

Contract No:

This document was prepared in conjunction with work accomplished under Contract No. DE-AC09-08SR22470 with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Environmental Management (EM).

Disclaimer:

This work was prepared under an agreement with and funded by the U.S. Government. Neither the U. S. Government or its employees, nor any of its contractors, subcontractors or their employees, makes any express or implied:

- 1) warranty or assumes any legal liability for the accuracy, completeness, or for the use or results of such use of any information, product, or process disclosed; or
- 2) representation that such use or results of such use would not infringe privately owned rights; or
- 3) endorsement or recommendation of any specifically identified commercial product, process, or service.

Any views and opinions of authors expressed in this work do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, or its contractors, or subcontractors.

We put science to work.™



**Savannah River
National Laboratory™**

OPERATED BY SAVANNAH RIVER NUCLEAR SOLUTIONS

A U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORY • SAVANNAH RIVER SITE • AIKEN, SC

Investigation of Thermolytic Hydrogen Generation Rate of Tank Farm Simulated and Actual Waste

C.J. Martino

J.D. Newell

W.H. Woodham

J.M. Pareizs

T.B. Edwards

D.P. Lambert

A.M. Howe

November 2017

SRNL-STI-2017-00611, Revision 0

SRNL.DOE.GOV

DISCLAIMER

This work was prepared under an agreement with and funded by the U.S. Government. Neither the U.S. Government or its employees, nor any of its contractors, subcontractors or their employees, makes any express or implied:

1. warranty or assumes any legal liability for the accuracy, completeness, or for the use or results of such use of any information, product, or process disclosed; or
2. representation that such use or results of such use would not infringe privately owned rights; or
3. endorsement or recommendation of any specifically identified commercial product, process, or service.

Any views and opinions of authors expressed in this work do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, or its contractors, or subcontractors.

Printed in the United States of America

**Prepared for
U.S. Department of Energy**

Keywords: *DWPF, Tank Farm, Hydrogen*

Retention: *Permanent*

Investigation of Thermolytic Hydrogen Generation Rate of Tank Farm Simulated and Actual Waste

C.J. Martino
J.D. Newell
W.H. Woodham
J.M. Pareizs
T.B. Edwards
D.P. Lambert
A.M. Howe

November 2017

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy under
contract number DE-AC09-08SR22470.



REVIEWS AND APPROVALS

AUTHORS:

C.J. Martino, Process Technology Programs Date

J.D. Newell, Process Technology Programs Date

W.H. Woodham, Process Technology Programs Date

J.M. Pareizs, Process Technology Programs Date

T.B. Edwards, Immobilization Technology Date

D.P. Lambert, Process Technology Programs Date

A.M. Howe, Process Technology Programs Date

TECHNICAL REVIEW:

E.K. Hansen, Wasteform Processing Technologies, Reviewed per E7 2.60 Date

M.E. Stone, Wasteform Processing Technologies Date

APPROVAL:

F.M. Pennebaker, Chemical Processing Technologies Date

D.E. Dooley, Director Date
Chemical Processing Technologies

J.E. Occhipinti, Manager Date
Waste Removal & Tank Closure

J.P. Schwenker, Jr., Manager Date
Tank Farm Facility Engineering

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To support resolution of Potential Inadequacies in the Safety Analysis for the Savannah River Site (SRS) Tank Farm, Savannah River National Laboratory conducted research to determine the thermolytic hydrogen generation rate (HGR) with simulated and actual waste. Gas chromatography methods were developed and used with air-purged flow systems to quantify hydrogen generation from heated simulated and actual waste at rates applicable to the Tank Farm Documented Safety Analysis (DSA). Initial simulant tests with a simple salt solution plus sodium glycolate demonstrated the behavior of the test apparatus by replicating known HGR kinetics. Additional simulant tests with the simple salt solution excluding organics apart from contaminants provided measurement of the detection and quantification limits for the apparatus with respect to hydrogen generation. Testing included a measurement of HGR on actual SRS tank waste from Tank 38. A final series of measurements examined HGR for a simulant with the most common SRS Tank Farm organics at temperatures up to 140 °C. The following conclusions result from this testing.

HGR was measured for an actual-waste Tank 38 sample. The HGR measurements at 80, 90, 100, and 110 °C were 1.7×10^{-7} , 4.7×10^{-7} , 5.9×10^{-7} , and 2.6×10^{-6} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹, respectively. The Limit of Detection and Limit of Quantification for the HGR measurements were 2.6×10^{-8} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹ and 5.1×10^{-8} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹, respectively.

HGR was measured in a high boiling point (HBP) simulant with major known SRS Tank Farm organic compounds. Testing used fresh organics and did not simulate the long-term exposure of these organics already experienced in the waste. Hence, testing is expected to provide high bias to the hydrogen generation rates. The final HGR measurements at 75, 100, and 140 °C were 6.2×10^{-7} , 3.0×10^{-6} , and 8.1×10^{-5} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹, respectively. Decreases in the HGR were noted at isothermal conditions with steady gas tracer concentration, which clouds development of a temperature dependent correlation for generation rate. While the simulant contains high concentrations of major SRS organics tested at high temperatures found in the 3H Evaporator, this limited data set may not fully bound values under all possible operating conditions.

The HGR measurement apparatus was successfully employed to replicate hydrogen production rate experiments. Simulant without deliberately added organic carbon was found to contain approximately 200 mg/L of organic carbon from tramp organics in the reagents used to prepare the solution. The tests using such simulant generated hydrogen at rates consistent with, but somewhat lower than, those predicted at equivalent carbon and aluminum loadings by methods used at the Hanford Site. Prior to identifying the organic contaminants, potential sources of hydrogen in simulants without deliberately added organic carbon were examined. Testing determined that this hydrogen is not due to caustic reaction of organic materials of construction within the reaction vessel, electrolysis due to current leak, anode/cathode reactions, corrosion, or the method of heating employed in the experiment.

The following recommendations result from this testing.

- Proceed with the planned HGR measurements using a sealed system. The sealed system is designed to measure the low HGR expected for a Tank 50 actual waste sample. The sealed system vessels are constructed of stainless steel in contrast to the glass vessel used in the flow system testing reported here.
- Consider HGR measurements for actual-waste samples of tanks representing other portions of the SRS Tank Farm system. A single test with Tank 38 material may not provide adequate information for the entirety of the liquid waste system. Special consideration should be given to tanks that have a history of high organic content. The need for thermolytic HGR for Tank Farm operations such as

aluminum dissolution and oxalic acid cleaning should also be assessed. A test with a sample from the 3H Evaporator system may be appropriate due to the hydrogen measured in the HBP test.

- If the rates from the HBP and Tank 38 testing prove restrictive when applied to DSA development, additional simulant test to decipher the contributions from individual organic sources in tank waste may be warranted. In such testing, a control test should be performed to establish a baseline HGR without the addition of organics. Use of irradiated organic bearing solutions may be more appropriate to represent the current waste conditions. Additional instrumentation may be warranted on simulant testing if identification and quantification of volatile organic carbon species is to be tested.
- Additional simulant testing should be performed to evaluate the effect of anion concentrations on organic thermolytic HGR, particularly in concentrations ranges relevant to SRS waste.
- Additional measurements should be made with the flow system to examine potential contribution of glass dissolution and aluminosilicate precipitation toward hydrogen generation. Comparison should be made between testing of identical solutions in the glass and stainless steel vessels, preferably at sub-boiling temperature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Experimental Procedure	3
2.1 Simulant Preparation	3
2.1.1 Simulant Preparation Setup	3
2.1.2 Simple Salt Solution Simulant	3
2.1.3 High-Boiling Point Simulant	4
2.2 Flow System Set-up	5
2.2.1 Simulant Rig – with Heating Rods	5
2.2.2 Simulant Rig – with Heating Mantle	7
2.2.3 Shielded Cells Rig	8
2.2.4 Data Acquisition Software Description	8
2.3 Data Collection	9
2.3.1 HGR Measurement Process	9
2.3.2 Gas Handling and Analysis	9
2.3.3 Limits of Detection for Hydrogen	12
2.3.4 Analytical Methods for Sample Analysis	14
2.4 Quality Assurance	15
3.0 Results and Discussion	16
3.1 Results from Testing with SY1-SIM-91B-NG	16
3.1.1 Analysis of Prepared Simulant	16
3.1.2 Testing Parameters and Descriptions	16
3.1.3 Benchmarking Tests (HGR-ASH-1 & HGR-ASH-2)	17
3.1.4 Glycolate-Free Hydrogen Generation Mechanism Investigation	19
3.1.5 Evaluation of Hydrogen Generation Rate at 75 °C	25
3.2 Results from High Boiling Point Simulant Test with Tank Farm Organics	28
3.2.1 HGR Results for HBP Simulant	28
3.2.2 Nitrous Oxide Generation from HBP Simulant	35
3.2.3 Feed and Product Analysis	36
3.2.4 Precipitated Solids Analysis	39
3.3 Tank 38 Sample Characterization	45

3.3.1 Sample HTF-38-17-60.....	45
3.3.2 Initial Analysis of HTF-38-17-60.....	45
3.3.3 Post HGR Measurement Analysis of HTF-38-17-60.....	48
3.4 Results from Tank 38 Actual Waste Test.....	50
3.5 Comparisons Between Simulant Tests, Tank 38 Tests, and Hu Equation Predictions.....	54
4.0 Conclusions.....	56
5.0 Recommendations.....	57
6.0 References.....	57
Appendix A . Thermolysis Testing to Determine Components Producing Hydrogen.....	A-1
Appendix B . Analysis of Solids Produced in Simulant Tests.....	B-9

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1. Results of Gas Standard measurements for Hydrogen Detection Determination.....	12
Table 3-1. Analysis of the Salt Simulant SY1-SIM-91B-NG.....	16
Table 3-2. Run Parameters for Simulant Testing with SY1-SIM-91B-NG	17
Table 3-3. Peak and Persistent HGR for Tests HGR-ASH-2,3,4,5, & 6.....	25
Table 3-4. HGR Measurements for HBP Simulant.....	33
Table 3-5. Comparison of HBP Simulant HGR Measurement to HGR Calculated by Equation 1	35
Table 3-6. Analysis of the Base Salt Solution Used to Create the HBP Simulant.....	36
Table 3-7. Analysis of Samples Taken During HBP HGR Testing.....	38
Table 3-8. Summary of Inorganic and Organic Carbon in HBP Tests	38
Table 3-9. PSAL ICP-AES Analysis of Samples Taken During HBP HGR Testing.....	39
Table 3-10. Ionic Composition of Tank 38 Sample HTF-38-17-60	46
Table 3-11. Other Analysis of Tank 38 Sample HTF-38-17-60	47
Table 3-12. Sample Dilution with Water for Insoluble Oxalate	48
Table 3-13. Pre- and Post-HGR-Measurement Sample Analysis Results Comparison.....	49
Table 3-14. Summary of Inorganic and Organic Carbon for Tank 38 Pre- and Post-HGR Measurement Samples.....	50
Table 3-15. HGR Measurements for Tank 38.....	51
Table 3-16. Comparison of HGR Measurement to HGR Calculated by the Hu Equation 1.....	54

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1. HGR Process Equipment.....	6
Figure 2-2. Insulated HGR Process Equipment (without drain) Used for HBP Simulant Test	6
Figure 2-3. HGR Measurement Apparatus with a Heating Mantle.....	7
Figure 2-4: Shielded Cells Process Equipment.....	8
Figure 2-5. Regression of Hydrogen Standards for Estimation of s_0	13
Figure 2-6. Regression of H_2 area versus QC Standards H_2 concentration (ppmv) Values	14
Figure 3-1. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-1.	18
Figure 3-2. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-2.	19
Figure 3-3. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-3.	20
Figure 3-4. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-4.	21
Figure 3-5. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-5.	22
Figure 3-6. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-6.	23
Figure 3-7. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-WATER.	24
Figure 3-8. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-5b.	26
Figure 3-9. Hydrogen Concentration as a Function of Time for Run HGR-ASH-5b.....	27
Figure 3-10. Overall HGR Measurement Results for HBP Simulant	28
Figure 3-11. Process Parameters During HBP Simulant HGR Measurements.....	29
Figure 3-12. HGR Measurement for the HBP Simulant during Initial Period of Testing	30
Figure 3-13. HBP Simulant HGR Measurement at 140 °C.....	31
Figure 3-14. HBP Simulant HGR Measurement at 100 °C.....	32
Figure 3-15. HBP Simulant HGR Measurement at 75 °C.....	32
Figure 3-16. Arrhenius Plot for HBP HGR Measurements	34
Figure 3-17. Hydrogen and Nitrous Oxide Generated during HBP Test at 140 °C (left), and the Hydrogen to Nitrous Oxide Ratio for HBP Test at 140 °C (right)	35
Figure 3-18. Appearance of HBP Simulant Material after Testing	40
Figure 3-19. Solids Deposited on Mixer Impeller (and Heating Rods) after HBP Simulant Testing.....	40
Figure 3-20. Solids Removed from Bottom of Kettle upon Completion of HBP Simulant Testing.....	41
Figure 3-21. SEM Image of Solid Material Deposited during 140 °C HGR Measurement.....	41

Figure 3-22. Representative XRD of Solids Deposited on Mixer, Heating Rods, and Walls of Kettle..... 43

Figure 3-23. XRD of a Gray Solid Mass Precipitated in the HGR Kettle 43

Figure 3-24. SEM Backscatter Image and XEDS of Gray Solid Mass Precipitated in the HGR Kettle.... 44

Figure 3-25. Photographs of sample HTF-38-17 60 in SRNL Shielded Cells, Cell 3 45

Figure 3-26. XRD of White Solids Precipitated in the Tank 38 HGR Kettle 50

Figure 3-27. Tank 38 Hydrogen Generation Rates as a Function of Time at Temperature 51

Figure 3-28. Curve Fit of Hydrogen Generation Rate vs 1/T to Calculate Activation Energy 52

Figure 3-29. Nitrous Oxide Generation during Boiling of Tank 38..... 53

Figure 3-30. Example Chromatogram from Tank 38 Testing at 110.5 °C..... 55

Figure 3-31. Example Chromatogram from HBP Simulant Testing at 140 °C..... 56

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AA	Atomic Absorption
AD	Analytical Development
CPC	Chemical Processing Cell
CSTR	Continuous Stirred Tank Reactor
CVAA	Cold Vapor Atomic Absorption
DAC	Data Acquisition and Control
DSA	Documented Safety Analysis
DWPF	Defense Waste Processing Facility
EDTA	ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid
FTIR	Fourier Transform Infrared
GC	Gas Chromatograph
HBP	High Boiling Point
HGR	Hydrogen Generation Rate
HLW	High Level Waste
IC	Ion Chromatography
ICP-AES	Inductively Coupled Plasma – Atomic Emission Spectroscopy
ICP-MS	Inductively Coupled Plasma – Mass Spectroscopy
LOD	Limit of Detection
LOQ	Limit of Quantification
OB	Other Base (excluding carbonate)
PID	proportional-integral-derivative
PISA	Potential Inadequacy in the Safety Analysis
ppmv	parts per million volume
PSAL	Process Science and Analytical Laboratory
RSD	Relative Standard Deviation
scm	standard cubic centimeters per minute
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscopy
SRAT	Sludge Receipt Adjustment Tank
SRNL	Savannah River National Laboratory
SRR	Savannah River Remediation
SVOA	Semivolatile Organic Analysis
TB	Total Base
TC	Total Carbon
TIC	Total Inorganic Carbon
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
TTQAP	Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan
TTR	Technical Task Request
VOA	Volatile Organic Analysis
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
XEDS	X-ray Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy
XRD	X-ray Diffraction
WTP	Waste Treatment Plant

1.0 Introduction

In February 2017, Savannah River Remediation (SRR) declared a Potential Inadequacy in the Safety Analysis (PISA) in each of three Savannah River Site (SRS) Liquid Waste facilities: Tank Farm,¹ Saltstone,² and the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF).³ The PISAs related to how formate and other organics can impact the radiolytic and thermolytic production of hydrogen, which is a flammable gas. Resolution of the PISAs requires research to evaluate the impact of organics including formate on the generation of hydrogen in SRS High-Level Waste (HLW) tanks, processing tanks, and evaporator systems.

This work is governed by a Technical Task Request (TTR)⁴ and a Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan (TTQAP).⁵ The work contained in this report partially fulfills Tasks 3 and 4 in the TTR, which are related to testing in support of the SRS HLW Tank Farm. Radioactive sample material from SRS Tank 38 was used for some of the testing, allowing for a measurement of thermolytic Hydrogen Generation Rate (HGR) with the mixture of organics present in the actual waste. The work also included two phases of simulant testing, one to determine the behavior of the equipment prior to HGR measurement in the actual waste material and the other to investigate high temperatures applicable to the SRS Tank Farm evaporator systems.

Three separate run plans were issued for the three separate portions of the work. Initiating prior to the start of actual waste testing and high boiling point (HBP) testing, simulant tests with a simple salt solution (plus sodium glycolate) examined the behavior of the test apparatus by replicating known HGR kinetics.⁶ This first group of tests also examined the behavior of the apparatus with respect to hydrogen generation without sodium glycolate. Next, testing included a measurement of HGR on actual SRS tank waste from Tank 38.⁷ The third series of measurements examined HGR for a HBP simulant with common SRS Tank Farm organics at temperatures up to 140 °C.⁸

Thermolytic production of gases in radioactive waste media was reported by Delegard in 1980.⁹ Using standard laboratory glassware, commercially available reagent-grade NaOH, NaNO₃, NaNO₂, Na₂CO₃, and technical grade NaAlO₂, Delegard was able to demonstrate the production of H₂, N₂, and N₂O gases as products from the thermolysis of N-(2-hydroxy)ethylenediaminetriacetate (HEDTA). It was shown that the production of gases was dependent on the presence of nitrite/nitrate salts and the concentrations of aluminum and hydroxide in solution.

In 1994, Ashby¹⁰ reported the thermolysis of glycolate and HEDTA in simple salt simulants similar to those employed by Delegard. Using Teflon-coated glassware and offgas sampling capabilities, Ashby was able to measure the decomposition rates of glycolate in alkaline media as well as track the production rates of H₂, N₂, and N₂O gases. Ashby also reported the rates of production of formate and oxalate, both of which are products from glycolate decomposition. Ashby posited the existence of a multi-reaction mechanism for glycolate decomposition and subsequent H₂ formation that depended on the presence of nitrite, aluminum, and hydroxide.

Thermolytic production of hydrogen from organic compounds was also described by Hu in 2004.¹¹ In work designed to support flammability calculations at the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant (WTP), Hu developed an empirical model describing the thermolytic production of H₂ from organic molecules as a function of temperature, organic carbon content, and aluminum content. This model is given in Equation 1 below:

$$HGR_{thm} = a_{thm} \cdot r_f \cdot [TOC] \cdot [Al]^{0.4} \cdot L_f \cdot e^{-E_{thm}/RT}$$

Equation 1

where,

HGR_{thm} = thermolytic hydrogen generation rate, mole kg⁻¹ day⁻¹
 a_{thm} = pre-exponential factor, 3.94×10⁹ mol kg⁻¹ day⁻¹
 r_f = reactivity coefficient
 $[TOC]$ = concentration of total organic carbon in the liquid, wt%
 $[Al]$ = concentration of aluminum, wt%
 L_f = mass fraction of waste present as liquid
 E_{thm} = thermolytic activation energy, 89,600 J mole⁻¹
 R = gas constant, 8.314 J mole⁻¹ K⁻¹
 T = temperature, K

Both the activation energy and the pre-exponential factor are values regressed from hydrogen generation measurements specific to Hanford actual waste samples at temperatures between 60 and 120 °C. Thus, the values are representative of the specific blend of organics present in that waste. The reactivity factor was used to improve the fit of the data, with recommended values varying between 0.15 and 1. Data generated in this report is compared to the most conservative recommendation, using Equation 1 and a value of reactivity factor of $r_f = 1$. This treatment is consistent with methodologies applied at the SRS Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) and Saltstone.¹²⁻¹³ Note that the use of a reactivity factor equal to 1 is more conservative than the values recommended by Hu for Hanford waste tanks (0.3 or 0.6).

The advantage of the empirical model developed by Hu is that exact knowledge of the concentrations for each organic species present is not needed. Rather, a composite measurement (i.e., Total Organic Carbon, TOC) is employed such that hydrogen generation from organic thermolysis can be predicted within a factor of 3 for Hanford organics without the need for extensive sampling and characterization campaigns. This approach is especially useful in the context of evaluating SRS wastes, where hundreds of organics are known to exist in trace amounts.¹⁴

In 2017, Crawford and King used observations and data generated by Ashby to develop a rate expression for hydrogen generation due to glycolate thermolysis.¹⁵ This rate equation was generated by assuming that the rate of destruction of glycolate is the maximum H₂ production rate (i.e., one mole of glycolate can make one mole of hydrogen). Using this assumption, Ashby's kinetic data for glycolate degradation, and an observed hydrogen generation activation energy (113,000 J/mol), a rate expression derived from the Crawford and King model can be developed, given in Equation 2 below:

$$HGR_{thm}^{gly} = k \frac{[Al][NO_2^-][gly]}{[OH^-]} e^{\frac{-E_A}{R} \left(\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{393.15} \right)} \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

where,

HGR_{thm}^{gly} = rate of hydrogen production by glycolate thermolysis, moles L⁻¹ hr⁻¹
 k = rate constant for glycolate degradation at 120 °C, L mole⁻¹ hr⁻¹
 $[Al]$ = aluminum concentration, M
 $[NO_2^-]$ = nitrite concentration, M
 $[gly]$ = glycolate concentration, M
 $[OH^-]$ = hydroxide concentration, M
 E_A = activation energy for hydrogen generation, 113,000 J mole⁻¹

R = gas constant, 8.314 J mole⁻¹ K⁻¹
 T = temperature, K

The analyses and kinetic studies performed by Ashby comprise a matrix of tests to validate and benchmark simulant experimental data generated at SRNL.

There are significant differences between the solution compositions used by Hu and the waste at SRS. Similar differences exist between the experiments performed by Ashby and the waste at SRS. Among these deviations, aluminum concentration differences may have the greatest influence on application of the equations given the relationship described by both Hu and Ashby between HGR and soluble aluminum concentration. Furthermore, the prior studies for Hanford did not consider temperatures as high as those experienced in the SRS evaporators. Therefore, in addition to benchmarking tests based on Ashby's work, additional experiments used a HBP simulant with organics representative of SRS waste, as well as testing with radioactive material from SRS tank waste.

2.0 Experimental Procedure

2.1 Simulant Preparation

2.1.1 *Simulant Preparation Setup*

All simulants used in this study were prepared by dissolving predetermined amounts of sodium salts into heated ASTM D1193-Type I deionized water. A 4-L glass or stainless-steel beaker was placed onto a heating stir plate equipped with a thermocouple and temperature control capability. A magnetic stir bar provided agitation while adding simulant components. Deionized water was generated using an Aries deionizing station equipped with a dual bed for organics removal (VP-17-4210) and a mixed bed for high purity (VP-17-4010). Reagent grade 50 wt% sodium hydroxide solution, sodium nitrate (>99%), sodium nitrite (99.9%), and sodium carbonate (>99.9%) were purchased from Fisher Chemicals and used as received. Technical grade sodium aluminate trihydrate was purchased from Spectrum Chemical Manufacturing Corporation and used as received.

While the compounds used and sequence of addition varied between each simulant type, sodium hydroxide was regularly added before sodium aluminate. This approach enhanced aluminum solubility and helped to mitigate the formation of insoluble aluminum hydroxide solids. The addition of sodium hydroxide evolved a significant amount of heat, as expected. Once this exothermic release of energy subsided, simulants were heated to 60 °C during preparation to facilitate complete dissolution. Despite this measure, a small amount of white solids was typically observed at the end of the simulant preparation step.

2.1.2 *Simple Salt Solution Simulant*

To benchmark the designed HGR measurement technique and demonstrate the adequacy of the equipment used, a salt solution simulant was prepared based on the SY1-SIM-91B simulant used by Ashby. Since SY1-SIM-91B included the use of organic compounds, a modified recipe was selected. The modified recipe of this simulant, designated SY1-SIM-91B-NG, follows (in order of addition).

- 0.42 M sodium carbonate
- 2.00 M sodium hydroxide
- 1.54 M sodium aluminate
- 2.24 M sodium nitrite
- 2.59 M sodium nitrate

Preparation of SY1-SIM-91B-NG departed from the method employed by Ashby to prepare SY1-SIM-91B in that components of SY1-SIM-91B-NG were added to a heated beaker of DI water and diluting to volume, whereas SY1-SIM-91B was prepared by dissolving each component in a glass volumetric flask, diluting to volume, and filtering.

2.1.3 High-Boiling Point Simulant

HBP simulant testing was designed to incorporate multiple chemical components found in SRS waste (e.g., soluble salts, noble metals, mercury, and organic species). The HBP simulant was prepared by first generating 3.6 L of a base salt solution simulant based on concentrations of hydroxide, aluminate, nitrite, and nitrate measured in Sample 200638582 on September 11th, 2013 from Tank 42 (given below in order of addition).¹⁶

- 5.48 M sodium hydroxide
- 0.52 M sodium aluminate
- 2.14 M sodium nitrite
- 2.12 M sodium nitrate

1.2 L of this solution was charged to the HGR measurement apparatus. A solution of trim metal nitrates was added such that the final metal concentrations in the kettle were:

- 450 mg/L mercury (added as mercuric nitrate),
- 1 mg/L ruthenium (added as ruthenium nitrosyl nitrate),
- 0.2 mg/L rhodium (added as rhodium nitrate),
- 0.2 mg/L palladium (added as palladium nitrate monohydrate), and
- 0.4 mg/L silver (added as silver nitrate).

After trim addition, the simulant was heated to boiling and continuously evaporated by boiling off excess water while adding approximately 0.7 additional liters of fresh base simulant. The feed rate of base simulant was monitored to maintain the liquid volume of solution in the kettle. While heating the solution, the following organic species were added to the specified concentrations:

- 3000 mg/L formate (added as sodium formate, near maximum concentration in SRS waste),
- 88 mg/L oxalate (added as sodium oxalate, near solubility limit at Tank Farm conditions),
- 1000 mg/L ion exchange resin (added as IONAC A641),
- 1000 mg/L antifoam (added as Antifoam 747),
- 1000 mg/L tributyl phosphate (near maximum concentration in SRS waste), and
- 78 mg/L MCU solvent (Waste Acceptance Criteria limit).

The collection of organic species were chosen on the basis of identification as the largest organic contributions to SRS liquid waste processing.¹⁷ Concentrations of these organic species were decided by discussion between SRR and SRNL personnel. One quarter of the antifoam and all other organic compounds were added before the initial boiling was achieved. The remaining three quarters of the antifoam were added as three separate additions when boiling was achieved. Continuous evaporation was performed by dewatering in the HGR measurement apparatus and adding fresh base simulant until a boiling point of 140.5 °C was achieved (removing approximately 0.9 L of water via evaporation). This solution was cooled to 100 °C, sampled, heated to 140.1 °C, and used in HBP testing.

Note that in some cases during high boiling-point testing, an increased purge rate of air was used to prevent accumulation of hydrogen to levels higher than 25% of the Lower Flammability Limit (LFL). In these cases,

it is assumed that the hydrogen present in air (nominally 0.5 ppm)¹⁸ has a negligible effect on the measured concentrations of hydrogen. This is expected because the relatively high generation rate of hydrogen necessary to warrant additional purge gas is significantly higher than the addition rate of hydrogen added as air.

2.2 Flow System Set-up

2.2.1 *Simulant Rig – with Heating Rods*

HGR simulant tests were performed in an approximately 1.2 L borosilicate glass vessel with an additional approximately 0.6 L of headspace, for a total system volume of approximately 1.8 L. Heating was provided using two 0.375-inch diameter Inconel Alloy 800 heating rods powered by an automated direct current power supply (TDK-Lambda Genesys, GEN150-10). Use of a borosilicate glass vessel flow through system with minimal headspace is consistent with the HGR measurement apparatus recommended and developed for qualification of actual-waste feeds for the Hanford WTP.¹⁹⁻²⁰ The WTP system, however, used a water-blanketed vessel for heating rather than heating rods and has a smaller capacity (nominally 100 mL).

Mixing was controlled using a mixer system consisting of a Servodyne mixing head coupled to an agitator shaft via a Parr high torque magnetic drive. A one inch diameter, 4-blade, 45° pitched turbine stainless steel impeller was welded to the stainless-steel agitator shaft. Purge gas was controlled using a MKS Model 647 Multi Gas Controller.

An offgas condenser allowed the condensate to reflux back to the HGR vessel or be collected in a sample bottle for concentration of the slurry. Offgas exiting the condenser was sampled by a dedicated Agilent/Inficon 3000A dual column micro gas chromatograph (GC), as described in Section 2.3.2.

A schematic depicting the equipment used during testing is presented in Figure 2-1. Figure 2-2 shows the heavily insulated system used during 140 °C measurements. The rig with heating rods originally had a drain valve at the bottom of the vessel, but this feature was removed in later testing.




Figure 2-1. HGR Process Equipment



Figure 2-2. Insulated HGR Process Equipment (without drain) Used for HBP Simulant Test

2.2.2 Simulant Rig – with Heating Mantle

Initial HGR results from simulant testing without added glycolate resulted in the unexpected generation of hydrogen gas. To evaluate the possibility that hydrogen gas was produced as a result of galvanic corrosion of the Inconel heating rods, stainless steel agitator shaft, or Incoel thermocouple, the heating rods were removed and heat was provided by an external heating mantle (Glas-Col® TM614) controlled using a variable autotransformer. The thermocouple was inserted inside a borosilicate glass thermowell. This system is shown in Figure 2-3. An additional test was performed without agitation after removal of the agitator shaft from the system and using an external heating mantle.




Figure 2-3. HGR Measurement Apparatus with a Heating Mantle

2.2.3 Shielded Cells Rig

Design elements from equipment used for 1-L and 4-L sludge batch qualification Chemical Process Cell (CPC) testing were combined to create the HGR measurement apparatus for actual waste tests²¹⁻²². A 1.2 L insulated glass vessel was mounted to the stand used for 4-L testing (Figure 2-4). Aside from manometer design, agitator motor, and the use of specially designed stand, the equipment used in simulant and actual waste tests was the same.




Figure 2-4: Shielded Cells Process Equipment^a

2.2.4 Data Acquisition Software Description

A Data Acquisition and Control (DAC) application was programmed using National Instruments LabVIEW software. The software that controlled the process parameters for both the simulant and actual waste tests was developed by adapting the DAC recently used in Sludge Batch 9 qualification. The DAC logged process data and controlled mixing speed, purge gas flow rate, and heating rod temperature.

^a The glass vessel seen in Figure 2-4 was fabricated with a side wall port. This design was used only for water testing, while the vessel used for actual waste testing was being fabricated. The final design did not include the side wall port. The vessel insulation was removed for photographing.

2.3 Data Collection

2.3.1 *HGR Measurement Process*

Vessel designs were chosen to minimize the headspace volume and decrease the time required for each test. The volume of the reactor pot was decreased to 1.2 L, and a condenser with a smaller internal volume was used. Given the final vessel headspace and offgas equipment volume of about 600 mL and the low purge rates necessary to achieve sufficiently-low limits of detection for hydrogen (i.e., 3 standard cubic centimeters per minute, or sccm), it was predicted that sub-boiling experiments would require at least 10 hours (or three volume turnovers) before achieving steady-state conditions.

Assuming a GC detection limit of 2 volumetric parts per million (ppmv) of hydrogen, a sample volume of 1.2 L, and a purge rate of 3 sccm, the method detection limit for the flow system would be expected to be approximately $4 \times 10^{-8} \text{ ft}^3/(\text{hr} \cdot \text{gal})$.

For DWPF simulations, SRNL has used 0.5% helium²¹ in the purge gas as an inert tracer during processing to evaluate system performance (e.g., in-leakage of air and response time of the system) and total gas generation. However, helium interferes with GC quantification of hydrogen at ppmv levels. Therefore, krypton, which is assumed to be inert in the process and doesn't interfere with the hydrogen signal, was substituted for helium as the tracer.

A proportional-integral-derivative (PID) control algorithm governs the amount of power supplied to the heating rods by comparing the bulk process temperature to the process temperature setpoint. To prevent the rods from overheating, a control limit is defined ("rod dT limit") that prevents the heating rods from exceeding the bulk temperature by the specified amount. Given that HGR is expected to be temperature dependent, efforts were made to eliminate localized hot regions in the process vessel by minimizing the differential temperature between the heating rods and the process temperature and by insulating the process vessel. Rod dT limits for these tests were constrained to 20 °C while at boiling except where noted.

HGR measurement is reported in the unit $\text{ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ to match the units used by the SRS Tank Farm, DWPF, and Saltstone facilities. The gas volume basis (ft^3) for data in this report is at standard conditions of 1 atm and 21.1 °C (70 °F). The liquid volume basis (gal^{-1}) for Tank 38 and SY1-SIM-91B-NG simulant data is evaluated at ambient temperature (approximately 22 °C). Conversely, the liquid volume basis for the HBP simulant data is evaluated at 140 °C.

2.3.2 *Gas Handling and Analysis*

Offgas from the flow through tests was characterized using Agilent/Inficon^b series 3000 micro GCs. Column-A collected data related to He, H₂, O₂, N₂, and Kr, while column-B collected data related to CO₂, and N₂O. Due to low GC sensitivity, other oxides of nitrogen and carbon were not analyzed. The GC methods were modified to quantify low quantities of hydrogen. The instruments have previously used to quantify offgas from DWPF CPC demonstrations which generally have significantly higher gas generation rates. To quantify the expected low concentrations of hydrogen, sample injection times were increased relative to DWPF simulations. For the Tank 38 sample, injection time was increased from 50 ms to 150 ms. For the non-radioactive tests, injection time was increased from 50 ms to 100 ms. The difference in the inject times for the two tests is because each GC is a little different, and settings for one GC may be different to attain similar results. To improve sensitivity, the GC sensitivity mode was changed from normal to high. Because of these changes, the ability to accurately quantify oxygen and nitrogen has been sacrificed, though even with previous settings, nitrogen results were not very repeatable or useful. Raw chromatographic data

^b Inficon purchased Agilent's micro GC business unit. While the GCs used in the simulant runs was an Inficon GC and the Tank 38 demonstration utilized an Agilent GC, the instruments are essentially the same.

were acquired by the GC from the offgas stream samples using a separate computer interfaced to the data acquisition computer. Sampling frequency was approximately one chromatogram every four minutes.

In DWPF CPC demonstrations, additional gasses can be detected via Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy and mass spectroscopy. However, these techniques cannot be used with the low flow rates necessary to quantify low hydrogen concentrations.

For all tests, the GCs were calibrated with a gas mixture containing nominally 50 ppmv hydrogen, 20 vol% oxygen, 0.5 vol% krypton, 1 vol% carbon dioxide, 0.5 vol% nitrous oxide, and the balance nitrogen. It is assumed that the GC response (peak area) is linear and proportional to gas concentration. This assumption was checked for hydrogen with several other hydrogen-bearing gas standards – 2.68 ppmv, 10.6 ppmv, 52 ppmv, and 10,000 ppmv. A chart showing linearity from 2.68 to 52 ppmv is given in Figure 2-5. Samples of the 10,000 ppmv gas yielded results of approximately 10,500 ppmv, biased high by approximately 5%. The calibration was verified prior to testing and after completing each HGR non rad experiment. For the Tank 38 series of tests, calibration was checked at the conclusion of all the testing.

The primary purge gas contained 0.5 vol% krypton, 20 vol% oxygen, and 79.5 vol% nitrogen. Overall purge rate could be significantly increased with a separate air purge to ensure hydrogen concentration remained below flammability limits. The Kr-bearing purge gas (as compared to air) served several purposes. First, by using the measured krypton concentration, one could determine if the headspace of the reaction vessel had been purged of air. Second, using the measured krypton concentration allowed for calculation of flow rate out of the vessel, particularly when the Kr-bearing purge gas was supplemented with air. Third, Kr was used to confirm absence of gross in-leakage or gas generation (i.e., essentially that flow rate into the vessel was equal to flow rate out of the vessel). Fourth, unlike air, the purge had no helium and hydrogen, which can interfere with quantification of hydrogen produced from thermolysis or radiolysis.

The calibration and purge gases were produced by Praxair and purchased from Nexair.

In calculating hydrogen generation rates, the following equations were used. Equation 3 was used for most of the experiments. With the use of this equation, it was assumed that flow out of the vessel was equal to flow in to the vessel. The validity of this assumption was confirmed by checking that the measured Kr concentration was the same as the Kr concentration in the purge to the reaction vessel. It should also be noted that typical peak hydrogen generation rates ($4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$) are equal to approximately 0.004 cc/min, 0.1% of the typical purge rates of 3 cc/min.

Equation 4, Equation 5, and Equation 6 were used for the HBP simulant tests, where an estimate of volume at 140 °C of 1.19 L was used instead of a measurement of mass and density since the simulant was prepared by adding additional salt solution as the vessel contents were heated and water removed to attain the target boiling point. Equation 4 was used when the vessel was being purged with only the Kr-bearing purge gas. Equation 5 was used when air was added to the Kr-bearing purge. Equation 6 was used when only dry air was being used as the purge.

$$H_2 \text{ gen} = H_{2\text{area}} \times \frac{H_{2\text{stdconc}}}{H_{2\text{stdarea}}} \times F_{\text{in}} \times \frac{\rho_{\text{sample}}}{m_{\text{sample}}} \times 8.020 \times 10^{-6} \quad \text{Equation 3}$$

$$H_2 \text{ gen} = H_{2\text{area}} \times \frac{H_{2\text{stdconc}}}{H_{2\text{stdarea}}} \times F_{\text{in}} \times \frac{1}{V_{\text{sample}}} \times 8.020 \times 10^{-6} \quad \text{Equation 4}$$

$$H_2 gen = H_{2area} \times \frac{H_{2stdconc}}{H_{2stdarea}} \times \frac{Kr_{stdarea} \times Kr_{bottle}}{Kr_{stdconc} \times Kr_{area}} \times F_{in} \times \frac{1}{V_{sample}} \times 8.020 \times 10^{-6} \quad \text{Equation 5}$$

$$H_2 gen = H_{2area} \times \frac{H_{2stdconc}}{H_{2stdarea}} \times F_{air} \times \frac{1}{V_{sample}} \times 8.020 \times 10^{-6} \quad \text{Equation 6}$$

where,

$H_2 gen$ = H₂ generation rate, ft³·gal⁻¹·hr⁻¹ at standard conditions of 21.1 °C and 1 atmosphere

H_{2area} = GC H₂ response for a gas sample

$H_{2stdconc}$ = Concentration of H₂ calibration gas, ppmv

$H_{2stdarea}$ = Average of five GC responses from the H₂ calibration gas

F_{in} = flow of Kr-bearing purge gas into the reaction vessel, sccm

F_{air} = flow of dry air into the reaction vessel, sccm

ρ_{sample} = density of sample, g·mL⁻¹

m_{sample} = mass of sample, g

V_{sample} = volume of sample, mL

8.020×10^{-6} = conversion factor, ft³·min·mL·cc⁻¹·gal⁻¹·ppmv⁻¹·hr⁻¹

Kr_{bottle} = Concentration of Kr in the purge gas, not including any supplemental air, vol%

Kr_{area} = GC Kr response for a gas sample

$Kr_{stdconc}$ = Concentration of Kr calibration gas, vol%

$Kr_{stdarea}$ = Average of five GC responses from the Kr calibration gas

The software package GUM workbench²³ was used to determine the partial derivatives used to calculate the overall uncertainty for the above equations. The overall uncertainty (using these derivatives) and one sigma uncertainties in the variables was then used to calculate uncertainties for all the data points using the software package JMP Pro Version 11.2.1.²⁴

In the Shielded Cells test with Tank 38, nitrous oxide (N₂O) was detected in the first 2.5 hours of boiling. Nitrous oxide was also observed in the first half of the HBP test at 140 °C. The calibration gas was adequate for N₂O quantification but was not suitable to support a rigorous statistical determination of the limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantification (LOQ). However, chromatograms where small quantities of N₂O were detected were examined. Peaks with areas above 500 μV·s were greater than three times the baseline noise, suggesting an area of 500 or greater reliably represents presence of N₂O. Based on a calibration gas of 0.5% N₂O and an area of approximately 51,000 μV·s (or 0.5%/51,000 μV·s = 9.8×10⁻⁶%/μV·s) for that calibration gas, the N₂O detection limit is estimated to be 500 μV·s × 9.8×10⁻⁶% / μV·s = 0.005% or 50 ppm_v. A corresponding generation rate is discussed in the Tank 38 results section. In SRNL testing supporting DWPF, other nitrogen oxides are not routinely quantified by GC. Nitric oxide (NO) may be observed after nitrogen on GC Column-A. However, the protocol used in this testing was not designed to ensure analysis of samples for presence of NO (i.e., no calibration for NO and no determination to ensure elution time fell within sampling period).

The analysis of other miscellaneous volatile organic compounds (VOCs) was outside of the scope of this testing. The low detection limit requirement for HGR measurement required low purge rates, which

precluded the use of other analytical instruments (i.e., Mass Spectrometry and Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy). However, it is unlikely that one of these online instruments would be able to measure additional VOCs with detection limits as low as the current hydrogen detection limit attained in this report. Additionally, GC chromatograms were inspected for unidentified peaks that could possibly correspond to VOCs.

2.3.3 Limits of Detection for Hydrogen

LOD and LOQ were determined for hydrogen measured by GC in the Tank 38 testing^c using a methodology outlined in the text “Quality Assurance of Chemical Measurements.”²⁵ In summary, the LOD is when a measured value becomes believable – that is, when the measured value exceeds the uncertainty of the measurement. The LOQ is the point where measurements become quantifiably meaningful. Typically, the LOD is set at $3 \times s_0$ and the LOQ is set at $10 \times s_0$, where s_0 = the standard deviation of the measurement noise.

To estimate s_0 , three concentrations of hydrogen were used. Results are shown in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1. Results of Gas Standard measurements for Hydrogen Detection Determination

H ₂ Concentration (ppmv)	N (samples)	Mean(H ₂ area)	Std Dev(H ₂ area)	%RSD (H ₂ area)
2.68	34	650	39.4	6.07
10.8	26	2552	60.4	2.37
52.0	32	12571	88.4	0.704

The standard deviation of interest may be reasonably well estimated by the smallest standard deviation in the above table, then $s_0 = 39.4$. This value yields, in terms of GC response, an LOD of $3 \times s_0 = 118$ and LOQ of $10 \times s_0 = 394$.

In trying to understand how these estimated “areas” should be utilized, a statistical interpretation is utilized. The regression of the area responses of the GC as it is used to measure the standards is shown in Figure 2-5.

^c Detection limits are instrument specific and may change. While a rigorous analysis of the GC used in the simulant work was not completed, results of 2.68 ppmv calibration gas suggest similar LOD and LOQ. Note also that for all testing, except the water test, hydrogen levels were well above 2.68 ppmv.




Figure 2-5. Regression of Hydrogen Standards for Estimation of s_0

Using the 95% confidence interval for individual predictions, the following graph (Figure 2-6) can be used to introduce the LOD and LOQ values for area results on the y-axis, and to map those values into H₂ concentration values, respectively, on the x-axis. The H₂ concentration value for LOD is 1.17 ppmv and the LOQ value is 2.31 ppmv. With a purge rate of 3 sccm and a liquid volume of 1.2 L, the corresponding HGR measurement will have a LOD of $2.6 \times 10^{-8} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ and a LOQ of $5.1 \times 10^{-8} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$.




Figure 2-6. Regression of H₂ area versus QC Standards H₂ concentration (ppmv) Values

2.3.4 Analytical Methods for Sample Analysis

Sample analyses for the radioactive actual waste materials were performed by SRNL Analytical Development (AD) Department. Sample analyses for simulant materials were performed by a combination of AD and SRNL Process Science and Analysis Laboratory (PSAL).

Samples of one batch of the five component simulant SY1-SIM-91B-NG and the four component HBP simulant were submitted to AD for Ion Chromatography (IC) for anions; Volatile Organics Analysis (VOA); Semivolatile Organics Analysis (SVOA); Total Base (TB), free hydroxide, and Other Base excluding carbonate (OB); and Total Inorganic Carbon (TIC) and Total Organic Carbon (TOC). Hydroxide ion (OH⁻) is reported from the free hydroxide measurement. Carbonate ion is determined from TIC measurement. These simulants were also measured at PSAL for density.

Fluid samples from the SY1-SIM-91B-NG simulant tests were taken after the test completed and the salt solution had been removed to the product container. Samples were taken after each steady state condition measurement during the HBP simulant testing. These samples were taken at elevated temperature (70 to 100 °C) because sampling after this material had cooled to ambient lab temperature would lead to precipitation of solids from the supersaturated solution. In the case of the HBP simulant, materials that deposited on surfaces would not be fully represented in these samples.

Products of the SY1-SIM-91B-NG simulant tests were submitted undiluted to PSAL for measurement by IC and Inductively Coupled Plasma – Atomic Emission Spectroscopy (ICP-AES). Products from the HBP simulant tests were diluted nominally three-times with deionized water and submitted to PSAL for measurement by IC and to AD for measurement by SVOA, TIC/TOC, and TB/OH/OB. Water diluted HBP simulant was further diluted nominally ten-times with 2M nitric acid and submitted to PSAL for measurement by ICP-AES.

Solids that were removed from the vessel after the SY1-SIM-91B-NG simulant tests were rinsed with deionized water and analyzed at Aiken County Technology Laboratory (ACTL) by Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) with X-ray Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (XEDS). Solids that were removed from the vessel after the HBP simulant tests were rinsed with deionized water and analyzed by AD using X-ray Diffraction (XRD) and SEM/XEDS. Washed solids from the HBP simulant test were also analyzed at ACTL by SEM/XEDS.

A portion of the actual-waste Tank 38 sample was split from the original sample and used for chemical characterization. The density was measured in quadruplicate on this analytical sample using 2mL volumetric flasks. Subsequently the density was measured in quadruplicate on the split of sample remaining after HGR measurement samples were prepared. The follow-up measurements were performed in quadruplicate using 8.5 mL plastic test tubes whose volumes were determined by weight of water. All density measurements were performed at ambient cell temperature.

Three preparations were performed for most of actual-waste Tank 38 sample analysis. Firstly, the Tank 38 material including insoluble solids was diluted nominally 10-times with 2M nitric acid and analyzed by ICP-AES, Inductively Coupled Plasma – Mass Spectroscopy (ICP-MS), IC, Atomic Absorption (AA), Cold Vapor Atomic Absorption (CVAA) digested for mercury, TIC/TOC, and gamma scan. Secondly, the Tank 38 material was filtered using a 0.45-micron nylon filter, diluted nominally 10-times with deionized water, and analyzed by IC, TIC/TOC, TB/OH/OB, CVAA digested, ICP-AES, ICP-MS, and gamma scan. Thirdly, the Tank 38 material including insoluble solids was diluted nominally 25-times with DI water and analyzed by IC and TIC/TOC.

The analyses for Tank 38 were performed for triplicate preparations with the following exceptions. For the acid diluted slurry, AA for arsenic and selenium and gamma scan were performed on single aliquots. SVOA and TOC were measured for single aliquots undiluted Tank 38 material.

Results are preceded by “<” when the analyte is below the limits of quantification. The average values and the RSDs are reported for the replicate sample preparations and measurements. The RSD values are not reported when all measurements are below the limits of quantification. When there is a combination of results both above and below the limits of quantification, only the results above the limits of quantification are used in the average. An analytical method “ 1σ unc.” (one sigma uncertainty; i.e., standard deviation) is reported for each analyte and is usually dominated by the uncertainty in the instrument calibration.

2.4 Quality Assurance

Requirements for performing reviews of technical reports and the extent of review are established in manual E7 2.60.²⁶ SRNL documents the extent and type of review using the SRNL Technical Report Design Checklist contained in WSRC-IM-2002-00011, Rev. 2.²⁷ Data are recorded in the electronic laboratory notebook system as notebook/experiment numbers A6583-00142-15, A6583-00142-16, A6583-00142-17, c7605-00021-14, L3293-00100-30, L3293-00100-31, L3293-00100-32, and L3293-00100-33.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Results from Testing with SY1-SIM-91B-NG

3.1.1 Analysis of Prepared Simulant

Table 3-1 contains the results of the measurement of the simulant SY1-SIM-91B-NG. The target recipe concentration is also given for reference. Good agreement is noted for most cases except for aluminum, which was higher than the recipe target. A TOC concentration of 192 mg carbon/L was measured, though no organic carbon was intentionally added in this simulant. Appendix A discusses additional studies to examine the source of the TOC. No volatile or semivolatile organics were identified or measured above the detection limit.

Table 3-1. Analysis of the Salt Simulant SY1-SIM-91B-NG

analyte	method	units	1 σ unc.	Measurement	RSD	Target
Al	ICP-ES	M	10%	1.72	0.4%	1.54
Na	ICP-ES	M	10%	9.00	0.7%	8.79
OH ⁻	TB/OH/OB	M	10%	2.18	--	2.00
NO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	10%	2.28	--	2.24
NO ₃ ⁻	IC	M	10%	2.44	--	2.59
CO ₃ ²⁻	TIC/TOC	M	10%	0.53	--	0.42
		mg C/L		6,400	--	5,000
CHO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	--	< 0.002	--	0
		mg C/L		< 27	--	0
C ₂ O ₄ ²⁻	IC	M	--	< 0.001	--	0
		mg C/L		< 27	--	0
PO ₄ ³⁻	IC	M	--	< 0.001	--	0
SO ₄ ²⁻	IC	M	--	< 0.001	--	0
F ⁻	IC	M	--	< 0.005	--	0
Cl ⁻	IC	M	--	< 0.003	--	0
Br ⁻	IC	M	--	< 0.001	--	0
TOC	TIC/TOC	mg C/L	10%	192	--	0
SVOA	SVOA	mg/L	--	< 1.0	--	0
VOA	VOA	mg/L	--	< 0.25	--	0
density	Densitometer	g/mL	2%	1.4206	--	N/A

3.1.2 Testing Parameters and Descriptions

In total, seven experiments have been conducted using SY1-SIM-91B-NG to measure HGR. Table 3-2 lists the experimental parameters used for each test including the mass of solution added, the concentration of glycolate added, the purge rate employed, and the temperature achieved. Additional information is given to

delineate differences in equipment configuration between each test (e.g., heating method, agitation, and thermowell use).

Table 3-2. Run Parameters for Simulant Testing with SY1-SIM-91B-NG

Test ID	Mass (g)	Purge Rate (sccm ^a)	Glycolate (M)	Temperature (°C)	Heating Method	Agitation Status	Thermowell Status
HGR-ASH-1	1706	3	0.21	90	Heating Rods	Mixed	None
HGR-ASH-2	1704	3	9.6×10 ⁻⁵	114 ^b	Heating Rods	Mixed	None
HGR-ASH-3	1708	3	1.9×10 ⁻⁵	114 ^b	Heating Rods	Mixed	None
HGR-ASH-4	1515	3	0	114 ^b	Heating Rods	Mixed	None
HGR-ASH-5	1552	3	0	114 ^b	External Mantle	Mixed	Glass
HGR-ASH-5b ^c	1552	9	0	75	Heating Rods	Mixed	Glass
HGR-ASH-6	1558	3	0	114 ^b	External Mantle	Unmixed	Glass

^a Standard Conditions of 1 atmosphere, 21.11 °C (70 °F).

^b Boiling

^c Test HGR-ASH-5b used the same solution from HGR-ASH-5.

Tests HGR-ASH-1 and HGR-ASH-2 were designed as benchmarking experiments to establish the capabilities of the designed HGR apparatus. HGR-ASH-1 was performed as an attempt to replicate an experiment reported in the literature by Ashby, while HGR-ASH-2 was performed as a modification of the literature experiment designed to demonstrate the ability to measure low concentrations of hydrogen (<10 ppm). Data from these tests led to the observation of an unexplained hydrogen generation in the absence of added organic molecules, which was further explored in tests HGR-ASH-3 through HGR-ASH-6. An additional test (HGR-ASH-4b) was performed at 90 °C; however, this run was not carried out to completion, and is therefore not reported here.

3.1.3 Benchmarking Tests (HGR-ASH-1 & HGR-ASH-2)

Figure 3-1 gives the measured HGR for test HGR-ASH-1 in units of standard cubic feet of H₂ per hour per gallon of simulant (ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹) as a function of time since achieving the target temperature (90 °C).




Figure 3-1. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-1. Red Line indicates krypton concentration as a function of time.

The maximum HGR measured in HGR-ASH-1 is $2.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. This value is in good agreement with the HGR predicted using the relationship derived by Crawford and King¹⁵ ($2.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$) and the rate reported by Ashby¹⁰ at 24 hours ($2.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$). Note that the increasing HGR observed in HGR-ASH-1 suggests a higher HGR may have been observed at longer reaction times. The fact that this increase appears to be decelerating within 6 hours combined with the fact that most of the data reported by Ashby exhibits constant generation rates at longer time scales suggest that the HGR profile follows exponential behavior consistent with that seen in continuously stirred-tank reactor (CSTR) kinetics. Extrapolation of the HGR trend in the deceleration region suggests that a “final” HGR of $3.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ was likely.

While a direct comparison between the dynamic HGR apparatus used here and the static apparatus employed by Ashby is not necessarily justifiable, the HGR observed in HGR-ASH-1 suggests that an order of magnitude comparison is satisfactory. Given the reasonable success with literature replication (and considering the technical differences between the HGR apparatus and the experimental method employed by Ashby), the HGR apparatus was deemed adequate and subsequent testing proceeded.

As mentioned earlier, HGR-ASH-2 was performed at a greatly reduced glycolate concentration relative to HGR-ASH-1 ($9.6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ M}$ vs. 0.21 M , or 0.05%) and a higher temperature ($114 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, boiling) to demonstrate the capability of the HGR apparatus to measure lower concentrations of hydrogen and to explore equipment performance at boiling. According to the glycolate thermolysis relationship described by Crawford and King,¹⁵ the predicted HGR for the conditions employed in HGR-ASH-2 is $2.1 \times 10^{-7} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. Figure 3-2 gives the measured HGR for HGR-ASH-2 as a function of time spent at boiling.




Figure 3-2. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-2. Red Line indicates krypton concentration as a function of time.

As shown in Figure 3-2, the measured HGR from test HGR-ASH-2 was significantly higher than the value expected ($2.1 \times 10^{-7} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$). A peak rate of approximately $3.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ is observed immediately following boiling. This rate then rapidly diminishes to a more persistent rate of $2.7 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. Both rates of hydrogen production are incongruous with the glycolate destruction rates reported by Ashby. This observation suggests that a non-glycolate mechanism for hydrogen generation is active in these tests.

Sample analysis for test HGR-ASH-1 was inconclusive and is not included in this report. Formate and oxalate were detected in the salt solution product from test HGR-ASH-1 but were below the instrument calibration curve and thus cannot be quantified. Glycolate quantification was not repeatable and reanalysis of the sample after significant time has passed would not be applicable to the test.

3.1.4 Glycolate-Free Hydrogen Generation Mechanism Investigation

Test HGR-ASH-3 was conducted to measure the HGR in the presence of a negligibly small amount of glycolate. Figure 3-3 gives the HGR measured in HGR-ASH-3 as a function of time at boiling.




Figure 3-3. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-3. Red Line indicates krypton concentration as a function of time.

As shown in Figure 3-3, HGR-ASH-3 exhibited similar behavior to that of HGR-ASH-2, with a peak generation rate of $2.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ which rapidly declined to a persistent rate near $2.5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. Within 12 hours, HGR-ASH-3 produced approximately 36 μmol of hydrogen atoms as hydrogen gas. This amount of generated gas constitutes a significant fraction of the hydrogen atoms added to the solution as glycolate (91 μmol of hydrogen atoms total, 61 μmol capable of undergoing hydrogen gas formation) and suggests a rapid degradation of glycolate in caustic solutions, which is refuted by glycolate destruction rates reported in the literature.¹⁰ The fact that the hydrogen generation behavior seen in HGR-ASH-3 closely mimics that seen in HGR-ASH-2, combined with the fact that the theoretical glycolate destruction rates required to sustain these hydrogen generation rates are in vast excess of glycolate destruction rates reported in literature adds further evidence to the notion that an alternative “glycolate-free” hydrogen generation mechanism must be responsible for the measured HGR.

Following the results of HGR-ASH-3, several glycolate-free tests were performed using the same salt simulant to determine the hydrogen production mechanism(s) responsible for the measured HGR. Test HGR-ASH-4 was conducted by utilizing the same apparatus employed in HGR-ASH-3 and a smaller volume of simulant. This volume reduction was performed to minimize solution contact with the Viton[®] O-ring and siloxane resin (described in Section 2.2), therefore mitigating the possibility of significant hydrogen generation due to reaction of the simulant with these organic components. Figure 3-4 gives the measured HGR for HGR-ASH-4 as a function of time at boiling.




Figure 3-4. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-4. Red Line indicates krypton concentration as a function of time.

Again, an initial peak of hydrogen generation is observed immediately following boiling, achieving a maximum HGR of approximately $2.3 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. Shortly thereafter, the HGR from HGR-ASH-4 rapidly decreases to an apparently stable value of $4.0 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. Offgas data from HGR-ASH-4 shows behavior is similar to that of HGR-ASH-2 and HGR-ASH-3, suggesting that any hydrogen produced by reaction of simulant SY1-SIM-91B-NG with the O-rings and resins employed in this study is not the dominant source of the unexpected higher hydrogen generation.

HGR-ASH-5 was conducted by removing the Inconel heating rods and placing the thermocouple within a borosilicate glass thermowell. These changes were made to eliminate the possibility of electrolytic hydrogen generation caused by stray current from the heating rods and thermocouple or from cathode-anode (i.e., galvanic) interactions between the Inconel heating rods, Inconel thermocouple, and stainless-steel agitator. Figure 3-5 gives the measured HGR for HGR-ASH-5 as a function of time at boiling.




Figure 3-5. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-5. Red Line indicates krypton concentration as a function of time.

As was seen in HGR-ASH-2, 3, and 4, a peak of $3.3 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ is seen in the hydrogen generation rate of HGR-ASH-5 immediately following boiling, followed by a rapid decrease to approximately $4.2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. The fact that the behavior of HGR-ASH-5 mirrors the behavior of HGR-ASH-2, 3, and 4 suggests that most of the generated hydrogen is not caused by electrolytic mechanisms due to the presence of metallic components in contact with the solution.

HGR-ASH-6 was conducted by placing the borosilicate glass vessel into the same heating mantle employed in HGR-ASH-5 and removing the Inconel heating rods. Furthermore, HGR-ASH-6 was performed in the absence of an agitator, thereby removing the last source of metal in the reaction vessel. Note that this modification led to an absence of forced convection in HGR-ASH-6, possibly leading to localized overheating. Figure 3-6 gives the measured HGR for HGR-ASH-6 as a function of time at boiling.




Figure 3-6. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-6. Red Line indicates krypton concentration as a function of time.

The HGR trend shown in Figure 3-6 matches well with the behavior exhibited in HGR-ASH-2, 3, 4, and 5, yielding an initial peak HGR of $5.2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ and a persistent, final HGR of $5.6 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. While the apparent HGR measured in HGR-ASH-6 is higher than those observed in HGR-ASH-2, 3, 4, and 5, it is not clear if this increase is due to physical changes in the test (e.g., additional chemistries present in the test, localized heating caused by a lack of forced convection, etc.) or if it is comparable to the previous runs within experimental error. However, given the absence of metal in HGR-ASH-6, it seems clear that corrosion of metal is a negligible contributor to the HGR observed in this testing.

To date, an insufficient number of tests have been performed to determine and quantify all of the sources of hydrogen generation in the glycolate-free tests described above. However, a number of possible sources of hydrogen have been eliminated, leaving a few possible candidates (some of which have been confirmed as active in these systems, see Appendix A). Testing with water (HGR-WATER) demonstrated that the hydrogen production is not a function of experimental apparatus alone. Figure 3-7 gives the measured HGR for HGR-WATER as a function of time at boiling.




Figure 3-7. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-WATER. Red Line indicates krypton concentration as a function of time.

The trends shown in Figure 3-7 show that no appreciable hydrogen is generated from operation of the HGR apparatus alone, but rather is dependent on the use of materials included in the simulant. A small peak in HGR is observed immediately after boiling ($3.1 \times 10^{-8} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$); however, it is likely that this peak is a relic of boiling and not a chemical reaction. The hydrogen observed in HGR-WATER appears to be solely due to hydrogen dissolved in the air initially present in the vessel, gradually disappearing with displacement by hydrogen-free purge gas. Several untested hydrogen generation mechanisms remain, and are currently under investigation. Some of these mechanisms are listed below:

- thermolysis of organic impurities in simulant components,
- reaction with glass components,
- reaction due to inorganic impurities in simulant components, or
- unexpected / unknown inorganic reactions.

Of these suggested mechanisms, the first two offer the most evidence for support. Formation of white solids was observed in each test conducted at boiling (see Appendix B). Literature reports of solids generated in similar conditions designate these solids as aluminosilicates, formed from reaction of sodium aluminate and silica dissolved by contacting the glass surface with sodium hydroxide. While there is no known chemistry that the authors are aware of describing hydrogen generation from these components, there is not enough data to completely rule out such contributions to HGR.

The approximately 200 mg/L TOC concentration (see Table 3-1) measured in SY1-SIM-91B-NG suggests the presence of an organic impurity in at least one of the chemical components used during the preparation of SY1-SIM-91B-NG. Additional testing (see Appendix A) investigated this possibility and concluded that

hydrogen generation can be observed in simple sodium hydroxide solutions (possibly due to corrosion of wetted surfaces in the presence of NaOH) and that sodium aluminate seems to bear a relatively large organic carbon impurity which appears to significantly affect the measured HGR in the glycolate-free testing described above.

The Hu model (shown in Equation 1) may be used to evaluate the potential contribution of TOC impurities toward hydrogen generation in SY1-SIM-91B-NG testing. Using a measured TOC concentration of 192 mg/L, the measured aluminum concentration of 1.72 M, and the measured density of SY1-SIM-91B-NG (1.4206 g/mL), weight percentages of TOC and aluminum can be calculated to evaluate the Hu model at the conditions employed in this testing. Doing so yields a Hu-predicted HGR of 1.3×10^{-5} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹. This calculated rate is, in general, lower than the initial peak HGRs observed in the glycolate free experiments and an order of magnitude above the persistent rates observed in this testing. For convenient comparison, the observed rates of HGR-ASH-2,3,4,5, and 6 are listed in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3. Peak and Persistent HGR for Tests HGR-ASH-2,3,4,5, & 6.

Test ID	Peak HGR (ft ³ hr ⁻¹ gal ⁻¹)	Persistent HGR (ft ³ hr ⁻¹ gal ⁻¹)	Estimated Uncertainty of the Persistent HGR (95% confidence interval) *
HGR-ASH-2	3.5×10^{-5}	2.7×10^{-6}	11%
HGR-ASH-3	2.7×10^{-5}	2.6×10^{-6}	10%
HGR-ASH-4	2.3×10^{-5}	4.0×10^{-6}	10%
HGR-ASH-5	3.3×10^{-5}	4.2×10^{-6}	10%
HGR-ASH-6	5.2×10^{-5}	5.6×10^{-6}	9%
AVERAGE	3.4×10^{-5}	3.8×10^{-6}	NA

* The uncertainties for these results were calculated by inserting the inputs for Equation 3 (see Section 2.3.2) into the software package, GUM workbench ²³, to derive a formula for the overall uncertainty. This formula was then used to calculate uncertainty using the software package JMPTM Pro, Version 11.2.1²⁴.

The observation that persistent HGR from these glycolate-free tests consistently falls below the generation rates expected by organic thermolysis according to the application of the Hu equation at similar conditions suggests that the TOC impurity measured in SY1-SIM-91B-NG is fully capable of explaining the hydrogen seen in this testing.

3.1.5 Evaluation of Hydrogen Generation Rate at 75 °C

To determine the effect of temperature on the hydrogen generation rate measured in these tests, the product from test HGR-ASH-5 was reheated to 75 °C and monitored for hydrogen production. This test was designated HGR-ASH-5b. Figure 3-8 gives the measured HGR from HGR-ASH-5b as a function of time at 75 °C.




Figure 3-8. Hydrogen Generation Rate as a Function of Time for Test HGR-ASH-5b. Red Line indicates krypton concentration as a function of time.

The data from Figure 3-8 suggest that HGR from the salt solution simulant is significantly lower at 75 °C than at boiling (114 °C), with a maximum recorded generation rate for HGR-ASH-5b of $4.4 \times 10^{-7} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ (compared to the value of $2.5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ observed in HGR-ASH-3). Note that the data shown in Figure 3-8 suggests a continuing, increasing trend, suggesting that the final, steady-state HGR at 75 °C is likely higher than values recorded. This final value is approximated by fitting the hydrogen concentration data recorded during HGR-ASH-5b to a first-principles model equation derived from the differential equations that govern the dynamics of vapor mixing in the headspace of the reaction vessel, such as shown in Equation 7.

$$y_{H_2}(t) = y_{H_2}^{MAX} \left(1 - e^{-t/\tau} \right) \quad \text{Equation 7}$$

where $y_{H_2}(t)$ is the time-dependent concentration of hydrogen in the vessel headspace, $y_{H_2}^{MAX}$ is the maximum hydrogen concentration achieved at equilibrium, and τ is the characteristic timescale of the mixing phenomena (e.g., residence time). The results of this fit are shown in Figure 3-9.




Figure 3-9. Hydrogen Concentration as a Function of Time for Run HGR-ASH-5b.

The fit shown in Figure 3-9 suggests that the steady state concentration of H₂ during HGR-ASH-5b is approximately 8.1 ppm, yielding an HGR of $5.4 \times 10^{-7} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. This rate is significantly lower than that measured at 114 °C, suggesting an expected dependence of hydrogen generation on temperature. By using this estimated rate along with the average observed HGR at 114 °C ($3.8 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$) and interpolating using an Arrhenius expression, the HGR at 100 °C can be estimated as $2.0 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. Note that this interpolation is empirically-derived and assumes that relative contributions to HGR from each H₂ production mechanism involved remain constant. Additional testing at lower temperatures is recommended to more completely evaluate the temperature dependence of HGR observed in this testing if further understanding of temperature dependence is desired.

3.2 Results from High Boiling Point Simulant Test with Tank Farm Organics

3.2.1 HGR Results for HBP Simulant

Figure 3-10 contains a summary of the results of the HGR measurements using the HBP simulant plotted on a log scale. The temperature is also included for reference. Additional data were collected after addition of 10,000 mg/L of glycolate, which will be included in a future report. Figure 3-10 and Figure 3-11 can be used to understand the sequence of testing and is useful in interpreting the results. Figure 3-11 contains data on the purge rate during the HBP simulant testing along with the process temperature and rod temperature. Purge rate was varied to attain hydrogen detection at low levels when HGR was low and avoid approaching the lower flammability limit for hydrogen when HGR was high. Purge rates up to 10 sccm are achieved using the purge gas (0.5% Kr, 20% O₂, 79.5% N₂). A purge rate of 370 sccm is achieved using dry air (i.e., compressed air treated to remove water and carbon dioxide). Intermediate purge rates (50 to 100 sccm) are achieved using mixtures of 10 sccm purge gas and the balance dry air. Note that the dry air contains small amounts of atmospheric hydrogen and helium (nominally 0.5 ppmv and 5.24 ppmv, respectively).¹⁸ Because the dry air purge is only used when the HGR is high, the impact of hydrogen in air on the hydrogen measurement is insignificant (i.e., <1% of the measurement value).




Figure 3-10. Overall HGR Measurement Results for HBP Simulant




Figure 3-11. Process Parameters During HBP Simulant HGR Measurements

Figure 3-12 shows a greater detail of the HGR measurement increase during the dewatering and sampling period of the HBP simulant test. Testing started with the addition of 1685 grams (approximately 1.2 L) of the HBP simulant base salt solution to the vessel, followed by heating to boiling. This portion of testing corresponds to the period around Point A in Figure 3-10. The hydrogen measured at Point A does not constitute a real HGR measurement. Instead, the measured values at point A are due to the hydrogen in the dry air purge multiplied by the relatively large purge rate used during the dewatering phase of testing.

Point B in Figure 3-10 and Figure 3-12 corresponds to reaching the boiling point of the HBP simulant stock solution, which was approximately 117 °C. One quarter of the overall Antifoam 747 addition (3 mL) was made prior to reaching the boiling point of the HBP simulant base salt solution. The three subsequent 3 mL additions of Antifoam 747 were made while dewatering and feeding of additional HBP simulant base salt solution. The four small peaks in the HGR noted near Point B correspond to initially achieving boiling and the three subsequent Antifoam 747 additions. The HGR corresponding to the initial boiling and the subsequent three antifoam additions at boiling are 2.4×10^{-4} , 2.2×10^{-4} , 2.8×10^{-4} , and 3.4×10^{-4} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹, respectively.

The period from Point B to Point C in Figure 3-10 and Figure 3-12 is the gradual dewatering and feeding additional HBP simulant base salt solution to attain a solution with an atmospheric pressure boiling point of 140 °C. An additional 1041 grams of HBP simulant base salt solution was added during this period. Subsequently, three isothermal HGR measurements were made at 140 °C, 100 °C, and 75 °C (i.e., Points E, F, and G, respectively).




Figure 3-12. HGR Measurement for the HBP Simulant during Initial Period of Testing

As mentioned previously, peaks in HGR were noted when boiling at 117 °C was first achieved and at the subsequent additions of Antifoam 747. At the 370 sccm purge rate, little delay was noted between a processing event such as an antifoam addition and the observation of a change in the hydrogen measurement as expected given the higher purge rate of the vessel vapor space. This rapid response contrasts with the large delays noted at lower purge rates (3 to 10 sccm) used during portions of testing. Ultimately, the HGR at 140 °C was $8.1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ in the freshly prepared HBP simulant. The solution was cooled to 100 °C so that the “Pre 140 °C” sample could be collected (Point D). At Point D, the HGR at 100 °C was approximately $5 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. The rates at Points C, D, and E, corresponding to HGR in the freshly prepared simulant, are not likely to be directly applicable to most of the tank farm conditions because the majority of the organics in the tank farm waste have already been processed through evaporators at some point. Thus, it may be justified for the tank farm to apply a lower persistent HGR rate rather than an initial peak HGR rate depending on their intended use.

It is expected that VOCs are released early in the processing. Isopar[®] L from the MCU solvent is likely released quickly at or just before when boiling is first attained (near Point B in Figure 3-10 and Figure 3-12). Hexamethyldisiloxane and trimethylsilanol from the decomposition of Antifoam 747 are likely released quickly at or just before the point when boiling is first attained and at the points when additional antifoam is added (Point B). Butanol from the decomposition of tribulyl phosphphate is likely released during simulant preparation (Point B to Point C) and may continue to be released at smaller amounts throughout the test. The release of these components would not be quantified by the only offgas instrument installed for this test, the GC with gas separation columns. An unidentified peak was seen in the GC chromatograms during HBP simulant testing at boiling and at 100 °C.

Figure 3-13, Figure 3-14, and Figure 3-15 contain the HGR measurement data for the HBP simulant tests at the isothermal conditions of 140 °C, 100 °C, and 75 °C, respectively. The error bars included on a portion of the HGR measurement points are the two sigma uncertainties from the uncertainty analysis described in Section 2.3.2. The data that display error bars are the data used as the initial and final HGR measurements.

Krypton data are also included on these graphs as an indication of the earliest that steady state measurements may have been detectable due to mixing delays. In general, krypton concentration is seen to increase, starting at 0 ppm and ending at the mixture concentration with the relation expected of a continuous stirred tank reactor (CSTR). At the boiling condition, the krypton increases faster than would be expected for a CSTR of the same volume due to impacts of the extra water vapor present and the increased temperature.




Figure 3-13. HBP Simulant HGR Measurement at 140 °C

Figure 3-13 displays the HGR measurement data for the HBP simulant at 140 °C with a purge rate of approximately 70 sccm. The inconsistency in HGR noted near 12 hours was due to a temporary disruption in the purge gas supply. The initial HGR averaged $4.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ and the final HGR averaged $8.1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. The initial rate has a low bias because of the time delay in achieving the appropriate purge rate for accurate measurement after attaining the 140 °C boiling condition. The measurement condition was maintained for approximately 16 hours. The initial and final HGRs were measured for 48 and 88 minutes, respectively. Krypton measurements during this test indicate a relatively rapid approach to steady state. Because of the relatively large uncertainty in the flow rate of dry air, krypton was used to determine the precise purge rate. The two-sigma uncertainty associated with this data is 10%. Steady HGR values were not attained, and carrying out this measurement over a longer period of time would be expected to lead to a lower final HGR measurement. The decaying HGR with time at isothermal conditions and constant purge rates suggest either that the ongoing consumption of an organic reactant important in the production of hydrogen is appreciable on the time scale of the experiment, or that another factor is leading to poisoning of the reaction. For instance, Hu¹¹ and Ashby¹⁰ suggest a dependence of thermolytic HGR on aluminum concentration, and the upcoming sections include data that show aluminum concentration decreased during testing likely due to the precipitation of sodium aluminosilicates. As will also be seen in upcoming sections, the portion of the TOC that corresponds to components other than formate and oxalate also decreased during HGR measurement at 140 °C.




Figure 3-14. HBP Simulant HGR Measurement at 100 °C




Figure 3-15. HBP Simulant HGR Measurement at 75 °C

Figure 3-14 displays the HGR measurement data for the HBP simulant at 100 °C with a purge rate of approximately 10 sccm. The initial HGR averaged $4.1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ and the final HGR averaged $3.0 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. The two-sigma uncertainty associated with this data is 10%. Steady HGR values were not attained and these data are dependent on the process history of the previous 140 °C measurement. As with the 140 °C data, the offset of the HGRs determined for the initial and final periods suggest either that the ongoing consumption of a reactant important in the production of hydrogen (i.e., a specific organic or aluminum) is appreciable on the time scale of the experiment, or that another factor is leading to poisoning of the reaction. The measurement condition was maintained for approximately 5 hours. The initial and final HGRs were measured for 68 and 28 minutes, respectively.

Figure 3-15 displays the HGR measurement data for the HBP simulant at 75 °C with a purge rate of approximately 3 sccm. The initial HGR averaged $7.7 \times 10^{-7} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ and the final HGR averaged $6.2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. The two-sigma uncertainty associated with this data is 12%. A relatively steady HGR was attained for a final 75 °C measurement. These data are dependent on the process history of the previous measurements. As with the previous data, the offset of the HGRs determined for the initial and final periods suggest either that the ongoing consumption of a reactant important in the production of hydrogen (i.e., a specific organic or aluminum) is appreciable on the time scale of the experiment, or that another factor is leading to poisoning of the reaction. The measurement condition was maintained for approximately 17 hours. The initial and final HGRs were each measured for 80 minute periods.

A tabulated summary of the initial and final HGR measurements obtained during HBP simulant testing is contained in Table 3-4. The estimated uncertainties are two-sigma values based on the HGR measurement uncertainty analysis described in Section 2.3.2. An asterisk is placed by all uncertainties due to the impact of previous measurements would likely contribute to measurements well outside of the uncertainty if HGR measurements were repeated in a different sequence.

Table 3-4. HGR Measurements for HBP Simulant

Temperature (°C)	Hydrogen Generation Rate ($\text{ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$)	Estimated Uncertainty (95% confidence interval)
140.1 (boiling) initial	4.9×10^{-4}	10%*
139.1 (boiling) final	8.1×10^{-5}	10%*
100.0 initial	4.1×10^{-6}	10%*
100.0 final	3.0×10^{-6}	10%*
75.0 initial	7.7×10^{-7}	12%*
75.0 final	6.2×10^{-7}	12%*

* Uncertainties do not reflect the consistent decrease in HGR with time, thus the inability to generate hydrogen at a steady rate at isothermal conditions. Reported uncertainties are thus only applicable to each condition considering the process history. The uncertainties for these results were calculated by inserting the inputs for Equations 5 and 4 (for 140 °C and other temperatures, respectively; see Section 2.3.2) into the software package, GUM workbench²³, to derive a formula for the overall uncertainty. This formula was then used to calculate uncertainty using the software package JMPTM Pro, Version 11.2.1²⁴.




Figure 3-16. Arrhenius Plot for HBP HGR Measurements

Figure 3-16 is an Arrhenius plot for the HBP HGR measurements showing two apparent activation energies. Significant reduction of HGR was noted at each temperature, and the vertical lines of data correspond to the range of HGR measurement at each temperature. In general, the HGR trended lower with the progression time. Because the tests were performed in series using the same material and reaction rates were decreasing during measurements, it is not possible to formulate an activation energy that would represent the entire test. Figure 3-16 shows that the apparent activation energy based on the final measurements taken at 140 °C and the initial measurements taken at 100 °C is 97.3 kJ/mol. The apparent activation energy based on the final measurements taken at 100 °C and the initial measurements taken at 75 °C is 59.3 kJ/mol. In general, there are additional uncertainties because the precise mechanisms for hydrogen generation have not been identified. The various TOC components added in this testing would likely have their own individual reaction rate and temperature dependence. As seen in Section 3.1.4 and Appendix A, organic contaminants in the simulant components may also contribute to the overall HGR measurement.

In Table 3-5, inputs for TOC and aluminum concentration measured in samples were used to evaluate HGR by the methodology of Hu shown in Equation 1. A reactivity factor of 1 was used. Initial and final HGR measurements were used for each condition. By comparison to the HGR measured in this work, Equation 1 predictions were higher than the HBP simulant HGR measurements. By comparing the HGR measurement to the Equation 1 predictions, the apparent reactivity factor was 0.82 for the initial 140.1 °C condition and averaged 0.25 for the other five conditions. The decrease in reactivity in subsequent test conditions is greater

than the decrease in the Equation 1 predictions using the measured TOC and aluminum concentrations. Perhaps use of adjusted TOC (subtracting formate and oxalate) is a better parameter for this evaluation.

Table 3-5. Comparison of HBP Simulant HGR Measurement to HGR Calculated by Equation 1

Temperature (°C)	HGR Measurement (ft ³ hr ⁻¹ gal ⁻¹)	TOC (wt%)	Al (wt%)	Hu (Eqn. 1) HGR (ft ³ hr ⁻¹ gal ⁻¹)
140.1 (boiling) initial	4.9×10 ⁻⁴	0.119	1.55	5.9×10 ⁻⁴ ^a
139.1 (boiling) final	8.1×10 ⁻⁵	0.0958	0.657	3.2×10 ⁻⁴ ^a
100.0 initial	4.1×10 ⁻⁶	0.0958	0.657	2.0×10 ⁻⁵
100.0 final	3.0×10 ⁻⁶	0.0875	0.624	1.8×10 ⁻⁵
75.0 initial	7.7×10 ⁻⁷	0.0875	0.624	2.3×10 ⁻⁶
75.0 final	6.2×10 ⁻⁷	0.0877	0.583	2.2×10 ⁻⁶

^a Calculation of the Hu HGR for the HBP test at ~140 °C is an extrapolation outside of the temperature range that the equation was developed for.

3.2.2 Nitrous Oxide Generation from HBP Simulant

Nitrous oxide (N₂O) was observed during the first half of the test at the highest measurement temperature (140 °C), after which it was below the LOD of the GC of approximately 0.018 vol% N₂O. Figure 3-17 shows that H₂ was generated at approximately 1.8 times the concentration of N₂O for the first several hours of the test. The [H₂]/[N₂O] increased to almost 3 as the N₂O concentration approached the LOD. The change in this concentration ratio may indicate a depletion of a reactant required for N₂O generation or a change in the mechanism of N₂O generation.




Figure 3-17. Hydrogen and Nitrous Oxide Generated during HBP Test at 140 °C (left), and the Hydrogen to Nitrous Oxide Ratio for HBP Test at 140 °C (right)

3.2.3 Feed and Product Analysis

Table 3-6 contains the results of the measurement of the base salt simulant used to create the HBP simulant prior to evaporation and concentration. The target recipe concentration (as first described in Section 2.1.3) is given for reference. OB is included in the table as an approximation of the aluminum (aluminate) concentration in the absence of ICP-AES analysis. Reasonable agreement is noted, but the hydroxide and aluminate (based on OB) were higher than the recipe target and the nitrate was lower than the recipe target. A TOC concentration of 258 mg carbon/L was measured, though no organic carbon was intentionally added in this simulant. No volatile or semivolatile organics were identified or measured above the detection limit.

Table 3-6. Analysis of the Base Salt Solution Used to Create the HBP Simulant

Analyte	Units	AD Measurement	PSAL Measurement	Target
OH ⁻	M	5.71	--	5.48
NO ₂ ⁻	M	2.15	2.26	2.14
NO ₃ ⁻	M	1.66	2.11	2.12
CO ₃ ²⁻	M	0.0083	--	0
CHO ₂ ⁻	M	< 0.002	< 0.002	0
C ₂ O ₄ ²⁻	M	< 0.001	< 0.001	0
PO ₄ ³⁻	M	< 0.001	< 0.001	0
SO ₄ ²⁻	M	< 0.001	< 0.001	0
F ⁻	M	< 0.005	< 0.005	0
Cl ⁻	M	< 0.003	< 0.003	0
Br ⁻	M	< 0.001	--	0
OB	M	0.73	--	0.52
TC	mg C/L	358	--	0
TOC	mg C/L	258	--	0
SVOA	mg/L	< 1.0	--	0
VOA	mg/L	< 0.25	--	0
density	g/mL	--	1.4087	--

Table 3-7 and Table 3-9 contain the analytical results of the samples taken during the HBP HGR measurement test and Table 3-8 is a summary of the carbon species identified in the samples. Table 3-9 also contains the PSAL ICP-AES analysis of the “Base Salt Solution” feed, which is the same solution that has analytical results reported in Table 3-6. The “Pre 140 °C” sample was collected after the organics have been added and additional Stock Solution was added continuously and boiled-down to a mixture that had an atmospheric boiling point of approximately 140 °C. This sample was effectively at the start of the 140 °C HGR measurement. The “Post 140 °C” sample was collected at the conclusion of the 140 °C HGR measurement and just prior to the initiation of the 100 °C HGR measurement. Due to a salt blockage, the sampler needed to be replaced in order to take the “Post 140 °C” sample. The sampler that was removed after the “Post 140 °C” condition contained a portion of the resin beads that were added at the start of the test. The “Post 100 °C” sample was collected at the conclusion of the 100 °C HGR measurement, prior to

the initiation of the 75 °C HGR measurement. The “Post 75 °C” sample was collected at the conclusion of the 75 °C HGR measurement. At ambient temperature, the pre- and post-measurement HBP simulant samples were saltcake mixtures with considerable solids. The physical characteristics of these samples made it difficult to determine the density.

An estimation of the density of the pre- and post-measurement HBP simulant samples is 1.66 g/mL at ambient temperature. This was determined through repeated measurement by volumetric flask of a heated sample while it was cooling. This method should be considered to have a greater uncertainty than the typical density measurement, possibly up to 10% 1σ uncertainty.

As seen in Table 3-7 and Table 3-9, many of the salt components remain constant during testing. Sodium, nitrite, nitrate, formate, and oxalate did not appear to significantly increase or decrease during testing beyond what can be attributed to analytical uncertainty. However, from Table 3-9 the soluble aluminum (aluminate) dropped by more than 50% during the 140 °C HGR measurement and continued to drop at subsequent temperatures. This finding is consistent with the formation of sodium aluminosilicate noted during testing. This change in aluminum concentration is expected to contribute to a decrease in HGR during the measurement tests based on Equation 1. Silicon and potassium increased due to the dissolution of the borosilicate glassware.

The carbon balance of Table 3-8 shows that the portion of the soluble TOC that is not due to formate or oxalate is about 65% of the TOC in the pre-measurement sample and drops to roughly 40% of the TOC in post-measurement samples. Formate remained relatively constant at the amount added in the simulant while oxalate increased from the amount added in the post 140 °C sample. The added amounts listed in the table contain the full amount of carbon contained in formate, oxalate, antifoam, tributyl phosphate, and ion exchange resin. For the MCU solvent, only the non-volatile carbon is included in the carbon contribution because the Isopar L[®] would leave in the offgas prior to the pre 140 °C sample. The estimate of the added carbon is greater than the pre 140 °C measured TC, TOC, and adjusted TOC for several reasons. Portions of the carbon in tributyl phosphate and antifoam are expected to leave in the offgas before the pre 140 °C sample. Also, carbon in the ion exchange resin would be underrepresented in the sample because much of the resin beads were observed to be intact. If a portion of the organics were concentrated (e.g., at the liquid surface) rather than evenly dispersed in the aqueous phase, this would also bias TOC analysis low by comparison to what was added.

SVOA identified one component at above the detection limit of approximately 4 mg/L. 2,3-dimethyl-2-butanol was reported at levels corresponding to approximately 50 mg/L in the pre-measurement sample and two of the post-measurement samples. However, the library-matched identification of this component is tenuous as the MS spectra of the sample had fragments that were not contained in the library match. Some fragments indicate that the organic might be better identified as a compound with an aromatic ring, possibly one that is not in the MS instrument library.

Table 3-7. Analysis of Samples Taken During HBP HGR Testing

analyte	method	units	1 σ unc.	Pre 140 °C	Post 140 °C	Post 100 °C	Post 75 °C
Na ⁺	ICP-AES	M	10%	17.2	18.3	14.8	17.5
OH ⁻	IC	M	10%	9.50	10.9	9.51	10.1
NO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	10%	3.86	4.31	3.86	4.09
NO ₃ ⁻	IC	M	10%	3.19	3.45	3.06	3.20
Al(OH) ₄ ⁻	ICP-AES	M	10%	0.955	0.404	0.384	0.359
CO ₃ ²⁻	TIC/TOC	M	10%	2.45E-02	3.59E-02	2.89E-02	2.76E-02
		mg/L		1470	2150	1740	1660
CHO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	10%	5.87E-02	6.89E-02	6.20E-02	6.46E-02
		mg/L		2640	3100	2790	2910
C ₂ O ₄ ²⁻	IC	M	10% ^a	< 5.8E-03	4.34E-03	3.94E-03	4.22E-03
		mg/L		< 510	382	346	371
TOC	TIC/TOC	mg C/L	10%	1980	1590	1450	1460

^a The 1 σ uncertainty for oxalate is likely greater than 10% because the measured values were below the instrument calibration curve

Table 3-8. Summary of Inorganic and Organic Carbon in HBP Tests

carbon analyte	units	added ^a	Pre 140 °C		Post 140 °C		Post 100 °C		Post 75 °C	
			result	1 σ	result	1 σ	result	1 σ	result	1 σ
Total Carbon (TIC+TOC)	mg C/L	2490	2270	230	2020	200	1800	180	1790	180
TIC (Carbonate Carbon)	mg C/L	0	294	29	431	43	347	35	331	33
TOC	mg C/L	2490	1980	200	1590	160	1450	150	1460	150
Formate Carbon	mg C/L	800	705	70	828	83	744	74	776	78
Oxalate Carbon	mg C/L	24	< 138	--	104	10	95	9	101	10
Adjusted TOC (TOC-Formate-Oxalate)	mg C/L	1670	1280	210	660	180	610	160	580	170

^a Does not include volatile MCU organics. Carbon from ion exchange resin and antifoam is approximate.

Table 3-9. PSAL ICP-AES Analysis of Samples Taken During HBP HGR Testing

analyte	units	Base Salt Solution	Pre 140 °C	Post 140 °C	Post 100 °C	Post 75 °C
Ag	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
Al	mg/L	1.61E+04	2.58E+04	1.09E+04	1.04E+04	9.69E+03
Ba	mg/L	< 1.0E-01	< 4.2E+00	< 5.0E+00	< 4.7E+00	< 4.3E+00
Ca	mg/L	9.01E-01	5.57E+00	1.09E+01	9.48E+00	1.04E+01
Cr	mg/L	6.65E-01	< 4.2E+00	< 5.0E+00	< 4.7E+00	< 4.3E+00
Cu	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
Fe	mg/L	5.93E+00	1.10E+01	9.63E+00	7.89E+00	9.51E+00
Hg	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
K	mg/L	1.59E+01	5.45E+01	1.82E+02	1.73E+02	2.02E+02
Li	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
Mg	mg/L	< 1.0E-01	< 4.2E+00	< 5.0E+00	< 4.7E+00	< 4.3E+00
Mn	mg/L	< 1.0E-01	< 4.2E+00	< 5.0E+00	< 4.7E+00	< 4.3E+00
Na	mg/L	2.68E+05	3.96E+05	4.21E+05	3.41E+05	4.02E+05
Ni	mg/L	< 1.0E-01	< 4.2E+00	< 5.0E+00	< 4.7E+00	< 4.3E+00
P	mg/L	< 2.0E+00	< 8.5E+01	< 1.0E+02	< 9.4E+01	< 8.5E+01
Pd	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
Rh	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
Ru	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
S	mg/L	6.39E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
Si	mg/L	9.69E+00	1.80E+03	1.08E+03	1.28E+03	6.32E+02
Sn	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
Ti	mg/L	< 3.0E+00	< 1.3E+02	< 1.5E+02	< 1.4E+02	< 1.3E+02
Zn	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01
Zr	mg/L	< 1.0E+00	< 4.2E+01	< 5.0E+01	< 4.7E+01	< 4.3E+01

3.2.4 Precipitated Solids Analysis

After completion of the HBP simulant test (including tests with glycolate that are not included in this report), the mixer and heating rods were removed from the pot while the material was cooling. Figure 3-18 contains two photographs taken early in the cooling period. The image on the left shows the yellow to brown colored liquid above white solids at the bottom of the vessel. The presence of the white solids at the bottom of the vessel was noted during simulant boil down and the first set of testing at 140 °C and these solids persisted throughout the test. The image on the right shows a small amount of persistent foam on the surface of the liquid. The image also shows some of the solids that accumulated above the final liquid level.

After the bulk of the cooled simulant was removed from the kettle, the kettle and internals were rinsed several times with water followed by scraping of the residual deposited solids from the surfaces. Figure 3-19 shows an example of the white solids deposited on the agitator that were not removed with water rinsing and subsequent scraping. Similar white solids were noted on the heating rods and on portions of the glass kettle. Figure 3-20 shows two types of solids that were removed from the kettle that were not very soluble in water. The image on the left shows a portion of a gray colored clump of solids that was unique in appearance from the other solids at the bottom of the kettle. The image on the right shows flakes of the more typical water insoluble solids removed from the kettle.



Figure 3-18. Appearance of HBP Simulant Material after Testing



Figure 3-19. Solids Deposited on Mixer Impeller (and Heating Rods) after HBP Simulant Testing



Figure 3-20. Solids Removed from Bottom of Kettle upon Completion of HBP Simulant Testing

The deposits associated with the sampling tube removed after the 140 °C HGR measurement were rinsed with water and analyzed by SEM with XEDS. Figure 3-21 shows an SEM image for the solid deposits. The XEDS indicated that this material was likely sodium aluminosilicate phases consistent with SRS HLW evaporators. There were also possible nitrate and carbonate salt crystals associated with this deposited material (although these compounds are commonly seen from the dried liquid from solutions of these compositions).




Figure 3-21. SEM Image of Solid Material Deposited during 140 °C HGR Measurement

Figure 3-22 contains XRD results for the solids removed from the mixer (and rinsed with deionized water) after the full set of tests with the HBP simulant (including tests with sodium glycolate not included in this report). This white material is shown in Figure 3-19. The results for solids removed from the heating rods and washed from the kettle wall were identical to this result for the mixer solids and thus are not included here separately. The results show either a cancrinite or sodalite phase of sodium aluminosilicate ($\text{Na}_8\text{Al}_6\text{Si}_6\text{O}_{24}\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})_{3,4}\cdot(\text{CO}_3)$). The analogous nitrate or hydroxy versions of sodalite and cancrinite are consistent with what is expected in SRS evaporator systems.²⁸⁻²⁹ The source of the silicon is likely from the dissolution of the glass kettle material by the concentrated hydroxide solution during this high temperature testing. The Antifoam 747 also contains silicon that could potentially contribute to sodium aluminosilicate formation. Because of the use of the glass kettle, this testing has a much greater silicon concentration than would be typical in the SRS Tank Farm evaporators. Thus, aluminosilicate formation in this testing is not quantitatively representative of the evaporators.

Figure 3-23 contains XRD results for the clump of gray solids removed from the pot after the testing and rinsed with deionized water prior to analysis. This corresponds to the material in left image of Figure 3-20. In addition to the sodalite or cancrinite phase noted in other locations ($\text{Na}_8\text{Al}_6\text{Si}_6\text{O}_{24}\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})_{3,4}\cdot(\text{CO}_3)$), this material contained lesser amounts (in decreasing order) of solid sodium oxalate ($\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$), the sodium carbonate phase trona ($\text{Na}_3\text{H}(\text{CO}_3)_2\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})$), and sodium nitrate (NaNO_3). There also may be some amorphous material that was not identified by the XRD method.

From Figure 3-24, bright areas of the SEM backscatter image of the gray solids correspond to mercury, as identified by the XEDS. Some localized areas include rod shapes in the SEM image, which is typical of sodium oxalate.

Additional SEM, XEDS, and XRD results for the simulant solids are in Appendix B.




Figure 3-22. Representative XRD of Solids Deposited on Mixer, Heating Rods, and Walls of Kettle




Figure 3-23. XRD of a Gray Solid Mass Precipitated in the HGR Kettle





Figure 3-24. SEM Backscatter Image (top) and XEDS (bottom) of the Gray Solid Mass Precipitated in the HGR Kettle

3.3 Tank 38 Sample Characterization

3.3.1 Sample HTF-38-17-60

Tank 38 waste sample HTF-38-17-60 was taken using a three liter sampler and delivered to SRNL on July 10, 2017. This supernate sample was slightly hazy due to the sample containing a small quantity of insoluble solids. Figure 3-25 shows three photographs of the sample. Insoluble solids had settled to the bottom of the sample bottle (see photograph b). After the solids were resuspended, a portion of the sample was poured into a 125 mL polymethylpentene beaker (see photograph c). The markings on the back of the beaker are only slightly visible through the HTF-38-17-60 material. This appearance is consistent with tank supernate samples with considerably less than 1 wt% of insoluble solids.




Figure 3-25. Photographs of sample HTF-38-17 60 in SRNL Shielded Cells, Cell 3: a) sample in 4 L poly bottle, b) solids settled at bottom of bottle, c) 60 mL portion of sample in a clear beaker

Tank 38 sample HTF-38-17-60 contained 4143.92 g of material. An initial analytical subsample of approximately 157 grams was prepared from the original sample. A portion of the analytical subsample was filtered to produce approximately 40 g of filtrate. Subsequently, the remainder of Tank 38 sample HTF-38-17-60 was split into two approximately 1.1 L portions for testing (1466.44 g and 1465.79 g) and a remaining portion of 1127.71 g. The 1466.44 g portion was used as feed for the test described in Section 3.4 of this report. The other two portions were retained for potential future testing.

3.3.2 Initial Analysis of HTF-38-17-60

The density of the Tank 38 sample HTF-38-17-60 material, including insoluble solids, was 1.327 g/mL (Relative Standard Deviation (RSD) = 0.67%, number of replicates (n) = 8). Density was measured at 25 to 27 °C. SVOA was used to determine whether there were any identifiable organic components. The result of SVOA was that all individual SVOA analytes were less than 1 mg/L in sample HTF-38-17-60.

Table 3-10 contains results for sodium, anions, TB/OH/OB, and TIC/TOC. Table 3-11 contains results for other analyses, primarily ICP-AES, ICP-MS, AA, and CVAA. The ICP-AES results for sodium (as Na^+) and aluminum (as $\text{Al}(\text{OH})_4^-$) are also included in Table 3-10 so that they can be included in the cation/anion balance. Other ICP-ES, ICP-MS, and AA analytes are ignored in the cation/anion balance due to their expected minimal impact on the balance.

As seen in Table 3-10, the 7.79 M of sodium balanced with the anions (i.e., 8.14 N) within analytical uncertainty, indicating a 0.35 N imbalance toward anions. The major anions were 2.85 M hydroxide, 2.37 M nitrite, 1.27 M nitrate, 0.67 M carbonate, and 0.094 M aluminate. The formate and oxalate were 1570 mg/L and 441 mg/L, respectively. The overall TOC was measured on an undiluted portion of sample as 676 mg carbon/L. Each of these measurements have a 1σ analytical uncertainty of 10%. The unidentified species that contribute to TOC not due to carbon from formate and oxalate thus sum to 136 mg carbon/L with a 1σ uncertainty of 80 mg carbon/L.

Surface and sub-surface samples from Tank 38 were previously analyzed most recently for samples HTF-38-17-52 and HTF-38-17-53 collected in June 2017.³⁰ The density, sodium, hydroxide, and many of the major components were very similar in HTF-38-17-52, HTF-38-17-53, and HTF-38-17-60. The formate is slightly (~10%) lower in the current sample HTF-38-17-60 when compared to the previous surface sample HTF-38-17-52. Oxalate in the current sample is only 60% of the concentration in the previous sample.

Table 3-11 shows agreement within analytical uncertainty for the acid diluted sample and the water diluted filtrate. One high value for water diluted filtrate silicon analysis is not included in the overall average because it is an outlier when compared with the other five measurements. The lower detection limit value of the two preparations is reported as the overall best detection limit.

Table 3-10. Ionic Composition of Tank 38 Sample HTF-38-17-60

analyte	method	units	1σ unc.	water diluted filtrate	
				average	RSD
Na ⁺	ICP-ES	M	10%	7.79E+00	0.4%
OH ⁻	TB/OH/OB	M	10%	2.85E+00	3.5%
NO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	10%	2.37E+00	0.8%
NO ₃ ⁻	IC	M	10%	1.27E+00	0.6%
Al(OH) ₄ ⁻	ICP-ES	M	10%	9.42E-02	0.8%
CO ₃ ²⁻	TIC/TOC	M	10%	6.72E-01	0.4%
		mg/L		4.03E+04	
CHO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	10%	3.49E-02	0.6%
		mg/L		1.57E+03	
C ₂ O ₄ ²⁻	IC	M	10%	5.01E-03	0.8%
		mg/L		4.41E+02	
PO ₄ ³⁻	IC	M	10%	3.89E-03	6.5%
SO ₄ ²⁻	IC	M	10%	6.08E-02	2.2%
F ⁻	IC	M	10%	2.97E-02	0.3%
Cl ⁻	IC	M	10%	6.90E-03	0.3%
Br ⁻	IC	M	--	< 1.27E-03	--
Na ⁺ /anions	calculation	N/N	--	0.96	--

Table 3-11. Other Analysis of Tank 38 Sample HTF-38-17-60

analyte	method	units	1 σ unc.	acid diluted sample		water diluted filtrate		overall		
				average	RSD	average	RSD	best	RSD	n
Ag	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 7.7E+00	--	< 1.6E+01	--	< 7.7E+00	--	--
Al	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	2.59E+03	1.0%	2.54E+03	0.8%	2.57E+03	1.3%	6
As	AA	mg/L	20%	1.76E+00	--	--	--	1.76E+00	--	--
B	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	1.81E+02	1.4%	1.83E+02	0.6%	1.82E+02	1.1%	6
Ba	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 5.9E-01	--	< 1.2E+00	--	< 5.9E-01	--	--
Be	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 2.4E-01	--	< 4.9E-01	--	< 2.4E-01	--	--
Ca	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 6.3E+00	--	< 1.3E+01	--	< 6.3E+00	--	--
Cd	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 7.6E+00	--	< 1.5E+01	--	< 7.6E+00	--	--
Ce	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 2.0E+01	--	< 4.1E+01	--	< 2.0E+01	--	--
Co	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 8.2E+00	--	< 1.7E+01	--	< 8.2E+00	--	--
Cr	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	1.05E+02	0.7%	1.03E+02	0.2%	1.04E+02	0.8%	6
Cs-137	gamma	dpm/mL	5%	3.27E+08	--	3.32E+08	1.5%	3.30E+08	1.4%	4
Cu	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 2.8E+01	--	< 5.5E+01	--	< 2.8E+01	--	--
Fe	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 1.0E+01	--	< 2.1E+01	--	< 1.0E+01	--	--
Gd	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 5.8E+00	--	< 1.2E+01	--	< 5.8E+00	--	--
Hg	CVAA	mg/L	20%	3.03E+02	2.6%	3.19E+02	3.4%	3.11E+02	3.8%	6
K	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	4.42E+02	4.2%	4.36E+02	5.8%	4.39E+02	4.6%	6
La	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 4.6E+00	--	< 9.1E+00	--	< 4.6E+00	--	--
Li	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	9.75E+01	1.2%	9.13E+01	1.4%	9.44E+01	3.8%	6
Mg	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 1.1E+00	--	< 2.2E+00	--	< 1.1E+00	--	--
Mn	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 1.1E+00	--	< 2.1E+00	--	< 1.1E+00	--	--
Mo	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 2.4E+01	--	< 4.7E+01	--	< 2.4E+01	--	--
Na	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	1.80E+05	0.6%	1.79E+05	0.4%	1.79E+05	0.4%	6
Ni	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 1.3E+01	--	< 2.6E+01	--	< 1.3E+01	--	--
P	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 2.3E+02	--	< 2.1E+02	--	< 2.3E+02	--	--
Pb	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 1.1E+02	--	< 2.1E+02	--	< 1.1E+02	--	--
Rh	ICP-MS	mg/L	10%	4.88E-01	1.6%	5.10E-01	0.9%	4.99E-01	2.7%	6
Ru	ICP-MS	mg/L	10%	4.31E+00	1.4%	4.47E+00	1.8%	4.39E+00	2.2%	6
S	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 6.6E+03	--	< 1.3E+04	--	< 6.6E+03	--	--
Sb	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 1.1E+02	--	< 2.21E+02	--	< 1.1E+02	--	--
Se	AA	mg/L	--	< 5.7E-01	--	--	--	< 5.7E-01	--	--
Si	ICP-AES	mg/L	11%	1.58E+02	1.8%	1.54E+02	4.1%	1.56E+02	2.8%	5 ^a
Sn	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 6.6E+01	--	< 1.3E+02	--	< 6.6E+01	--	--
Sr	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 2.1E-01	--	< 4.3E-01	--	< 2.1E-01	--	--
Tc-99	ICP-MS	mg/L	10%	1.94E+00	0.8%	1.84E+00	1.3%	1.89E+00	3.1%	6
Th	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 6.0E+00	--	< 1.2E+01	--	< 6.0E+00	--	--
Ti	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 2.3E+01	--	< 4.7E+01	--	< 2.3E+01	--	--
U-235	ICP-MS	mg/L	10%	2.54E-01	1.9%	2.58E-01	1.6%	2.56E-01	1.8%	6
U-236	ICP-MS	mg/L	10%	1.55E-02	2.9%	1.61E-02	1.7%	1.58E-02	3.0%	6
U-238	ICP-MS	mg/L	10%	4.07E+01	0.8%	4.12E+01	1.5%	4.09E+01	1.3%	6
Total U	ICP-MS	mg/L	10%	4.09E+01	0.8%	4.15E+01	1.5%	4.12E+01	1.5%	6
V	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 3.1E+00	--	< 6.2E+00	--	< 3.1E+00	--	--
Zn	ICP-AES	mg/L	12%	1.29E+01	2.6%	1.26E+01	5.7%	1.27E+01	4.2%	6
Zr	ICP-AES	mg/L	--	< 3.6E+00	--	< 7.2E+00	--	< 3.6E+00	--	--

^a one high silicon outlier value is not included.

Table 3-12 contains results of a water dilution performed on the sample material without filtration. The purpose of this analysis was to measure oxalate and other salts that might have been partially insoluble in the sample at the shielded cell temperature. By comparison with Table 3-10, the results for oxalate and most other salts agree within analytical uncertainty for preparations with and without filtration.

Table 3-12. Sample Dilution with Water for Insoluble Oxalate

analyte	method	units	1σ unc.	water diluted sample average	RSD
NO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	10%	2.36E+00	1.3%
NO ₃ ⁻	IC	M	10%	1.30E+00	1.1%
CO ₃ ²⁻	TIC/TOC	M	10%	6.68E-01	0.4%
CHO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	10%	3.55E-02	0.4%
C ₂ O ₄ ²⁻	IC	M	10%	5.03E-03	6.7%
PO ₄ ³⁻	IC	M	10%	4.46E-03	1.0%
SO ₄ ²⁻	IC	M	10%	5.85E-02	1.8%
F ⁻	IC	M	--	< 1.51E-02	--
Cl ⁻	IC	M	--	< 8.10E-03	--
Br ⁻	IC	M	--	< 3.60E-03	--

The estimated 1-sigma uncertainty for individual analytical methods are as follows: 10% for ICP-AES, ICP-MS, IC, TIC/TOC, and TB/OH/OB; 20% for CVAA and AA; and 5% for gamma. The RSD is a representation of repeatability and includes the uncertainty introduced by the dilution preparation and a portion of the analytical method uncertainty.

3.3.3 Post HGR Measurement Analysis of HTF-38-17-60

Table 3-13 contains the post HGR measurement sample analysis results and a comparison to the pre HGR measurement sample analysis results. ICP-AES results are only included for analytes measured above the limit of quantification. The pre HGR sample results were initially reported in Table 3-10 and Table 3-11. The column “post/pre” is an indication of the fractional increase of a component measured after the test when compared with the value measured before the test. Post/pre values between approximately 0.8 and 1.2 would not indicate a statistically significant difference in the pre and post HGR measurement samples.

Dissolution of the borosilicate glass kettle of the HGR apparatus is evident by the increase in silicon and boron concentrations. There was also a marked decrease in aluminum concentration in the sample taken after the test. The decrease in aluminum concentration is consistent with the formation of sodium aluminosilicate, which is favored at high temperatures in the presence of sufficient silicon. White solids were observed in the bottom of the kettle at the conclusion of HGR testing. XRD analysis confirmed that the solids were sodium aluminosilicates (see Figure 3-26). The other identified sodium salts are likely from dried Tank 38 material; the solids were not washed prior to submission for analyses.

Formate concentration appeared unchanged during the test. Oxalate and nitrate are slightly lower in the post HGR measurement sample analysis, which may be due to analytical uncertainty or may indicate the precipitation or decomposition of oxalate and the precipitation of nitrate. The increases in sulfate and phosphate in the post HGR measurement sample may be due to analytical uncertainty or may indicate an actual increase in the soluble sulfate and phosphate concentration. The disagreement between pre and post HGR measurement of fluoride is outside of the analytical uncertainty and the cause has not been identified. All other concentrations in the pre and post HGR measurement sample analysis results match within the analytical uncertainty.

Table 3-13. Pre- and Post-HGR-Measurement Sample Analysis Results Comparison

analyte	method	units	1 σ unc.	pre HGR measurement		post HGR measurement		post/pre
				average	RSD	average	RSD	
Na ⁺	ICP-AES	M	10%	7.79E+00	0.4%	7.71E+00	1.8%	0.99
OH ⁻	TB/OH/OB	M	10%	2.85E+00	3.5%	2.73E+00	--	0.96
NO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	10%	2.37E+00	0.8%	2.30E+00	0.5%	0.97
NO ₃ ⁻	IC	M	10%	1.27E+00	0.6%	1.06E+00	0.8%	0.84
Al(OH) ₄ ⁻	ICP-AES	M	10%	9.42E-02	0.8%	3.66E-03	5.4%	0.039
CO ₃ ²⁻	TIC/TOC	M	10%	6.72E-01	0.4%	6.53E-01	0.4%	0.97
		mg/L		4.03E+04		3.92E+04		
CHO ₂ ⁻	IC	M	10%	3.49E-02	0.6%	3.59E-02	0.9%	1.03
		mg/L		1.57E+03		1.62E+03		
C ₂ O ₄ ²⁻	IC	M	10%	5.01E-03	0.8%	4.30E-03	1.2%	0.86
		mg/L		4.41E+02		3.79E+02		
PO ₄ ³⁻	IC	M	10%	3.89E-03	6.5%	4.58E-03	0.9%	1.2
SO ₄ ²⁻	IC	M	10%	6.08E-02	2.2%	7.14E-02	0.8%	1.2
F ⁻	IC	M	10%	2.97E-02	0.3%	1.19E-02	0.7%	0.40
Cl ⁻	IC	M	10%	6.90E-03	0.3%	7.53E-03	0.1%	1.09
Br ⁻	IC	M	--	< 1.27E-03	--	< 8.19E-03	--	--
Na ⁺ /anions	calculation	N/N	N/N	0.96	--	1.01	--	--
TOC	TIC/TOC	mg C/L	10%	6.76E+02	--	6.88E+02	--	1.02
Al	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	2.57E+03	1.3%	9.88E+01	5.4%	0.039
B	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	1.82E+02	1.1%	5.59E+02	1.9%	3.1
Cr	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	1.04E+02	0.8%	1.03E+02	2.1%	0.99
K	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	4.39E+02	4.6%	5.31E+02	0.7%	1.2
Li	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	9.44E+01	3.8%	1.03E+02	0.9%	1.09
Na	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	1.79E+05	0.4%	1.77E+05	1.8%	0.99
P	ICP-AES	mg/L	10%	< 2.28E+02	--	1.98E+02	0.4%	--
Si	ICP-AES	mg/L	11%	1.56E+02	2.8%	1.03E+03	0.005%	6.6
Zn	ICP-AES	mg/L	12%	1.27E+01	4.2%	1.34E+01	0.7%	1.05

The 7.71 M of sodium balanced with the anions (i.e., 7.62 N) within analytical uncertainty in the post-HGR-measurement, indicating a 0.09 N imbalance toward sodium. The major anions were 2.73 M hydroxide, 2.30 M nitrite, 1.06 M nitrate, an 0.65 M carbonate. The overall TOC was measured on an undiluted portion of sample as 688 mg carbon/L. As seen in Table 3-14, the adjusted TOC corresponding to the unidentified species that contribute to TOC not due to carbon from formate and oxalate sum to 154 mg carbon/L (with a 1 σ uncertainty of 82 mg carbon/L). Despite minor inconsistencies, Table 3-14 shows reasonable agreement between the pre- and post-HGR-measurement materials with respect to organic carbon content. In both the pre- and post- measurement samples, the portion of the soluble TOC that is not due to formate or oxalate is about 20% of the TOC.




Figure 3-26. XRD of White Solids Precipitated in the Tank 38 HGR Kettle

Table 3-14. Summary of Inorganic and Organic Carbon for Tank 38 Pre- and Post-HGR Measurement Samples

carbon analyte	units	pre HGR		post HGR	
		result	1σ	result	1σ
Total Carbon (TIC+TOC)	mg C/L	8750	870	8540	850
TIC (Carbonate Carbon)	mg C/L	8070	810	7850	780
TOC	mg C/L	676	68	688	69
Formate Carbon	mg C/L	419	42	431	43
Oxalate Carbon	mg C/L	120	12	103	10
Adjusted TOC (TOC-Formate-Oxalate)	mg C/L	136	80	154	82

3.4 Results from Tank 38 Actual Waste Test

Hydrogen generation rates from Tank 38 sample material were determined from measured hydrogen concentrations using Equation 3. The Tank 38 sample was mixed and purged for multiple hours at Shielded Cells ambient temperature (27 °C). The sample was then heated to boiling (110.5 °C), cooled to 90 °C, cooled to 80 °C, and finally heated to 100 °C. The material was held at each temperature until a constant or declining hydrogen generation rate was observed. Results are presented graphically in Figure 3-27.




Figure 3-27. Tank 38 Hydrogen Generation Rates as a Function of Time at Temperature

The hydrogen generation rates for each temperature are given in Table 3-15. Because the hydrogen generation rates in some tests began to decrease over time, a rolling average of 10 generation rates were calculated. For example, in the 90 °C test, hydrogen generation rate decreased to $4.2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ after peaking at $4.7 \times 10^{-7} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$, a decrease of 11%. The maximum rolling average generation rate for each temperature was chosen as the generation rate.

Table 3-15. HGR Measurements for Tank 38

Temperature (°C)	Hydrogen Generation Rate ($\text{ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$)	Estimated Uncertainty (95% confidence interval)*
27	$4.8 \times 10^{-8} \dagger$	NA
80	1.7×10^{-7}	10%
90	4.7×10^{-7}	10%
100	5.9×10^{-7}	10%
110.5 (boiling)	2.6×10^{-6}	10%

* The uncertainties for these results were calculated by inserting the inputs for Equation 2 (see Section 2.3.2) into the software package, GUM workbench²³, to derive a formula for the overall uncertainty. This formula was then used to calculate uncertainty using the software package JMP™ Pro, Version 11.2.1²⁴.

† This value is less than the limit of quantification but above the limit of detection; hydrogen is indeed present, but this number should not be used.

The hydrogen generation rates were fit to an Arrhenius model (exponential decay) to estimate an activation energy. This approach assumes no appreciable change in Al concentration, first order kinetics, and neglects any other factors (e.g., such as competing reactions to form aluminosilicates).

$$\text{Rate} = Ae^{-\frac{E_a}{RT}} \quad \text{Equation 8}$$

The results and Excel's exponential fit of the data are presented graphically in Figure 3-28, with $x = 1/T$, $A = 1.92 \times 10^{-7}$, and $E_a/R = 1.14 \times 10^4 \text{ K}^{-1}$. E_a , the activation energy, can be calculated by multiplying by $R = 8.314 \text{ J}\cdot\text{K}^{-1}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ yielding an activation energy of 94.8 kJ/mol which compares favorably with the $89.6 \pm 1.96 \text{ kJ/mol}$ proposed by Hu¹¹ for the Hanford waste (see Equation 1).




Figure 3-28. Curve Fit of Hydrogen Generation Rate vs 1/T to Calculate Activation Energy

The HGR measurements appear to be somewhat dependent on the order in which the measurements were performed. The data in Figure 3-28 show that the first two experimental measurements taken (110 °C and 90 °C) are above the curve fit and the latter two experimental measurements (80 °C and 100 °C) are near or below the curve fit. This trend is possibly due to the fact that subsequent measurements at different temperatures used the material from the previous experiment rather than fresh material, leading to possible consumption of reagents necessary for hydrogen production. Inspection of the data in Table 3-13 reveals that the only compounds exhibiting significant changes in concentration between the beginning and ending of testing are soluble silicon (560% increase), soluble boron (210% increase) and soluble aluminum (96% decrease). Note that these changes are likely due to dissolution of the glass vessel and subsequent formation of aluminosilicate solids (for further discussion on evidence of glass dissolution in these tests, see Appendix A). Note also that the trendline given in Figure 3-28 yields an R^2 value of 0.924, suggesting reasonable agreement with Arrhenius behavior despite the large changes in Al, Si, and B. This agreement indicates that aluminum, boron, and silicon likely have little effect on the hydrogen generation mechanism captured

in this testing at the concentrations examined. Note that this does not mean that aluminum, boron, and silicon are exempt from participation in hydrogen generation mechanisms not captured in this testing (including thermolysis of other organic molecules). It is unclear if the apparent decrease in reaction rate as a function of experiment order is due to the lesser consumption of analytes other than aluminum, silicon, or boron. It is also unclear if this apparent decrease is a secondary effect from glass.

During heating to boiling, nitrous oxide was detected and quantified by the GC. The generation rate is presented in Figure 3-29. Within 2.5 hours of boiling, nitrous oxide was no longer detected. The estimated detection limit of nitrous oxide is 0.005% or 10^{-6} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹ in this experiment. Unlike the HBP simulant, the release rate of nitrous oxide during the Tank 38 test did not appear to be related to the thermolytic HGR. Based on the measurement delays in the test system at the low 3 sccm gas purge rate, the nitrous oxide profile is consistent with a short-term release at or just before boiling and the subsequent dilution by the purge gas. One possibility is that the nitrous oxide was formed from the radiolysis of nitrate and nitrite¹⁷ prior to the test and released from the solution as its solubility decreased as the temperature increased. Another possibility is that the nitrous oxide was formed by a thermolysis reaction in which a reactant was quickly depleted.




Figure 3-29. Nitrous Oxide Generation during Boiling of Tank 38

3.5 Comparisons Between Simulant Tests, Tank 38 Tests, and Hu Equation Predictions

Table 3-16 summarizes the measured hydrogen generation rates given throughout this report, the TOC and Al concentration, and the generation rate calculated using the Hu correlation (e.g., Equation 1). For Tank 38, the initial TOC and Al concentrations were used to calculate the generation rates by the Hu correlation, since Al concentrations at each specific temperature is not known. Calculated generation rates using the final TOC and Al concentrations would yield generation rates of approximately one fourth of the values in the table.

In all cases, a reactivity factor, r_f , of one was used in the Hu equation. As stated in Section 1.0, the constants in the Hu equation (activation energy and pre-exponential factor) were regressed from hydrogen generation measurements specific to Hanford actual waste samples, and the reactivity factor was used to improve the fit of the data, with recommended values varying between 0.15 and one.

A reactivity factor for the SRNL tests were calculated by dividing the measured HGR by the calculated Hu HGR (see last column). In the three HBP tests, the calculated reactivity factor was consistent, ~0.3. For the two SY1-SIM-91B-NG tests, the reactivity factors were significantly different. Note that the generation rate for the 75 °C test was an extrapolation.

Table 3-16. Comparison of HGR Measurement to HGR Calculated by the Hu Equation 1

Test	HGR Measurement (ft ³ hr ⁻¹ gal ⁻¹)	TOC (wt%)	Al (wt%)	Hu (Eqn. 1) HGR (ft ³ hr ⁻¹ gal ⁻¹)	Measured HGR/ Hu HGR (calc. reactivity factor)
SY1-SIM-91B-NG (T = 75 °C)	5.4×10 ⁻⁷	0.0135	3.27	5.9×10 ⁻⁷	0.92
SY1-SIM-91B-NG Persistent HGR (T = 114 °C boiling)	3.8×10 ⁻⁶	0.0135	3.27	1.3×10 ⁻⁵	0.29
HBP (T = 75 °C) final	6.2×10 ⁻⁷	0.0877	0.583	2.2×10 ⁻⁶	0.28
HBP (T = 100 °C) final	3.0×10 ⁻⁶	0.0875	0.624	1.8×10 ⁻⁵	0.17
HBP (T = 139.1 °C boiling) final	8.1×10 ⁻⁵	0.0958	0.657	3.2×10 ⁻⁴ ^a	0.26
Tank 38 (T = 80 °C)	1.7×10 ⁻⁷	0.0509	0.194	1.0×10 ⁻⁶	0.16
Tank 38 (T = 90 °C)	4.7×10 ⁻⁷	0.0509	0.194	2.4×10 ⁻⁶	0.20
Tank 38 (T = 100 °C)	5.9×10 ⁻⁷	0.0509	0.194	5.4×10 ⁻⁶	0.11
Tank 38 (T = 110.5 °C boiling)	2.6×10 ⁻⁶	0.0509	0.194	1.2×10 ⁻⁵	0.22

^a Calculation of the Hu HGR for the HBP test at 139.1 °C is an extrapolation outside of the temperature range that the equation was developed for.

For Tank 38, the reactivity factor decreased as testing progressed (order of tests: 110 °C, 90 °C, 80 °C, and finally 100 °C). The decrease in this calculated result is likely caused by using the initial Al concentration in the Hu equation; based on initial and final analysis of Tank 38, Al concentration was changing. For example, the final Tank 38 test (100 °C), using the final Al concentration, the Hu HGR is calculated to be 1.4×10⁻⁶ ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹, yielding a reactivity factor of 0.42 (compared to a reactivity factor of 0.11 calculated when using the initial aluminum concentration).

Tank 38 generation rates cannot be directly compared to simulant generation rates because the organic species present (other than formate and oxalate) are not necessarily the same.

Based on information on previous HGR testing, the reactivity factors for formate and oxalate are likely very near zero.¹⁰ The calculations of Hu HGR via Equation 1 in Table 3-16 use measured TOC, which includes the contribution of both oxalate and formate. An adjusted TOC, which is TOC minus the zero reactivity factor components formate and oxalate, has been calculated for the HBP and Tank 38 tests (see Table 3-8 and Table 3-14, respectively). Roughly 60% of the TOC in the HBP post-measurement samples and 80% of the TOC in the Tank 38 pre- and post-measurement are formate and oxalate. If the adjusted TOC is used in the Hu HGR calculation, the calculated reactivity factors move closer to one. Note that the adjusted TOC has a much larger relative uncertainty than the original measurements have because the adjusted TOC calculation is a difference.

In addition to differences in apparent reactivity, simulant and real-waste experiments exhibit somewhat different offgas compositions. GC monitoring of Tank 38 experiments recorded the appearance of three unknown gases in addition to the expected process gases (H₂, O₂, N₂, Kr). An example chromatogram from Tank 38 testing is given in Figure 3-30. Note that a question mark indicates the presence of an unidentified gaseous species.




Figure 3-30. Example Chromatogram from Tank 38 Testing at 110.5 °C.

Only one additional gas was observed during HBP simulant testing. An example chromatogram is given in Figure 3-31. Note that retention times for monitored process gases are markedly different in the simulant system when compared to the real-waste system, eluting 15-30 seconds later in the case of the simulant system.




Figure 3-31. Example Chromatogram from HBP Simulant Testing at 140 °C.

Due to the difference in retention times between the two measurement systems, it is possible that the unknown species observed at 88 seconds in Figure 3-31 is identical to the unknown species observed at 47 seconds in Figure 3-30. Additional testing with GC and other offgas capability (e.g., MS and FTIR) is recommended to characterize these unknown gaseous products and determine if these species are volatile organic compounds formed from thermolysis of dissolved organics.

4.0 Conclusions

The following conclusions have been drawn from the results presented in this report:

The HGR measurement apparatus has been successfully employed to replicate hydrogen production rate experiments reported by Ashby and predicted by Crawford. Simulant without deliberately added organic carbon was found to contain approximately 200 mg/L of organic carbon from tramp organics in the reagents used to prepare the solution. The tests using such simulant generated hydrogen at rates consistent with, but somewhat lower than, those predicted by the Hu equation at equivalent carbon and aluminum loadings. Prior to identifying the organic contaminants, potential sources of hydrogen in simulants without deliberately added organic carbon were examined. Testing determined that this hydrogen is not due to caustic reaction of organic materials of construction within the reaction vessel, electrolysis due to current leak, anode/cathode reactions, corrosion, or the method of heating employed in the experiment. Tests conducted at boiling (114 °C) exhibited an average HGR of $3.8 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. Extrapolation of test data taken at 75 °C provides an estimated HGR of $5.4 \times 10^{-7} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. Arrhenius interpolation of these points yields an estimated HGR of $2.0 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ at 100 °C.

HGR was measured in a HBP simulant with major known SRS Tank Farm organic compounds. Testing used fresh organics and did not simulate the long-term exposure of these organics already experienced in the waste. Hence, testing is expected to provide high bias to the hydrogen generation rates. The final HGR measurements at 75, 100, and 140 °C were 6.2×10^{-7} , 3.0×10^{-6} , and $8.1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$, respectively. Decreases in the HGR were noted at isothermal conditions with steady gas tracer concentration, which clouds development of a temperature dependent correlation for generation rate. While the simulant contains high concentrations of major SRS organics tested at high temperatures found in the 3H Evaporator, this limited data set may not fully bound values under all possible operating conditions.

HGR was measured for an actual-waste Tank 38 sample. The HGR measurements at 80, 90, 100, and 110 °C were 1.7×10^{-7} , 4.7×10^{-7} , 5.9×10^{-7} , and 2.6×10^{-6} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹, respectively. The Limit of Detection and Limit of Quantification for the HGR measurements were 2.6×10^{-8} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹ and 5.1×10^{-8} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹, respectively.

5.0 Recommendations

Proceed with the planned HGR measurements using a sealed system, which is described in Section 4.4 of the TTQAP and requested by Task 6 of the TTR. The sealed system is designed to measure the low HGR expected for a Tank 50 actual waste sample. The sealed system vessels are constructed of stainless steel in contrast to the glass vessel used in the flow system testing reported here.

As discussed in the TTR and TTQAP, the program should consider HGR measurements for actual-waste samples of tanks representing other portions of the SRS Tank Farm system. A single test with Tank 38 material may not provide adequate information for the entirety of the liquid waste system. Special consideration should be given to tanks that have a history of high organic content. The program should also assess the need for thermolytic HGR for Tank Farm operations such as aluminum dissolution and oxalic acid cleaning. A test with a sample from the 3H Evaporator system may be appropriate due to the hydrogen measured in the HBP test.

If the rates from the HBP and Tank 38 testing prove restrictive when applied to DSA development, additional simulant test to decipher the contributions from individual organic sources in tank waste may be warranted. In such testing, a control test should be performed to establish a baseline HGR without the addition of organics. Use of irradiated organic bearing solutions may be more appropriate to represent the current waste conditions. Additional instrumentation may be warranted on simulant testing if identification and quantification of VOC species is to be tested.

Additional simulant testing should be performed to evaluate the effect of anion concentrations on organic thermolytic HGR, particularly in concentrations ranges relevant to SRS waste.

Additional measurements should be made with the flow system to examine potential contribution of glass dissolution and aluminosilicate precipitation toward hydrogen generation. Comparison should be made between testing of identical solutions in the glass and stainless steel vessels, preferably at sub-boiling temperature.

6.0 References

- ¹ W. A. Condon, "Potentially inadequate recognition of the effect of organics on hydrogen generation rates in CSTF.", PI-2017-0003, February 28, 2017.
- ² A. V. Staub, "Potentially inadequate recognition of the effect of organics on hydrogen generation rates in Saltstone", PI-2017-0002, February 28, 2017.
- ³ K. M. Brotherton, "Potentially inadequate recognition of the effect of organics on hydrogen gas generation rates in DWPF process vessels", PI-2017-0004, February 28, 2017.

- ⁴ J. E. Occhipinti, “Research and Development for Tank Farm, DWPF, and Saltstone HGR PISAs”, X-TTR-G-00003, Revision 0, June 7, 2017.
- ⁵ C. J. Martino, J. D. Newell, J. M. Pareizs, M. R. Duignan and M. L. Restivo, “Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan for Testing to Support Hydrogen Generation Rate in the Savannah River Site Tank Farm, Defense Waste Processing Facilities, and Saltstone”, SRNL-RP-2017-00305, Revision 1, September 20, 2017.
- ⁶ C. J. Martino, J. D. Newell and W. H. Woodham, “Run Plan for Thermolysis Tests with Ashby Simulant for Equipment Checkout”, SRNL-L3300-2017-00022, Revision 0, August 1, 2017.
- ⁷ C. J. Martino, J. D. Newell and J. M. Pareizs, “Run Plan for Tank 38 Actual-Waste Thermolysis Tests”, SRNL-L3300-2017-00024, Revision 1, August 28, 2017.
- ⁸ W. H. Woodham, C. J. Martino and J. D. Newell, “Run Plan for Thermolysis Tests with High Boiling Point Simulant and Common Tank Farm Organics”, SRNL-L3300-2017-00023, Revision 0, August 29, 2017.
- ⁹ C. Delegard, “Laboratory Studies of Complexed Waste Slurry Volume Growth in Tank 241-SY-101”, RHO-LD-124, 1980.
- ¹⁰ E. C. Ashby, et al., “Synthetic Waste Chemical Mechanism Studies”, WHC-EP-0823, Revision 0, October 1994.
- ¹¹ T. A. Hu, “Empirical Rate Equation Model and Rate Calculations of Hydrogen Generation for Hanford Tank Waste”, HNF-3851, Revision 1, September 2004.
- ¹² A. T. Clare, “Inclusion of Organic Contribution to Radiolytic and Thermolytic Hydrogen Generation at DWPF”, X-ESR-S-00320, Revision 2, 2017.
- ¹³ A. B. Chandler, “Safety Analysis Input: Thermolytic Hydrogen Generation Rate”, SF-I-GE-0063, 2017.
- ¹⁴ D. D. Walker, “Organic Compounds in Savannah River Site High-Level Waste”, WSRC-TR-2002-00391, Revision 0, September 30, 2002.
- ¹⁵ C. L. Crawford and W. D. King, “Impacts of Glycolate and Formate Radiolysis and Thermolysis on Hydrogen Generation Rate Calculations for the Savannah River Site Tank Farm”, SRNL-STI-2017-00303, Revision 0, August 2017.
- ¹⁶ B. Speight, “09/19/13 DIRT Meeting Minutes”, SRR-LWE-2013-00174, 2013.
- ¹⁷ C. H. Keilers, Jr, et al., “Flammable Gas Generation Mechanisms for High Level Liquid Waste Facilities”, X-ESR-G-00062, Revision 1, October 25, 2017.
- ¹⁸ “U.S. Standard Atmosphere, 1976”, NOAA-S/T 76-1562, October 1976.
- ¹⁹ M. E. Stone, D. J. Adamson, D. J. Pak and J. M. Pareizs, “Hydrogen Generation Rate Measurement Apparatus: Final Design Package”, SRNL-RP-2014-00866, Revision 0, September 2014.
- ²⁰ M. E. Stone, J. D. Newell, T. E. Smith and J. M. Pareizs, “WTP Waste Feed Qualification: Hydrogen Generation Rate Measurement Apparatus Testing Report”, SRNL-STI-2016-00247, Revision 0, June 2016.

- ²¹ J. D. Newell, et al., “Actual Waste Demonstration of the Nitric-Glycolic Flowsheet for Sludge Batch 9 Qualification”, SRNL-STI-2016-00327, Revision 1, March 9, 2017.
- ²² J. M. Pareizs, J. D. Newell, C. J. Martino, C. L. Crawford and F. C. Johnson, “Sludge Washing and Demonstration of the DWPF Nitric/Formic Flowsheet in the SRNL Shielded Cells for Sludge Batch 9 Qualification”, SRNL-STI-2016-00355, Revision 0, October 2016.
- ²³ Metrodata GmbH, “GUM Workbench: User Manual for Version 1.3, 2.3, and 2.4”, 2009.
- ²⁴ “SAS Institute Inc., JMP™ Pro, Ver. 11.2.1”, Cary, NC, 2014.
- ²⁵ J. K. Taylor, *Quality Assurance of Chemical Measurements*. Lewis Publishers, Inc.: Chelsea, MI, 1987.
- ²⁶ “Technical Reviews”, Manual E7, Procedure 2.60, Revision 17, August 25, 2016.
- ²⁷ “Savannah River National Laboratory Technical Report Design Check Guidelines”, WSRC-IM-2002-00011, Revision 2, August 2004.
- ²⁸ C. M. Jantzen, J. E. Laurinat and K. G. Brown, “Thermodynamic Modeling of the SRS Evaporators: Part I. The 2H and 2F Systems (U)”, WSRC-TR-2000-00293, Revision 1, April 4, 2002.
- ²⁹ J. Addai-Mensah, J. Li, M. Zbik and S. W. Rosencrance, “The Chemistry, Crystallization, Physicochemical Properties and Behavior of Sodium Aluminosilicate Solid Phases: Final Report”, WSRC-MS-2002-00907, Revision 0, November 20, 2002.
- ³⁰ M. S. Hay, C. J. Coleman and D. P. DiPrete, “Analysis of Tank 38H (HTF-38-17-52, -53) and Tank 43H (HTF-43-17-54, -55) Samples for Support of the Enrichment Control and Corrosion Control Programs”, SRNL-STI-2017-00472, Revision 0, August 2017.

Appendix A. Thermolysis Testing to Determine Components Producing Hydrogen

The hydrogen generated by the SYI-SIM-91B-NG simulant without added glycolate exceeded pre-test expectations. SRNL conducted a series of tests to determine whether any single component or components (i.e., sodium hydroxide, sodium carbonate, sodium nitrite, sodium nitrate, and sodium aluminate) of the SYI-SIM-91B simulant are responsible for hydrogen generation.¹ A test with aluminum nitrate was also conducted, as the impurity level of aluminum nitrate is believed to be significantly lower than that of sodium aluminate.

These experiments used a nominal 1.2 L borosilicate glass kettle as a reaction vessel that was joined to a nominal 0.6 L borosilicate glass top. (A full description of the equipment is included in the body of the report.) Purge gas of 0.5% Kr, 20% O₂, and 79.5% N₂ was supplied through a port at the top of the vessel. The purge gas swept the vessel headspace and carried generated products through a condenser for downstream GC analysis. Heat was supplied to the vessel contents via Inconel heating rods. Prior to testing, the glass vessel and INCOLOY 800 heating rods were soaked in acid and scrubbed to remove residue from previous tests. A new stainless steel agitator and shaft was installed. All components were rinsed with deionized water before use. Three 8.79 M solutions (sodium hydroxide, sodium nitrite, and sodium nitrate) were prepared. Since the solubility of sodium carbonate, aluminum nitrate, and sodium aluminate in water is significantly less than 8.79 M, these components were added as solid reagents, additional water was added to return the volume to 1 L.

Testing started with sodium hydroxide and the remaining components were added separately in five subsequent tests. The composition of the solution at the start of the sixth test approximated the composition of the SYI-SIM-91B-NG simulant (2.00 M sodium hydroxide, 0.42M sodium carbonate, 2.24 sodium nitrite, 2.59 M sodium nitrate, and 1.54 M sodium aluminate) with exception made for deviations due to aluminum nitrate addition (aluminum nitrate requires addition of excess sodium hydroxide and generates an excess of nitrate due to the 1:3 Al:NO₃⁻ ratio). The solution volume was kept at approximately 1 L. The tests were performed at the boiling point (atmospheric pressure) of the solution with a purge rate of 3 mL/min. The agitator speed ranged from 200 to 400 rpm. After the completion of the sixth test, a total of 1,604.1 g of simulant (containing approximately 171 g insoluble solids) were removed from the vessel. Table A-1 lists the test conditions.

Table A-1. Tests HGR DC-1 Through HGR DC-6.

Test #	Required Component Added	Pre-Test Mass Added (g)	Water Addition	Post-Test Mass Removed (g)
HGR DC-1	8.79 M NaOH	1293.6	-	224.6
HGR DC-2	Na ₂ CO ₃	161.5	Adjust Volume to 1 L	639.9 at 80 °C
HGR DC-3	8.79 M NaNO ₂	675.4	-	482.3
HGR DC-4	8.79 M NaNO ₃	521.6 at 83 °C	-	232.7
HGR DC-5	Al(NO ₃) ₃ ·9(H ₂ O) 8.79 M NaOH	143.6 169.4	Adjust Volume to 1 L	0
HGR DC-6	Na ₂ O·Al ₂ O ₃ ·3H ₂ O	125.89	Rinse Water	1,604.1

Since there was concern that organic impurities in the reagents might be responsible for higher hydrogen generation rate than expected, the total organic carbon (TOC) concentrations of each reagent was analyzed. Reagents of interest were diluted to target concentrations corresponding to the composition of SYI-SIM-91B-NG with DI water (hydroxide solution was used to dissolve NaAlO₂) prior to analysis, then the amount

of TOC in the resulting solution measured. The results are summarized in Table A-2 on a μg carbon per g reagent basis. According to these results, sodium aluminate contributes significantly more TOC to the simulant than the other additives with a concentration of 2311 $\mu\text{g/g}$. Note that sodium aluminate is a lower grade compound (i.e., it is technical grade, not ACS reagent grade) compared to the other chemicals utilized in this study and possibly contains humic acid as an impurity.²

Table A-2. Total Organic Carbon Concentration of Reagents Used in Testing.

Required Component Added	TOC Impurity ($\mu\text{g/g}$ reagent)
50% NaOH Solution	154
Na_2CO_3	1,137
NaNO_2	6.8
NaNO_3	0.8
$\text{Na}_2\text{O} \cdot \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$	2,311
DI Water	0.2

After the completion of the first set of six tests, the glass vessel, glass thermowell, the agitator, and the heating rods were thoroughly rinsed with deionized water. The initial test (HGR-DC-1) was repeated with the rinsed apparatus components (reported as HGR DC-7) following the same experimental parameters. Following this test, the stainless-steel agitator was removed and a fresh solution of 8.79 M NaOH was charged to the reaction vessel for the HGR DC-8 test. The results of HGR-DC-7 and 8 are summarized in Table A-3.

Table A-3. Tests HGR DC-7 and HGR DC-8.

Test #	Pre-Run Mass Added (g)	Post-Run Mass Removed (g)
HGR DC-7	1294.5	1274.4
HGR DC-8 ^a	1293.6	1279.3

^aStainless-steel agitator was removed for this test.

The maximum hydrogen generation rates for all tests described above are summarized in Table A-4 and Figure A-1. The largest hydrogen generation rate was observed in test HGR DC-1 (containing only 8.79 M sodium hydroxide). The hydrogen generation rate peaked at $2.2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$. Hydrogen generation declined in subsequent tests, dropping two orders of magnitude to $8.4 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$ in HGR DC-2. After the addition of sodium aluminate (HGR DC-6), an increase in hydrogen generation was observed relative to DC-5 (1.1×10^{-5} vs $1.7 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ft}^3 \text{ hr}^{-1} \text{ gal}^{-1}$). This result is similar to what was observed during the previous SYI-SIM-91B-NG simulant testing, suggesting that sodium aluminate and its relatively high quantities of TOC may be responsible for hydrogen generation. Note that the increase in HGR observed in DC-6 relative to the HGR observed in DC-5 is not expected to be due to the addition of aluminum, as aluminum was present in DC-5.

Table A-4. Maximum Hydrogen Generation Rates.

Test #	Boiling Temperature (°C)	Maximum HGR (ft ³ hr ⁻¹ gal ⁻¹)
HGR DC-1	114.3	2.2×10 ⁻⁴
HGR DC-2	113.3	8.4×10 ⁻⁶
HGR DC-3	113.3	6.4×10 ⁻⁶
HGR DC-4	113.1	3.1×10 ⁻⁶
HGR DC-5	111.3	1.7×10 ⁻⁶
HGR DC-6	113.1	1.1×10 ⁻⁵
Cleaned glassware, agitator, and heating rods with deionized water		
HGR DC-7	114.5	1.8×10 ⁻⁵
HGR DC-8	114.4	8.9×10 ⁻⁶




Figure A-1. Hydrogen Generation Rates for DC-1 Through DC-8.

In the later sodium hydroxide-only tests (i.e., HGR DC-7 and HGR DC-8), the hydrogen generation rates reached maximums of 1.8×10^{-5} and 8.9×10^{-6} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹, respectively; 1-2 orders of magnitude lower than the chemically-identical test HGR DC-1. It is possible that the reduced hydrogen rate from HGR DC-1 to HGR DC-7 and HGR DC-8 is due to the use of new or cleaned equipment (vessel, agitator, etc.) in the first experiments vs. the use of equipment that had only been rinsed in the latter two experiments. If this hypothesis is true, it may suggest the presence of a corrosive mechanism of hydrogen production due to the caustic corrosion of stainless-steel (agitator shaft), INCOLOY 800 (heating rods), or borosilicate glass

(reaction vessel and thermowell). Note that the sodium hydroxide solutions lack nitrite and nitrate which act as inhibitors for the formation of hydrogen generated from the corrosion of steel in the SRS Tank Farm.

To investigate the influence of corrosion in this testing, liquid samples were pulled at the completion of each test. Filtrate was analyzed for anions and metals by ion chromatography, titration, and ICP-ES. Borosilicate glass has a composition of 79.7-80.6% SiO₂, 10.3-13.0% B₂O₃, 4.0-5.2% Na₂O, 2.3-3.1% Al₂O₃, and residual traces of CaO, MgO, and other miscellaneous oxides by weight.^{3,4} The compositions of 316L stainless steel and INCOLOY 800 are summarized in Table A-5.^{5,6} This data is included to allow identification of metals in samples and determine whether corrosion of glassware, agitator, or heating rods might lead to the increase in concentration in samples.

Table A-5. 316L Stainless-Steel & INCOLOY 800 Compositions^{4,5}

Elemental Composition	316L Stainless Steel (wt.%)	INCOLOY 800 (wt.%)
Chromium	16.00 – 18.00	19.00 – 23.00
Nickel	10.00 – 14.00	30.00 – 35.00
Molybdenum	2.00 – 3.00	-
Manganese	< 2.00	< 1.50
Copper	-	< 0.75
Aluminum	-	0.15 – 0.60
Aluminum & Titanium	-	0.3 – 1.20
Silicon	< 0.75	-
Phosphorus	< 0.05	-
Sulfur	< 0.03	-
Carbon	< 0.08	< 0.10
Nitrogen	0.10	-
Iron	Balance (~65)	Balance (~42)

Table A-6 summarizes the results of the titration and ICP-ES analyses for samples pulled during testing. No sample was pulled following the completion of DC-5. Note that the silicon concentration increased from 43.65 mg/L before the beginning of testing (DC-1 Pre-Run) to 4150 mg/L after completion of the first NaOH-only test (DC-1 Post-Run). A similar trend is seen in aluminum concentration, increasing from <1 mg/L before HGR DC-1 to 106 mg/L after HGR DC-1. The DC-1 Post Test ratio of Si to Al is approximately 39:1 on a mass basis. This ratio is consistent with the Si:Al ratio in borosilicate glass (31:1 on a mass basis). Similar Si:Al ratios are observed for DC-7 Post Test and DC-8 Post Test samples (35:1 and 42:1). These observations indicate that glass corrosion occurs during the testing with NaOH. The fact that the three tests exhibit comparable concentrations of dissolved silicon in the product filtrate (4150, 3260, and 3380 mg/L, respectively) suggests that glass corrosion occurs in each of these tests to a comparable extent despite the fact that hydrogen generation varies by 2 orders of magnitude. This variation in HGR with relatively consistent glass corrosion suggests that the corrosion of glass does not correlate with HGR.

Table A-6. Feed and Product Analytical Results from Titrations and ICP-ES.

Sample ID ^b	Total Base (mol/L)	Al (mg/L)	Fe (mg/L)	Si (mg/L)	Cr (mg/L)
DC-1 Pre-Test	8.85	< 1.00	< 1.00	43.65	< 1.00
DC-1 Post-Test	8.80	106	16.4	4,150	3.20
DC-2 Post-Test	8.64	191	15.0	6,680	2.90
DC-3 Post-Test	4.41	109	8.14	3,850	1.43
DC-4 Post-Test	2.89	7.41	1.33	4,055	< 1.00
DC-6 Post-Test	3.97	37,900	11.3	32.5	2.81
Cleaned glassware, agitator, and heating rods with deionized water					
DC-7 Post-Test	NA ^a	93.9	3.69	3,260	< 1.00
DC-8 Post-Test	NA ^a	81.2	2.51	3,380	< 1.00

^aNA = Not Analyzed.

^bTitanium concentration was reported below detection limit of 1 mg/L in every sample except DC-2 Post-Test (1.46 mg/L).

An increase in the soluble iron and chromium concentrations were also observed during testing. This trend suggests corrosion of the stainless-steel agitator employed during testing. The low titanium concentrations and absence of aluminum in excess of what is expected from glass dissolution (discussed above) suggests that corrosion of the INCOLOY 800 heating rods is minimal. Note that the increase of Al after HGR DC-6 is due to the addition of aluminum as aluminum nitrate and sodium aluminate, not corrosion of the heating rods. Comparison of the concentrations of dissolved iron in DC-1 Post-Test and DC-7 Post-Test samples suggest that approximately 80% less iron was dissolved during HGR DC-7 than during HGR DC-1. This closely matches the 90% decrease in HGR observed between HGR DC-1 and HGR DC-7 (2.2×10^{-4} vs. 1.8×10^{-5} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹), suggesting that corrosion of the stainless-steel agitator shaft may play a significant role in HGR measured during NaOH-only testing. The reduction of HGR from 1.8×10^{-5} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹ to 8.9×10^{-6} ft³ hr⁻¹ gal⁻¹ in HGR DC-8 (performed without steel agitator) suggests that a less-dominant hydrogen production mechanism exists that is eclipsed by the larger HGR observed during HGR DC-1.

Results from titration and IC analyses for total base, nitrite, and nitrate concentrations following selected tests are given in Figure A-2, Figure A-3, and Figure A-4 respectively. Additionally, predicted concentrations based on dilution and sampling effects are given for each species and test.




Figure A-2. Predicted and Measured Concentrations of Total Base for Tests.




Figure A-3. Predicted and Measured Concentrations of Nitrite for Selected Tests.




Figure A-4. Predicted and Measured Concentrations of Nitrate for Selected Tests4, & DC-6.

The similarity between predicted and measured concentrations of total base, nitrite, and nitrate shown in Figure A-2 through Figure A-4 suggest that changes in anion concentrations throughout this testing are negligible, implying slow or non-existent consumption.


In conclusion, eight follow-on experiments were conducted to evaluate the formation of hydrogen in testing with SY1-SIM-91B-NG simulant. The following conclusions have been drawn from this follow-on testing.

- The increase of silicon observed in solution after the HGR DC-1 test suggests that corrosion of glassware occurs in the presence of sodium hydroxide. The large variation in observed HGR and small variation in glass corrosion suggests that glass corrosion is not the dominant source of hydrogen production in this testing.
- The relative absence of titanium and aluminum in excess of that expected from glass dissolution suggests that the corrosion of the INCOLOY 800 heating rods is negligible throughout this testing.
- The presence of iron and chromium in post-test solutions suggests that measurable corrosion of the stainless-steel agitator does occur in the presence of NaOH. The HGR and iron dissolution measurements in this subset of experiments suggest that appreciable hydrogen generation due to corrosion occurred in the absence of corrosion inhibitors.
- Total organic carbon measurements confirmed the presence of organic impurities in each of the stock chemicals used to prepare the SY1-SIM-91B-NG simulant. The greatest source of TOC impurity is sodium aluminate (due to a combination of relatively high contamination of stock material and target simulant concentration). The lowest source of TOC impurity is the DI water employed in simulant preparation.
- Results from DC-6 suggest that the addition of sodium aluminate in SY1-SIM-91B-NG testing is a dominating source of hydrogen production. The decrease in HGR observed despite addition of aluminum when transitioning between DC-4 and DC-5 suggests that the increase in HGR observed in DC-6 is due to an impurity rather than the additional aluminum present.

Appendix A References

1. D.P. Lambert, A.M. Howe “Run Plan for Thermolysis with Ashby Simulant to Determine Components Producing Hydrogen,” Savannah River National Laboratory, SRNL-L3300-2017-00038
2. Susic, Armstrong LG (1990) High-performance liquid chromatographic determination of humic acid in sodium aluminate solution. *Journal of Chromatography*. 502: 443-446.
3. Properties of PYREX[®], PYREXPLUS[®] and LOW Actinic PYREX Code 7740 Glasses. (n.d.). Retrieved October 23, 2017, from <http://www.quartz.com/pxprop.pdf>
4. M.B. Volf, “Technical Glasses”, 1961, London and Prague
5. 316 and 316L Stainless Steel Sheet, Coil & Bar - AMS 5524, 5507, UNS S31600, S31603. (n.d.). Retrieved October 23, 2017, from <https://www.upmet.com/products/stainless-steel/316316l>
6. INCOLOY[®] 800H / 800HT[®]. (n.d.). Retrieved October 23, 2017, from http://megamex.com/incoloy_800H_800HT.html

Appendix B. Analysis of Solids Produced in Simulant Tests



Ashby 5B0001


2017/09/08

H

D7.4 x500


200 um

Figure B-1. SEM of Solids from HGR-ASH-5 and 5B



Element	AN	series	Net	[wt.%]	[norm. wt.%]	[norm. at.%]	Error in %
Oxygen	8	K-series	9734	59.2969	53.43397	58.94581	7.156705
Sodium	11	K-series	10675	39.60166	35.68608	27.39702	2.471061
Carbon	6	K-series	429	8.933468	8.050179	11.82948	1.780481
Aluminium	13	K-series	668	2.131103	1.920392	1.25621	0.123493
Silicon	14	K-series	367	1.009161	0.909381	0.571482	0.066832
			Sum:	110.9723	100	100	

Figure B-2. XEDS of an Area of the HGR-ASH-5 and 5B Solids



Element	AN	series	Net	[wt.%]	[norm.wt.%]	[norm.at.%]	Error in %
Oxygen	8	K-series	4298	33.38238	52.77526	59.74133	4.381668
Sodium	11	K-series	4530	18.60453	29.41249	23.17103	1.174139
Nitrogen	7	K-series	389	5.295182	8.371322	10.82446	1.091798
Aluminium	13	K-series	1280	4.197684	6.636253	4.454556	0.219005
Silicon	14	K-series	591	1.774063	2.804672	1.808623	0.098539
			Sum:	63.25383	100	100	

Figure B-3. XEDS of an Area of the HGR-ASH-5 and 5B Solids





Figure B-4. XEDS Composite SEM Image for the HGR-ASH-5 and 5B Solids




HGR-HBP0001

2017/09/08


H D7.1 x600 100 um

Figure B-5. SEM of Solids from HBP Simulant Test Sampler




Element	AN	series	Net	[wt.%]	[norm. wt.%]	[norm. at.%]	Error in %
Oxygen	8	K-series	9543	82.20149	51.23381	56.17846	9.928127
Sodium	11	K-series	9991	41.11452	25.62549	19.55485	2.564505
Nitrogen	7	K-series	643	11.2846	7.033363	8.809355	2.043714
Carbon	6	K-series	416	10.06253	6.271685	9.160558	2.017788
Aluminium	13	K-series	3032	9.602981	5.98526	3.891644	0.468822
Silicon	14	K-series	2125	6.177719	3.850393	2.405137	0.281081
			Sum:	160.4438	100	100	

Figure B-6. XEDS of an Area of Solids from HBP Simulant Test Sampler



Element	AN	series	Net	[wt.%]	[norm. wt.%]	[norm. at.%]	Error in %
Oxygen	8	K-series	7324	45.30824	49.76673	60.69456	5.614638
Sodium	11	K-series	6681	23.67492	26.00461	22.07141	1.48732
Aluminium	13	K-series	4542	12.84351	14.10736	10.20219	0.61859
Silicon	14	K-series	3248	9.214558	10.1213	7.031835	0.406966
			Sum:	91.04122	100	100	

Figure B-7. XEDS of an Area of Solids from HBP Simulant Test Sampler



Element	AN	series	Net	[wt.%]	[norm. wt.%]	[norm. at.%]	Error in %
Oxygen	8	K-series	9540	68.84123	52.6494	60.45716	8.318766
Sodium	11	K-series	8500	31.86017	24.36649	19.47226	1.992896
Aluminium	13	K-series	4286	12.20809	9.336684	6.357465	0.589223
Nitrogen	7	K-series	688	9.516842	7.27843	9.546846	1.702223
Silicon	14	K-series	3069	8.327721	6.368996	4.166265	0.370204
			Sum:	130.7541	100	100	

Figure B-8. XEDS of an Area of Solids from HBP Simulant Test Sampler





Figure B-9. SEM and XEDS of Gray Solids from HGR Simulant Test




Figure B-10. XRD of Gray Solids from HGR Simulant Test





Figure B-11. SEM and XEDS of White Solids from the Kettle of HGR Simulant Test




Figure B-12. Additional XEDS for Figure B-11P




Figure B-13. XRD of White Solids from the Kettle of HGR Simulant Test





Figure B-14. SEM and XEDS of Solids on the Mixer from HGR Simulant Test





Figure B-15. SEM and XEDS of Solids on the Mixer from HGR Simulant Test




Figure B-16. XRD of Solids on the Mixer from HGR Simulant Test




Figure B-17. SEM and XEDS of Solids on the Heating Rods from HGR Simulant Test




Figure B-18. SEM and XEDS of Solids on the Heating Rods from HGR Simulant Test





Figure B-19. SEM and XEDS of Solids on the Heating Rods from HGR Simulant Test




Figure B-20. XRD of Solids on the Heating Rods from HGR Simulant Test