

**This document was prepared in conjunction with work accomplished under Contract No. DE-AC09-96SR18500 with the U. S. Department of Energy.**

**DISCLAIMER**

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

**STRONTIUM AND ACTINIDE SEPARATIONS FROM HIGH  
LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE SOLUTIONS USING MONOSODIUM  
TITANATE 1. SIMULANT TESTING**

D. T. Hobbs,\* M. J. Barnes, R. L. Pulmano, K. M. Marshall, T. B. Edwards, M. G. Bronikowski and S. D. Fink, Savannah River National Laboratory, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC 29808

\* corresponding author: [david.hobbs@srs.gov](mailto:david.hobbs@srs.gov)

**ABSTRACT**

High-level nuclear waste produced from fuel reprocessing operations at the Savannah River Site (SRS) requires pretreatment to remove  $^{137}\text{Cs}$ ,  $^{90}\text{Sr}$  and alpha-emitting radionuclides (i.e., actinides) prior to disposal. Separation processes planned at SRS include caustic side solvent extraction, for  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  removal, and ion exchange/sorption of  $^{90}\text{Sr}$  and alpha-emitting radionuclides with an inorganic material, monosodium titanate (MST). The predominant alpha-emitting radionuclides in the highly alkaline waste solutions include plutonium isotopes  $^{238}\text{Pu}$ ,  $^{239}\text{Pu}$  and  $^{240}\text{Pu}$ . This paper provides a summary of data acquired to measure the performance of MST to remove strontium and actinides from simulated waste solutions. These tests evaluated the influence of ionic strength, temperature, solution composition and the oxidation state of plutonium.

**ACTRONYMS**

HLW	high level waste
I	ionic strength
ICP-MS	inductively coupled plasma mass spectroscopy
ITP	in-tank precipitation
MST	monosodium titanate
SRNL	Savannah River National Laboratory
SRS	Savannah River Site

## INTRODUCTION

Monosodium titanate (MST) was first prepared by Lynch, *et al.* using a sol-gel synthetic method[1] The reported synthesis consisted of mixing a methanol solution of NaOH with an isopropanol solution of titanium tetraisopropoxide,  $Ti(OC_3H_7)_4$ , followed by the addition of water. The precipitated solids were isolated by filtration, washed with water and acetone and air dried. Chemical analysis suggested a formula of the amorphous solids as  $NaTi_2O_5H$ . Testing indicated that the solids exhibit high selectivity for many metallic ions in both acidic and alkaline waste solutions including those containing strontium and several actinides.[2,3]

The Savannah River Site contractor selected MST for strontium removal in conjunction with cesium removal by precipitation as the tetraphenylborate salt for the in-tank precipitation (ITP) process.[4] MST exhibited high strontium removal capacity at acceptable removal rates along with the added benefit of plutonium removal. SRNL developed a modified synthesis of MST that produced a material tailored for the ITP deployment in a HLW tank (1.3 million gallon) equipped for the batch process.

Testing at SRNL during the 1980s and 1990s indicated that the MST successfully removed sufficient  $^{90}Sr$  and alpha-emitting radionuclides to meet the requirements for disposing of the decontaminated waste solution in a low-level cement-based wasteform.[5] Testing also indicated that the small quantity of MST required for  $^{90}Sr$  and actinide removal did not adversely impact high-level waste glass chemistry and physical properties. Actinide removal characteristics of the MST became an increasingly

important issue in the early 1990s as waste characterization data revealed an increasing need to remove alpha-emitting radionuclides from HLW supernates. Also of concern was the accumulation of fissile radionuclides onto the MST from a nuclear criticality safety basis.[6] Accumulation of fissile isotopes onto the MST was found to below levels that would pose a nuclear criticality safety concern.[7] Thus, the use of MST proved acceptable for the ITP process.

The ITP facility operated for a brief time before shutting down permanently in 1998 due to operational and safety concerns. SRS conducted an extensive evaluation process for alternate pretreatment processes to separate radioactive components from the high level nuclear waste solutions.[8] The engineering evaluation and down selection of the preferred treatment process included considerable research and development testing.[9] This paper provides a summary of research data that was acquired on the performance of MST using simulated waste solutions for the engineering evaluation and down selection process. A separate paper will provide a summary of testing results on the performance of MST using actual tank waste supernatant liquids.

## **EXPERIMENTAL**

### *Preparation of Simulated High Level Nuclear Waste Solutions*

Personnel prepared all solutions using reagent grade chemicals and deionized distilled water. Table 1 provides a summary of the compositions for the simulated waste solutions used to evaluate the affects of ionic strength and temperature. After dissolving each of the salts, we added MST (Optima Chemical Company, Inc.) to the solution and mixed for

a minimum of 48 hours to remove any strontium added as impurities from the reagent grade chemicals. The MST treatment was not applied to the simulated waste solution used to evaluate the influence of solution composition (see Table 3).

After removing the MST solids, personnel added the targeted amount of  $^{85}\text{Sr}$  radiotracer (Perkin Elmer Life Sciences Cat. #NEZ082) and the actinides. Actinide sources included uranyl nitrate hexahydrate (Mallinckrodt Lot # 8640KDAL) and nitric acid solutions of plutonium(IV) (19.328 g/L) and neptunium(V) (67.1 g/L) supplied by the Actinide Technology Section of SRNL, which derive from plutonium and neptunium production operations at the Savannah River Site. After addition of the  $^{85}\text{Sr}$  and actinides, we allowed the solutions to mix 1 – 3 weeks at ambient room temperature. After this equilibration time, we filtered the solutions through a 0.45-micron pore size nylon membrane filter to remove any residual solids.

#### *Preparation of Pu(VI)*

Plutonium oxidation state testing required the preparation of solutions containing single actinide components of Pu(IV) and Pu(VI). For tests with Pu(IV), we used the nitric acid stock solution of Pu(IV) as described above. For tests with Pu(VI) we oxidized Pu(IV) to Pu(VI) by treating 4.021 mL of a 0.965 mg/mL acidic solution of Pu (IV) with a stoichiometric amount (15.9 mL) of 0.001 M  $\text{KMNO}_4$  (in 1 M  $\text{HNO}_3$  acid).[10] The color of the solution provided an indicator of complete oxidation. The initial solution was colorless. Upon first addition of the purple-colored  $\text{KMNO}_4$ , the plutonium solution

turned purple but soon thereafter turned colorless again. After addition of all required  $\text{KMnO}_4$ , the solution remained colored indicating complete oxidation.

#### *Batch Ion Exchange/Adsorption Tests*

Researchers added between 115 and 200 mL of the appropriate simulated waste solution into labeled polyethylene (PE) bottles and then randomly placed the bottles in a LabLine shaking waterbath (Cole-Parmer Catalog #E-01290-20) set to maintain a temperature of 25 °C, 45 °C or 65 °C. After incubating the solutions in the waterbath for one day, testing began with an initial sampling of each bottle followed by the addition of the appropriate quantity of MST to provide the desired MST concentration (typically 0.2 or 0.4 g/L). We operated the shaker at a speed of 175 rpm. Periodically we sampled each test bottle and analyzed the liquid phase for strontium and actinide content.

The sampling method consisted of removing the test bottle from the waterbath, briskly shaking manually for about 30 seconds to provide a homogeneous suspension, and pulling approximately 5-6 mL of the suspension into a disposable plastic syringe. The researcher then inserted a 0.45  $\mu\text{m}$  disk filter (nylon membrane) onto the syringe, collected about 5 mL of filtrate into a clean PE sample bottle and pipetted 4 mL of the resulting filtrate into a glass vial containing 4 mL of 5M nitric acid. A white precipitate formed and gases evolved immediately upon mixing of the sample and the nitric acid. Personnel then capped the glass sample vial, gently agitated it and then allowed it to stand at ambient laboratory temperature for a minimum of 2 hours. After several minutes the white precipitate dissolved in the nitric acid solution producing a clear colorless solution.

Personnel recapped the test bottle and returned it to the waterbath. The total time outside of the waterbath for sampling did not exceed three minutes.

The Analytical Development Section of SRNL performed all radio-strontium and actinide analyses. The  $^{85}\text{Sr}$  activity measurement occurred by gamma pulse height spectroscopy. Personnel determined concentrations of  $^{237}\text{Np}$ ,  $^{238}\text{U}$ ,  $^{239}\text{Pu}$  and  $^{240}\text{Pu}$  by Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectroscopy (ICP-MS) analysis. The  $^{239/240}\text{Pu}$  and  $^{238}\text{Pu}$  activity determination relied on alpha spectroscopy after chemically separating the plutonium from neptunium.

## RESULTS

### *Influence of Ionic Strength and Temperature*

Initially we conducted tests at two different ionic strengths (Solution #1 –  $I = 8.2\text{ M}$ , Solution #2 –  $I = 4.9\text{ M}$ ) to assess the influence of ionic strength on the performance of the MST to remove strontium, plutonium, neptunium and uranium. Figure 1 provides plots of the batch distribution constants ( $K_d$ ) for each of the four sorbates at the different ionic strengths upon contact of the simulated waste solutions with 0.2 g/L of MST for 168 hours at three different temperatures, 25 °C, 45 °C and 65 °C. The batch distribution constants ( $K_d$ ) were calculated from the experimental data using equation 1,

$$K_d (\text{mL/g}) = V/m * ([S]_o/[S]_f - 1) \quad (1)$$

where,  $V$  is the volume of treated salt solution (mL),  $m$  is the mass of MST (g),  $[S]_o$  is the initial sorbate concentration and  $[S]_f$  is the final sorbate concentration.

Figures 2 and 3 provide plots of strontium and plutonium concentrations, respectively, versus time upon addition of 0.2 g/L MST with the three different ionic strength solutions,  $I = 4.9M$ ,  $6.1M$  and  $9.2M$ , maintained at  $25\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ . Strontium and plutonium concentrations decreased rapidly with time in all three ionic strength solutions. The general shape of the curves is consistent with typical sorption reactions involving a solid sorbent and liquid sorbate. Sorption proceeds rapidly when the sorbate concentration and the fraction of available sites on the sorbents are high. Sorption decreases as the sorbate concentrations decrease and the concentration of sorbate on the sorbent increases.

#### *Influence of Solution Composition*

Solution composition testing featured a statistically designed test matrix based on mixture experimental design problems [11] and consisted of 11 experimental trials, as listed in Table 3. The first six trials examined whether a linear relationship exists between MST adsorption ability and the concentrations of  $\text{NaNO}_3$ ,  $\text{NaOH}$ ,  $\text{NaNO}_2$ ,  $\text{NaAl}(\text{OH})_4$ ,  $\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3$ , and  $\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4$ . Trials 7 and 8 of the experimental series served as replicates of the centroid composition. Initial sorbate concentrations in each were in close agreement (See Table 2). Trial #9 is the center point composition with added trace salts. Trace salts included sodium oxalate (0.008 M), sodium phosphate (0.010 M), sodium fluoride (0.032 M), sodium chloride (0.025 M), sodium silicate (0.0040 M), sodium molybdate (0.0020 M), potassium nitrate (0.015 M) and cesium nitrate (0.00014 M). Trial #10 features the

same centroid composition as Trials #7 and #8, but without the addition of MST. Trial #11 serves as a comparison to previous testing (see reference 12).

Trial 10 served as a control with no added MST. The final trial provides the same composition as that provided in Table 1 for Solution #3. This trial served as a means to correct for removal of sorbates by sorption onto the bottle walls or filter membranes and precipitation. The results indicated no significant removal of sorbates in the control sample throughout the duration of the experiments. For this reason, the testing results did not require correction for sorption by mechanisms other than that with MST.

Additional input to the development of these trials included two constraints. First, we required that the ionic strength would remain constant for each trial solution at 6.13 M (i.e., ionic strength for 5.6 M  $\text{Na}^+$  simulated waste solution of composition provided in Table 1 – Solution #3). The second constraint required that the concentration of  $\text{NaNO}_3$  in the salt solutions equaled at least three times that of the  $\text{NaAl(OH)}_4$  concentration. This requirement originates from the simulant preparation method. The solution preparation generates  $\text{NaAl(OH)}_4$  from the reaction of  $\text{Al(NO}_3)_3$  and four equivalents of  $\text{NaOH}$  releasing three equivalents of nitrate per equivalent of aluminum.

Researchers targeted strontium, plutonium, neptunium and uranium concentrations in the simulated waste solutions at 100, 200, 400 and 10,000  $\mu\text{g/L}$ , respectively. The actual concentrations differed from the targets and across the different solution compositions (see Table 3). The strontium values exceeded the targeted because personnel did not

remove tramp strontium from the reagent chemicals prior to solution preparation.

Neptunium concentrations measured lower due to the addition of a smaller aliquot of the stock neptunium solution. Plutonium and uranium concentrations varied considerably among the different solution compositions. We conclude that analytical errors are not responsible for the variance since the relative standard deviation of triplicate samples measured with the solution used in trials 7, 8 and 10 (see Table 3) all measured below 3%. We attributed the wider range of plutonium and uranium values to the variance in solubility as a function of the solution composition.

#### *Influence of Plutonium Oxidation State*

These tests examined whether the oxidation state of either plutonium significantly affected the extent and rate of removal using MST as the removal agent. The tests targeted Pu(IV) and Pu(VI) for comparison. We prepared individual salt solutions (see Table 1 – Solution #3) with each component and measured removal upon contact with 0.4 g/L of MST in triplicate. Results reported below represent the average of the three tests.

Figure 4 compares the average plutonium concentration as a function of time for the salt solutions containly only Pu(IV) or Pu(VI) as well as that previously reported with a salt solution containing four sorbates, Pu(IV), Np(V), U(VI) as uranyl and strontium.[12]

The initial plutonium concentration in the Pu(VI) tests measured 712  $\mu\text{g/L}$ .

Correspondingly, the starting plutonium concentration in the Pu(IV) tests measured 37

µg/L, nearly twenty times less than that of Pu(VI). In tests with multiple sorbates the initial soluble Pu concentration measured 190 µg/L.

Soluble plutonium concentrations for the Pu(IV), Pu(VI) and the previous Pu(IV) tests measured 2.68, 25.3, and 5.19 µg/L, respectively, after 168 hours of contact with the MST. Inspection of Figure 4 indicates that only the test which initiated with Pu(IV) at 37 µg/L appeared to reach equilibrium. We base this finding on the very similar concentrations for the last three sampling times of 24, 48 and 168 hours. The other tests may be at equilibrium after 168 hours, but the limited data between 96 hours and 168 hours does not allow confirmation that equilibrium had occurred within 168 hours.

## **DISCUSSION**

Savannah River Site high level waste supernatant liquids and dissolved saltcake are strongly alkaline concentrated salt solutions. Sodium serves as the chief cation. The predominant anionic components include hydroxide, nitrate, nitrite, aluminate, carbonate and sulfate. Strontium and actinide concentrations in high level waste supernates range from about 1 µg/L to 25 mg/L. In general, the solubility of actinides in aqueous solutions increase with an increase in the oxidation state of the actinide (e.g., Pu(VI) > Pu(V) > Pu(IV) > Pu(III)). The solubility of strontium typically ranges between that of Pu(IV) and Pu(VI) in the strongly alkaline concentrated salt solutions.

Previous testing has shown that MST can remove strontium, plutonium, neptunium and uranium from strongly alkaline salt solution.[6,12] Table 2 provides typical

decontamination factors, % sorbate removed and quantity of sorbate loaded onto the MST for a simulated waste solution having a salt composition as that reported for Solution #3 in Table 1 and with initial strontium and actinide concentrations as provided in Table 2. Decontamination factors follow the order; Sr > Pu > Np > U. Sorbate loadings follow the order; U > Sr > Pu > Np. The much higher loading for uranium results from the much higher mass concentration of uranium (4 – 40 times higher) compared to the other sorbates.

The theoretical ion exchange capacity of MST is 5000 micro-equivalents per gram ( $\mu\text{eq/g}$ ) assuming an empirical formula of  $\text{NaTi}_2\text{O}_5\text{H}$ . Given the loading values in Table 2 and assuming strontium loads as  $\text{Sr}^{2+}$ , plutonium as  $\text{Pu}^{4+}$ , neptunium as  $\text{NpO}_2^+$  and U as  $\text{UO}_2^{2+}$ , the total loading of the four sorbates represents less than 3.6% of the theoretical capacity of the MST. Thus, at these conditions, the quantity of strontium and actinides exchanged with the MST appears well below the theoretical capacity of the material.

#### *Influence of Ionic Strength and Temperature*

Radiochemical separations from high level waste solutions must be capable of operating at high ionic strengths to minimize the amount of dilution water added to the waste.

Current plans are to treat waste diluted to a sodium concentration of 5.6M. To evaluate the influence of ionic strength on MST performance, we tested at sodium concentrations of 4.5M and 7.5M, which corresponds to ionic strengths of 4.9 and 8.2M, respectively (see Table 1).

From Fig. 1, the  $K_d$  for each sorbate decreases upon an increase in ionic strength. This is the expected trend. At the higher ionic strength, the concentration of sodium ion is much higher making the exchange or sorption of the sorbate for sodium in the MST more difficult. This results in the lower value for the batch distribution constant. Plans are to operation waste pretreatment processes at or near 25 °C. At this temperature the  $K_d$  values decrease for strontium, plutonium, neptunium and uranium by factors of 6.2, 32, 3.0 and 6.4, respectively upon an increase in the ionic strength from 4.9M to 8.2M.

At the lower ionic strength, we observed a decrease in the  $K_d$  for strontium upon an increase in the temperature. This result is consistent with the ion exchange/adsorption of strontium onto the MST being an exothermic reaction. For the actinides, the general trend is an increase in the  $K_d$  with temperature, which suggests that the exchange or sorption of the actinides onto the MST is an endothermic reaction. We observed a sharp decline in the plutonium  $K_d$  at 65 °C in the low ionic strength solution. This trend appears inconsistent with that of plutonium at the higher ionic strength and the other actinides at either ionic strength. For neptunium and uranium, we observed either no change (within experimental error) or increases in the  $K_d$  value with increasing temperature. Thus, we believe the low  $K_d$  value for plutonium at 65 °C is the result of experimental error.

We also conducted tests with a simulated waste solution having a sodium concentration of 5.6 M, which corresponds to an ionic strength of 6.1 M. This the target sodium concentration planned for waste pretreatment processing at the Savannah River Site.

Figures 2 and 3 provide plots of the strontium and neptunium concentrations, respectively versus time for the tests with the ionic strength simulants at 25 °C. Plots of plutonium and uranium concentrations versus time (not shown) are similar to those shown from strontium and neptunium. In all cases, the sorbate concentration drops rapidly and then tapers off as the system approaches steady-state or equilibrium conditions. Note that the initial sorbate concentrations were different for each of the three ionic strength solutions. Thus, quantitative comparison of removal kinetics among the three ionic strengths is not possible. However, given the similar shapes of the curves obtained, we speculate that the rate of exchange/sorption of strontium with MST at these conditions is not strongly influenced by the ionic strength of the solutions.

#### *Influence of Solution Composition*

Previous studies have shown that the solubility of strontium and actinide elements in strongly alkaline salt solutions can vary over a wide range.[13-15] In general, the solubility of the strontium and actinide elements follows the order,  $\text{Pu} < \text{Sr} < \text{U} < \text{Np}$ . Independently, Delegard[14] and Hobbs[16] developed empirical prediction models for plutonium and uranium in alkaline salt solutions as a function of the anionic component concentrations. In general, the chemical potential for sorption of a species is proportional to the solution concentration. Thus, increased sorption would occur with increased sorbate concentration.

The composition of the waste solution may also influence the strontium and actinide species in solution, which could result in either increased or decreased sorption.

Furthermore, the solution composition may also influence the surface site characteristics of the MST, which could result in decreased or increased sorption. Given these possible influences, we conducted tests to determine if the solution composition influenced sorbate removal characteristics of the MST. In addition to the six major anionic components, we also included a test in which small quantities of the following trace solution components, sodium oxalate (0.008 M), sodium phosphate (0.010 M), sodium fluoride (0.032 M), sodium chloride (0.025 M), sodium silicate (0.0040 M), sodium molybdate (0.0020 M), potassium nitrate (0.015 M) and cesium nitrate (0.00014 M).

Table 4 presents the DFs calculated from samples collected after 24-hours and 168-hours of contact with the MST. The DF values for the replicate trials (#7 and #8) showed good agreement except for the 24-hour strontium result. The difference in the strontium sample analyses results at 24 hours may reflect error associated with the handling of the sample prior to or during analysis. Reanalysis of the 24-hour samples using the residues from the gamma and alpha counting aliquots confirmed the relatively high strontium concentration in Trial 8, which results in a low strontium DF value. Since good agreement resulted for the 7-day strontium values and all of the actinide values in both trials, we conclude that the 24-h result for Trial #8 cannot be discarded. Consequently, the statistical analysis includes the 24-hour result for Trial #8.

Analysis of the data provided models for the decontamination factor of each sorbate at 24 and 168 hours as a linear function of the six major anion concentrations. The predicted

DF increased with increased nitrate concentrations for each sorbate. In general, the concentrations of the other anions exhibited a smaller affect or a decrease in the DF compared to the nitrate concentration. The influence of the minor salt components (e.g., oxalate, phosphate, fluoride, chloride, silicate, molybdate, potassium and cesium) proved statistically insignificant.

We attribute the increased DF with increased nitrate concentration to the nature of the sorbate species. In general, nitrate forms much weaker complexes with metal ions than other components such as hydroxide and carbonate.[17] For example, strontium and actinides are known to form hydroxide complexes that result in increased solubility with increased free hydroxide concentrations. Thus, as the salt solution composition changes from that which is low in nitrate and high in hydroxide to one that is high in nitrate and low in hydroxide, the degree of hydroxide complexation may be reduced. The reduced hydroxide-complexed strontium and actinides would favor ion exchange/sorption with the MST resulting in greater removal and a higher DF.

Note that even though the solution composition can have a measurable influence on the measured DF for a sorbate, the influence is relatively small in consideration of removal efficiencies required for the pretreatment of high level waste solutions at SRS. Based on the measured DFs for strontium and the actinides in this study (see Table 4), the treated waste solution would meet the current waste acceptance limits for waste disposal except for wastes containing bounding concentrations of plutonium and neptunium upon contact of the waste with 0.4 g/L MST.[18] For wastes with these high plutonium and neptunium

concentrations, the waste would require treatment with increased quantities of MST to affect the necessary removal for the decontaminated waste to meet the waste disposal criteria for total alpha and  $^{237}\text{Np}$  activities.

#### *Influence of Plutonium Oxidation State*

Plutonium exhibits multiple stable oxidation states in aqueous solutions. For example, alkaline solutions containing Pu(IV), Pu(V) and Pu(VI) can be prepared and are stable for long periods of time.[19] In general the solubility of plutonium and neptunium increase as the oxidation state increases. The predominant oxidation state for plutonium in fresh HLW solutions is Pu(IV). However, conditions that occur during the evaporation, storage and retrieval of HLW solutions may result in the oxidation or reduction of the plutonium. For example, Delegard[14] and Karraker[20] reported evidence of Pu(V) and Pu(VI) oxidation states forming from Pu(IV) in simulated high level waste solutions at very high hydroxide concentrations. Thus, the oxidation state of the dissolved plutonium may not be limited to a single oxidation state such as Pu(IV).

The low concentrations of plutonium in alkaline salt solutions typical of high level nuclear wastes prevent the direct determination of plutonium species in solution by spectroscopic techniques at this time. Solubility data suggests that at the high hydroxide concentrations ( $> 1$  molar) in tank waste solutions, soluble plutonium is probably present as anionic hydroxide complexes. For example, Pu(IV) may be present as the dianionic complex,  $\text{Pu}(\text{OH})_6^{2-}$ , Pu(V) as the trianionic,  $[\text{PuO}_2(\text{OH})_4]^{3-}$ , and Pu(VI) as the dianionic complex,  $\text{PuO}_2(\text{OH})_4^{2-}$ . [21,22] Given the possibility of plutonium in multiple oxidation

states and differences in the reactivity of the different plutonium species, the oxidation state of the plutonium may have a pronounced influence on the sorption or ion exchange performance exhibited by the MST. Given these factors we carried out a series of tests to determine if two different oxidation states of plutonium, Pu(IV) and Pu(VI), exhibited a significant influence on removal by the MST.

Figure 4 provides a plot of the solution phase plutonium concentrations versus time upon contact of the simulated waste solution with 0.4 g/L MST. Inspection of Figure 4 indicates similar relative changes in the plutonium concentration with time for each test suggesting similar removal kinetics for both Pu(IV) and Pu(VI). Table 5 contains decontamination factors (DFs) and distribution constants ( $K_d$ ) from the average plutonium concentration data. The listed DFs and  $K_d$ s derive from samples collected after 1 and 7 days of contact. DF and  $K_d$  data for the three data sets [Pu(IV), Pu(VI) and previous Pu(IV)] are within a factor of approximately two of each other. Given the similar results for the Pu(IV) and Pu(VI)-spiked solutions, we conclude that MST exhibits similar affinity for both plutonium oxidation states.

Removal rates for sorption or ion-exchange of sorbates and porous sorbents depend on three consecutive mass transport steps; (1) bulk transport of the sorbate in the solution phase, (2) transport of the sorbate through a hydrodynamic boundary layer or film and (3) transport of the sorbate within the pore volume of the sorbent to the active sorption or ion exchange site.[23] The latter step also includes the steps involved in sorption or exchange at the sorbent site (e.g., dehydration, exchange, etc.). Generally, the latter two

steps are the major factors controlling rates of removal. Since these steps act in series, the slower of the two steps will be rate limiting. In the solutions with multiple sorbates, the removal kinetics may be further complicated by competition for sites among the sorbates (strontium, plutonium, neptunium and uranium). Each sorbate could have a different rate limiting step or influence the transport of other sorbates during any of the above steps.

During the early stages of contact between the MST and alkaline solutions containing the sorbates removal kinetics may exhibit a first or second order dependence on the sorbate concentration. Inspection of Figure 4 plotting plutonium concentrations versus time indicates that overall, the removal kinetics do not fit first or second order expressions in plutonium concentration. However, between 1 and 4 hours, plutonium removal fits first order kinetics with respect to the concentration of plutonium.

We calculated removal rate constants from the linear fit of the average concentrations for the time interval of 1 to 4 hours. The rate constants are reported in Table 5. Reaction rate constants are known to vary with oxidation state[24] and, thus, determination of the rate constants for the Pu(IV) and Pu(VI) spiked solutions may provide additional information concerning the stability and reactivity of Pu(IV) and Pu(VI) in alkaline solutions. The rate constants for the tests using the Pu(IV) spiked solutions ranged from 1.29 to 1.42 times greater than that for the solution spiked with Pu(VI). This suggests a slight increase in the removal rate for Pu(IV) compared to Pu(VI). However, given the experimental variance in rate constants calculated for each individual test, the ranges in

rate constants, as defined by the measured value plus or minus two times the standard deviation ( $\text{value} \pm 2\sigma$ ), overlap for all three test cases. Thus, with this limited data set, we cannot conclusively establish that Pu(IV) removal is faster than Pu(VI) between 1 and 4 hours of contact with MST.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank the Department of Energy, Office of Environmental Management for funding the research through contract with the Westinghouse Savannah River Company. We thank M. Blume and L. Thacker for performing the laboratory tests and the Analytical Development Section of SRNL especially D. P. DiPrete, C. C. DiPrete, and W. T. Boyce for the radiochemical and mass spectrometry measurements.

## REFERENCES

1. Lynch, R.; Dosch, R.; Kenna, B.; Johnstone, J; Nowak, E. The Sandia Solidification Process – a Broad Range Aqueous Solidification Method. IAEA Symposium on the Management of Radioactive Waste, Vienna, Austria, 1976, 360-372.
2. Lynch, R. W. (Ed.). Sandia Solidification Process Cumulative Report. Technical Report SAND-76-0105, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, January 1976.
3. Dosch, R. G. The Use of Titanates in Decontamination of Defense Wastes. Technical Report SAND-78-0710, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, June 1978.
4. Martin, H. D.; Schmitz, M. A.; Ebra, M. A.; Walker, D. D.; Kilpatrick, L. L.; Lee, L.-M. In-Tank Precipitation Process for the Decontamination of Water Soluble Radioactive Waste. Proceedings of the Waste Management Symposium, Tucson, AZ, March 1984.
5. d'Entremont, P. D.; Walker, D. D. Tank Farm Processing of High Level Waste for the Defense Waste Processing Facility. Proceedings of the Waste Management Symposium, Tucson, AZ, March 1987.

6. Hobbs, D. T.; Fleischman, S. D. Fissile Solubility and Monosodium Titanate Loading Tests. Technical Report WSRC-RP-92-1273, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC, February 12, 1993.
7. Bess, C. E. Nuclear Criticality Safety Bounding Analysis for the In-Tank Precipitation (ITP) Process, Impact by Fissile Isotopic Weight Fraction (U). Technical Report WSRC-TR-94-0004, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC, April 22, 1994.
8. Savannah River Site High Level Waste Salt Disposition Systems Engineering Team, Final Report: Recommendation Pre-conceptual Design. Technical Report WSRC-RP-98-00170, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC, October 29, 1998.
9. Harmon, H.; Murphy, J.; Smalley, R. Savannah River Site Salt Processing Project Down Selection Decision Analysis Summary Report. Technical Report, TFA-0106, Rev. 0, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, June 2001.
10. Cleveland, J. M. *The Chemistry of Plutonium*, Gordon & Breach, 579, pp. 49-52 (1970), (Am. Nucl. Soc. Reprint 1979).
11. Cornell, J. A. *Experiments with Mixtures*, Second Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1990.
12. Hobbs, D. T. , Blume, M. S. and Thacker, H. L. Phase V Simulant Testing of Monosodium Titanate Adsorption Kinetics. Technical Report WSRC-TR-2000-00142; Westinghouse Savannah River Company; Aiken, SC, May 24, 2000.
13. Felmy, A. R.; Dixon, D. A.; Rustad, J. R.; Mason, M. J.; Onishi, L. M. The Hydrolysis and Carbonate Complexation of Strontium and Calcium in Aqueous Solution. Use of Molecular Modeling Calculations in the Development of Aqueous Thermodynamic Models. *J. Chem. Thermodynamics*, **1998**, 30(9), 1103 – 1120.
14. Delegard, C. H. Solubility of  $\text{PuO}_2 \cdot x\text{H}_2\text{O}$  in Alkaline Hanford High-Level Waste Solution. *Radiochim. Acta*, **1987**, 41, 11 – 21.
15. Hobbs, D. T.; Karraker, D. G. Recent Results on the Solubility of Uranium and Plutonium in Savannah River Site Waste Supernate. *Nuclear Technology*, **1996**, 114, 318 – 324.
16. Hobbs, D. T; Edwards, T. B.; Fleischman, S. D. Solubility of Plutonium and Uranium in Alkaline Slat Solution (U). Technical Report WSRC-TR-93-056, Westinghouse Savannah River Company; Aiken, SC, February 12, 1993.
17. Hogfeldt, E. *Stability Constants of Metal-Ion Complexes Part A: Inorganic Ligands*. IUPAC Chemical Data Series, No. 21, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1982.

18. Bases, Assumptions, and Results of the Flowsheet Calculations for the Decision Phase Salt Disposition Alternatives. Technical Report WSRC-RP-99-00006, Rev. 3, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC, May 2001.
19. Peretrukhin, V. F., Kryutchkov, S. V., Silin, V. I., Tananaev, I. G. Determination of the Solubility of Np(IV)-(VI), Pu(III)-(VI), Am(III)-(VI), Tc(IV),(V) Hydroxo Compounds in 0.4 – 14 M NaOH Solutions. Technical Report WHC-EP-0987 Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA, September 1996.
20. Karraker, D. G. Plutonium(VI) Solubility Studies in Savannah River Site High-Level Waste. Technical Report WSRC-TR-95-0244, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC, 1995.
21. Burney, G. S., Delegard, C. H. Chemical Species of Plutonium in Hanford Radioactive Tank Waste. Technical Report HNF-SA-3181-FP, B&W Hanford Company, Richland, WA, March 1997.
22. Shilov, V. P. Probable Forms of Actinides in Alkaline Solutions. *Radiochem.* **40**, 11 (1998).
23. Slejko, F. L. *Adsorption Technology: A Step-by-Step Approach to Process Evaluation and Application*, Tall Oaks Publishing, Inc., Voorhees, New Jersey, 1985, 18 – 22.
24. Cotton, F. A.; Wilkinson, G. *Advanced Inorganic Chemistry A Comprehensive Text*, Third Edition, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1972, 652 – 680.

**Table 1. Chemical Composition of Simulated Waste Solutions**

<u>Component</u>	<u>Concentration (M)</u>		
	<u>Solution #1</u>	<u>Solution #2</u>	<u>Solution #3</u>
NaOH	1.78	1.07	1.33
NaNO <sub>3</sub>	3.47	2.08	2.66
NaNO <sub>2</sub>	0.178	0.107	0.134
NaAl(OH) <sub>4</sub>	0.572	0.343	0.429
Na <sub>2</sub> CO <sub>3</sub>	0.0347	0.0208	0.0260
Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>	0.694	0.416	0.521
Total Na	7.5	4.5	5.6
Ionic Strength	8.2	4.9	6.1

**Table 2. Typical Strontium and Actinide Removal Results upon Contact of Simulated Waste Solutions with 0.4 g/L MST**

<u>Sorbate</u>	<u>Initial Conc.</u> <u>(<math>\mu</math>M)</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>% Removed</u>	<u>Loading on MST</u> <u>(<math>\mu</math>mole/g)</u>
Sr	10	100	99	25
Pu	1	15	93	2.3
Np	2	5	80	4.0
U	40	2.5	60	60

**Table 3. Chemical and Sorbate Concentrations in Simulants Used to Evaluate Influence of Solution Composition**

<b>Trial</b>	<b>Component Concentration</b>										
	<b>NaNO<sub>3</sub></b>	<b>NaOH</b>	<b>NaNO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>NaAl(OH)<sub>4</sub></b>	<b>Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub></b>	<b>Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub></b>	<b>Sr</b>	<b>Pu</b>	<b>Np</b>	<b>U</b>	
	<b>(M)</b>	<b>(M)</b>	<b>(M)</b>	<b>(M)</b>	<b>(M)</b>	<b>(M)</b>	<b>(<math>\mu\text{g/L}</math>)</b>	<b>(<math>\mu\text{g/L}</math>)</b>	<b>(<math>\mu\text{g/L}</math>)</b>	<b>(<math>\mu\text{g/L}</math>)</b>	
1	1.000	3.000	0.500	0.100	0.020	0.490	621	231	241	7,050	
2	1.000	3.000	0.100	0.100	0.200	0.443	656	102	244	8,080	
3	3.000	1.070	0.100	0.100	0.020	0.600	302	42.8	242	5,960	
4	3.000	1.630	0.500	0.100	0.200	0.100	541	140	249	7,120	
5	1.730	1.000	0.500	0.500	0.200	0.600	537	121	249	4,490	
6	2.170	3.000	0.100	0.500	0.020	0.100	828	119	190	5,490	
7	1.959	2.122	0.292	0.299	0.106	0.379	617	208	218	6,620	
8	1.959	2.122	0.292	0.299	0.106	0.379	649	203	220	6,980	
9	1.907	2.066	0.284	0.291	0.104	0.369	742	242	307	10,400	
10	1.959	2.122	0.292	0.299	0.106	0.379	628	203	225	6,950	
11	2.600	1.330	0.134	0.429	0.026	0.521	568	65.7	215	4,320	
							Trials 7, 8 & 10				
							Average	631	205	221	6,850
							Std Dev	16.3	2.89	3.61	200
							RSD	2.58%	1.41%	1.63%	2.92%

**Table 4. Decontamination Factors for Strontium, Plutonium, Uranium and Neptunium Measured upon Contact of 0.4 g/L MST with Solutions Having Varying Salt Compositions**

<u>Trial #</u>	Decontamination Factor (DF)							
	Sr		Pu		U		Np	
	<u>24-h</u>	<u>168-h</u>	<u>24-h</u>	<u>168-h</u>	<u>24-h</u>	<u>168-h</u>	<u>24-h</u>	<u>168-h</u>
1	123	155	4.13	9.10	1.36	1.62	1.53	2.02
2	10.8	112	3.40	8.42	1.27	1.58	1.59	2.72
3	78.5	246	16.5	43.3	1.56	2.30	2.50	9.82
4	174	190	7.91	20.9	1.43	2.08	1.90	3.55
5	102	140	10.6	24.2	1.48	2.35	2.21	4.28
6	50.5	137	4.14	8.06	1.26	1.74	1.94	3.56
7	100	126	5.70	13.8	1.15	1.66	1.24	2.17
8	18.8	141	4.64	13.9	1.15	1.74	1.41	2.64
9	90.7	127	3.85	9.31	1.16	1.56	1.00	1.43
10	1.09	1.16	1.01	0.99	0.85	1.01	0.79	0.94
11	137	181	12.4	37.6	1.42	2.27	2.25	8.27


Note: Trial #10 represents a control test with no added MST.

**Table 5. Decontamination Factors, Batch Distribution Constants and Sorption/Ion Exchange Rates for Plutonium Containing Solutions**


Species	Decontamination Factor (DF)		Batch Distribution Constant $K_d$ $\times 10^{-4}$ (mL/g)		Rate Constant ( $h^{-1}$ )
	1 day	7 days	1 day	7 days	
Pu(IV)	14.8 (11.5)	18.5 (9.5)	3.46 (2.89)	4.36 (2.36)	0.0227
Pu(VI)	9.2 (0.53)	28.2 (1.2)	2.05 (0.12)	6.78 (0.23)	0.0176
Pu(IV)*	12.9 (0.99)	36.6 (0.16)	2.98 (0.23)	8.90 (0.039)	0.0250

numbers in parenthesis are single standard deviation


\* from reference 12.




**Fig. 1. Sorbate batch distribution constant ( $K_d$ ) versus ionic strength and temperature; A = strontium, B = plutonium, C = neptunium and D = uranium.**




**Figure 2. Strontium Concentration ( $\mu\text{M}$ ) versus Time (h) at 25 °C and 0.2 g/L MST (Ionic strength of solutions: O = 4.9 M,  $\Delta$  = 6.1 M and  $\square$  = 8.2 M).**



**Figure 3. Neptunium Concentration ( $\mu\text{M}$ ) versus Time (h) at 25 °C and 0.2 g/L MST (Ionic strength of solutions:  $\circ$  = 4.9 M,  $\Delta$  = 6.1 M and  $\square$  = 8.2 M).**



**Figure 4. Plot of plutonium concentration versus time upon contact of 0.4 g/L MST with a solution prepared with Pu(IV) or Pu(VI). Data identified as Pu(IV) – previous is that reported in reference 12.**



**Figure 5. Plot of neptunium concentration versus time upon contact with a solution prepared with Np(V) or Np(IV). Data identified as Np(V) – previous is that reported in reference 12.**