the TPD method has a detection limit of approximately 1% of a monolayer.

We note that prior to the experiments shown here with the agent GB, we performed a control study with the simulant dimethyl methylphosphonate. In this study, we mimicked the conditions under which the results from a recently published experiment were recorded.⁵⁰ The IR spectral features and the TPD desorption profiles were indistinguishable, to within our signal-to-noise, for the two experiments. In addition to RAIRS and TPD, XPS measurements are typically performed before and after dosing for elemental analysis and determining surface composition. XPS experiments help confirm the molecular desorption mechanism indicated by the IR data. A demonstration of typical XPS data is provided below.

B. Uptake of VX on silica

The solid sorbent doser has been employed to study the uptake of the agent, VX. While specifically designed for lower vapor pressure molecules, the solid sorbent doser has also been shown to be effective for dosing high vapor pressure molecules including the nerve agent simulant diisopropyl methylphosphoante (DIMP). For VX dosing, the cartridge was packed with a graphitized carbon sorbent (Carbopack Y 60/80 Mesh) and then dosed with 20 μ L of VX. While carbon was used for the VX experiments, the sorbent can easily be changed depending on the agent under investigation. Proper selection of sorbent material requires careful consideration, as it is important that the sorbent material itself is not involved in any agent chemistry. VX was dosed onto the silica surface by heating the cartridge (see Experimental Section) and TPD experiments were performed to study the activation energy for desorption from the surface.

Figure 4A shows a typical TPD spectrum for VX from silica. Comparing the TPD spectra of VX and GB (Fig 3B), similar peak shapes are observed; however, the maximum rate of desorption of VX occurs at 350 K, which is nearly 100 K higher than that observed for GB. This data suggests that VX interacts with the silica surface significantly more strongly than does GB. Experiments are currently underway to further investigate the adsorption mechanism and potential decomposition pathways for VX on the surfaces of silica.

After desorption of VX and annealing the surface to 600 K, XPS was used to search for signatures of physisorbed species that would be indicative of an irreversible chemical reaction on the surface. XPS is sensitive enough to detect below 1% atomic percent near the surface. Figure 4B shows a survey XPS scan. The small peak in the P 2p region shows that phosphorus residues remain on the silica, suggesting that, while VX desorbs molecularly at elevated temperatures (as shown in the TPD experiments), a measurable amount of decomposition on the silica surface may also occur. Future work will focus on uncovering the reaction pathways and branching ratios for this interesting system.




Figure 4. A. TPD of VX desorption from silica (ramp rate 1 K/s, mass fragment 114 amu) B. XPS spectrum of silica following TPD of VX in which a small amount of phosphorus (~1 atomic percent) is observed.

IV. Summary

A new multifunctional UHV instrument has been successfully designed, constructed, and tested at the Edgewood Chemical and Biological Center, in Aberdeen Maryland, to perform some of the first vacuum-based surface science measurements of the interactions of CWAs with materials of interest to the military and public defense communities. Protection against the hazards of working with highly toxic compounds has been accomplished through the incorporation of a novel ventilation system and methods for directing exhaust from pumps or gases from the chamber during venting to the hood. In addition, a new doser specifically designed to enable safe, *in vacuo* dosing of low vapor pressure compounds (such as VX) was developed. All functions of the instrument were tested and evaluated during a series of experiments where the CWAs GB, GD, HD, and VX, as well as the simulant DIMP were dosed onto a high surface area silica surface. These experiments have been used to evaluate the type of interaction between a silica surface and gas phase CWAs, and to determine desorption energies. Quantitative results from these measurements will be described in a forthcoming series of publications. This novel instrument will enable high-fidelity studies of the adsorption, reaction, and desorption of CWAs with surfaces of importance to national security.

References

- (1) Seto, Y. *Yakugaku Zasshi-Journal of the Pharmaceutical Society of Japan* **2009**, *129*, 53.
- (2) Prasad, G. K.; Ramacharyulu, P. V. R. K.; Singh, B. *Journal of Scientific & Industrial Research* **2011**, *70*, 91.
- (3) Sundarajan, S.; Chandrasekaran, A. R.; Ramakrishna, S. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **2010**, *93*, 3955.
- (4) Fitch, J. P.; Raber, E.; Imbro, D. R. *Science* **2003**, *302*, 1350.
- (5) Hirakawa, T.; Mera, N.; Sano, T.; Negishi, N.; Takeuchi, K. *Yakugaku Zasshi-Journal of the Pharmaceutical Society of Japan* **2009**, *129*, 71.
- (6) Houston, M.; Hendrickson, R. G. *Critical Care Clinics* **2005**, *21*, 653.

- (7) Raber, E.; Carlsen, T. M.; Folks, K. J.; Kirvel, R. D.; Daniels, J. I.; Bogen, K. T. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research* **2004**, *14*, 31.
- (8) Yang, Y. C.; Baker, J. A.; Ward, J. R. *Chemical Reviews* **1992**, *92*, 1729.
- (9) Eubanks, L. M.; Dickerson, T. J.; Janda, K. D. *Chemical Society Reviews* **2007**, *36*, 458.
- (10) Golightly, R. S.; Doering, W. E.; Natan, M. J. *Acs Nano* **2009**, *3*, 2859.
- (11) Janata, J. In *Annual Review of Analytical Chemistry* 2009; Vol. 2, p 321.
- (12) Wagner, G. W.; MacIver, B. K. *Langmuir* **1998**, *14*, 6930.
- (13) Bartelt-Hunt, S. L.; Knappe, D. R. U.; Barlaz, M. A. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology* **2008**, *38*, 112.
- (14) Love, A. H.; Vance, A. L.; Reynolds, J. G.; Davisson, M. L. *Chemosphere* **2004**, *57*, 1257.
- (15) Munro, N. B.; Talmage, S. S.; Griffin, G. D.; Waters, L. C.; Watson, A. P.; King, J. F.; Hauschild, V. *Environmental Health Perspectives* **1999**, *107*, 933.
- (16) Bermudez, V. M. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **2005**, *109*, 9970.
- (17) Bermudez, V. M. *Langmuir* **2010**, *26*, 18144.
- (18) Chen, D. A.; Ratliff, J. S.; Hu, X. F.; Gordon, W. O.; Senanayake, S. D.; Mullins, D. R. *Surface Science* **2010**, *604*, 574.
- (19) Ferguson-McPherson, M. K.; Low, E. R.; Esker, A. R.; Morris, J. R. *Langmuir* **2005**, *21*, 11226.
- (20) Gay, I. D.; McFarlan, A. J.; Morrow, B. A. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* **1991**, *95*, 1360.
- (21) Gordon, W. O.; Tissue, B. M.; Morris, J. R. *Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2007**, *111*, 3233.
- (22) Li, Y. X.; Schlup, J. R.; Klabunde, K. J. *Langmuir* **1991**, *7*, 1394.
- (23) Mitchell, M. B.; Sheinker, V. N.; Mintz, E. A. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **1997**, *101*, 11192.
- (24) Panayotov, D.; Kondratyuk, P.; Yates, J. T. *Langmuir* **2004**, *20*, 3674.
- (25) Panayotov, D. A.; Morris, J. R. *Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2009**, *113*, 15684.
- (26) Panayotov, D. A.; Paul, D. K.; Yates, J. T. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **2003**, *107*, 10571.
- (27) Ratliff, J. S.; Tenney, S. A.; Hu, X.; Conner, S. F.; Ma, S.; Chen, D. A. *Langmuir* **2009**, *25*, 216.
- (28) Nazari, B.; Jaafari, M. *Digest Journal of Nanomaterials and Biostructures* **2010**, *5*, 909.
- (29) Bermudez, V. M. *Langmuir* **2010**, *26*, 18144.
- (30) Panayotov, D. A.; Morris, J. R. *Langmuir* **2009**, *25*, 3652.
- (31) Panayotov, D. A.; Morris, J. R. *Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2009**, *113*, 15684.
- (32) Groenewold, G. S.; Gresham, G. L.; Avci, R.; Deliorman, M. *Surface and Interface Analysis* **2009**, *41*, 244.
- (33) Kim, K.; Tsay, O. G.; Atwood, D. A.; Churchill, D. G. *Chemical Reviews* **2011**, *111*, 5345.
- (34) Vanbokhoven, J.; Kuiper, A. E. T.; Medema, J. *Journal of Catalysis* **1976**, *43*, 168.
- (35) Vanbokhoven, J.; Kuiper, A. E. T.; Medema, J. *Journal of Catalysis* **1976**, *43*, 181.
- (36) Kuiper, A. E. T.; Vanbokhoven, J.; Medema, J. *Journal of Catalysis* **1976**, *43*, 154.
- (37) Strukov, O. G.; Petrunin, V. A.; Sheluchenko, B. V.; Kuntsevich, A. D.; Drozd, G. I.; Makarochkina, S. M. *Doklady Akademii Nauk* **1999**, *368*, 787.
- (38) Wagner, G. W.; Bartram, P. W.; Koper, O.; Klabunde, K. J. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **1999**, *103*, 3225.
- (39) Wagner, G. W.; Bartram, P. W. *Langmuir* **1999**, *15*, 8113.

- (40) Wagner, G. W.; Koper, O. B.; Lucas, E.; Decker, S.; Klabunde, K. J. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **2000**, *104*, 5118.
- (41) Wagner, G. W.; Procell, L. R.; O'Connor, R. J.; Munavalli, S.; Carnes, C. L.; Kapoor, P. N.; Klabunde, K. J. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **2001**, *123*, 1636.
- (42) Saxena, A.; Srivastava, A. K.; Singh, B.; Gupta, A. K.; Suryanarayana, M. V. S.; Pandey, P. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* **2010**, *175*, 795.
- (43) Taylor, D. E.; Runge, K.; Cory, M. G.; Burns, D. S.; Vasey, J. L.; Hearn, J. D.; Griffith, K.; Henley, M. V. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2013**.
- (44) Neatu, S.; Cojocaru, B.; Parvulescu, V. I.; Somoghi, V.; Alvaro, M.; Garcia, H. *Journal of Materials Chemistry* **2010**, *20*, 4050.
- (45) Wagner, G. W.; O'Connor, R. J.; Edwards, J. L.; Brevett, C. A. S. *Langmuir* **2004**, *20*, 7146.
- (46) Wagner, G. W. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* **2011**, *50*, 12285.
- (47) Fisher, G. L.; Meserole, C. A. *Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology A* **2005**, *23*, 722.
- (48) Lu, J. W.; Fiegand, L. R.; Davis, E. D.; Alexander, W. A.; Wagner, A.; Gandour, R. D.; Morris, J. R. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2011**, *115*, 25343.
- (49) Wilmsmeyer, A. R.; Gordon, W. O.; Davis, E. D.; Troya, D.; Mantoosh, B. A.; Lalain, T. A.; Morris, J. R. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2013**, *117*, 15685.
- (50) Wilmsmeyer, A. R.; Uzarski, J.; Barrie, P. J.; Morris, J. R. *Langmuir* **2012**, *28*, 10962.
- (51) King, D. A.; Wells, M. G. *Surf. Sci.* **1972**, *29*, 454.
- (52) Taylor, D. E.; Runge, K.; Cory, M. G.; Burns, D. S.; Vasey, J. L.; Hearn, J. D.; Griffith, K.; Henley, M. V. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2013**, *117*, 2699.