LEGIBILITY NOTICE

cal Information Center is to provide the broadest dissemination possi ble of information contained in A major purpose of the Techni-DOE's Research and Development Reports to business, industry, the academic community, and federal, state and local governments.

Although a small portion of this report is not reproducible, it is being made available to expedite the availability of information on the research discussed herein.

1

 $MDF - 400291 - 2$

LA-UR $90 - 1603$

Los Alamos harional Laboratory is oberated by the University of California for the United States Debartment of Energy under contract W-7405-ENG 36

 LA -UR--90-1603

DE90 011960

TITLE Impurity Tolerant Electrocatalysts

AUTHOR(S) M. T. Paffett

SUBMITTED TO Proceedings of the Second Annual Fuel Cell Contractors Review Meeting, Morgantown, WV May 2-4, 1990

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 hability 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 berein do not necessarily scate or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

By accepiance of this article. The publisher recognizes that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, reyalty-free license to publish or remoduce the published form of this contribution, or to allow ethers to do so. for U.S. Government burboses

The Los Alamos Nalional Laboratory requests that the aublisher identify this article as work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy

IMPURITY TOLERANT ELECTROCATALYSTS

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$. $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A})$

CONTRACT INFORMATION

 \bullet , and \bullet , and \bullet , and \bullet

OBJECTIVES:

This project has two central goals. The primary research effort addresses fundamental aspects of Pt electrocatalyst poisoning by CO and an understanding of practical schemes for improving the CO tolerance of electrocatalytic materials. The second mission of this work is an attempt to address, on a fundamental leve!, the surface chemical properties that enhance the direct electrooxidation of methanol at binary Pt alloy electrode surfaces. More specifically each of Ihese two objectives arc described in bullet form as follows.

We have explored the physical and chemical basis of elimination of CO poisoning effects by direct injection of low levels (-1%) of O₂ into the anode feed stream of working single fuel cells. The fuel cell systems examined include both polymer electrolyte (PEFC) and phosphoric acid fuel cells (PAFC). This examination has included model studies of $O₂$ coinjection with low levels of CO at R rotating disk electrodes and exhaust gas analysis of working fuel cells.

 \bullet We have examined the s fice structural properties and reactivity of Sn/Pt surface alloys prepared by vapor deposition of Sn onto single crystal substrates followed by annealing $(1000K)$. These studies have included a variety of surface analysis characterization studies. In addition, the reactivity of these templates with respect to small molecule adsorbates and the electrochemical reactivity towards direct methanol electrooxidation have also been examined.

The surface properties and reactivity of

other bimetallic electrocatalytic materials (e.g., PdAu, PdSn) will also be examined using the same set of techiniques and methods as described for the RSn surface alloys.

BACKGROUND STATEMENT:

The rational for studying the first programmatic area is that CO severely poisons the hydrogen electrode reaction in fuel cells for temperatures below 150°C. This is a difficult problem **to** overcome for Pt based fuel cells operating at low temperature **or** under cold startup conditions. Recent progress at Los Alamos (Pafford and Gottesfeld) has demonstrated a practical solution for a supported Pt anode electrocatalyst operating on hydrogen with up to 0.05% CO at temperature <100 $^{\circ}$ C. This scheme of CO cleansing **relies** on coinjecting low levels of oxygen or air into the anode compartment. We are in the process of fully examining the range of parameters that contribute to this technologically important finding.

In addition, we are atterming to gain a fundamental understanding of how and why certain (reported) bimetallic electrode combinations display less poisoning by CO than pure Pt. This know!edge should, in turn, allow us to suggest (and try) other materials that may display better anode operating characteristics in the presence of CO. In addition, these same eicctrocatalysts have been used for the direct electrooxidation of methanol. These fundamental tiudies should allow a better understanding of liow surface chemical reactivity depends on the properties of the bimetallic surface.

RESULTS

EXHAUST GAS ANALYSIS:

We have performed anode exhaust gas analysis for operational single fuel cells (PEFCS) using FTIR and GC methods to elucidate the effects of added $O₂$. We have examined the effects of gas flow rate, membrane thickness and feed gas compositon on the cleansing effect of 02 added to a CO-contaminated anode feed stream of PEFCS. Our results indicate hat under every conditon where O_2 was blended at a level of 2% into the anode feed stream complete removal of CO (al the hundreds of ppm level) from the exhaust stream was achcived. On :he basis of these results, and comparision with literature values for the heterogenous oxidation of CO by O_2 , a model in which the CO impurity is oxidized in a heterogenous process, possibly at nonelectrochemically active Pt sites within the electrode assembly, is proposed. Representative data from these ana!ysis **is** shown in the **following** paragraphs.

Several methods of quantitatively analyzing for CO and $CO₂$ at ppm levels were suggested (e.g., GC, MS, IR). For ease of operation, reproducibility and lack of interferences, analysis by IR was determined to be the method of choice for CO and $CO₂$ analysis. For quantifying the loss of injected O_2 , by interaction with H_2 to form H_2O , GC was utilized. The IR analysis was conducted using a Mattson Cygnus FTIR spectrometer configured with a DTGS detector and a variable $(2.25 20.25$ M) path length IR cell. Quantification of the CO and $CO₂$ levels was acheived through the use of a primary gas standard containing 100 ppm each of CO and $CO₂$ (supplied by Scott Specialty Gases), Other concentration ranges (usually the higher concentrations) were prepared by blending CO and/or $CO₂$ mixtures with N₂.

Absorbances were determined at 5-7 different path lengths to insure that background $CO₂$ levels $(-330$ ppm in air) did not introduce any systematic error into the observed absorbance readings. The entire IR beam path was flushed with dry N_2 to lower background CO_2 levels to less tian 0.0005 absorbance units. In most cases the exhaust gas streams were passed through a coiled Cu tubing trap immersed in an ice bath with added salt $(T \sim 2.4$ °C). This step was taken to lower the water content going into the IR analysis cell and to prevent nonlinear absorbance behavior arising from severe IR transmittance losses. Water was, however, always present in the IR spectra. A representative spectrum recorded after purging the IR cell for 45 minutes with anode exhaust gas is shown in Fig. 1. Note that the CO (2130 cm⁻¹) and CO₂ (2360 cm⁻¹) bands are quite distinct and sufficiently well separated from the prominent water bands. Prior to examining the the anode exhaust, the IR gas cell was purged with dry N_2 at a high (~50 CFM) flow rate for 5-10 minutes. This is to insure that the measurement is not contaminated from prior sampling and to preclude a potential explosion in cases whe. the cathode icel cell exhaust is sampled. A flow rate of 400 seem through a 50 cm^2 PEFC corresponds roughly to a stiochiometric gas flow of $-2x$ the gas required to sustain the load of 20A employed.

A series of PEFC experiments were conducted in an attempt to address the following questions, \mathcal{A}) Does \mathbf{O}_2 coinjection at the anode successfully convert all of the CO impurity to $CO₂$? (B) In the absence of $O₂$ coinjection is any of the CO oxidized by the low levels of \mathbf{O}_2 cross-over from the cathode side of the fuel cell structure? (C) Are there flow rate dependencies to the observed disappearence of CO for both cases (with and without coinjected $O_{\mathbb{C}}$)?

We begin by describing the exhaust gas

analysis for 100ppm CO injection using a 7 mil membrane separator with and without \mathcal{O}_2 coinjections. For all cases examined, when level of 7% ~ . at **a** the 100 p om CO in H_2 , the CO was completely converted to CO₂ (detection $limit < 5$ ppm CO). Representative IR data taken at a cell path length of 20.25M are shown in Fig. 2. The gas flow input parameters are listed on the figure. Note that there is no evidence of CO in the exhaust gas. In the Fig. 2 inset the $CO₂$ concentration is also plotted versus anode input gas flow rate through the cell. Note that the $CO₂$ level is considerably higher than that expected from a total conversion of CO to $CO₂$. However, it should be poimed out that an exact mass balance on the CO conversion requires accounting for the loss of $H₂$ due to the electrochemical oxidization in the anode electrocatalyst structure. To address the accounting issue and to examine appropriate control experiments for $CO₂$ production we have also examined the effect of added $O₂$ in the absence of CO and an exhaust gas analysis using only H_2 as the anode gas feed.

In Fig. 3 the CO and $CO₂$ levels in the exhuast gas are shown plotted versus flow rate through the anode structure for the case of no $O₂$ example the model substitute for the case of the control $H₂$). Two observations are immediately apparent from inspection of Fig. 3. Firstly, at close to stiochiometric utilization of the anode gas input, the CO levels arc observed to be very low (<10ppm). As the flow rate is increased the amount of CO observed in the anode exhaust increases in linear fashion up **to** nearly the input level of 100 ppm. Secondly, the $CO₂$ levels increase as expected from a stiochiometric oxidation of the initial CO level. At the highest flow rate (700 scem) the $CO₂$ levels are also observed to drop off slightly.

This puzzling behavior, namely the loss of CO measured at the PEFC anode exhaust gas at low flow rates (high stiochiometric gas utilization) when injected at a level of 100ppm is speculated to be due to low levels of $O₂$ crossing from the cathode compartment through the membrane separator and reacting a: exposed Pt sites to produce $CO₂$. The degree of reactant cross-over (O_2) penetration) will depend on the $O₂$ partial pressure at the cathode, the membrane thickness, and on the possible presence of flaws (e.g., pinholes) in the membrane. It should also be mentioned that for the PEFC assemblies used in this work, the cathode side is held at a higher pressure than the anode.

For the experiments with no added CO, the CO₂ concentration was measured to be 55 \pm 20ppm at several anode input flow rates (no CO was observed) We hypothesize that at low flow rates of H₂ with 2% O_2 , this level of CO_2 production in the absence of added CO is derived from some low level of gasification of the C support. This rate of C gasification is insignificant in the context of long term stability of the carbon material in the PEFC.

The fate of the coinjected O_2 was examined by GC analysis and will be briefly discussed. Surprisingly, for all of the fuel flow rates examined (200-800 sccm) the $O₂$ was not completely converted to $H₂O$. Significant levels of $O₂$ remained after passing through the enode assembly. In addition, no clear cut dependence of the O_2 conversion to H_2O with flow rate was observed. Typical conversion levels of $O₂$ to $H₂O$ were around 50%. The data are being further examined to assess the effect of flow rate on reaction product partial pressure.

Further experiments arc in progress to complete this description of the complex interfacial chemistry occuring in PEFC assemblies when $O₂$ is coinjected with low levels of CO in the anode feed stream. In addition, phosphoric acid fuel cell (PAFC) assemblies are **being** constructed **to** test the beneficial effects of $G₂$ coinjection in scrubbing the anode feed gas of low levels of CO. Several avenues will be explored in this upcoming venture, among them are the effects of CO on the low temperature operation of the PAFC and the effects of coinjection of O_2 . An exhaust gas analysis identical to that done for the PEFC assemblies will also be conducted for the PAFC.

MODEL ELECTROCHEMICAL REACTIONS AT Pt RDEs

h additon to following the combustion of the CO impurity by heterogenous reaction at the supported Pt anode electrocatalyst, we have performed more carefully controlled electrochemical experiments using rotating disk electrodes to delineate parameters that influence CO poisoning of both Ihe hydrogen electrooxidation and $O₂$ reduction processes at polycrysta!line Pt surfaces immersed in aqueous acid solutions over the temperature range 25-**75"C.** Examining both the hydrogen oxidation and 0~ reduction processes has allowed us **to** sugg: alternative reaction pathways that result in t_k emoval of the electrode poison CO. This work has beensubmitted for publication ((a)Faffett, Pafford, and Gottesfeld, and (b) Paffett, Hawker, Tobias, Valerio, and Gottesfeld). The primary conclusion of this worl. is that at Pt electrode surfaces at temperatures of 80°C. CO adsorbed at potentials of $\leq +0.35V$ vs NHE (in the upd-H region) can apparently be effectively removed by O_2 in solution. At potentials above+0.35V or in the absence of $O₂$, electrode performance (towards either ORR or H_2 oxidation) was completely poisoned.

In summary, there appear to be at least two viable mechanisms for the removal of CO by coinjected $O₂$ in these fuel cell systems. The first process is a hcterogenous process in which the well known rates of CO oxidation by $O₂$ can account for observed removal rates. The second process(that may be occuring simultaneously) is a CO oxidation process that is occurring at the surface of Pt particles in contact with electrolyte whenever the electrode potential is negative of +0.35V and above 75°C.

SURFACE CHEMISTRY AND
ELECTROCHEMISTRY OF Sn/Pt $ELECTROCHEMISTRY$ **SYSTEMS**

We **have** completed a study of the interactions of vapor deposited Sn at Pt(100). The motivation for this body of work stems from a more complete picture of surface alloy behavior for the Sn/Pt systems. Previous work on the Sn/Pt(111) ((a)Paffett and Windham, (b) Overbury, Mullins, Paffett, and Koel) systems has indicatd that clean ordered surface alloys can be conveniently and reproducibly prepared by this method. These surfaces in turn display rather unique reactivity (Paffett, Gebhard, **Windham, and** Kocl) **that** lends insight into the surface chemical process occuring when these bimetallic surfaces are used to acheive higher electrochemical rates of methanol elcctrooxidation. In the present case, the Sn/Pt(100) system was chosen to complete the preparation methodology and to determine whether a more open starting template (Pt(100). FCC) would produce ordered surface alloys that mighi be similar to bulk terminated SnPt alloys, The roles of surface order and sticchiometry are then directly addressed in attempting to answer specific questions regarding surface chemical ' reactivity.

Specifically, Sn/Pt(100) interfaces prepared by vapor deposition of Sn onto $Pt(100)$ surfaces were examined using Auger and x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (AES, XPS), low energy electron diffraction (LEED), and inert gas low energy ion surface spectroscopy (LEISS) (Paffett, Simonson, and Koel). The Sn depositions have been performed at 300K and 600K and the surface composition and order were examined as functions of further annealing to 1200K. The AES uptake plots at 300K indicate that a fairly uniform layer deposition process acurs up **to** 2 adlaycrs. For the 600K depositions AES data indicate significant interdiffusion and surface alloy formation. LEED observations indicate that the characteristic 5x20 Pt(100) reconstruction disappears with Sn exposures of 0.35 monolayer (ml). Further Sn depositions result in a $c(2x2)$ LEED pattern starting with an exposure of slightly above 0.5 ml. The c(2x2) LEED pattern becomes progressively more diffuse with increasing Sn exposure with eventual loss of all LEED features obove 2.2 ml exposure. AES, LEED, and LEISS **icsults** were obtained after annealing α arious precoverages of Sn on Pt(100). For specific Sn precoverages and annealing conditions $p(3\sqrt{2x}\sqrt{2})R45^\circ$ and $c(2x2)$ LEED patterns were observed. Plausible real space models, based on ovcrlaycr structures, are suggested with idealized Sn surface coverages of 0.67 and 0,50 ml, respectively. However, further analysis is being performed to determine whether these results might not also be consistent with surface alloys in which the Sn adatoms reside in the surface layer as opposed to on top of the surface $P(100)$ template. These surfaces when examined in conjunction with the Sn/Pt(111) ordered surface alloys should provide interesting templates for exar ining the surface

——. electrochemical reactivity towards small fuel molecules (e.g., $CH₅OH$).

The electrochemical reactivity of the ordered Sn/Pt(l 11) surface alloys has been examined using a microreactor coupled to a ultrahigh vacuum {WHV) chamber. A schematic drawing of the apparatus used in this study is shown in Fig. 4. The surface analysis techniques were used to adequately prepare and characterize the surface alloys as described in manuscripts on the Sn/Pt(111) ordered surfaces (Paffet and Windham). The suifaces of interest were transferred to the microreactor region where this smaller region (volume-100 ml) was backfilled with Ar, electrolyte introduced and the prepared surface alloy was then used as an clectmde surface for the clectrocatalytic activity towards methanol electrooxidation. The electrolyte solution was removed from the surface(s), the the electrode was rinsed with ultrapure water (no electrolyte) and then were transferred back into the UHV environment. At this juncture the surface was examined using the same surface annalytical techniques utilized to prepare and characterize the surface originally, We have at this point in time repeated the preliminary experiments reported previously (quarterly report $(1/89)$) and describe the results in outline form below. All of the electrochemical results described below were obtained in 0.1M $H₂SO₄$ solutions and potentials are referenced with respect to a Pd/H reference electrode that had been charged galvanostatically in 0.1M H_2SO_4 solution prior to assessing the methanol electrochemical activity.

1) In $0.1M$ $H₂SO₄$ solutions the electrochemical stripping of the vapor deposited Sn proceeds above approximately $+0.6V$ and no sharp, strong electrochemical features were seen in cyclic voltammograms of the specifically prepared surfaces. Experimental evidence for the above statement is suppo ted by the AES spectra. recorded over the region 100-550 eV. AES traces have been recorded from $Pt(111)$, an unannealed Sn overlayer on Pt(111) ($\Theta = 0.7$ ml), and the $(\sqrt{3}x\sqrt{3})R30^{\circ}$ Sn/Pt(111) surface alloy prior to and after electrochemical cycling in $0.1 M$ H₂S0₄. After exposure to the electrochemical environment an appreciable O content builds up at the interface. In addition, a slightly variable C concentration is present after exposure to electrochemical environments. This C content was essentially the same (to within $\pm 20\%$) regardless of whether methanol was present in the electrolyte. For surfaces that have been electrochemically cycled to potentials greater than $+0.6V$ the surface concentration of Sn was drastically decreased (<5% atomic concentration).

X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) recorded from the Sn overlayer and the $(\sqrt{3}x\sqrt{3})R30^{\circ}$ Sn/Pt(111) surface alloy after electrochemical potential excursions below +0.6V indicates hat the surface contains a hydrated Sn oxide (most likely either SnOH_y or $SnO₂.nH₂O-$ quarterly report 1/90). Potential excursions abov \bullet this resulted in a loss of Sn in agreement w_1 , the AES data.

The actual election hermical enhancement for methanol electrooxidation was probed using cyclic voltammetry. These preliminary results will be discussed and have been reported in prior quarterly report (1/90).

In summary, the overlayer surfaces appeared to be rather unreactive with respect to methanol electooxidation and in all cases a carboneaceous residue was readily detected by AES. The $Sn/P1(111)$ surface alloys, however, do appear to more reactive towrds methanol electrooxidation. Work is currently in progress to further delineate the role that specifically prepared bimetallic surfaces (in the form of ordered surface alloys) have on the observed elearooxidation behavior towards methanol.

REFERENCES

J. Pafford and S. Gottesfeld, J. Electrochem. Soc., 135 (1988) 2651.

M.T. Paffett, J. Pafford, and S. Gotresfeld, Extended Abstract of the Electrochemical Society, Spring Meeting of the Electrochemical Society, May 1989, Los Angeles, CA,

M.T. Paffett, D. Hawker, H. Tobias, J. Valerio, and S. Gottesfeld, submitted to ?.

M.T. Paffett and R.G. Windham, Surface Sci., 208 (1989) 34.

M.T. Paffett, S. Gebhard, R. Windham, and B. Koel, Surface Sci., 223 (1989) 449.

M.T. Paffett, S. Gebhard, R. Windham, and B. Koel, J. Phys. Chem., in press, 1990.

S. Overbury, D. Mullins, M.T. Paffett, and B. Kocl, 3rd lntemational Conference on Surface Structure, Milwaukee, WI, July , 1990.

M.T. Paffett, R.J. Simonson, and B.E. Koel, manuscript in preparation.

 $\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$. $\frac{1}{2}$

÷,

 \sim

Fig 4